

KOSMAS



N° 27.1

by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU)

KOSMAS ISSN 1056-005X

©2014 by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU)

Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal

(Formerly *Kosmas: Journal of Czechoslovak and Central European Studies*, Vols. 1-7, 1982-1988, and *Czechoslovak and Central European Journal*, Vols. 8-11, (1989-1993).

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).

Editor: Hugh L. Agnew (The George Washington University)

Associate Editor: Thomas A. Fudge (University of New England, Australia)

Subscription Editor: Peter Steiner (University of Pennsylvania)

Book Review Editor: Mary Hrabík Šámal (Oakland University)

The editors assume no responsibility for statements of fact or opinion made by contributors.

Manuscript submissions, books for review, and correspondence concerning editorial matters should be sent via email to the editor, Hugh L. Agnew. The email address is KosmasAgnew@gmail.com. In the event that postal correspondence proves necessary, the postal address of the editor is Hugh L. Agnew, Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University, 1957 E St., NW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20052 USA.

CONTENTS

From the Editor

By Hugh L. Agnew

v

ARTICLES

Masaryk and the Austrian Philosophical Tradition: Bolzano and Brentano

By Zdeněk V. David

1

Anthony Philip Heinrich (1781-1861): A Critical Twenty-First Century Re-assessment of the American Beethoven

By Louis A. Reith

17

From the Communist Era to the Present: Women Writers in Czech Literature Textbooks

By Ursula Stohler

27

Surrealism, Sexuality, and Jakub Deml

By Alexander Wöll

39

Czechs in the US Military

By Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr.

49

The Antichrist in the Slovak Writings of Hugolín Gavlovič (1712-87)

By Gerald J. Sabo, S.J.

79

Antichristus (Diplomatic Edition)

By Hugolín Gavlovič, edited by Gerald J. Sabo, S.J.

92

ESSAYS

Spring 1945: A Memoir

By Mary Hrabík Šámal

98

Překlady básní Ogdena Nashe do češtiny

By Věra Bořkovcová† and Jiří Weinberger

103

Translating Ogden Nash into Czech

By Věra Bořkovcová† and Jiří Weinberger

109

Poisonous Chicken

By Tracy Burns

115

Editing Kosmas, 2000-2012

By Clinton Machann

119

BOOK REVIEWS

Hajíček, Jiří. *Rustic Baroque (Selský baroko)*. Trans. Gale A. Kirking. Brno: Real World Press, 2012. ISBN: 978-80-905357-1-8, 200 pp.

By Tracy A. Burns

125

Fudge, Thomas A. *The Memory and Motivation of Jan Hus, Medieval Priest and Martyr*, Europa Sacra, 11. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2013. ISBN 978-2-503-54442-7. 291 pp.

By Zdeněk V. David

128

Baer, Josette. *Revolution, Modus Vivendi or Sovereignty? The Political Thought of the Slovak National Movement from 1861 to 1914*. Stuttgart: Ibidem Verlag, 2010, xvi, 252 pp.

By Susan Mikula

130

Donskis, Leonidas, ed. *Yet another Europe: Rethinking Milan Kundera and the idea of Central Europe*. New York: Rodopi, 2012. ISBN 978-90-420-3543-0. 215 pp.

By Mila Saskova-Pierce

134

Jerczyński, Dariusz. *Józef Koźdoń (1873-1949): przywódca Śląskiej Partii Ludowej, a kwestia narodowości śląskiej na Śląsku Cieszyńskim i Opawskim w XIX i XX stuleciu* (Josef Koźdoń (1873-1949): The Leader of the Silesian People's Party, and the Question of the Silesian Nationality in Teschen Silesia and Troppau Silesia during the 19th and 20th Centuries), Zabrze: Narodowa Oficyna Śląska, 2011, p. 290, ISBN 978-83-60540-08-4.

By Piotr J. Wróbel

136

CONTRIBUTORS

139

Advice to Prospective Authors

142

From the Editor

Hugh L. Agnew

Volume 27, No. 1 (Fall 2013) of *Kosmas* is finally ready to view the light of day, after many delays that have tried the patience of contributors and subscribers alike. I can only apologize, thank all concerned for their support, and promise to continue on the track of bringing the publication schedule of *Kosmas* back into harmony with the actual solar calendar. With that end in view, I am delighted to announce that the editorial team of the journal has been expanded by the welcome addition of Professor Thomas Fudge, University of New England (Australia) to the position of Associate Editor, and of Professor Peter Steiner, University of Pennsylvania, to the post of subscription editor. I am grateful to both these colleagues for their interest in the journal and their willingness to devote time and energy to the task of shepherding it through continued publication. With the supervision of Professor Fudge, plans are underway to mark the six hundredth anniversary of the death of Jan Hus with a special volume of *Kosmas* in 2015. With the many other anniversaries coming around the calendar in this and subsequent years, we expect to have contributions linking up with many significant moments in Czech, Slovak and Central European experience.

The present volume reflects the breadth and scope of that experience in many different facets. Zdeněk David continues his long-running exploration of aspects of the philosophical foundation of Masaryk's thought, this time by examining its relationship to major figures in the Austrian philosophical tradition, Bernard Bolzano and Franz Brentano. The career of the Bohemian-born pioneer of serious music in America, Anthony Philip Heinrich, is the subject of Louis Reith's fascinating article, suggesting the significance of this relatively unknown figure to the history of music in the New World and its ties to the old. Two other papers turn from music to literature: one contribution, from *Kosmas* newcomer Ursula Stohler, explores the position of women writers in textbooks of Czech literature from the communist era to the present (perhaps incomplete) "transition" era. Another article, again from a first-time contributor, Alexander Wöll, explores the themes of surrealism and sexuality in the prose poems of Jakub Deml. Aiming his genealogical energies to the question of Czech American military figures, Mila Rechciĝl provides copious evidence in his contribution to revise the assertion that Czechs contributed more musicians than generals to the US military.

Kosmas Book Review Editor Mary Hrabík Šámal shares her memories of a fateful spring at the end of World War II, when her family ended up hosting (willingly or unwillingly) German, Russian and American soldiers. In an engaging essay printed here in the original Czech (contrary to standing *Kosmas* policies, but with an indulgence justified by the fact that it deals, after all, with translating from English into Czech, not just in form, but in spirit and truth) the late Věra Bořkovcová and Jiří Weinberger discuss their approach to translating Ogden Nash into Czech. An English translation of the same essay follows. Slovak literary and cultural history appears in this volume in a fascinating exploration of the theme of the Antichrist in the work of the Slovak Franciscan, Hugolín Gavlovič, written by Gerald Sabo, S.J. Professor Sabo also provides a diplomatic edition of an original

verse treatment of the Antichrist theme by Gavlovič. Tracy Burns, another faithful contributor to the pages of *Kosmas*, shares another piece of her creative writing with thought-provoking subject matter, and the volume closes appropriately with a retrospective essay by Clinton Machann, looking back on his round dozen years as editor of *Kosmas*.

Book reviews of works of Czech fiction, history, Slovak political history, Central European politics and culture, and regional and ethnic politics in Silesia round out the volume. We are grateful to our reviewers, Tracy Burns, Zdeněk David, Susan Mikula, Mila Saskova-Pierce, and Piotr Wróbel for their contributions, which help bring these significant works to the attention of our readers. Suggestions for books to review, as well as offers to write reviews of received books, may be sent to Mary Hrabík Šámal, *Kosmas* Book Review Editor, at her email address, maruska48@gmail.com.

Masaryk and the Austrian Philosophical Tradition: Bolzano and Brentano¹

Zdeněk V. David

The important distinction between two traditions in the development of Central European philosophy, one primarily empirical, the other essentially metaphysical, has been drawn in the recent writings of Barry Smith and Rudolf Haller. Smith and Haller designate these philosophical orientations as Austrian and German respectively. "For some time now," according to Smith, "historians of philosophy have been gradually coming to terms with the idea that post-Kantian philosophy in the German-speaking world ought properly to be divided into two distinct strands which we might refer to as the *German* and the *Austrian* traditions. The main line of the first consists of a list of personages beginning with Kant, Fichte, Hegel and Schelling and ending with Martin Heidegger, Theodor Adorno, and Ernst Bloch. The line of the second begins with Bernard Bolzano, Ernst Mach, and Alexius Meinong, and ends with Ludwig Wittgenstein, Otto Neurath, and Karl Popper."² Roderick M. Chisholm had commented on the Austrian part: "The Austrian tradition that begins with Bolzano, continues with Franz Brentano and then leads on to Wittgenstein is one of the most productive in the history of modern philosophy."³ Thomas Masaryk, as an academic philosopher, was deeply rooted in the Austrian tradition. While he was only marginally concerned with Bernard Bolzano, his philosophical outlook was to a considerable extent shaped by the teaching and the scholarship of Franz Brentano at the University of Vienna.⁴ Nevertheless, his desideratum to incorporate a religious dimension into the intellectual life of modern man led him to consider the outlook of the Austrian school too narrowly empirical and, therefore, inhospitable to concepts beyond the reality of sense perceptions. Hence, his search for accommodating religious ideas tended to transcend the Austrian philosophical tradition.⁵

¹ I wish to thank John W. Brennan, Grace Leahey, and Petros Nungovitch for their helpful comments on the manuscript of this article.

² Barry Smith, *Austrian Philosophy: The Legacy of Brentano* (Chicago, 1994), 1.

³ Roderick M. Chisholm, "Opening Address," *Philosophie des Geistes, Philosophie der Psychologie*, Akten des 9. Internationalen Wittgenstein Symposiums, 19. bis 26. August 1984, Kirchberg am Wechsel (Österreich) [*Philosophy of Mind: Philosophy of Psychology*, Proceedings of the 9th International Wittgenstein Symposium, August 1984, Kirchberg/Wechsel, Austria] (Vienna: Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1985), 27.

⁴ On the Czech participation in the Austrian philosophical tradition, see also Barry Smith, "Von T. G. Masaryk bis Jan Patočka: Eine philosophische Skizze," in Josef Zmr and Thomas Binder, eds., *T. G. Masaryk und die Brentano-Schule* (Prague: Filosofický ústav Československé akademie věd, 1992), 95.

⁵ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, Spisy 15 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2005), 427.

The Austrian Philosophy

The realist Austrian school of philosophy grounded Masaryk in his opposition to German Idealism, as it had previously done for Masaryk's eminent predecessor, Karel Havlíček. As Havlíček had his mentor in Bolzano, Masaryk would have his in Brentano to immunize him against the allurements of the Hegelian *weltanschauung*. Before encountering Brentano, Masaryk had an opportunity to gain a positive impression of another strand of thought in the Austrian intellectual tradition, the philosophy of Johann F. Herbart, which was entrenched in Bohemia and Austria, largely thanks to the exertions of Franz Exner. Masaryk also had an opportunity to become familiar with Herbart's teaching when he studied Friedrich A. Lange's survey of Western philosophy that represented his first introduction into the philosophical field.⁶ Ultimately, however, Masaryk would find Herbart's concepts too abstract, not allowing sufficient philosophical space for practical ethics that would lead to a religiously meaningful life.⁷

The key influence on Masaryk from the side of the Austrian philosophical school, in any case, was his favorite teacher of philosophy at the University of Vienna, Franz Brentano (1838-1917).⁸ Against the ontological monism of German Idealism, Brentano asserted the standpoint of an ontological pluralist who attributed proper existence to real things or individuals, not to concepts of things or universals. He was one of the precursors of Edmund Husserl's phenomenism, as well as of the logical positivism of the Vienna Circle.⁹ Masaryk encountered him during his own stay at the University (1874-1876, 1879-1882), after Brentano, formerly a Catholic priest, had broken away from the Roman Church over the dogma of papal infallibility.¹⁰ Brentano was one of the leading figures in the Austrian school of philosophy that stemmed from Bolzano and opposed the line of German Idealism from Kant through Hegel to Nietzsche. The main principles of his philosophical orientation, as he discussed them in the inaugural lecture at the University of Vienna, were: (1) the philosophy of Aristotle and

⁶ Lange listed Herbart, together with Leibniz and Kant, among the most intelligent [*scharfsinnigsten*] thinkers; see Lange, Friedrich Albert, *Geschichte des Materialismus und Kritik seiner Bedeutung in der Gegenwart*, ed. Alfred Schmidt, 2 vols. (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1974), 1:172. On Masaryk's interest in Lange see Zdeněk V. David, "Thomas G. Masaryk's Ambivalent View of the Enlightenment and Political Liberalism," *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal*, 19, 2 (2006): 83-85.

⁷ Stanislav Polák, *T. G. Masaryk*, 6 vols. (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2000-2012), 2:37, 77-78.

⁸ Viera Hudečková, "Príspevok k vymedzeniu vzťahov T. G. Masaryka a F. Brentana," *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 18 (1969), řada filosofická (B), no. 16, 86-93.

⁹ Karel Mácha, *Glaube und Vernunft: Die Böhmisches Philosophie in geschichtlicher Übersicht*, 3 vols. (Munich: Sauer, 1985-89), 2:150.

¹⁰ Karel Čapek, *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem*, Spisy, 20 (Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1990), 71-72.

Thomas Aquinas from his seminary training; (2) a distaste for the a priori assumptions of the German idealists, as well as any other speculative conceptualization, or any form of “dogmatism;” and (3) an attachment to the empirical method of study that had proved its worth in the natural sciences.¹¹

Brentano was personally interested in British empirical philosophy, not only in Locke and Hume, but also in more recent thinkers, such as Bentham, John S. Mill and William Stanley Jevons (1835-82). Already in his Würzburg lectures Brentano extolled the contributions of the English to psychology. Other leading philosophers in Germany, however, did not approve of his attitude feeling that “through such contacts the distinctiveness of the German mind suffers a diminution.”¹² His empiricism derived ultimately from Aristotle, and Brentano attached special importance to Aristotle’s concept of the “inner sense,” which formed a basis for unifying individual perceptions.¹³ His objections to German Idealism were radical, going right back to the founding father. According to Brentano, Kant was responsible for the travails of most subsequent philosophy; his celebrated Copernican turn was actually a fundamental error. According to Brentano, Kant’s methods were based on arbitrary propositions; his *Critique of Pure Reason* was a grand illusion. In that sense, Brentano was more radical than Herbart who, as noted, had dominated the realistic philosophy in Bohemia at the mid-century and after. Herbart had still, in fact, retained a measure of respect for Kant, and mainly blamed the succeeding German Idealists for drawing perverse conclusions from his subjective epistemology.¹⁴

Like the rest of Masaryk’s initial philosophical orientation, the nature of Brentano’s influence on him and the limitation of this influence have not been sufficiently explored.¹⁵ An examination of this relationship is the central concern of this article. Prior to this, I will touch upon Masaryk’s views on Bolzano, the acknowledged fountainhead of the Austrian philosophical tradition. Subsequently, I will examine Masaryk’s intellectual contact with Brentano’s disciples and, finally, his relationship to the philosophy of Herbart and to Herbart’s followers. As noted, the development of Herbartism through Exner, Robert Zimmermann, and Josef Durdík represented what may be considered a parallel line to that of Bolzano, Brentano, and the Vienna Circle in the Austrian philosophical tradition.

¹¹ Basic ideas, expressed in Brentano’s Inaugural Lecture at the University of Vienna, April 1874, see Franz Brentano, *Über die Gründe der Ermutigung auf philosophischem Gebiete* (Vienna, 1874); also in Franz Brentano, *Über die Zukunft der Philosophie*, ed. Oskar Kraus (Leipzig, 1929), 83-100.

¹² “...dass durch solchen Kontakt die Eigentümlichkeit des deutschen Geistes Einbusse erleiden könnte.” Anton Marty, “Franz Brentano. Eine biographische Skizze,” Marty, *Gesammelte Schriften*, eds. Josef Eisenmeier, Alfred Kastil, and Oskar Kraus, 2 vols. (Halle: Niemeyer, 1916-1920), 1, pt. 1: 98; Polák, *T.G. Masaryk*, 1:211.

¹³ Miloslav Bednář, “Masarykův pojem náboženství, aristotelismus Franze Brentana a Masarykova polemika s Bertrandem Russellem,” *České myšlení* (Prague: Philosophia, 1996), 138, referring to Franz Brentano, *Die Psychologie des Aristoteles, insbesondere seine Lehre vom Nous Poietikos* (Mainz, 1867), 98.

¹⁴ Polák, *T.G. Masaryk*, 1: 165, 397-398, n.18.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 1: 397, n. 18.

Masaryk and Bolzano

Before considering Masaryk's personal and intellectual contacts with Brentano, it is appropriate to step back and explore Masaryk's views of Brentano's great precursor in the Austrian philosophical tradition, namely, Bernard Bolzano. Masaryk had the most contact with Bolzano's teaching through Zimmermann who, after Brentano, was his principal mentor at the University of Vienna. Zimmermann had in turn been a very close disciple of Bolzano.¹⁶ His textbook of philosophy, published in 1853, was based on Bolzano's logical concepts, such as "propositions as such" [*Sätze an sich*] and "truths as such" [*Wahrheiten an sich*]. The textbook taught, in the spirit of Bolzano, that the aim of knowledge was not to know the real or factual relations of objects, but the "true proposition as such" which did contain them.¹⁷ Oddly, Zimmermann was rather reticent in acknowledging his dependence on Bolzano's ideas.¹⁸

Masaryk himself did not refer to Bolzano in his own major philosophical works, such as his dissertation on suicide, or his early treatises on concrete logic,¹⁹ and he would not name Bolzano in his autobiographical conversations with Karel Čapek and Emil Ludwig, which he conducted while President of Czechoslovakia.²⁰ Yet, traces of Bolzano's influence could be discerned in some of Masaryk's basic philosophical ideas. Rudolf Haller has pointed out that Masaryk tacitly endorsed two basic principles of Bolzano's philosophy: first, that there were truths as such; and second, that man could know the truth. Although he did not use Bolzano's terminology (e.g. *Sätze an sich*), he was convinced of the truth of mathematical propositions, and maintained an optimistic view that science

¹⁶ Rudolf Haller, "Bolzano and Austrian Philosophy," in *Bolzano's Wissenschaftslehre, 1837-1987*, International Workshop, Firenze, 16-19 September 1987 (Florence: Olschki, 1992), 197-201; Eduard Winter, ed., *Robert Zimmermanns philosophische Propädeutik und die Vorlagen aus der Wissenschaftslehre Bernard Bolzanos: eine Dokumentation zur Geschichte des Denkens und der Erziehung in der Donaumonarchie* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975).

¹⁷ Rudolf Haller, "Bolzano and Austrian Philosophy," 198, referring to Robert Zimmermann, *Philosophische Propädeutik für Obergymnasien* (Vienna: W. Braumüller, 1853). Second and third ed. of the textbook (1860 and 1867) de-emphasized the references to Bolzano's concepts of logic, *ibid.*, 201.

¹⁸ Haller, "Bolzano and Austrian Philosophy," 201. Strangely enough, the same was true of Brentano. On Brentano's reluctance to acknowledge Bolzano's influence on his philosophy, see also Samuel H. Bergmann, "Bolzano und Brentano," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 48 (1968), 308ff.

¹⁹ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem společenským moderní osvěty*, Spisy 1 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2002); *idem*, *Základové konkrétné logiky: třídění a soustava věd*, Spisy 2 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2001); *idem*, *Pokus o konkrétní logiku: třídění a soustava věd*, Spisy 3 (Prague: Ústav T. G. Masaryka, 2001).

²⁰ Čapek, *Hovory*; Emil Ludwig, *Defender of Democracy: Masaryk of Czechoslovakia* (New York: R. M. McBride, 1936).

could, in fact, reach authentic verities.²¹ Moreover, Chisholm has called attention to the fact that, in the classification of mental phenomena, Masaryk followed Bolzano more closely than he did Brentano. Brentano postulated a single type of “emotion” as a mental phenomenon. Bolzano distinguished between sensing and the acts of will. Masaryk established a similar distinction between having a feeling and acting upon it.²² In addition, Peter Simons has traced, specifically to Bolzano, Masaryk’s concept of “concrete logic” that Masaryk defined as the theory of method, which all sciences had in common.²³

While not mentioning Bolzano in his more strictly philosophical works, Masaryk did refer to him in his writings on the intellectual history of Bohemia, particularly in the *Česká otázka*, in *Jan Hus*, and in *Karel Havlíček*. Masaryk referred approvingly to Bolzano’s relationship with Josef Dobrovský, and to their common humanist orientation.²⁴ In particular, however, Masaryk stressed Havlíček’s philosophical dependence on Bolzano,²⁵ and he further emphasized that Havlíček not only learned from Bolzano, but also—and more importantly—that he esteemed his mentor most highly. In fact, Masaryk was ready to recognize Bolzano as the leading Bohemian philosopher of his time. His one reservation was of Bolzano’s excessive docility *vis à vis* the government authorities.²⁶ In this assessment, however, Masaryk may have been rather unjust since Bolzano did endorse civil disobedience in the face of oppressive governmental demands that interfered with the rights of the individuals.²⁷ Masaryk’s assertion that Bolzano,

²¹ Rudolf Haller, “Masaryk’s Theorie der Wissenschaft,” in Josef Novák, ed., *On Masaryk: Texts in English and German*, Studien zur österreichischen Philosophie, Bd. 13 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988), 45.

²² Roderick M. Chisholm, “Masaryk and Brentano on the Nature of the Mental,” in Josef Zúmr and Th. Binder, eds., *T. G. Masaryk und die Brentano-Schule* (Prague and Graz, 1992), 22-23, referring to Franz C. Brentano, *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1874); and Masaryk, *Pokus o konkrétní logiku*. According to Chisholm, Bolzano distinguishes five basic classes of mental phenomena: thinking, judging, sensing, willing (includes: wishing, desiring, and wanting); acting or doing. Bolzano postulates these, especially the distinction between wishing and acting, in *Wissenschaftslehre*, Section 143; see Bernard Bolzano, *Wissenschaftslehre, Gesamtausgabe*, eds. Eduard Winter, Jan Berg, Friedrich Kambartel, Jaromír Loučil, and Bob van Rootselaar, 40 vols. in 57 (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann Holzboog, 1979), Reihe I, Schriften: Band 12, 1: 125-127.

²³ Peter Simons, “Masaryk and the Classification of Sciences,” in Josef Zúmr and Th. Binder, eds., *T. G. Masaryk und die Brentano-Schule* (Prague and Graz, 1992), 64. He does not give his source, but he then discusses Masaryk’s *Pokus o konkrétní logiku*.

²⁴ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Česká otázka. Naše nynější krize. Jan Hus*, Spisy 6 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2000), 40.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 15, 103. Also Bolzano’s influence on Šafárik, Palacký, as well as Havlíček, *ibid.*, 317.

²⁶ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Karel Havlíček: Snahy a tužby politického probuzení*, Spisy 7 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 68, 176.

²⁷ Helmut Rumpel, ed., *Bernard Bolzano und die Politik: Staat, Nation und Religion als Herausforderung für die Philosophie im Kontext von Spätaufklärung, Frühnationalismus und Restauration*. Studien zu Politik und Verwaltung, Band 61 (Vienna: Böhlau, 2000), 59.

like Pavel Šafarik, Havlíček, and František Palacký, was impressed by Herder's ideas is also questionable.²⁸

Above all, Masaryk was impressed by the religious aspect of Bolzano's intellectual outlook. He called attention to Havlíček's lengthy quote from Bolzano's last testament that expressed the essence of Josephist reform Catholicism. The testament endorsed a transcendent God, the immortality of the human soul and the Catholic Church while at the same time, it stressed a pressing need for reform because the Church's current corrupt state prevented reunion with other Christians and caused others, dispirited, to leave its ranks. Thus, according to Masaryk, Havlíček clearly expressed his own religious and humanistic orientation in the article on Bolzano's death, directly revealing the depth of his own religious conviction, especially concerning the last things in life.²⁹

Aside from the appeal of Bolzano's realist and logical empiricism, Masaryk also revealed a major interest in his political liberalism and his Josephist reform Catholicism. Inasmuch as Masaryk's rejection of the Roman Church was sweeping and included liberal Catholicism, his endorsement of Bolzano's religiosity, however, could not but be seriously qualified and limited. Later in his life, Masaryk regretted that he did not pay even more attention to Bolzano's philosophy with which he had come into contact after settling in Prague in 1882. Writing in the mid-1920s, he expressed his satisfaction that Bolzano was being appreciated in certain circles in Germany and urged Czech philosophers to their outstanding compatriot.³⁰

Masaryk and Brentano

Masaryk started studying under Brentano after the latter's appointment to the chair of philosophy at the University of Vienna in April 1874 when Masaryk was in his fourth semester at the University (having matriculated in 1872). Masaryk first took Brentano's psychology course that reflected Brentano's central interest.³¹ He also signed up for Brentano's course of practical philosophy (ethics) and the discussion course on major philosophers. He was not able to attend Bolzano's lectures regularly because of outside employment, but he could visit Brentano at his home to discuss issues of interest. As Nejedlý points out, he was

²⁸ Masaryk, *Česká otázka. Naše nynější krize. Jan Hus*, 317; see also Masaryk, *Karel Havlíček*, 195.

²⁹ Masaryk, *Česká otázka*, 79, 329; Masaryk, *Karel Havlíček*, 194-195.

³⁰ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, Spisy 15 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2005), 425. Jan Patočka deplores Masaryk's relative neglect of Bolzano in his Jan Patočka, "O potřebě obnovit činnost Ústavu T. G. Masaryka," 1968, in his *Češi II*, Sebrané spisy, 13 (Prague: Oikymenh, 2006), 248.

³¹ This work was never completed, but on Brentano's ideas about immortality, see Alfred Kastil, *Die Philosophie Franz Brentanos. Eine Einführung in seine Lehre* (Bern: A. Francke, 1951), 305-313. He still took Brentano's psychology course in 1875-1876; see Zdeněk Nejedlý, *T. G. Masaryk*, vols. 3-4 (Prague: Melantrich, 1935-1937); vols. 1-2, 2d ed., Sebrané spisy, 31-32 (Prague: Orbis, 1949-1950), 1: 374.

given a kind of tutorial by Brentano.³² Much later, in a letter to Oskar Krause in 1929, he gratefully reminisced that Brentano not only instilled in him the realistic viewpoint in philosophy, but also supported him emotionally by engaging in “a close friendly relationship.”³³ He was so close to Brentano personally that he could borrow money from his mentor while he studied in Vienna.³⁴

Brentano, together with Zimmermann, were Masaryk’s doctoral thesis directors at the University of Vienna. He submitted his dissertation, *Das Wesen der Seele bei Plato. Eine kritische Studie vom empirischen Standpunkte* (The Being of the Soul in Plato: A Critical Study from An Empirical Standpoint), to them on January 19, 1876, and he was granted the degree of doctor of philosophy (with an allied field in classical philology) on March 10, 1876.³⁵ Subsequently, Brentano intervened at the Ministry of Education in favor of Masaryk’s plans to study at the University of Leipzig (1876-1878).³⁶ After his return from abroad, Masaryk was once more grateful to his two mentors for supporting his appointment to a non-tenured teaching position at the University of Vienna in 1879, where he worked on his *Habilitation* that was based on his treatise, *Der Selbstmord als soziale Masserscheinung der Gegenwart* (Suicide as Social Mass Phenomenon of the Present).³⁷ Among his teachers Masaryk by and large valued Brentano more highly than he did Zimmermann or his professors at the University of Leipzig.³⁸ Among the latter, the outstanding figure for Masaryk was the philosopher and psychologist, Gustav T. Fechner (1801-1887), whose psychologically-based religious concepts, including the immortality of the human soul, did not jar with the empirical approach in philosophy.³⁹ Although Fechner was already retired, Masaryk was able to meet with him privately.⁴⁰

³² Nejedlý, *T. G. Masaryk*, 1:450-451. Masaryk later would practice the same contact with his own students outside the formal lecture hall. *Ibid.*, 3: 151.

³³ Josef Novák, “Masaryk and the Brentano School,” ed. Josef Novák, *On Masaryk: Texts in English and German*, Studien zur österreichischen Philosophie, Bd. 13. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988, 30. See also Josef Jirásek, ed., “Z korespondence Franze Brentana a T. G. Masaryka,” *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 18 (1969), 95-103.

³⁴ Čapek, *Hovory*, 92.

³⁵ V. K. Škrach, “Masaryk,” *Masarykův slovník naučný* (Prague: Československý kompas, 1929), 4: 776.

³⁶ Polák, *T.G. Masaryk*, 1: 223.

³⁷ The “Habilitation” was granted despite some doubts about the suitability of a sociological study for the department of philosophy; Čapek, *Hovory*, 86, 91.

³⁸ The latter included the philosophers Moritz W. Drobisch (1802-1896), Ludwig Adolf Strümpell (1812-1899), and Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920); see Rudolf Haller, “Brentanos Spuren im Werk Masaryks,” in Josef Zmr and Thomas Binder, eds., *T. G. Masaryk und die Brentano-Schule* (Prague: Filosofický ústav Československé akademie věd, 1992), 14; and the Lutheran theologians, Christoph Ernst Luthardt (1823-1902) and Gustav A. Fricke (1822-1908); see Novák, “Masaryk and the Brentano School,” 31.

³⁹ As the ideas of revelation or pure metaphysics would.

⁴⁰ Polák, *T.G. Masaryk*, 1:237. On Masaryk’s relation to Fechner, see Zdeněk V. David, “Thomas G. Masaryk’s Ambivalent View of the Enlightenment and Political Liberalism,” *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal*, vol.19, no. 2, Spring 2006, p. 83-85.

While references to Brentano are relatively scarce in Masaryk's early philosophical works, they are not completely absent, as they are in the case of Bolzano. In both *Základové konkrétné logiky* [Foundations of Concrete Logic] and *Pokus o konkrétní logiku* [An Essay of Concrete Logic] there are prominent mentions of Brentano's *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkte* I (1874).⁴¹ Likewise, in *Základové konkrétné logiky*, Masaryk praised Brentano for a major advance in abstract logic through his teachings about judgment.⁴² Elsewhere, Masaryk called attention—on the basis of *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkte*—to Brentano's similarity with John S. Mill on the issue of judgment as an independent mental activity, separate from perceptions (ideas). Moreover, Masaryk credited Brentano with proving the validity of such a distinction.⁴³ In addition, he endorsed Brentano's doubts about the assertion that, according to Aristotle, reason remained completely inactive after death. Brentano had expressed this skepticism in his book, *Die Psychologie des Aristoteles*.⁴⁴

While direct references to Brentano are rather meager in Masaryk's own philosophical writings, his subsequent testimony, as well as the comparison of their doctrinal stands show major similarities, as well as, of course, significant differences. The agreements will be considered in this section, the disagreements in the next. The concurrences can be gathered under the following headings: (1) endorsement of empiricism; (2) rejection of idealism; (3) psychological methodology; (4) mental phenomena; (5) link of epistemology with ethics; and (6) rational theism.

(1) Masaryk praised Brentano for his adherence to empirical method and for his penetrating analysis of other philosophers' epistemologies. According to Masaryk, Brentano's attachment to empiricism was based, on the one hand, on his especially harsh rejection of the epistemology of Kant.⁴⁵ He ridiculed Kant's idea of synthetic judgments a priori, claiming that such a priori judgments were, in fact, mere fictions that failed to supply any explanations. On the other hand, Brentano entertained a great fondness for west European philosophy. He was attracted especially to John S. Mill, and through Mill found Comte. He perceived a wide gulf separating west European philosophy from the "corrupted" German philosophy.⁴⁶

⁴¹ Masaryk, *Základové konkrétné logiky: třídění a soustava věd*, 101, referring to Franz C. Brentano, *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1874), vol 1.

⁴² Masaryk, *Základové konkrétné logiky*, 122.

⁴³ Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Z počátků Athenea, 1883-1885*, Spisy 18 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2004), 27-28, referring to Franz C. Brentano, *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1874).

⁴⁴ Masaryk, *Z počátků Athenea, 1883-1885*, 133, referring to Franz Clemens Brentano, *Die Psychologie des Aristoteles, insbesondere seine Lehre vom nous Poietikos* (Mainz, F. Kirchheim, 1867). There are no references to Brentano in either Masaryk, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem společenským*, or in his *Otázka sociální. Základy marxismu filosofické a sociologické*, 2 vols. Spisy 9-10 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2000).

⁴⁵ Čapek, *Hovory*, 71-72.

⁴⁶ Nejedlý, T. G. Masaryk, 1: 463; 2: 464.

However, Brentano was mainly a devotee of Aristotle and he introduced Aristotle to Masaryk.⁴⁷ As a distinct type of an Aristotelian, he made Masaryk aware of the contrast between the Platonic and Aristotelian approach to philosophy.⁴⁸ Masaryk agreed with Brentano that Aristotle corrected Plato's erroneous view of matter as something inferior, or less pure, than the spirit. Both Brentano and Masaryk argued that, in fact, all knowledge of matter was given through mental activity.⁴⁹

(2) Together with Brentano (and indeed with all of the Austrian philosophy), Masaryk rejected the tradition of German Idealism that he viewed as a species of mysticism rather than a truly scientific philosophy. He agreed with Brentano's scathingly negative view of Kant's a priori and the underlying concept of synthetic judgments. In addition, he criticized the absence of a historical sense in Kant, i.e. the neglect of the dynamic aspect of the sciences.⁵⁰ Similarly, for Brentano, the philosophy of German idealists represented "an ultimate degeneration of human thinking."⁵¹ Above all, Brentano disliked Hegel,⁵² and experienced an almost physical revulsion against Schopenhauer.⁵³ Finally, he opposed not only Kant and his immediate successors, but also the subsequent Neo-Kantian revival.⁵⁴

Having rejected both Hegelian idealism and the Kantian concept of synthetic a priori judgments, Masaryk argued, like Brentano, that "scientific philosophy and sociology" had to be based, instead, on "exact psychological analyses."⁵⁵ According to Masaryk, Kant's German followers and adherents—in particular Hegel—made the fundamental error of converting logic into metaphysics. He credited Bolzano (together with Friedrich E. Beneke and Friedrich Ueberweg) with the restoration of logic to a realistic mode.⁵⁶ He described his own fundamental evolution in philosophy as follows: "I have grown away from Plato, bit my way through the scepticism of Hume and the subjectivism of Kant, and then learned from Comte, [J. S.] Mill, Brentano, and others."⁵⁷

(3) As to methodology, instead of penetrating into the essence of things (as the Idealists wished), Brentano considered it necessary to patiently investigate

⁴⁷ Ibid., 1: 465-466.

⁴⁸ Čapek, *Hovory*, 74; Nejedlý, *T. G. Masaryk*, 3: 177.

⁴⁹ Karel Čapek, *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem* (Prague, 1946), 227, cited by Miloslav Bednář, "Masarykův pojem náboženství, aristotelismus Franze Brentana a Masarykova polemika s Bertrandem Russellem," *České myšlení* (Prague: Philosophia, 1996), 141-142.

⁵⁰ Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 32; Haller, "Brentanos Spuren im Werk Masaryks," 18.

⁵¹ Franz C. Brentano, *Die vier Phasen der Philosophie und ihr augenblicklicher Stand*, ed. Oskar Kraus (Leipzig: Miner, 1926), 23, 91.

⁵² Smith, "Von T. G. Masaryk bis Jan Patočka," 96.

⁵³ Nejedlý, *T. G. Masaryk*, 1:463-464.

⁵⁴ Polák, *T.G. Masaryk*, 1:165.

⁵⁵ Masaryk, *Základové konkrétné logiky*, 88-90. See also Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 32.

⁵⁶ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Pokus o konkrétní logiku*, 160.

⁵⁷ Čapek, *Hovory*, 215.

phenomena. The experiences of inner perception were true in and of themselves. Novak quotes Brentano as asserting: "Consequently, no one can really doubt that a mental state which he perceives in himself exists, and that it exists just as he perceives it."⁵⁸ Human thinking was always directed toward some object, and the object was "intentionally" contained in human mental activity. Without any ontological assumptions made on a metaphysical level, all intentional acts had in common their mental givenness. This givenness was then the subject of study by psychology. Psychology was, in turn, the crowning discipline of philosophy with ethics, logic, philosophy of language, etc. as its subdivisions.⁵⁹

According to Masaryk, in overcoming Hume's skepticism, Kant merely substituted the subjectivism of reason for the subjectivism of sensory data. Masaryk, therefore, preferred to accept Brentano's concept of "inner perceptions." In order to resolve the problem of Humean skepticism, he ascribed ontological certainty to mental phenomena. Accordingly, "the inner perceptions" were for him just as much an experience as sensory perceptions. In their inner perceptions men grasped mental phenomena immediately, apodictically, and with absolute confidence.⁶⁰ Although striving to overcome Hume's skepticism, both Masaryk and Brentano, at the same time, held Hume in high regard, crediting him with penetrating insights into human psychology.⁶¹

Concerning methodology, there were two other important points of agreement between Masaryk and Brentano in their beliefs: first, in the scientific nature of philosophy; and second, in its methodological unity with other sciences.⁶² While the method of philosophy was not different from that of the natural sciences, psychology was the basic discipline of philosophical knowledge because inner experience was the only basis on which the truthfulness of a judgment could rest.⁶³ The unmediated evidence of inner experience was empirically more valid than the perception of a physical object.⁶⁴ According to Brentano, intentionality distinguished the perception of physical from mental phenomena; physical

⁵⁸ Franz C. Brentano, *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, tr. By A. C. Rancurello, D.B. Terrell, and L. L. McAlister (New York: Humanities Press, 1973), 10.

⁵⁹ Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 32.

⁶⁰ Masaryk, *Základové konkrétné logiky*, 23, 83-85. See also Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 33.

⁶¹ Viera Hudečková, "Príspevok k vymedzeniu vzťahov T. G. Masaryka a F. Brentana," *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 18 (1969), řada filosofická (B), no. 16, 91-92.

⁶² Simons, "Masaryk and the Classification of Sciences," 65.

⁶³ Haller, "Brentanos Spuren im Werk Masaryks," 14. Zumr agrees with Haller that those were the two most important influences of Brentano on Masaryk; see Josef Zumr, "T. G. Masaryk a němečtí filozofové jeho doby," in *T. G. Masaryk a situace v Čechách a na Moravě od konce XIX. století do německé okupace Československa*, ed. Eva Broklová (Prague: Ústav T. G. Masaryka, 1998), 21-22.

⁶⁴ Rudolf Haller, "Masaryk's *Theorie der Wissenschaft*," in Josef Novák, ed., *On Masaryk : Texts in English and German*, Studien zur österreichischen Philosophie, Bd. 13 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988), 43.

phenomena were perceived (hearing a sound), mental ones were imagined (imagining a sound).⁶⁵

(4) According to both Masaryk and Brentano, every mental act referred not just to a single object, but always to two objects: first to something external, second to the mental phenomenon itself in which the perceived object was contained. The mental phenomenon had three aspects: (a) it was depicted; (b) it was judged on the basis of its depiction; (c) a certain attitude (favorable or unfavorable) was adopted toward it, either love or hate. Therefore, the three aspects of the mental phenomenon were: idea (*Vorstellung*), judgment, and feeling. These were some elements of psychology analogous to those recognized in chemistry.⁶⁶

Against “extreme empiricism” both Brentano and Masaryk recognized that not all mental states were “sensible.” According to Brentano, “intentional phenomena” need not be sensible as, for instance, our “attitudes,” the presence of which was as certain and indubitable as the presence of our sensations.⁶⁷ Mental phenomena could be defined as phenomena that “include[d] an object intentionally within themselves.”⁶⁸ Although Masaryk did not discuss “intentionality,” he seemed to accept the primacy of the intentional. Unlike Brentano, however, Masaryk did not restrict psychological phenomena to conscious phenomena. He distinguished phenomena that were “individual” and that were “social.”⁶⁹

In the application of the psychological method, Brentano recognized a double approach: first, ex post facto reflection on one’s own psychological phenomena that were already past, but still alive in memory; second, indirect, external physical phenomena mediated by an observation of the psychology of others as reflected in their statements, conscious acts, automatic gestures or changes of facial expressions. The expert compared the data from both sources (internal and external) on the basis of experiences gained through introspection and far-reaching analogies among human individuals. Thus he arrived at some conclusions of general validity.⁷⁰

Similarly, Masaryk was aware of the pitfalls in the study of inner perceptions or mental phenomena. Subjective observation was not enough. The solid ground was in objective observation; subjective findings required verification with other

⁶⁵ Haller, “Brentanos Spuren im Werk Masaryks,” 15. Also ranking of sciences in the *Versuch einer konkreten Logik* of Masaryk resembled Brentano’s approach; *ibid.*, 16-17.

⁶⁶ Polák, *T.G. Masaryk*, 1: 213.

⁶⁷ Intentionality was the principle according to which the reference that is performed by language must be understood in terms of the reference that is performed by thought. See Chisholm, “Masaryk and Brentano on the Nature of the Mental,” 23.

⁶⁸ *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Donald M. Borchert, 10 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 2006), 1:689.

⁶⁹ Chisholm, “Masaryk and Brentano on the Nature of the Mental,” 23. Chisholm, *ibid.*, 23, saw in this distinction an anticipation of Carnap’s primary (*die primären geistigen Gegenstände*) and higher mental states (*die höheren geistigen Gegenstände*), in Rudolf Carnap, *Die logische Aufbau der Welt* (Berlin: Weltkreis Verlag, 1928), sections 150-151.

⁷⁰ Polák, *T.G. Masaryk*, 1:213.

people's mental phenomena. These were expressed in their activities. Thus Masaryk, in addition to the analysis of subjective experiences, insisted on studying expressions of inner life objectively through analyses of literature and the state of human society in its political and economic conditions. The approach was to be basically sociological. It involved three stages: exploration of inner consciousness (psychological analysis), daily human life and practice (sociological analysis), and verbal communications (logical and semantic analysis).⁷¹ Employing sociology in exploring the mental phenomena was condoned by Brentano: "The observation of mental phenomena in human society undoubtedly sheds light upon psychic phenomena of the individual. The opposite, however is even more true..."⁷²

According to Novák, Masaryk's adherence to Brentano's doctrine of "inner perception," or mental phenomena, helped to explain his resistance to the British "associationism" of John S. Mill and Alexander Bain, as well as to Neo-Kantianism. As for associationism, Masaryk, like Brentano and others, objected to the concept of the mind as merely a storehouse of images and ideas; it was rather for him a constant change, a stream of consciousness.⁷³

(5) Linking epistemology with ethics was a striking common characteristic of the philosophical approaches of both Masaryk and Bolzano, or—in the words of Ján Pavlík—Masaryk owed to Brentano a peculiar synthesis of strong empiricism with an ethical transcendence that became a hidden paradigm of Masaryk's total *Weltanschauung*.⁷⁴

Both Masaryk and Brentano dealt with the spiritual crisis of modern man. Brentano proposed placing ethics on the foundation of scientific methodology. Ethics in turn could provide a proper guidance for science so that the world did not end up in a technological disaster. For Masaryk, the crisis "which showed itself in an increasing tendency to suicide and murder" was due to a schism between intellect and moral action. The prevalent semiliteracy (*Halbbildung*) could be removed by constructing an ethical system through logically perfect operations and constructs, derived from the methodology of natural sciences. Hence: "it is not man who defines his moral system according to the arbitrary nature of his or her needs, wishes and desires, but on the contrary, it is morality which defines man."⁷⁵

⁷¹ Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 34, citing Tomáš G. Masaryk, "Podstata a methoda sociologie," *Naše doba* 8 (1901), 822-823.

⁷² Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 34, citing Bolzano, *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, 24.

⁷³ Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 33-34.

⁷⁴ Ján Pavlík, in "Brentano und Masaryks Auffassung seiner Ethik," in Josef Zúmr and Thomas Binder, eds., *T. G. Masaryk und die Brentano-Schule* (Prague: Filosofický ústav Československé akademie věd, 1992), 90.

⁷⁵ Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 35-36. The concept of *Halbbildung* was, however, also used by another of Masaryk's favorite philosophers, Paul de Lagarde; see David, "Masaryk's Attitude toward Nationalism: Encounters with Paul Anton de Lagarde."

J. C. Nyíri saw parallels between the moral principles in Masaryk's book on suicide, *Der Selbstmord als soziale Masserscheinung*, and Brentano's book on ethics, *Grundlegung und Aufbau der Ethik*, which, although published only in 1952, had been written in 1876, and repeatedly used by Brentano in his lectures at the University of Vienna.⁷⁶ According to Nyíri, Masaryk derived from Brentano's lectures on ethics two very important concepts. The first was the concept of superficial education (smattering of culture, Masaryk's *Halbbildung*) that was at the basis of modern man's spiritual malaise. The second one was the use of statistics to determine the state of moral behavior in society. Masaryk used these concepts in constructing the framework of his *Habilitation* thesis on suicide.⁷⁷

The view that acts of cognition were properly imbued with an ethical purpose established a bridge to a religious purposefulness for both Masaryk and Brentano. For Brentano, the revival of religious consciousness was an important objective of philosophy, perhaps its highest calling.⁷⁸ Similarly, Masaryk believed in the need for restoring religious convictions to modern man, who was otherwise beset by despair that culminated in the increasing incidence of suicides. Philosophy should "develop in man the capacity for harmonious and thorough cultivation of ideas and feelings, imbue them with power and energy, and give them a moral basis." He therefore envisaged a religion that would derive from philosophy and provide not just speculative concepts, but a guide to action that would transform the behavior of the individual by the vision of a common good.⁷⁹

(6) Ultimately, the concept of an ethical pervasiveness in viewing human actions led Masaryk, like Brentano, to the idea of God. This idea rested for them on the convictions that man needed to avoid an existential vacuum, and that the concept of God responded to the need for security and for an ultimate purpose in

⁷⁶ J. C. Nyíri, "Zu Masaryks Begriff der 'Halbbildung'," Josef Zmr and Thomas Binder, eds., *T. G. Masaryk und die Brentano-Schule* (Prague: Filosofický ústav Československé akademie věd, 1992), 128, referring to Franz C. Brentano, *Grundlegung und Aufbau der Ethik: nach den Vorlesungen über 'Praktische Philosophie' aus dem Nachlass*, ed. Francizska Mayer-Hillebrand (Bern: A. Francke, 1952).

⁷⁷ Nyíri, "Zu Masaryks Begriff der 'Halbbildung,'" 128-129. Masaryk's concept of "Halbbildung" may have been influenced by the writings of the German philosopher and theologian, Paul A. de Lagarde. Lagarde maintained that Hegel's disciple Schulze perpetuated Hegel's educational ideas in Prussia, involving learning numerous facts; this ingurgitation of the formless and anomalous assemblage produced *Asemi-culture*" *Halbbildung*, a false vision of culture. Paul de Lagarde, *Deutsche Schriften*, Gesamtausgabe letzter Hand, 5th ed. (Göttingen: Dietrich, 1920), 78f, 173f, 341; Jean Favrat, *Pensée de Paul de Lagarde, 1827-1891: contribution à l'étude des rapports de la religion et de la politique dans le nationalisme et le conservatisme allemands au XIXème siècle*. Thesis: Université de Paris IV. (Lille: Atelier Reproduction des thèses, Université de Lille III; Paris: H. Champion, 1979), 517.

⁷⁸ Carl Stumpf, "Erinnerungen an Franz Brentano," in Oskar Kraus, *Franz Brentano: Zur Kenntnis seines Lebens und seiner Lehre*, (Munich: Beck, 1919), 116.

⁷⁹ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Suicide and the Meaning of Civilization*, tr. William B. Weist and Robert G. Batson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970, 223, cited by Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 37.

life and in the universe.⁸⁰ Both of them rejected institutionalized and ritualistic religion, such as was offered and practiced by the Roman Church. Brentano felt that the propositions of a revealed religion might have been useful for the uneducated masses, but intellectuals required a philosophical basis for their religious convictions.⁸¹ Again, as in the case of his teaching on ethics, Brentano's ideas about the existence of God were not published until long after his death in 1929, but Masaryk in all probability had a chance to know them from lectures or private discussions with Brentano.⁸²

Milíč Čapek saw a parallel in Brentano's and Masaryk's critique of Aristotle's assertions of co-eternity of God and the world. While Brentano accepted most of Aristotle's philosophy, he asserted a belief in the created universe. Similarly, Masaryk in his essay, "Über den Creatianismus des Aristoteles" (1882) presented a theistic interpretation of Aristotle's cosmology. Brentano had argued against Eduard Zeller's (1814-1908) standard interpretation of Aristotle, and in favor of the creation of the universe, as well as of the mind or thought. Like Brentano, Masaryk retained the belief in God as creator of the world and of immortal human minds.⁸³

Masaryk agreed with Brentano on at least three basic points of philosophical and religious orientation: first, the view of philosophy as an instrument of social reform; second, the commitment to an empirical approach to knowledge, while dealing with the ultimate questions of human existence; third, resolving the problem of leaving the Catholic Church, while retaining the belief in a personal God on the basis of a "rational theism."⁸⁴

Disagreements with Brentano

Masaryk signaled his intellectual independence from Brentano quite early.⁸⁵ He used Brentano's fundamental work, *Psychologie vom empirischen Standpunkt*, in his philosophy pro-seminar at the University of Prague (as in the summer of 1883) but, in his teaching of psychology, he did not rely solely on Brentano in the same way as his colleague Durdík relied on Herbart.⁸⁶ He missed in Brentano an

⁸⁰ Otakar A. Funda, "Rationaler Theismus bei Masaryk und Brentano," Josef Zumr and Thomas Binder, eds., *T. G. Masaryk und die Brentano-Schule* (Prague: Filosofický ústav Československé akademie věd, 1992), 172.

⁸¹ Polák, *T. G. Masaryk*, 1: 177-178.

⁸² Franz C. Brentano, *Vom Dasein Gottes*, ed. Alfred Kastil (Leipzig: F. Meiner, 1929).

⁸³ Milíč Čapek, "Masaryk's Critical Comments on David Hume and Herbert Spencer, and Various Forms of Monism," in Josef Zumr and Thomas Binder, eds., *T. G. Masaryk und die Brentano-Schule* (Prague: Filosofický ústav Československé akademie věd, 1992), 177-178.

⁸⁴ Funda, "Rationaler Theismus bei Masaryk und Brentano," 170-171.

⁸⁵ Haller, "Masaryk's Theorie der Wissenschaft," 42. Late in his life, Masaryk referred to his reservations about Brentano in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, Spisy 15 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2005), 422.

⁸⁶ Nejedlý, *T. G. Masaryk*, 3:187, citing Drtina, *T. G. Masarykovi k 60. narozeninám (1910)*, 249 in *Masarykův sborník* 4: 340.

opening to an intuitive grasp of the religious dimension of life. While both shared the abandonment of Catholicism, triggered by the proclamation of the dogma of papal infallibility, according to Masaryk, however, Brentano was reticent about religion. He did cite general philosophical arguments for theism, but—on a more specific level—he did not even realize his promise to argue in his writings on psychology for the immortality of the soul. Masaryk's interest in religion was broader and much more overt.⁸⁷ Against this background, Masaryk was inclined to be more aggressive than Brentano in the pursuits of the idea of God, and the concept of the human soul and its immortality. In addition, he was not reluctant to enlist in these endeavors elements from the modernist Lutheran theology of "inner feeling," especially those of Paul de Lagarde and Gustav Fechner.⁸⁸ Likewise, Masaryk was not reluctant to turn to Hume's emphasis on emotion as a complement to sensory perception. He also endorsed Hume's conviction that the human being was endowed by an immediate selfless non-egotistical feeling of sympathy for one's neighbor.⁸⁹ Moreover, Hume's epistemology was superior to that of Kant.⁹⁰

Hence, when it is maintained that Masaryk steered "Czech thought away from German to English and French models,"⁹¹ the statement is accurate not in the literal sense, but only if the term "German philosophy" stood for the Idealist and Hegelian brand, which Masaryk in fact repudiated. He was, indeed, influenced by the German-language philosophy in its "Austrian" variant, represented above all by Brentano, whom Masaryk heartily endorsed,⁹² although he was not Brentano's blind follower. Zdeněk Nejedlý, therefore, was wrong when he interpreted Masaryk's relatively minor reservations vis-à-vis Brentano as an effort to distance himself from a German philosopher, and advertise his attachment to British and French philosophy. In fact, as Josef Zúmr pointed out, Brentano shared not only Masaryk's distaste for the post-Kantian tradition of German idealism, but also his orientation toward west European philosophers, such as Spencer, Mill, and Comte.⁹³ Likewise, as noted, Masaryk continued to maintain relations with the

⁸⁷ Polák, *T. G. Masaryk*, 1: 178.

⁸⁸ David, "Masaryk's Attitude toward Nationalism: Encounters with Paul Anton de Lagarde."

⁸⁹ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Moderní člověk a náboženství*, Spisy, 8 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2000), 117; Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, Spisy 15 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2005), 89; cited by Zdeněk Novotný, *Korektiv Masarykovy filosofie* (Prague: Filosofie, 2011), 145-146, 151.

⁹⁰ Jaroslav Opat, *Filozof a politik: T. G. Masaryk, 1882-1893* (Prague: Melantrich, 1990), 52.

⁹¹ For instance, *Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Ted Honderich (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 174.

⁹² Oskar Kraus, "Die Grundzüge der Welt- und Lebensanschauung T. G. Masaryks," in *La pensée de T. G. Masaryk*, Internationale Bibliothek für Philosophie, 3 (1937), no. 3/5, p. 106.

⁹³ Nejedlý, *T. G. Masaryk*, 4:257; Zúmr, "T. G. Masaryk a němečtí filozofové jeho doby," 22.

Germanophone pupils of Bolzano and Brentano, many of whom were actually active in post-World War I Czechoslovakia.⁹⁴

As for his reservations toward Brentano, and thus also toward the Austrian philosophical tradition, Masaryk was ultimately not satisfied with so austere an empirical approach. For him, it had failed to reach the essential religious aspects of life. Brentano's conceptual constructs for the demonstration of God's existence were not adequate. The Neo-Kantian approach did not satisfy him either.⁹⁵ For Masaryk, the proper philosophy would lead to the discovery of an overwhelming sense of common good, posited by a theistic divinity.⁹⁶ He still kept looking toward Comte and Plato. Later, he would add the image of Herder's hypostatized Humanity. A specter of ontological monism was hovering in the background. Masaryk's deviation from the Austrian philosophical tradition becomes most obvious when his ultimate philosophical views are compared with those of the Vienna Circle which in the post-World War I period seemed to embody the quintessence of the Austrian philosophical tradition. The religious problem, which the Vienna Circle rejected as illusory, if not nonsensical, represented a crucial concern for Masaryk.

⁹⁴ Zumr, "T. G. Masaryk a němečtí filozofové jeho doby," 21-27.

⁹⁵ Polák, *T.G. Masaryk*, 1:165, 397-398, n.18; Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 33-34.

⁹⁶ Masaryk, *Suicide and the Meaning of Civilization*, 223, cited by Novák, "Masaryk and the Brentano School," 37.

Anthony Philip Heinrich (1781-1861): A Critical Twenty-First Century Re-assessment of the *American Beethoven*¹

Louis J. Reith

In the preface to his insightful biography of Anthony Philip Heinrich, a Bohemian-American composer who lived from 1781 to 1861, William Upton calls this comparatively unknown composer “the oddest figure in American musical history.”² Surprisingly, the composer, better known as “Father Heinrich” and dubbed by admiring critics “the American Beethoven” has received only one full-length biographical treatment to date, by William Upton from the Music Division of the Library of Congress, first written in 1939 and republished in 1967. In the opinion of Neely Bruce, “It would be difficult to find a more influential figure in American musical society in the fifty years preceding the Civil War than Anthony Philip Heinrich.”³ Benjamin R. Tubbs has called him “the foremost American composer of his day,” whose music—“effusively Romantic, wildly imaginative, spectacularly orchestrated, and technically demanding—was beyond the reach of most of his contemporaries.”⁴ Only near the end of his long life did some of his orchestral works receive an adequate performance, and that was in the year 1857 in Prague.

In 1917 Oscar G. Sonneck, then Chief of the Music Division of the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., managed to secure for his library a collection of Heinrich’s works—both in published and in manuscript form—that now numbers no fewer than thirty-seven archival boxes, including a thousand-page *Scrapbook* in which the intrepid composer preserved for posterity not only all of his correspondence but also all of the newspaper reviews of the occasional East Coast festivals dedicated to the performance of Heinrich’s works. Only now, 150 years later, has Kallisti Music Press undertaken to publish his complete works in critical editions so that this distinctive Bohemian-American composer’s music may at last receive the attention which it so richly deserves.

Heinrich was born on March 11, 1781 in Schönbüchel, Bohemia (now Krásný Buk, Czech Republic), due north of Prague near the German border, into a merchant family that had made its fortune from wholesaling wine, linen, thread

¹ This article is an expanded and corrected version of a paper presented at the 36th Interdisciplinary Symposium sponsored by the Center for Great Plains Studies, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, April 7-9, 2010, *Czech and Slovak Americans: International perspectives from the Great Plains*. I wish to express special thanks to Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., for suggesting to me this fascinating topic.

² William Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich: A nineteenth-century American composer* (New York, 1967), [xi]. Upton’s English-language biography is the only extant full-length biographical treatment of Heinrich and his musical development.

³ Frank Neely Bruce, “Notes on the Program”, in: Anthony Philip Heinrich, *The Dawning of Music in Kentucky*, CD-ROM. New York, Vanguard Classics USA, 1974.

⁴ Benjamin Robert Tubbs, *The Music of Anthony Philip Heinrich (1781-1861)*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Kallisti Music Press. <http://www.pdmusic.org/heinrich.html> (accessed February 24, 2014).

and other commodities. As a child he learned to play violin and piano and developed an insatiable love for music. Heinrich inherited the family business when a wealthy uncle, who had adopted him, suddenly died in 1800. At once he formed a company with himself as the director. In 1803 he sold the fine mansion which he had inherited from his uncle for 10,000 gulden, and in 1805 used the proceeds to visit the United States of America, to assess business prospects and, as he later put it, “to take a peep at the new world.”⁵ But financial reverses in Europe brought about by the Napoleonic Wars sent his firm into bankruptcy. In 1810 Heinrich returned to Philadelphia in an attempt to rebuild his business. He succeeded for several months, conducting *gratis* at the Southwark Theater and even marrying a young woman from Boston whom he found “abundantly rich in beauty, accomplishments and qualities of a noble heart.”⁶ But by 1811 his business had collapsed for good. In 1813 he took his bride back to Bohemia, where their daughter Antonia was born. When the new mother became ill, they left the child with a distant relative, Joseph Hladek, and returned to Philadelphia. Soon after their return, Mrs. Heinrich died, leaving young Heinrich in a state of shock.

In 1816, at the age of thirty-five, bereft of family and fortune, Heinrich determined to reconstruct his career as a professional musician. He secured a position as theater conductor in Pittsburgh, walking the entire distance from Philadelphia. When that venture failed, he set out down the Ohio River as far as Maysville, Kentucky, walked the sixty miles to Lexington, and set himself up as violinist, music teacher, and conductor in that community. His constant companion during his travels was a magnificent Cremona violin which he had acquired on an earlier visit to the island of Malta. On November 12, 1817 he presented a *Grand Concert of Vocal and Instrumental Music* that opened with a *Sinfonia con Minuetto* by Beethoven, probably that composer’s *First Symphony*—only the third known performance of this work in the United States. The following spring, Heinrich moved to a secluded log cabin in the mostly Roman Catholic community of Bardstown, “thrown, as it were, by discordant events ... into the isolated wilds of nature.”⁷ He lived in this cabin for about a year, until January 5, 1819, when he moved onto the estate of Judge John Speed—the same Kentucky family that later befriended future President Abraham Lincoln. As Heinrich recounted in an interview in 1846:

I was not a little frightened after midnight whilst playing on the violin a dead march in honor of my poor departed wife, when a negro, prowling about, burst suddenly open the shattered door of my hut ... He soon pacified my agitation by his harmonious request that I would go on playing, as he had been attracted solely

⁵ Anthony Philip Heinrich, “Scrapbook,” 102, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 4.

⁶ John Tasker Howard, *Our American Music* (New York, 1954), 227; Frank J. Metcalf, *American Writers and Compilers of Sacred Music* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1925), 187.

⁷ Frank Neely Bruce, “Notes on the Program”, in *Anthony Philip Heinrich, The Dawning of Music in Kentucky* (New York: Vanguard Classics USA, 1974).

by the sweet sounds ... I liked the good ear, taste and generosity of the sable visitor exceedingly.⁸

Encouraged by a young Bardstown student, Heinrich then began to compose and to write down the pieces which he was playing on his violin, in spite of the fact that he had never taken a single course in music theory in his life. As Upton observes, "He came to feel that much as he loved his ability as a violinist, his true passion was for composition, as fulfilling a desire for full and free self-expression which had first come to him here in the forests of Kentucky."⁹

Heinrich began to write for violin and piano as well as for voice. All of these manuscripts were gathered together and sent to Bacon & Hart in Philadelphia for publication. In May 1820 some 46 numbers were published in a single volume entitled: *The Dawning of Music in Kentucky, or, The Pleasures of Harmony in the Solitudes of Nature, Opera Prima*. Amateur though he was, Heinrich had produced a work unique in American musical history. In June 1820 he published yet a second volume in Philadelphia entitled *The Western Minstrel*. In his own words, it represented "a collection of original, moral, patriotic and sentimental songs for the voice and pianoforte interspersed with airs, waltzes, etc."¹⁰ A quick survey of the contents of the first volume reveals patriotic praise for his new homeland—*Hail to Kentucky, Hail Columbia (Minuet), The Yankee Doodleiad, and The Birthday of Washington*—as well as nostalgic yearning for the Bohemian countryside which he had left behind—*The Prague Waltz, The Fair Bohemian, and The Bohemian Emigrant*—not to mention a surprisingly unique title, *The Sons of the Woods (Indian War Song)*. One sonata in the collection, reminiscent of the music of Haydn, utilizes a progression of fifths which Upton calls "really delicious ... he was merely a hundred years ahead of his time."¹¹

Among the non-musical oddities of Heinrich's output from Kentucky is a rambling letter which he wrote in August 1820 to Her Majesty Charlotte Augusta of Austria, to be forwarded with a number of his compositions, grouped under the title *The Minstrel's Petition*, and addressed from "a native of Bohemia, a Son of misfortune, cast amid the distant regions of Kentucky."¹² In his appeal Heinrich begs that the Empress may extend her patronage to enable him to visit his infant daughter back in "my native soil" of Northern Bohemia. We have no evidence that the Empress ever read the petition or replied to it.

In March of 1821 we find Heinrich back at the Walnut Street Theatre in Philadelphia with a musical entitled *Child of the Mountain, or, the Deserted Mother*, with "entire[ly] new music, composed expressly for the piece by A. P. Heinrich, Esq., professor of music."¹³

⁸ Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 40.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 40.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 314.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 47.

¹² *Ibid.*, 58.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 60-62.

A month later Heinrich gave a concert in Masonic Hall of that same city that featured no fewer than thirteen of his own compositions—vocal, instrumental, and orchestral. At the same time, a Boston music critic named John Rowe Parker reviewed Heinrich's *Dawning of Music in Kentucky* in tones so laudatory that he proclaimed that its composer "may justly be styled *the Beethoven of America*, and as such he is actually considered by the few who have taken the trouble to ascertain his merits."¹⁴ Sometime later, a review by the same critic provided a more sober assessment of Heinrich's talents:

Bereft of all other means, he had recourse to music for support, and from a mere amateur, became, as suddenly, perhaps the most profound and scientific composer of the new world. There was, however, so much eccentricity mixed with the real merit of his compositions; so much of that somber cast which betrays a protracted struggle with the evils of life, and a spirit wounded past all cure by the tragic loss of a beloved friend; so much more of a comet than a regular planet ... that his voluminous works, shunned and disdained by professors for their very originality, breaking forth in all the wildness of native grandeur, have remained a mere burthen on the shelves of music sellers in the sister-cities ... Indeed, they need only the pruning knife and a more frequent reprieve from intense labor to become popular and current in any part of the world.¹⁵

For the next sixteen years Heinrich lived a remarkably peripatetic existence, supporting himself with his music as he went. From the spring of 1823 through 1826 we find him living in the city of Boston, where he published his Opus 3, *The Sylviad, or, Minstrelsy of Nature in the Wilds of North America* and began composing for larger orchestral forces. The notice of a benefit concert for A. P. Heinrich on May 29, 1823 was the first of what became an entire series of benefits for the needy musician/composer in different East Coast cities. As a Boston paper dryly noted: "Mr. A. P. Heinrich took a benefit concert at Boylston Hall, which was well attended; but we are sorry to add, that he was benefitted by 'money out of pocket'. The receipts were not sufficient to defray certain necessary expenses for which the concert was given."¹⁶ Heinrich's extemporizing on the organ of Boylston Hall led to his engagement as organist of Old South Church, but only three months later he resigned. A local newspaper reporter noted that "some super-refined critics" became displeased with his playing, but the singers loved him. Heinrich did not quit his post without issuing this stinging defense:

During my short modulations on your organ, I have been treated rather roughly by some super-refined critics, lurking in ambush like fell-destroyers or puny insects, not to say beasts of prey. To them I would observe, 'Those are never the worst blossoms or fruits, on which the wasps are gnawing.'¹⁷

¹⁴ From the Boston *Euterpeiad*, April 13, 1822, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 66.

¹⁵ Heinrich, "Scrapbook," 1194, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 68.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 1072, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 76.

¹⁷ From the Boston *Euterpeiad*, September 1822, 60, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*,

Several benefits later, the intrepid composer was on his way to London, England in order to find the means to reconnect with his daughter Antonia, now in her teens, back in his native Bohemia. Heinrich's arrival in England was hardly auspicious. Either on shipboard, or in leaving the ship, his precious violin was crushed and—worse still—the index finger of his left hand was broken. The finger was later partially restored, but Heinrich's concertizing days were over. "Lebe wohl, teure Violine," he exclaimed: "Der Concertist hat aufgehört zu sein" [Farewell, dear violin – the concert artist has ceased to exist].¹⁸ He decided to spend some time in London, not in playing but in teaching and in attempting to produce some of the music which he had composed in America, all in the hope of earning sufficient money to take him to the Continent, there to be reunited with his beloved young daughter.

The *Boston Gazette* quoted an extract from the *Liverpool Mercury* which read: "For our own part, we have seldom met with a more interesting character. He seems to combine great genius with the utmost simplicity of manner and character...It is impossible not to feel deeply interested for him at the first interview."¹⁹ Irish poet Thomas Moore was rather hard on Heinrich in a letter which he published in a London paper on September 1, 1829:

The truth is, I fear, that the reason of your compositions not having the success they deserve, is the...portion of harmonic science you have infused into them, so far beyond the capacity or powers of execution of any of our ordinary amateurs of music; and if I might venture to give advice to a composer of your experience and knowledge, it would be to counsel you to keep your science a little more in the back-ground than you do at present, or at least to throw it into the accompaniments, and not let it interfere so much with the simplicity of your airs. The perpetual variety of your modulations, though they show the extent of your resources in the art, disturb too much the flow of the melody, and render your compositions rather learned exercises than songs.²⁰

Another review termed Heinrich's songs "most strange and wild...They resemble nothing that was ever seen before, so unaccountably strange and odd is their construction."²¹ Heinrich's days seem to have been spent playing in an orchestra at Drury Lane and Vauxhall Gardens. A high point of his London years (from 1826 to 1831) seems to have been meeting and dining with Felix Mendelssohn on the latter's visit to London in 1829. While in London for a second time between 1833 and 1835 (after a brief interlude in Boston from 1831 to 1833), Heinrich composed pieces for orchestras the size of Berlioz or Richard

76-77.

¹⁸ F. A. Mussic, *Skizzen aus dem Leben des sich in Amerika befindenen deutschen Tondichter Anton Philip Heinrich, nach authentischen Quellen bearbeitet* (Prague, 1843), 13, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 94.

¹⁹ Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 94-95.

²⁰ As cited in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 103.

²¹ *Quarterly Musical Magazine and Review*, X (1828), 528-29, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 105.

Strauss ensembles rather than for orchestras from the era of Haydn or Mozart. Among his compositions were now three identifiable major works: 1) a grand oratorio entitled *The Tower of Babel, or, The Languages Confounded*; 2) *Complaint of Logan the Mingo Chief, the Last of his Race*; and 3) *The Treaty of William Penn with the Indians*.

Still lacking sufficient travel funds, Heinrich returned to Boston between 1831 and 1833 instead of proceeding to the Continent to look for his daughter. From 1833 to 1835 he was back in London, where he continued to teach and compose larger orchestral and choral works. Finally in 1835 he returned to the northern Bohemian village from which he had emigrated, but daughter Antonia was nowhere to be found. Weary of waiting for her absent father to return for her, she had suddenly made up her mind to go to him, hoping to locate him in Boston.

In 1837 we find him once again in New York City, where he lived for the next twenty years, miraculously reunited with long-lost daughter Antonia, who in the meantime had married a Strasbourg-born gentleman with a doctoral degree. In 1841 Heinrich received a letter from the popular author Washington Irving, who returned some of the self-composed musical works which Heinrich had sent him for inspection. In 1845 he composed a mammoth American symphony entitled *The Mastodon*. This title is misleading, for the three movements of this symphony are decidedly autobiographical: 1) *Black Thunder, or the Patriarch of the Fox Tribe*, ostensibly concerns an Indian chief who complained in 1815 of being cheated by “my Great Father, the President of your nation,” but actually uses a Heinrich piano piece, *Tyler’s Grand Veto*, which he had written after a humiliating performance for President John Tyler in the White House in 1843; 2) *The Elkhorn Pyramid, or the Indian’s Offering to the Spirit of the Prairies* depicts the heap of antlers piled up by Blackfoot hunting parties on the Great Plains,” perhaps suggesting Heinrich’s own “piles of folio scores ... which he shows to everyone but has never even heard himself;” 3) *Shenandoah, an Oneida Chief* who lived to a great age and compared himself to “an ancient hemlock ... dead at the top.” Just as Indians frequently depicted wise tribal elders, so “Father Heinrich” here reminisces over his own life as an elder statesman in American musical life who had managed to outlive all of his musical contemporaries.²²

We cannot leave “Father Heinrich’s” biography without noting his famously unsuccessful White House recital before President John Tyler in 1843. Heinrich had composed a grandiose symphony entitled *Jubilee* in 1840 for full orchestra and chorus, which commemorated the American experience from the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers to the consummation of American liberty. He spent years trying to line up patrons for the piece and even journeyed to Washington to get the names of high government officials onto his list. John Hill Hewitt, who taught piano to the President’s daughter, introduced Heinrich to President Tyler in a memorable soiree. They arrived at the White House and were shown in by the President, who was overjoyed to finally meet someone who was not soliciting

²² Benjamin Robert Tubb, *The Music of Anthony Philip Heinrich (1781-1861)*.

help in obtaining a government office. Let Mr. Hewitt describe what happened next:

Heinrich was elated to the skies, and immediately proposed to play the grand conception...The composer labored hard to give full effect to his weird production; his bald pate bobbed from side to side, and shone like a bubble on the surface of a calm lake...The composer labored on, occasionally explaining some incomprehensible passage, representing, as he said, the breaking up of the frozen river Niagara, the thaw of the ice, and the dash of the mass over the mighty falls...The inspired composer had got about half-way through his wonderful production, when Mr. Tyler arose from his chair, and placing his hand gently on Heinrich's shoulder, said: 'That may all be very fine, sir, but can't you play us a good old Virginia reel?' Had a thunderbolt fallen at the feet of the musician, he could not have been more astounded. He arose from the piano, rolled up his manuscript, and taking his hat and cane, bolted toward the door, exclaiming: 'No, sir; I never plays dance music!' I joined him in the vestibule...As we proceeded along Pennsylvania Avenue, Heinrich grasped my arm convulsively, and exclaimed: 'Mein Gott in Himmel! De peebles vot made Yohn Tyler Bresident ought to be hung! He knows no more apout music than an oyshter!' [My God in heaven! The people who made John Tyler President ought to be hung! He knows no more about music than an oyster].²³

Heinrich seems to have spent the last twenty years of his life continuously composing music and organizing sporadic "grand festivals" devoted to promoting his compositions in live performance. For the *Heinrich Musical Festival* held in the Broadway Tabernacle on June 16, 1842, music lovers in New York City were wooed in the following fashion: "Nothing delights Anthony more than when he has struck off a composition which those whippersnappers who affect to be his critics cannot read, much less play. Come forward and crown this man's career, and let him die happy!"²⁴ Critical opinion of this concert, however, was decidedly mixed. One member of the audience observed: "The melodies were good, but the harmony was magnificent. It is to be feared however, that the passages were upon too scientific and German principle[s] to receive their due measure of applause, except in the hearing of musical critics."²⁵ On the day before another all-Heinrich festival was to be held in the same Broadway Tabernacle, May 6, 1846, the *New York Tribune* printed this sympathetic portrait of the aging composer by a personal friend, Lydia Maria Child, citing an earlier letter in which the composer had confessed:

I am trotting about from morning till night, teaching little misses [i.e. young ladies] on the piano forte, for small quarter money, often unpaid ... At night I close my toilsome labors and lonely incubations, on a broken, crazy, worn-out,

²³ As described by John Hill Hewitt in his *Shadows on the Wall*, in John Tasker Howard, *Our American Music*, 231-32.

²⁴ *Brother Jonathan*, cited in Heinrich, "Scrapbook," 879, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 165.

²⁵ Heinrich, "Scrapbook," 1053, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 166.

feeble, and very limited octaved piano forte...I believe that my music runs in the same vein as my letters to you; full of strange ideal somersets [i.e. somersaults] and capriccios. Still I hope there may be some method discoverable, some beauty...Perhaps the public may acknowledge this, when I am dead and gone. I must keep at the work with my best powers, under all discouraging, nay suffering circumstances. The pitcher goes to the well till it breaks, and that I apprehend, will soon be the case with my old shell. It is hard to go out of the world without the least encouragement.²⁶

“Father Heinrich” made one final visit to his native Bohemia, arriving in 1857 and spending the entire year in Prague. In anticipation of the trip, Heinrich composed a “sinfonia patriotica-dramatica in 4 parts” for full orchestra: *The Empress Queen and the Magyars: A Tribute to the Memory of the Empress Queen Maria Theresia*, dedicated to Caroline Augusta, Empress of Austria, in a thinly-disguised appeal for financial support. But the gigantic work was never performed. Instead, in three Prague concerts Heinrich presented his best New World music to great acclaim, especially a new work entitled *The Columbiad, or Migration of American Wild Passenger Pigeons*. A note at the end of another score completed in April 1859 describes the desolate winter of 1858/1859 which the aged composer spent in Prague—“in a desolate, comfortless chamber, without any fire whatsoever, during great sufferings of cold, as also without the aid and solace of a pianoforte. The wanderer leaves now his severe winter quarters for more congenial climes, on his musical experimental tour, under the banner, ‘Hope on, hope ever.’”²⁷ In 1859 we find Heinrich back in New York City where, after a lingering illness, he died on May 3, 1861, leaving behind several large trunks, packed full with unperformed and unpublished music manuscripts (now in the Music Division of the Library of Congress).

Any reassessment of Heinrich’s” impact upon the North American musical landscape must begin with his biographer William Upton’s commendation:

And so passed this brave, fighting spirit to its reward. There is infinite pathos in such a character. The constant struggle for recognition, the fight for mere physical existence, making all of life a perpetual warfare—how pitiful, how tragic, and yet how heroic!²⁸

That Heinrich, an autodidact who never took a single course in music theory, was able to compose music at all is an amazing feat. Upton does not understate his obvious musical limitations—lack of adequate technique, limited harmonic sense, inability to condense his musical ideas or prune away extraneous material, as well as rather conventional melodies. But the presentation of his material in rare live performances could be both radical and transforming. His orchestration reminded critics more of Berlioz and Wagner than of Haydn and Mozart. Other musical scholars have discovered in Heinrich’s approach to composing a foreshadowing of

²⁶ Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 182.

²⁷ From a note at the end of the score of *Der Felsen von Plymouth*, dated April, 1859, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 235.

²⁸ Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, [237].

the European avant-garde composers who emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. On the North American scene, the names of Charles Ives or Louis Moreau Gottschalk surely come immediately to mind.

John Tasker Howard places Heinrich near the top of his Pantheon of American classical music composers for his innovative “treatment of nationalistic material. Others had taken the Indians as a subject for musical description, but Heinrich was the first to use the red man as a theme for orchestral works on a large scale. In this he was truly a pioneer.”²⁹ Although Heinrich seems to have been primarily rooted in the German-speaking communities of the Sudeten borderlands ringing the Bohemian heartland, there is nothing in Heinrich’s life or writings to indicate that he possesses any real sense of ethnic awareness. Instead, he seems to have accepted as a matter of course the dysfunctional multiculturalism of the Habsburg Empire into which he was born. His openness to the different social and cultural currents of the New World is readily apparent in his desire to relate sympathetically with both the black and the red strains of the American melting pot, as well as in his unique ability to fit into Old Europe as well as the New World without any apparent difficulty. Furthermore, Heinrich’s efforts to incorporate American folk tunes and national songs into his musical vocabulary, point to a man who, for all his eccentricities, possessed an astounding gift for integrating his music.

The conductor Howard Shanet, in his program notes for a rare public performance of Heinrich’s music, has given this description of the composer’s compositional style:

Heinrich’s method of composition is usually to start each movement with simple and even old-fashioned material and then to give his fantasy free rein in expanding and developing it. Daring modulations, ingenious instrumental devices, and a very distinctive kind of chromatic decoration that is peculiarly his own, are characteristic of this unjustly neglected composer. When one adds to this Heinrich’s ability to [write effectively at length] ... it does not seem so far-fetched that some of his contemporaries called this forceful musician ‘the Beethoven of America.’³⁰

Certainly Heinrich missed out on many opportunities to perform his larger orchestral compositions due to the lack of large-scale orchestral ensembles in North America at the time. After an 1846 benefit for the composer in New York City, another critic offered his explanation for the strangeness of Heinrich’s work: “Heinrich is undoubtedly ahead of his age; and we believe that his music will be far more popular long after he is dead than now.”³¹ That Heinrich himself came to recognize this is evident in a letter which he wrote that same year, 1846: “Possibly the public may acknowledge this, when I am dead and gone. I must keep at the

²⁹ John Tasker Howard, *Our American Music*, 236.

³⁰ Benjamin Robert Tubb, *The Music of Anthony Philip Heinrich (1781-1861)*.

³¹ Richard Crawford, *America’s Musical Life*, 320.

work with my best powers, under all discouraging, nay suffering circumstances.”³² As a composer, he strove not to please audiences but to meet an internal deep-felt obligation to promote the art of music. Perhaps it is just such a dedication to a life of lonely creativity that makes someone like Anthony Philip Heinrich so intriguing for a new generation of music-lovers today.

³² Heinrich, “Scrapbook,” 320, in Upton, *Anthony Philip Heinrich*, 193.

From the Communist Era to the Present: Women Writers in Czech Literature Textbooks

Ursula Stohler

This article seeks to ascertain how women writers, in particular, and women, in general, are viewed in Czechoslovak and Czech society through an analysis of Czech literature textbooks used in secondary schools from 1948 on. It will look at the number and identity of the women authors included in textbooks, as well as at the specific excerpts chosen from their works. The discussion is divided into three periods: the Communist (1948–1989), the immediate post-Velvet Revolution (from 1989 to the mid-1990s) and finally the post-Communist capitalist (mid-1990s to 2010).¹

Textbook production differed in the various periods. During Communist era, the state had a monopoly on the production of textbooks. The government allowed only authors known to be loyal to the regime to write them. Only one textbook series existed for the elementary schools and one for the secondary schools: no choice was possible. The sole publishing house was the *Státní pedagogické nakladatelství*. This changed after the Velvet Revolution of 1989; any publishing house and any author could produce textbooks. The Ministry of Education reviewed the textbooks, and those deemed acceptable have an annotation added, the so-called “*doložka ministerstva školství*.” This serves as a guarantee of the textbook’s acceptable quality. The state-developed curriculum does not prescribe specific textbooks; yet, many textbooks include notification that they are assembled on the basis of the “framework for the educational program” (*rámcový vzdělávací program*).²

All textbooks analyzed for this study are for secondary schools (*střední školy*); some are intended for academic high schools (*gymnasia*), others for vocational schools (*odborné školy*) or for both. Each textbook series usually consists of four parts, one for each grade of the secondary school level. In addition, for each grade there exists one textbook that focuses on literary history (*literatura*) and another one that includes excerpts from literary works (*čítanka*). The former is an overview of literary history and deals with the traditional subject matter of this discipline, such as literary movements, works and authors. The latter reveals a regime’s values more clearly through the choice of authors, works and excerpts. Different regimes might, for instance, choose one and the same author for their *čítanka*, yet used different works, or they might choose one and the same

¹ This paper is based on the research for a project entitled *Canon, Identity, and Literary Learning in Czech Literature Textbooks (1948 – 2009)* which was hosted at the Department of Czech Literature, Pedagogical Faculty, Charles University, and Prague and funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation. A version of this article was presented as a paper at the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies Convention in Boston in November 2013. I am grateful to Mary Hrabik Samal for her suggestions on how to transform this paper into this article.

² *Rámcový Vzdělávací Program* accessed March 30, 2014, http://stary.rvp.cz/soubor/RVP_G.pdf.

work, but excerpt different passages. Thus, the excerpts more fully provide information about the values a regime wanted to transfer to its future citizens.³

This article is based on an analysis of eleven literature textbook series published from 1950 to 2009. Textbooks held in the Comenius Pedagogical Library in Prague (*Pedagogická knihovna J. A. Komenského*) were chosen for the Communist and immediate post-Velvet Revolution era. The selection was difficult for the post-Communist capitalist era because the choice of textbook is left to the individual teachers or the schools' Czech language department. Since it was not feasible to survey each and every school in the Czech Republic, textbooks that have been on the market for the past several years were selected.

The series chosen for the 1950s has three different titles for the publishing houses: *Státní nakladatelství*, *Státní nakladatelství učebnic*, and *Státní pedagogické nakladatelství*. This reflects a regime that after the 1948 *coup d'état* had not yet consolidated the educational system and was just at the very beginning of the transformation of Czechoslovakia into a full-blown Communist state.⁴ However, the textbooks that appeared during the rest of the Communist period invariably have the *Státní pedagogické nakladatelství* as their publisher.⁵

The first volume of the 1950s series is different from the other three: it seems more suitable for the highest grades of elementary school than for second level, even though the title says that it is intended for secondary schools. It includes various excerpts from literary works without chronological order. From the second volume onwards, the editors followed the chronological order that would become typical for Czech *čítanka*, i.e., starting with Old Church Slavonic legends and moving onwards in time to the present. Because the first volume is so different from the other volumes of the 1950s series, it has not been included in the analysis.

In the 1960s series, the first volume was intended both for the first and the second year of the secondary school, whereas there existed one volume each for the third and one for the fourth year.⁶ For this reason, there are only three volumes

³ I am grateful to Štěpánka Klumpárová from the Department of Czech Literature, Pedagogical Faculty, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic for clarification on this question

⁴ Karel Dvořák and Rudolf Schams, eds, *Čítanka pro první třídu středních škol* (Prague: Státní nakladatelství, 1950); Josef Hrabák and Vojtěch Slouka and Oldřich Audy, eds, *Čítanka pro II. třídu gymnasií a vyšších odb.ých škol* (Prague: Státní nakladatelství učebnic, 1950); Josef Brambora et al., eds, *Čítanka pro III. třídu gymnasií a vyšších odb.ých škol* (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1952); Milena Blahová et al., eds, *Čítanka pro IV. třídu gymnasií a vyšších odb.ých škol* (Prague: Státní nakladatelství učebnic, 1950).

⁵ On the Communist transformation of the Czech school system, which included the creation of the so-called unified state school (*jednotná státní škola*), see Radim Cigánek, *Politický zápas o jednotnou státní školu 1945-1949* (Prague: Karolinum, 2009).

⁶ Pravoslav Hykeš and Vilém Pech, eds, *Čítanka pro první a druhý ročník středních a odb.ých škol* (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1964); Vítěslav Tichý, ed., *Čítanka pro III. ročník středních a odb.ých škol* (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1964); Ludvík Páleníček and Otakar Hönig and Václav Týml, eds, *Čítanka pro čtvrtý ročník středních odb.ých škol* (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1963).

altogether for the 1960s series. This study encompasses only one series of textbooks for the 1970s and none for the 1980s as no new textbooks had appeared then, apart from a re-edition of the 1970s series.⁷

In the early 1990s, when the Communist monopoly on textbook production ended, the so-called alternative textbooks appeared, such as the series by Jitka Černíková, Věra Martinková, et al.⁸ These textbooks were intended to present to the Czech readers those authors and texts that had previously been excluded.

During the post-Communist capitalist period, core literature textbooks began to appear. They included previously unstudied authors and works. The editors thought that students needed to be acquainted with this new material to pass the school-leaving exam (*maturita*). Some of these textbooks seem to be produced rather as supplementary material rather than textbooks to be used in schools, even though the latter cannot be excluded. An example is the highly successful series by Maria Sochrová, which was first published at the turn of the millenium (1999–2001). This particular series has been re-edited several times in the past two decades.⁹

During the first three years of the new millenium, Vladimír Nezkusil et al. published their series of literature textbooks.¹⁰ In the second half of the new millenium's first decade (2004–2007), Josef Soukal's literature textbook series appeared, as well as another series edited by Otakar Slanař, Markéta Kostková, Drahuše Mašková, and Lenka Krausová.¹¹ The latter was probably meant to serve

⁷ Karel Dvořák, ed., *Čítanka I pro střední školy* (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1976); Svatopluk Cenek and Václav Kučera, *Čítanka II pro střední školy* (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1976); Svatopluk Cenek and Vlasta Libosvárová, eds, *Čítanka III pro střední školy* (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1972); Milan Zeman and Vlastislav Hnízdo, eds, *Čítanka IV pro střední školy* (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1978).

⁸ Jitka Černíková and Věra Martinková, eds, *Čítanka 1: Alternativní učebnice pro 1. ročník středních škol* (Prague: Trizonia 1991); Jitka Černíková and Věra Martinková, eds, *Čítanka 2: Alternativní učebnice pro 2. ročník středních škol* (Prague: Trizonia, 1992); Věra Martinková et al., *Čítanka 3: Alternativní učebnice pro 3. ročník středních škol* (Prague: Trizonia, 1993); Věra Martinková and Pavla Ziegová and Daniela Fochová and Lenka Chytilová, eds, *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. Ročník středních škol* (Prague: Trizonia: 1994).

⁹ Marie Sochrová, ed., *Čítanka I. k Literatuře v kostce* (Havlíčkův Brod: Fragment, 1999); Marie Sochrová, ed., *Čítanka II. k Literatuře v kostce* (Havlíčkův Brod: Fragment, 2000); Marie Sochrová, ed., *Čítanka III. k Literatuře v kostce* (Havlíčkův Brod: Fragment, 2000); Marie Sochrová, ed., *Čítanka IV. k Literatuře v kostce* (Havlíčkův Brod: Fragment, 2001).

¹⁰ Vladimír Nezkusil, ed., *Čítanka české a světové literatury pro 1. ročník středních škol: Nejstarší literární památky: Počátky českého národního obrození* (Prague: Fortuna, 2000); Vladimír Nezkusil, ed., *Čítanka české a světové literatury pro 2. ročník středních škol: 19. století* (Prague: Fortuna, 2001); Vladimír Nezkusil, ed., *Čítanka české a světové literatury pro 3. ročník středních škol: 1900-1945* (Prague: Fortuna, 2003); Vladimír Nezkusil, Jaromír Adlt, Aleš Haman, Miloslav Hoznauer, Jiří Kostečka, eds, *Čítanka české a světové literatury pro 4. ročník středních škol: Po roce 1945* (Prague: Fortuna, 2003).

¹¹ Josef Soukal, ed., *Čítanka pro I. ročník gymnazií* (Prague: Pedagogické nakladatelství, 2007); Josef Soukal, ed., *Čítanka pro II. ročník gymnazií* (Prague: Pedagogické

as a supplementary text for the school-leaving exam (*maturita*). Also during that time (2004–2008) Vladimír Prokop published a “script,” a series of printed lectures originally meant for university students, on Czech literature teaching.¹² This script is included in the analysis, even though this is not a textbook in the proper sense of the word, i. e., it does not have the Ministry of Education’s annotation, but it is available on the shelves of Czech textbook stores and might well be used in Czech schools.

The latest re-edition of the above mentioned Sochrová’s textbook series (2008–2010) has also been included.¹³ It is intriguing to look at this re-edition to find out if changes have been made. Finally, a series that Martinková had edited in 2009 has been added. Martinková is the same editor who had published the alternative textbooks in the early 1990s.¹⁴ Even though this 2009 edition is not properly speaking a re-edition of earlier work, it is very similar.

The number of women writers, whose works were excerpted in the *Čítanky* from 1950 to 2009, is low; they comprise only 4.6 percent of the authors. Twice the percentage of included women peaked. During the Stalinist 1950s, which in Czechoslovakia lasted from the Communist seizure of power in 1948 to Stalin’s death in 1953, women accounted for 7.5 percent of the excerpted writers. In the early 1990s women comprised 6.5 percent of the authors. During the Communist period (1948–1989) the percentage of women writers was 5.9 percent. During the three decades after the 1989 Velvet Revolution, the percentage dropped to 4.1. If the early nineties were excluded, a mere 3.8 percent of the excerpted writers in the post-Communist capitalist textbooks were women. These percentages suggest that whatever new freedom resulted from the collapse of the Communist regime a

nakladatelství, 2005); Josef Soukal, ed., *Čítanka pro III. ročník gymnazií* (Prague: Pedagogické nakladatelství, 2007); Josef Soukal, ed., *Čítanka pro IV. ročník gymnazií* (Prague: Pedagogické nakladatelství, 2004). Otakar Slanař, ed., *Čítanka 1 (k Literatuře – přehled SŠ učiva)* (Třebíč: Petra Velanová, 2008); Markéta Kostková, ed., *Čítanka 2 (k Literatuře – přehled SŠ učiva)* (Třebíč: Petra Velanová, 2006); Drahuše Mašková, ed., *Čítanka 3 (k Literatuře – přehled SŠ učiva)* (Třebíč: Petra Velanová, 2006), Lenka Krausová, ed., *Čítanka 4 (k Literatuře – přehled SŠ učiva)* (Třebíč: Petra Velanová, 2008).

¹² Vladimír Prokop, ed., *Čítanka k Dějinám literatury od starověku do počátku 19. století (pro výuku literatury na středních školách)* (Sokolov: O.K.-soft, 2008); Vladimír Prokop, ed., *Čítanka k Literatuře 19. a počátku 20. století (od romantiků po buřiče) (pro výuku literatury na středních školách)* (Sokolov: O.K.-soft, 2004); Vladimír Prokop, ed., *Čítanka k Přehledu české literatury 20. století (pro výuku literatury na středních školách)* (Sokolov: O.K.-soft, 2008); Vladimír Prokop, ed., *Čítanka k Přehledu světové literatury 20. století (pro výuku literatury na středních školách)* (Sokolov: O.K.-soft, 2006).

¹³ Marie Sochrová, *Čítanka I. k Literatuře v kostce pro SŠ* (Prague: Fragment, 2008); Marie Sochrová, *Čítanka II. k Literatuře v kostce pro SŠ* (Prague: Fragment, 2010); Marie Sochrová, *Čítanka III. k Literatuře v kostce pro SŠ* (Prague: Fragment, 2010); Marie Sochrová, *Čítanka IV. k Literatuře v kostce pro SŠ* (Prague: Fragment, 2010).

¹⁴ Věra Martinková et al., *Čítanka 1* (Plzeň: Fraus, 2009); Věra Martinková et al., *Čítanka 2* (Plzeň: Fraus, 2009); Věra Martinková et al., *Čítanka 3* (Plzeň: Fraus, 2009); Věra Martinková et al., *Čítanka 4* (Plzeň: Fraus, 2009).

focus on women authors is not a part of the contemporary approach to the teaching of literature.

Each era had its chosen female writers. The Communist canon consisted of the following: Božena Němcová (1820–1862), Karolina Světlá (1830–1899), Eliška Krásnohorská (1847–1926), Teréza Nováková (1853–1912), Marie Majerová (1882–1967), Marie Pujmanová (1893–1958), Božena Benešová (1873–1936), Anna Marie Tilschová (1873–1957), Jarmila Glazarová (1901–1977), and Božena Slančíková-Timrava (1867–1951). (Although Slovak, Slančíková-Timrava is included because the Czechs and the Slovaks were considered as one nation during Communism; furthermore, she cannot be regarded as a foreign writer.) This group included famous nineteenth-century Czech women writers (Němcová, Světlá) whose writings often focused on the countryside and who were also concerned with emergence of a Czech national culture. Early twentieth women writers whose works featured realistic depictions of the living conditions in the cities and small towns (Benešová, Slančíková-Timrava), as well as women authors with explicit Communist world views (Nováková, Majerová, Pujmanová) also were studied during this period. In the 1970s textbook, the neo-socialist realist woman writer Jaromíra Kolářová makes an appearance with an excerpt from her novel *Můj chlapec a já* from 1974.¹⁵

After the Velvet Revolution, when textbook editors had the freedom to choose whatever author they considered appropriate, they retained most of these canonical women writers of the Communist era. They omitted only Krásnohorská, Slančíková-Timrava and Kolářová.¹⁶ The new women, they included, can be arranged into three groups: 1) the “‘generation’ of lonely runners” (*‘generace’ osamělých běžců*), as Petr Bílek has called them, 2) the prose writers whose works the Communist authorities banned and 3) emerging novelists.¹⁷

Bílek uses the expression “‘generation’ of lonely runners” to designate the poets who published their works officially in the 1970s and in the 1980s, even if they did so sometimes with difficulty. Their work did not appear in underground or exile publications. They were different from the poets of the *sýsovsko-žáčková* generation, who represented an officially recognized conception of literature at that time. These women poets were diverse in age (this is why Bílek has put the term “generation” into inverted commas) and created varying types of poetry. For this later reason, Bílek calls them “lonely runners.” At that time, no one knew which of these individuals would eventually receive recognition for her works.¹⁸ Many of these women, Bílek emphasized, often addressed topics, such as the

¹⁵ Zeman and Hnízdo, Jaromíra Kolářová: “Můj chlapec a já,” in *Čítanka IV pro střední školy*, pp. 290–294.

¹⁶ Černíková and Martinková, *Čítanka 1: Alternativní učebnice pro 1. ročník*; Černíková and Martinková, *Čítanka 2: Alternativní učebnice pro 2. ročník*; Martinková et al., *Čítanka 3: Alternativní učebnice pro 3. ročník*; Martinková et al., *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*.

¹⁷ Petr A. Bílek, “*Generace*” *osamělých běžců* (Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1991).

¹⁸ Bílek, “*Generace*,” pp. 9–18.

family or female self-reflexions.¹⁹ In the textbooks, excerpts from the works of the following women poets from the “‘generation’ of lonely runners” can be found: Blanka Albrechtová (b. 1951), Lenka Chytilová (b. 1952), Jiřina Salaquardová (b. 1955), Jitka Stehlíková (b. 1955), Soňa Záchová (b. 1961), Zdena Bratřšovská (b. 1951), Sylva Fischerová (b. 1963), Markéta Procházková (b. 1963).²⁰ Albrechtová’s playful use of poetic language, which often focuses on family life, is represented with excerpts from her collections *Pukání pecek* (1976) and *Pokus o hnízdo* (1981).²¹ Chytilová’s often tender, reflexive poetry appeared with two excerpts from her collection *Proč racek přemýšlí* (1984).²² Female self-reflexion, as well as conceptions of humans as fragile beings in their quest for an awareness of their own limits, were some of the main features of Salaquardová’s poetry.²³ She was popular in the 1980s when her first collection *Já, Kryštof Kolumbus* (1985) was published. In the textbook, she is represented with excerpts from her second, equally well received collection, *Snídaně na Titaniku* (1987).²⁴ Bílek places Stehlíková among the most typical representatives of what he considers the trend of women’s poetry in the 1980s.²⁵ He points out her lyrical personae’s tendency to present the reader with her own emotional view of the things and phenomena around her. In the textbook, there are excerpts from her first publication *Noční trhy* (1980). Záchová is represented with poems from her collection *Dopis černému městu* (1984), which address a young woman’s reflections about the meaning of love in her life.²⁶ From Bratřšovská’s work, the editor chose excerpts from her collection *Chůdy po předcích* (1986), Fischerová figured in the textbook with poems from her second collection, *Velká zrcadla*, which appeared in 1990.²⁷ Procházková is represented with poems from her collection *Vitání světla* (1981).²⁸

The other group of women writers of the post-Velvet period included prose writers whose works were banned during the Communist era. Some of these

¹⁹ Bílek, “Mladé básnířky, mladé básnířky, mladé básnířky...,” in “*Generace*,” pp. 73-79 (pp. 74-75).

²⁰ Martinková et al., “Blanka Albrechtová: Pukání pecek; Pokus o hnízdo,” “Lenka Chytilová: Průsvitný sisýfos; Proč racek přemýšlí,” “Jiřina Salaquardová: Snídaně na titaniku,” “Jitka Stehlíková: Noční trhy,” “Soňa Záchová: Dopis černému městu,” “Zdena Bratřšovská: Chůdy po předcích,” “Sylva Fischerová: Velká zrcadla,” Markéta Procházková: Vitání světla,” *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice*, pp. 250-258.

²¹ Blanka Albrechtová, *Pukání pecek* (Hradec Králové : Kruh, 1976); Blanka Albrechtová, *Pokus o hnízdo* (Hradec Králové: Kruh, 1981).

²² Lenka Chytilová, *Proč racek přemýšlí* (Hradec Králové: Kruh, 1984).

²³ Bílek devotes parts of his study to Salaquardová’s work: “Básnířka putující k čistým vodám (Jiřina Salaquardová),” in Bílek, “*Generace*,” pp. 41-47, and also 63-64.

²⁴ Jiřina Salaquardová, *Já, Kryštof Kolumbus* (Brno : Blok, 1985); Jiřina Salaquardová, *Snídaně na Titaniku* (Praha : Československý spisovatel, 1987).

²⁵ Bílek, “Mladé básnířky,” pp. 73-79 (p. 75).

²⁶ Soňa Záchová, *Dopis Černému městu* (Ostrava: Profil, 1984).

²⁷ Zdena Bratřšovská, *Chůdy po předcích* (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1986); Sylva Fischerová, *Velká zrcadla* (Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1990).

²⁸ Markéta Procházková, *Vitání světla* (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1981).

authors lived in exile. The most prominent among these is Zdena Salivarová (b. 1933), who along with her husband, Josef Škvorecký (1924–2012), founded 68 Publishers. Located in Toronto, this publishing house brought out in print many *samizdat* works. Her novel *Honzlová* is excerpted in two textbooks: the first one is from the series that appeared in 1994, and the other is the 2009 re-edition of this work.²⁹ Věra Linhartová (b. 1938), who has lived in Paris since 1961, is represented with *Prostor k rozlišení*, a novel that became famous in the 1960s because of its experiments with language and with *Ianus tři tváři* written in 1993.³⁰ She appears in the textbook from the post-Communist time, as well as in its 2009 re-edition and in a textbook from 2008; there, with an excerpt from *Chiméra neboli Průřez cibulí* (1967).³¹ Iva Hercíková (1935–2007), who emigrated in 1986 but returned after the Velvet Revolution, makes an appearance with her 1966 novel for young girls, *Pět holek na krku*.³² She is published only in a 1994 textbook.³³

Several women authors who remained in Czechoslovakia, but were not allowed to publish there also are excerpted in the textbook of the immediate post-Velvet Revolution years. Eva Kantůrková (b. 1930) is probably the best known of this group. Her *Přítelkyně z domu smutku* (1984) was excerpted in a 1994 textbook, in its 2009 re-edition, and in one from 2004.³⁴ For the 1994 textbook, the editors had also chosen excerpts from the oeuvre of another dissident woman writer, Lenka Procházková (b. 1951). Her *samizdat* works explicitly addressed the situation of women during Communism. The selected passages are from her collection of short stories *Hlídač holubů* 1984.³⁵ Eda Kriseová (b. 1940), another dissident woman writer who published in *samizdat*, is represented with an excerpt

²⁹ Zdena Salivarová, *Honzlová* (Toronto : Sixty-Eight Publishers, 1972); Martinková et al., “Zdena Salivarová: Honzlová,” in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*, pp. 335–336; Martinková et al., “Zdena Salivarová: Honzlová,” in *Čítanka 4*, pp. 278–279.

³⁰ Věra Linhartová, *Prostor k rozlišení* (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1964); Věra Linhartová, *Ianus tři tváři* (Prague: Český spisovatel, 1993).

³¹ Martinková et al., “Věra Linhartová: Prostor k rozlišení; Ianus tři tváři,” in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník* pp. 340–343; Martinková et al., “Věra Linhartová: Prostor k rozlišení; Ianus tři tváři,” in *Čítanka 4*, pp. 281–283; Krausová, “Věra Linhartová (1938): Chiméra, neboli, Průřez cibulí (1967),” in *Čítanka 4*, pp. 174–175; Věra Linhartová, *Chiméra, neboli, Průřez cibulí* (Praha : Trigon, 1993).

³² Iva Hercíková, *Pět holek na krku* (Praha : SNDK, 1966). Evald Schorm also made this book into a film in 1967.

³³ Martinková et al., “Iva Hercíková: Pět holek na krku,” in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*, pp. 217–219.

³⁴ Eva Kantůrková, *Přítelkyně z domu smutku* (Köln : Index, 1984); Martinková et al., “Eva Kantůrková: Přítelkyně z domu smutku,” in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*, pp. 319–320; Martinková et al., “Eva Kantůrková: Přítelkyně z domu smutku,” in *Čítanka 4*, pp. 269–270; Soukal, “Eva Kantůrková: Přítelkyně z domu smutku,” in *Čítanka pro IV. ročník*, pp. 213–218.

³⁵ Lenka Procházková, *Hlídač holubů* (Praha: Edice Petlice, 1984); Martinková et al., “Lenka Procházková: Hlídač holubů,” in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*, pp. 331–333.

from *Křížová cesta kočárového kočího* (1977). She appears in just one 1994 textbook.³⁶ Tereza Boučková (b.1957), another dissident author, also published in *samizdat*. The textbook editors chose an excerpt from her controversial novel *Indiánský běh*, which is brought out shortly after the Velvet Revolution and is set in the dissident milieu. This work is excerpted in the textbook that come out in 1994 and in its 2009 re-edition.³⁷

Two new novelist, Alexandra Berková (1949–2008) and Daniela Hodrová (b.1946), who belong to neither the generation of lonely runners nor the banned writers, also make their appearance in the *čítanky* of the early nineties. Berková had become famous with the publication of her novel *Knížka s červeným obalem* in 1986. Her *Magorie* (1991), a work that addressed women's topics and included experiments with language is excerpted in the 1994 textbook and its 2009 re-edition.³⁸ From Daniela Hodrová's works, the editors selected an excerpt from her novel *Podobojí* (1991) for an 1994 textbook and in its 2009 re-edition.³⁹

In the post-Communist capitalist period that extends from the late 1990s to the present day, there were changes in the roster of the women authors represented in Czech literature textbooks. Not only are there fewer women writers, but the type of women authors chosen also has changed. The most prominent woman author during this period is Bohumila Grögerová (b. 1921), who appears in five of the literature textbooks, which is the highest number among the "new" women authors.⁴⁰ Grögerová is always mentioned together with Josef Hiršal, with whom she collaborated. His name always appears in front of hers. The question arises if Grögerová would have figured so prominently had she not appeared together with Hiršal. These two authors became famous for their 1968 experimental poetry collection *Job – Boj*.⁴¹ All textbook excerpts are from this work. This type of

³⁶ Eda Kriseová, *Křížová cesta kočárového kočího* (Praha: Edice Petlice, 1977); Martinková et al., "Eda Kriseová: Křížová cesta kočárového kočího," in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*, pp. 329-331.

³⁷ Tereza Boučková, *Indiánský běh* (Bratislava : Fragment, 1991); Martinková et al., "Tereza Boučková: Indiánský běh," in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*, pp. 367-369; Martinková et al., "Tereza Boučková: Indiánský běh," in *Čítanka 4*, pp. 327-279.

³⁸ Alexandra Berková, *Magorie* (Prague: Horizont, 1991); Alexandra Berková, *Knížka s červeným obalem* (Prague: Práce, 1986); Martinková et al., "Alexandra Berková: Magorie," in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*, pp. 374-377; Martinková et al., "Alexandra Berková: Magorie," in *Čítanka 4* (Plzeň: Fraus, 2009), pp. 333-334.

³⁹ Daniela Hodrová, *Podobojí* (Ústí nad Labem: Severočeské nakladatelství, 1991); Martinková et al., "Daniela Hodrová: Podobojí," in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*, pp. 373-374; Martinková et al., "Daniela Hodrová: Podobojí," in *Čítanka 4*, pp. 331-332.

⁴⁰ Vladimír Nezkusil et al., "Josef Hiršal, Bohumila Grögerová," in *Čítanka české a světové literatury pro 4. ročník*, p. 230; Sochrová, "Josef Hiršal, Bohumila Grögerová," in *Čítanka IV.*, pp. 146-147; Soukal, "Josef Hiršal, Bohumila Grögerová," in *Čítanka pro IV. ročník gymnazií*, p. 200; Sochrová, "Josef Hiršal, Bohumila Grögerová," in *Čítanka IV.*, pp. 88-89; Sochrová, "Josef Hiršal, Bohumila Grögerová," in *Čítanka IV.*, pp. 134-135

⁴¹ Josef Hiršal, Bohumila Grögerová, *JOB-BOJ* (Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1968).

works has similarities with Václav Havel's (1936–2011) visual poetry *Antikódy*.⁴² Maybe this is the reason Grögerová's work figures so prominently during the post-Communist capitalist period as the topic of an experimental approach to language appears frequently in literature textbooks. Two women authors are excerpted in three textbooks of the post-Communist capitalist period. They are Eva Kantůrková and Věra Linhartová.⁴³ Selection from the writings of each of the following women appear twice in the textbooks of this era: Markéta Procházková, Alexandra Berková, Blanka Albrechtová, Lenka Chytilová, Jiřina Salaquardová, Jitka Stehlíková, Soňa Záchová, Zdena Bratršovská, Zdena Salivarová, Tereza Boučková, Sylva Fischerová, Gabriela Preissová (1862–1948), Květa Legátová (1919–2012), and Ilona Ferková (b. 1956). (The last mentioned writes in the Roma language.) Most of the excerpts can be found in Věra Martinková's textbook (in the first edition from 1994 and the re-edition from 2009) or Josef Soukal's 2004 edition.

The following make just one appearance in the post-Communist capitalism textbook series analyzed for this study: Iva Hercíková, Eda Kriseová, Lenka Procházková, and Daniela Hodrová (series by Martiknová, 1994); Věra Slavíková, Irena Dousková, Viola Fischerová (b. 1935), and Kateřina Rudčenkova (b. 1976) (series by Soukal, 2004); Barbara Nesvadbová (b. 1975), Petra Hůlová (b. 1979), Natálie Kocábová (b. 1984), Daniela Fischerová (b. 1948), Halina Pawłowska (b. 1955) and Alena Vávrová (b. 1952).

Approximately ten years later, certain women authors, namely, Iva Hercíková, Eda Kriseová, and Lenka Procházková, who figured in the textbook that came out in 1994, have completely disappeared. This development suggests that the genre of girls' literature and role of women in the dissident community of the Communist period were not considered an important topic for discussions in literature classes. The type of literature teaching that focuses on the situation of women, as it had been present during the years immediately following the Velvet Revolution, has been lost along the way to post-Communist capitalism.

The differences in the textbooks used in the various political epochs are not only quantitative, i.e., which woman writers and how many have been selected, but also qualitative. Even when the textbook editors of different timeframes choose to present the same woman writer, they selected different passages from her oeuvre because they intended or had to transfer different values to the young generation of readers. Karolina Světlá, whose work is presented in the textbooks used in every regime best illustrates this point.

⁴² Václav Havel, *Antikódy* (Praha: Odeon, 1993).

⁴³ Martinková, "Eva Kantůrková: Přítelkyně z domu smutku," in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*, pp. 319–320; Soukal, "Eva Kantůrková: Přítelkyně z domu smutku," in *Čítanka pro IV. ročník gymnazii*; Martinková et al., "Eva Kantůrková: Přítelkyně z domu smutku," in *Čítanka 4*, pp. 269–270; Martinková et al., "Věra Linhartová: Prostor k rozlišení; Ianus tři tváří," in *Čítanka 4: Alternativní učebnice pro 4. ročník*, pp. 319–320; 340–342; Krausová, "Věra Linhartová: Chiméra nebli Průřez cibulí," in *Čítanka 4*, pp. 174–175; Martinková et al., "Věra Linhartová: Prostor k rozlišení; Ianus tři tváří," in *Čítanka 4*, pp. 281–283.

The Communists considered her to be one of their model authors: her works address life in the countryside, which could be used to focus on the folklore so popular during Communism. They also include questions of national awareness and social inequality—also topics that were at the center of the Communist ideology. In a 1952 textbook, the editors chose excerpts that addressed the topic of social inequality as shown in a selection from the novel *Na úsvitě*. The female protagonist, a young girl, has to work in her aunt's house and thereby experiences the disadvantage of not belonging to a privileged social class.⁴⁴ In the same textbook, there is an excerpt from the short story "Hubička," which, as is well known, Eliška Krásnohorská used as a basis for the libretto of Smetana's opera with the same title.⁴⁵ The passage presents the scene where, in the opera, the female protagonist is singing the famous lullaby. In the same textbook, the editors also present an excerpt from Krásnohorská's libretto. This textbook definitely offers the opportunity to address questions of national identity and folklore, which were important to Zdeněk Nejedlý (1878–1962), the minister of education of that era, who was also a musicologist. Tichý's 1964 textbook preserves excerpts from "Hubička," but instead of the novel *Na úsvitě* excerpts from the novels *První češka* and *Vesnický román* figure in the textbooks; the editors still focus on social inequality, but they added the topic of misery in the countryside.⁴⁶

In the 1970s the textbook editors chose a different work from Světlá's oeuvre: the novel *Černý Petříček* is situated in the city of Prague, a different location than the countryside, which had been present in the novels chosen for textbooks in the 1950s and in the 1960s. The first excerpt from *Černý Petříček* describes a scene where a young girl is rebelling against her mother and against society's rules.⁴⁷ The second excerpt from *Černý Petříček* in this textbook presents the following scene to the readers.⁴⁸ Between the first and the second scene, the girl has eloped with the man she loved and they made a living singing and dancing. Then, he is killed in a duel. The girl, now very ill and dying, returns to her mother in Prague. The mother has called a priest, who asks the girl to confess her sins. The girl declares vehemently that she does not regret anything; that she would do precisely the same again if somebody were trying to force her to live according to rules imposed to her. In an act of defiance, she throws away the candle, which the priest had given her.

In the 1992, so after the Velvet Revolution, two excerpts were chosen that are quite similar to those in the 1970s textbooks. They are from the short story "Cikánka."⁴⁹ In the first one, again a young girl who is questioning social

⁴⁴ Brambora et al., "Karolina Světlá: Život u tety," in *Čítanka pro III. třídu*, pp. 122–124.

⁴⁵ Brambora et al., "Karolina Světlá: Hubička," in *Čítanka pro III. třídu*, pp. 124–128.

⁴⁶ Tichý, "Karolina Světlá: První Češka; Upomínky: Mžiknutí osmačtyřicátnice do naší minulosti; Vesnický román; Hubička," in *Čítanka pro III. ročník*, pp. 86–110.

⁴⁷ Cenek and Kučera, "Karolina Světlá: Černý Petříček," in *Čítanka II*, pp. 176–178.

⁴⁸ Cenek and Kučera, "Karolina Světlá: Černý Petříček," in *Čítanka II*, pp. 179–180.

⁴⁹ Černíková and Martníková, "Karolina Světlá: Cikánka," in *Čítanka 2: Alternativní učebnice pro 2. ročník*, pp. 225–227.

conventions appears and expresses her wish to dedicate herself to music and dancing. In the second excerpt, the girl has become a gypsy dancer. When asked if she was happy, she replies that even though her life was difficult, she would never return to the life that was originally destined for her, where she had to be silent and calm.

The topic of female identity is very prominent in both passages, but that changed in post-Communism capitalism. In the 2000 Sochrová textbook, the chosen passage from *Frantina* features a powerful female protagonist (she is a judge) who considers her duty more important than personal happiness.⁵⁰ Excerpts from the novel *Skalák* in the 2001 Nezkusil textbook present a male main protagonist, which is a change from the previous years.⁵¹ Here again, the female protagonist sacrifices her own happiness trying to save the male main protagonist. None of Světlá's works as such figures in the 2004 Soukal textbook. Instead Soukal has chosen to cite Jan Neruda's letter to her.⁵² Světlá is thus presented only indirectly, through the voice of another writer. However, two excerpts from *Vesnický román* and one from *Kříž u potoka* can be found in Kostková's 2006 edition.⁵³ In the first, Světlá presents a male main protagonist, Antoš, and the question of his marriage to a rich widow. The plot in the second excerpt revolves around Sylva, the young woman who falls in love with Antoš, and decides to renounce her personal happiness with him because she wants to become a nurse in Prague. In the excerpt from *Kříž u potoka* a husband is complaining to his wife that she was spending too much time with their baby.⁵⁴ In Prokop's script on the history of Czech literature, Světlá does not figure at all.⁵⁵ In Sochrová's re-edition, which appeared in 2010, the same excerpt from *Frantina* can be found as in the 2000 edition.⁵⁶ Finally, in 2009, in Martinková's re-edition of the textbook from 1992, Neruda's letter to Světlá is quoted.⁵⁷ Further, there are two excerpts from *Kříž u potoka*.⁵⁸ In the first one, Štěpán has just beaten up his wife Evička, and Ambrož is trying to persuade her to leave her husband, she refuses—again the topic of female self-sacrifice. The second excerpt details how Evička begs her husband's lover to stop destroying her marriage. However, the lover makes fun of her and suggests that Evička is to blame because her erudition was the cause for her husband's inferiority complex and subsequent infidelity.

Světlá's textbook presence from the 1950s to 2010 illustrates a shift towards more conservative, domestic topics that address problems of relationships between

⁵⁰ Sochrová, "Karolína Světlá: Frantina," in *Čítanka II.*, pp. 96-97.

⁵¹ Nezkusil, "Karolína Světlá: Skalák," in *Čítanka české a světové literatury pro 2. ročník*, pp. 163-166.

⁵² Soukal, "Jan Neruda: Z dopisu Karolině Světlé," in *Čítanka pro II. ročník gymnazií*, pp. 258-259.

⁵³ Kostková, "Karolína Světlá: Vesnický román," in *Čítanka 2*, pp. 154-155

⁵⁴ Kostková, "Karolína Světlá: Kříž u potoka," in *Čítanka 2*, pp. 156-157.

⁵⁵ Prokop, *Čítanka k Literatuře 19. a počátku 20. století*.

⁵⁶ Sochrová, "Karolína Světlá: Frantina," in *Čítanka II.*, pp. 101-103.

⁵⁷ Martinková et al., "Jan Neruda: Z Nerudovy korespondence," in *Čítanka 2*, pp. 261-264.

⁵⁸ Martinková et al., "Karolína Světlá: Kříž u potoka," in *Čítanka 2*, pp. 272-275.

the sexes. This stands in sharp contrast to her presence in the Communist 1970s and the post-Communist 1990s, where excerpts included confident female protagonists rebelling against social conventions and calling for a self-determined way of life. During Communism, such a type of text might have fitted into requirements of the official canon of interpretation to analyze any literary text from the perspective of class struggle, i.e. the young woman rebelling against the bourgeois social order. However, the fact that a similar type of text was chosen for the post-Communist 1990s suggests that the topic of female emancipation might also have played a part during those two periods.

The analysis of the literature textbooks used in Czechoslovak secondary schools in the communist era has shown that the excerpts chosen from the writing of women authors dealt with life in the countryside, the emerging Czech national culture and poverty and other problems in the cities. The textbooks from the years immediately following the Velvet Revolution list a relatively high number of Czech women authors, with a focus on works that address questions about female identity and about dissident women's experiences of everyday life in the totalitarian system. Since then, the numbers of Czech women authors in the textbooks have dropped and are now lower than during Communism. One can observe a shift of focus from works that offered a female perspective on the life in Czechoslovakia before 1989 to excerpts chosen during the post-Communist capitalist period that outline an image of women who give female duty preference over personal happiness, in addition to the topics of marriage and family. This trend towards excerpts that address more intimate aspects of relationships between husband and wife might be interpreted in two different ways: either as a sign that this a period that cherishes more conservative values, or as a way of addressing topics that result from the problems women face in their personal life.⁵⁹ There has also been an increased attention to works by women that learners are supposed to use for stylistic exercises.

The future will tell how the current generation of learners will interpret these texts, which values they will extract from them and how they will use them for their own lives.

⁵⁹ I am indebted to David Cooper from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for suggesting this interpretation.

Surrealism, Sexuality, and Jakub Deml

Alexander Wöll

Jakub Deml's poems in prose thrive on images which, in the context of his oeuvre, towards the end of his life tend to lean more and more towards poetic hermeticism. I should like therefore to begin by discussing Deml's relationship with the Fine Arts in general and the image as such. What was it about the art of František Bílek and Felix Jenewein that fascinated him so much that he wrote essays about their works throughout his life? In the case of Jenewein Angelo Maria Ripellino has delivered an explanation:¹ Jenewein was strongly influenced by Hanuš Schwaiger and the clear formal expression of the Pre-Raphaelites (Rossetti etc.) and Nazarenes (Overbeck etc.) as well as in the clear visionary allegorization of Alfred Rethel, which reflects Deml's child-like astonishment and the staged simplicity in his texts. In this respect Ripellino also compares Deml's text *Miriam* with Vítězslav Nezval's *Žena v množném čísle* (The Woman in the Plural) (1935).² Bílek and Jenewein are two artists who stage-manage simplicity and 'child-like' naivety in the depiction of everything to do with the body. František Skácelík drew these parallels to Deml in 1918 as follows:

Deml správně stanoví spojitost umění Jeneweina s antikou oklikou přes Michel Angela a Wyspiańskiego [*sic*] a zároveň jeho příbuznost s Grotgierem a Alšem. Jenewein taky nevyloučil ze svého umění to, co upomíná na antický kult těla a přírody, necítil potřebu jako to učinilo starokřesťanské umění dosadit zaň nově nebo jiné hodnoty, zachoval taky reliéfní pozadí, ale při tom přes to starokřesťanská cudnost, citovost prostoduchosti zůstala v něm.³

(Deml thus establishes a connection between Jenewein's art and Antiquity by way of a detour via Michelangelo and Wyspiański and at the same time his own relationship with his contemporaries Grotgier and Aleš. Jenewein also did not exclude from his art that which reminds one of the ancient cult of the body and nature; it did not appear necessary to him to replace it—as the Early Christian Art had done—with new or different values, he also retained the relief background, but the Early Christian Chastity, the sensitivity for naivety, nonetheless remained within him.)⁴

In accordance with this, the view of the body should, to a large extent, be one of 'child-like' innocence. It is this sublimated form of sensitivity in Bílek's paintings that speaks to Deml.

Také v jiných obrazech a sochách má Fr. Bílek těla nahá, těla mužův a žen a přece vidíte, že všechna tato těla jsou 'chrámem Ducha svatého'! I když zobrazuje sochařsky 'Tanec kol zlatého telete' a 'Sodomu', vidíte, že všechnu zhovadilost

¹ Angelo Maria Ripellino, "Due studi di letteratura ceca. I. L'arte di Josef Čapek. II. L'arte di Jakub Deml," *Convivium raccolta nuova*, no. 3 (1950): 398, 399–400.

² Vítězslav Nezval, *Žena v množném čísle* (1935): *Básně, poznámky z deníku, jevištní poesie, surrealistická experimentace* (Prague: Borový, 1936), 9–55.

³ František Skácelík, "Dva mystikové," *Lumír* 55, no. 7 (1928): 326.

⁴ Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

vášně vystihl a zdůraznil především jen výrazem očí a úst. Všimněte si těchto očí a úst a řeknete: jak výmluvně ztrácí svou rajskou lidskost a se rozplývají!⁵ (Fr. Bílek has also portrayed naked bodies, the bodies of men and women, in other paintings and in sculptures and you nevertheless still see that all of these bodies are 'Temples of the Holy Spirit'! And when he depicts in sculptural form the 'Dance around the Golden Calf' and 'Sodom', you see that he captured all the bestiality of the passion and preferred to highlight only the expression of the eyes and ears. Just take a look at these eyes and mouths and you will say: how eloquently do they lose their paradisiacal humanity and become indistinct.)

Deml is thus interested in a physicality that attempts to deny symbolism. In his study *Speech and Phenomena*, which concerns itself with this problem, Jacques Derrida took up Husserl's differentiation between 'Symptoms' and 'Expressions.' According to this, 'Symptoms' are those signs that do not deliberately express anything, such as "das Mienenspiel, die Geste, die Gesamtheit des Körpers und der mundanen Einschreibung, mit einem Wort das Ganze des Sichtbaren und Räumlichen als Sichtbares und Räumliches, das will sagen, insofern sie nicht vom Geist, vom Willen, von der Geistigkeit bearbeitet sind" (facial expressions, gestures, the totality of the body and mundane registration, in a word the whole of the visual and spatial as visual and spatial which intends to say something inasmuch as it is not processed by the *mind*, the will, the *intellectual*).⁶

Derrida argues that a presence may only be conceived from the non-present, which is why there cannot be any transcendental, i.e. present significant items. But it is precisely these kinds of present-like moments that are imagined in Deml's essays on art in which he, in his linguistic expression, attempts to nullify the deficiency of the representation by building a dense cosmos of cross-references. Last but not least he also gives to his diary-like records from all walks of life the title *Šlépěje* (footsteps). In Deml's case these steps always point to a divinely commemorated presence of something past, whereby it is in the poetic word that the presence of truth is to be found.

An important aspect in the conquering of material representation would appear to be the design of the light. Light is also for Otokar Březina the leitmotif of his entire poetical oeuvre. For Deml, light is a symbol of non-representative presence, whereby an inter-medial dialogue with poetry always takes place in the course of his confrontation with the conception of light in the Fine Arts:

Bílkova barva není drtivým prknem, hozeným na záhony květů, ani šatem zakrývajícím tajemství těla a duší, vzduchem šálícím zraky: je světelným, životajevným fluidem prýstícím ze samého nitra a podstaty věcí, fluidem, jemuž z pozemských barev a pojmů jediné odpovídá světlo a všechny formy a linie věcí jsou jen mřížemi, jimiž z věčnosti do věčnosti proudy se řítí Život.⁷

⁵ Jakub Deml, "František Bílek," *Niva* 9, no. 12 (1921): 226.

⁶ Jacques Derrida, *Die Stimme und das Phänomen* (Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp, 1979), 87.

⁷ Jakub Deml, "Korouhve Františka Bílka v Babicích," *Mediace* 2, (1909): 227.

(Bílek's palette of colors is not an oppressive tray that is simply thrown over the flowerbed, nor is it a gown that conceals the secrets of the body and of the soul, deceiving one's glances with air: it is a life-revealing aura of light that springs completely from the inside and from the very nature of things, an aura to which, of all the colors and concepts of this world, light is the only one that corresponds, all forms and lines of things are merely a grid through which the streams of life flows from eternity to eternity.)

The word as that which is significant and as color of the painting may be interpreted in parallel here. As the color points to the light, so, too, must the word transcend itself stylistically, rhythmically and metaphorically. Deml attempts, by way of turning prose into lyric, breaking down semantic relationships and his own always specific metaphorization to weaken the material mimesis and to attain a form of presence beyond the realm of mimetic representation. In this sense he is probably the first surrealist in Czech literature.

This general strategy in Deml's texts is not merely restricted to his poems in prose, but also pervades his essays on the theory of art with respect to Jenewein, Bílek, Konůpek or other artists.⁸

As examples of the texts that Deml produced in the last years of his life, this paper will analyze two of his texts in which he combines sublimated sexuality and surrealism in his own specific manner: *Ledové květy* (Ice Blossoms) (1959) and *V této chvíli provalují se hráze světla* (At this moment the dams of light are breaking) (undated):

Ledové květy

První a poslední slovo. Mluvte děti! První a poslední věc. Má za hlavou jako žlutá peříčka.

Je to zakrnělá korunka. Chatrný pozůstatek vlády.

V letopisech tohoto krále čteme, že se jednou vyrojili hadi a napadli vinohrad. A v spirálách stále užším lisováním hroznů tlačili se k břehům života, aby prorazili hráz tmy.

Učilo se od nich nemluvně. Než dospěli ke světlu, ztrnuli v ledové květy a stékali v slzách.

Potří je svou patou, Immaculata!

Poslední kapitola *Mých Přátel*

Jakub Deml

V Tasově 8.XII.1959⁹

(The first and the last word. Speak, children! The first and the last thing. On the back of its head there is something resembling a yellow feather.

It is a stunted little crown. The shabby remnants of its glory.

In the chronicles of the king we read that once upon a time

⁸ Cf. Jakub Deml, *Jan Konůpek a jiné eseje* (Olomouc: Votobia, 1997).

⁹ Jakub Deml, *Ledové květy* (Prague: Viola, 1966), 8.

The serpents swarmed out and invaded the vineyards. And in spiral formations
 Like onto the ever stronger winepresses did they force
 Their way to the banks of life to break through the dam of darkness.
 The infant learnt from them. Before they reached the light,
 They froze to ice blossoms and flowed down in streams of tears.
 Crush them with your heel, o Immaculate One!

The last chapter of *My Friends*
 Jakub Deml
 Tasov, 8.XII.1959)

This text, written two years before Deml's death, adds to the living flowers a further, metaphorical 'type of flower' – namely the ice crystal. The eighty-one year-old writer here forged a link between flower blossoms and the macrocosm. Due to a cold snap, the water condenses on the window panes and kaleidoscope-like patterns are formed that resemble the blossoms.¹⁰ With them, an apocalyptic note is added to the collection *Moji přátelé* (My Friends). The flower texts would have secured Deml the position of an idyllic author in most histories of literature. In contrast to his supposed idyll of nature, however, he had in *Svědectví o Otokaru Březinovi* (My Testimony about Otokar Březina) already forged a link between the cold and the satanic:

Zlo je studené. Ďábel je vtělený chlad (E. Hello). Dante nechává Satana trčeti v ledu. Kristus odpouštěl i cizoložnicím. Peccaverunt magis mobilitate animi quam pravitate.¹¹

(Evil is cold. The devil is living coldness (E. Hello). Dante causes Satan to get stuck in the ice. Christ also pardoned the adulteresses. Peccaverunt magis mobilitate animi quam pravitate [You have sinned more by way of the inconstancy of the soul than by way of badness].)

Deml thus 'corrects' Dante. For him, it is not eternal damnation and coldness that rule but, ultimately, forgiveness. In Dante it is precisely those who commit adultery who are punished by coldness. Deml transforms this image of coldness from the private individual nature of love-sin to the political collective sin of power. The very first sentence about the first and the last word, which readers of a religious nature will associate with the letters *Alpha* and *Omega*, signalizes to the reader that this text is attempting to bring to a conclusion what is probably Deml's most popular collection of texts. Innocence and the naive play instinct of children with images from the world of fairy tales are called upon against powers that bring death and destruction.

By way of the expression '*První a poslední věc*' (The first and the last thing) the world is characterized as a place of violence and power where things rule

¹⁰ Compare the motif of coldness in consideration of Carl Schmitt by Helmut Lethen, *Verhaltenslehren der Kälte. Lebensversuche zwischen den Kriegen* (Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1994), 215–234.

¹¹ Jakub Deml, *Mé svědectví o Otokaru Březinovi* (Prague: Plejada, 1931), 252.

materialistically. But the king's yellow crown, the symbol of earthly power, is stunted so that its turrets merely look like Red Indians' feathered headdresses. As a result of this comparison the hard, stable and eternal gold of the king's crown is transformed to a combination of light, vulnerable, fragile and materially ephemeral feathers, the very opposite of its original self. The adjective 'stunted' also alludes to the manner in which power deforms people both physically and mentally. The days of earthly power are drawing to their apocalyptic close when Christ shall assume all power. This cipher overcomes the opposition between 'socialist' and 'anti-socialist.' Deml develops his texts in a process of inner-literary evolution whereby he calls into life a clear counter-movement to the official culture of 'socialist realism', but one that does not lose itself in protesting dissent.

The kingdom itself has already collapsed. The implicit author and the implicit reader together read in the chronicles and learn what has happened and why this empire has fallen. This introductory, static and staccato diction is transformed at this point to an ambitious cadenza, as if the sentences were adopting a rhythm of their own reflecting their content in which, rhythmically, the movements of the serpents who have invaded the vineyard are reflected.¹² They are compared to the rotations of the winepress. In the press, the grapes are robbed of their juice of life, in order that this may be ennobled to form an alcoholic beverage. The serpents now squeeze out life with increasing violence by strangling and choking the grapes. They press tighter and tighter, until they reach the very edges of life, the limiting banks. The serpents, which in the Biblical Genesis are a symbol of knowledge, begin their work of destruction because they are striving to reach the light and do not wish to remain in the darkness. These serpents – as, so to speak, earth-bound life forms par excellence, to be found right at the bottom of the pile – wish to draw close to the light of revelation by means of their aggressive invasion. However, they do not succeed in breaking through the barrier to the light and their strength slowly disappears. They are not warmed by the light but stiffen to dead objects. Finally, they also become so small in size that they ultimately sink back down to the earth again as small teardrops, whence they originally came as crawling, twisting beings. The overall image is thus one of the rise to power and descent into insignificance.

The transition from the darkness into the light is compared to birth. Just as the baby has to leave the darkness of its mother's womb in order to see the light of the world, so, too, will man, at the end of his life, have to leave the darkness of this world in order to enter the world of eternal light. In this world, the serpents that caused the Fall from Paradise have been stripped of their power. This motif is one with a long tradition in Slavic literature. In Ivan Turgenev's novella *Pesn' torzhesvuyushchey lyubvi* (The Song of Triumphant Love) (1881), for example, the hero Muzzio plays on the flute in order to lure dangerous serpents from their

¹² Compare the snakes in Bohuslav Reyneks collection of poems *Had na sněhu* [Snake on Snow, 1924]. Bohuslav Reynek, *Le serpent sur la neige / Had na sněhu*, trans. Xavier Galmiche (Paris: Romarin, Les Amis de Suzanne Renaud et Bohuslav Reynek, 1996), 22–23.

basket. In the case of Tadeusz Miciński, whose style is very similar to that of Deml, the plot of his symbolist poem in prose *Pieśń tryumfującej miłci* (Song of Triumphant Love) (1899) flows into a poetic simile: “sine kaktusy jako węże zasluchane we fletnia, naprężone i groźne” (blue serpent-like cactuses absorbed in harkening to the flute, tense and threatening). In Jakub Deml’s case the serpents blend into the overall allegorical structure of the text. The sexual knowledge of Adam and Eve with all of its material consequences is heightened into another form of knowledge. The imperative at the end demands that “the Immaculate One” might crush the serpents with her heel. From one’s knowledge of Deml’s entire oeuvre it would appear extremely over-simplified to merely interpret this ‘pure women’ in a very narrow sense as Mary, Mother of God. Once again it is Deml’s cosmic vision of the salvation-bringing female principle as such that comes to the fore. Against warrior-like manliness as temptation to evil, it is the protective and nourishing femininity that dominates by him throughout – even though Deml himself as a real author had been an intransigent disputant during his lifetime.

The later text picks up a motif that Deml had already expressed poetically in a similar vein on June 29 1910 in *Sen o světové katastrofě* (Dream of the World Catastrophe):

Svatá Panna ve svém jaksi plavném letu obrátila se ještě jedenkrát k severozápadu (tak se mi zdálo) a nyní *žezlem*, vybíhajícím ve tvar lilie, vyzývala ty, na něž byla před tím s láskou pohlédla, aby ihned přehalí za Ní. Byl pak pohyb žezla Jejího jako když prudce vyrývají se květiny z půdy.

Aspoň v tu chvíli, Královno nebes, kdy smrtí mou

žalář mého těla se otevře a rozedlní,

abych nebyl zavalen a rozdrcen svou vlastní tmou,

obrat’ ke mně své oči v hodince poslední!

A ve světle pohledu Tvého, Rodičko Boží,

před Trůnem Beránka uprostřed věčných chval

kde blaženost každým dechem ještě se množí,

ať uzmím ty, které jsem nenáviděl a miloval!¹³

(The Holy Virgin, in her somehow floating flight, turned to the northwest once again (or so it seemed to me) and now demanded, with her *sceptre* in the form of a lily, that those, upon whom she had looked with love, should now flee after HER. The movement of HER sceptre, however, was as if one would rip out flowers from the ground impetuously.

At least in this moment, o QUEEN of Heaven, when

My death opens the prison of my body and becomes light and bright,

that I might not be buried and crushed by my own darkness

may YOUR eyes look upon me in my final area!

And in the light of YOUR sight, MOTHER OF GOD,

before the THRONE OF THE LAMB in the midst of eternal rejoicing,

where blessedness increases further with every breath,

that is where I should like to see those I have hated and loved!)

¹³ Jakub Deml, “Sen o světové katastrofě (29.VI.1910),” in *Můj očistec*, ed. Jakub Deml (1929, repr. Olomouc: Votobia, 1996), 249.

Here, the darkness emerges from inside one's own self and threatens to destroy the subject as such. The invasion of the serpents and the darkness had been interpreted by Vladimír Binar in his *Triptych, Zjevení a Ledové květy* (Triptych, Revelation and Ice Blossoms) as a threat to man from within his own self.¹⁴ In this text, dated 1910, light appears after death from divine revelation, whereby in this case it is the "Queen of Heaven" ("Královno nebes") and not an earthly king who is spoken of. Topographically speaking, the northwest in the sense of Dante's *Divina Comedia* is that part of the lost paradise, the "paradiso terrestre" at the summit of the Mountain of Purgatory in the southern hemisphere—a place "that did not know sin as yet" ("na neznámou planetu, která ještě nepoznala hříchu").

In this text the contrast between the female-heavenly and the male-earthly kingdom is very important. Whereas the literature of so-called 'Socialist Realism' with its focus upon tractors, locomotives and 'masculine-like' female workers attempted to cement a thoroughly patriarchal world, Deml's cosmos dissolves into the feminine. In addition to this opposition, however, the antithesis of words and things is also accentuated. The imperative at the beginning "Mluvte děti!" (Speak, children!) challenges one to transcend the purely material world and to transfigure the child-like, the heart of which is formed by the later wording "učilo se od nich nemluvně" (the babe learnt from them). In his interpretation of this passage of the text Vladimír Binar assumes a landscape somewhere between the world of the internal and the external man. The stepping out from one's self is interpreted from the child's point of view as impossibility and as death. It is only in a third realm, namely the divine that is above the world, that man is able to identify himself with the world.¹⁵ In Binar's view the text is about how man, in the face of power, is no longer capable of any actions.¹⁶ Against this, one should place the spoken word of the poet at the heart of the interpretation as a positive, constructive principle. Just as in *Hlas mluví k slovu* (The Voice speaks to the Word) the point is that the word is not purely rational and material. It is rather the case that man is able to return once more to a paradisiacal state by way of the poet's word.

In the text *V této chvíli provalují se hráze světla* (At this Moment the Dams of Light are breaking) the significance of light and the Mother of God for Deml are made clearer still. This second text was also written shortly before his death. He left it in a hand-written form with no title and no specific date of origin:¹⁷

V této chvíli provalují se hráze světla
a proti jeho proudu – nevidíš?
nesčíslné množství hlasův [sic], očí a rukou
žene se v opojení. Vlna teplá

¹⁴ Vladimír Binar, "Triptych, Zjevení a Ledové květy," *Glosy se Strahova*, no. 9-10 (1969): 27.

¹⁵ Ibid., 28.

¹⁶ Ibid., 29.

¹⁷ Jakub Deml, *Sen jeden svítí* (Prague: Odeon, 1991), 295.

z nozder zvířat betlémských
 vždy dál a výš
 zachvacuje prostor. V zlatý smích
 nebešťanů křídla tlukou.
 Gloria in excelsis.
 Jeden z nich se k zemi blíží –
 neminul se cíle?
 Všechno je na něm veliké a bílé.
 Hrůzně velebné.
 Noci děs i sláva dne.
 Oči jeho tůně,
 v nichž mléko diamantů klokotá a víří,
 duha na duhu,
 však každá barva zvlášť,
 a přece promíseny. Láska i zášť,
 Není neduhu:
 v tomto pohledu, když se otevírá,
 nemoc stůně,
 i sama Smrt zmírá!
 (At this moment the dams of light are breaking
 and against its current – do you not see that?
 The uncountless multitude of voices, eyes and arms are fighting
 Drunkenly. A warm wave emanating
 From the nostrils of the animals of Bethlehem
 Is embracing the room ever further and higher
 The wings of the heavenly creatures are beating
 In golden laughter.
 Gloria in excelsis.
 One of them is drawing close to the earth
 Has he not missed his destination?
 Everything about him is large and white,
 shudderingly sublime.
 Scourge of the night and glory of the day
 His eyes are as deep as wells,
 in which the milk of diamonds bubblingly swirls,
 Rainbow upon rainbow,
 but each color is separated,
 and yet merged. Love and hate
 there is no weakness
 In this look when it opens itself up,
 illness and even death itself
 pass away!)

Here the voices (“nesčíslné množství hlasův”) are pitted against the coldness of space. In this late text the sun rises at the beginning. In the eyes of that being that appears in the second verse, the milk of diamond suns (“v nichž mléko diamantů klokotá a víří”) bubbles and swirls through space. Warmth rises from the breath of the animals in the manger at Bethlehem. Thus the incarnation of God and the embodiment of the divine words in his Son are indirectly thematized.

It is however neither Christ himself nor a feminine being but this one heavenly creature (from the “nebešťanů”) that, in the second verse, nears the earth and is now at the center of the reader’s attention. The image of the Fallen Angel Lucifer resounds here also, the one who, before his fall, had shone the brightest of them all in heaven. With reference to a painting by Felix Jenewein Deml wrote:

Felix Jenewein viděl po křesťanskú: jeho Anděl není ani z krve, ani z vůle těla, ani z vůle muže, nýbrž z vůle Boha rozen jest (Jan 1,13), u něhož není proměnění, ani pro obrácení se jinam zastínění. Bůh se nemůže jinam obrátit. Vicissitudo znamená střídání, změnu, avšak u Boha vůbec není střídání! ‘On sám jest bez proměny.’¹⁸

(Felix Jenewein's view was a Christian one: his angel is born not of blood, not of the will of the body and not of the will of man but of the will of God (Joh. 1,13), for him there is no transformation and no darkening to turn elsewhere. God cannot turn to anywhere else. Vicissitudo means change but there is no change for God! ‘He himself is without change.’)

Deml's Luciferian angel is drawing closer to the earth instead of his true destination—hell. He is of sublime greatness and whiteness. The angel here is an ambivalent being that meets the finite world with all its shortcomings and limitations when it gets involved with the world. Love and hate (“Láska i zášť”) are united thereby. Evil and weakness (“neduha”) are transcended by the cosmic vision. Lists are a popular stylistic instrument in Baroque visionary literature. They were considered in that epoch to be a method of proving the existence of the divine upon the earth. As a number of examples in this work have attempted to demonstrate, Deml's textual cosmos consists of poetic methods and lists which, like mirrors standing opposite one another, create a transcending infinity, even though he himself was forever striving for the unity of all things. In this text also, Deml attempts to push the censuses into the endless: “nesčíslné množství hlasův” (countless voices), “vždy dál a výš” (ever further and higher) and “duha na duhu” (Rainbow upon rainbow). The rainbow as such is for Deml a symbol of divine perfection:

Duhu nazývá Hospodin svou. Proto říkáme Boží duha. Jest pak sedmibarevná. Harfa Davidova měla sedmero strun, oslavujíc šest dní Stvoření a sedmý den Odpočinku. Panna Maria má svému Srdci vetknuto sedm mečů. Dle svatého Řehoře sedm dní zahrnuje v sobě veškeren čas, proto prý číslo sedm jest představitelem nebo symbolem všelikosti. Septenario numero universitas figuratur.¹⁹

(The LORD calls the rainbow his own. This is why we say *Boží duha* [the beloved rainbow]. It also consists of seven colors. David's harp had seven strings and celebrated the six days of the CREATION and the seventh day of REST. The VIRGIN MARY has seven swords stuck in her HEART. For Saint Gregory seven days embody all time within themselves, which is why the number seven is the

¹⁸ Jakub Deml, *Dílo Felixe Jeneweina* (Prague: Výtvarný Odbor Umělecké Besedy, 1928), 30.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 88.

representative or symbol of universality: *Septenario numero universitas figuratur* [Seven is the figure that stands for all].)

In the image of the colors “zvlášť, a přece promísěný” (individual and yet merged) Deml once again has recourse to his favored rhetorical device—the oxymoron. As the sun rises at the beginning, so, too, does a look open itself at the end (“v tomto pohledu, když se otevírá”). In the context of Deml’s complete text it is once again the eye for the poetic word that overcomes all things material so that illness dies away (“nemoc stůně”) and death dies (“sama Smrt zmírá”). In this world of the poetical the contrasts are still in existence but have been overcome. Here, too, Deml is completely bound to the tradition of the Baroque epoch. In this text the long transition in Deml’s oeuvre from narrative story-telling via the poem in prose to poetical imagery is perfected. Here there is no longer a meta level that contrasts with the remaining text segment, just as there are also no longer any representative and mimetic segments. The dualism of image and idea has completely dissolved in the image.

Deml thus established a counter movement to ‘socialist lyricism’. In his case, realism gives way via the genre of the poem in prose more and more to a non-mimetic poetization. This is evolutionary at the end of Deml’s life with the perfection of the world of the imagination, so characteristic for him, which we associate today with the word ‘Tasov’. Tasov, his small Moravian village, is indeed not ‘realistic’ but a seal to a world of the poetical, in which he alone was able and still is able to transport his readers (and himself). In an article for the literary magazine *Niva* in 1921 he expressed this as follows:

Jeti do Tasova, jest pro mne jako jeti do pohádky. Jako do tance smrti, jako na rytířskou výpravu, anebo domů z dálného východu na svůj hrad... Nedobytný.²⁰
(For me, travelling to Tasov is like travelling to the world of the fairytale. Like in a dance of death, a knight’s quest or returning home from the Far East to my fortress ... the unconquerable.)

²⁰ Jakub Deml, “Kollokvia. (Pokračování.) <Úvahy a črty>,” *Niva* 9, no. 11 (1921): 221.

Czechs in the US Military

Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr.

Throughout history, Czechs have been known as outstanding warriors¹ which they had amply demonstrated, particularly during the Hussite wars.² Nevertheless, with respect to the involvement of Czech Americans in the military, the general opinion has not been as flattering. Thus, Thomas Čapek, who is considered to be an objective writer of Czech immigration, stated that “In the Civil War the Čechs provided the United States Army with more musicians than generals.”³ Francis Dvorník, who devoted a small chapter in his slender volume⁴ to Czechs in the Civil War, states that most Czech immigrants sympathized with the Union and supported it, giving a number of examples of Czech volunteers in the Union Army. Marek Valha, who was also more generous in his appraisal of Czech soldiers in the American Civil War, nevertheless laments about the paucity of information existing about the Czechs in the American military.⁵ Of all the States of the Union, only Texas patriots have given systematic attention to documenting the Czech American presence in the US Military.⁶ To this author’s knowledge,

¹ Emanuel Salomon Friedberg-Mírochorský, “Dějiny válečnictví v Čechách,” in: *Ottův slovník naučný*. Praha: J. Otto, 1898, vol. 6, pp. 438-444; Adam Hauner, “Armáda 1792-1914,” in: *Československá vlastivěda*. Praha: Sfinx, 1929-1936, díl 5. Stat; Antonín Bouček, *Staré české válečnictví 1915*; Otakar Frankenberger, *Naše velká armáda*. Praha: A. Neubert, 1921-22, 2 vols.; H. Jireček, “Čeští válečníci,” *Časopis Musea Království českého*, vol. 32; Jan Kapras, “Z naší vojenské minulosti: Z dějin vojenského zřízení,” in: *Armáda a národ*. Praha: Národní rada Československá, 1938; Josef Fries, *Slavné prohry, slavná vítězství Koruny české. Devět vybraných kapitol z dějin českého válečnictví*, Praha: Formát, 1998; Dagmar Hasalová White, “The Czech Nation and its Armies in Warfare, Victory, Defeat and Nation Building,” in: *Czech and Slovak Culture in International and Global Context, Selected Papers from the 23rd SVU World Congress*, University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice, 24 June -2 July 2006. České Budějovice: University of South Bohemia, 2008, pp. 251-253.

² Hugo Toman, *Husitské válečnictví*. Praha: Královská česká společnost nauk, 1898; Hanuš Kuffner, *Husitské vojny v obrazech* 1907; Max v. Wulf, *Die hussitische Wagenburg*. Berlin, 1889; Petr Klučina, *Jak válčili husité*. Praha: Naše vojsko, 1983; Frederick G. Heymann, *John Žižka and the Hussite Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955; Josef Pekař, *Žižka a jeho doba*. Praha: Odeon, 1992; Josef Dolejší and Leonid Křížek, *Husité – Vrchol válečného umění v Čechách*. Praha: Elka Press, 2009; Victor Verney, *Warrior of God: Jan Žižka and the Hussite Revolution*. Barnsley, UK: Frontline Books, 2009.

³ Thomas Čapek, “The Čech as a Soldier,” in: *The Čechs (Bohemians) in America*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920, pp. 155-103.

⁴ Francis Dvorník, “Czechs in the Civil War,” in: *Czech Contributions to the Growth of the United States*. Chicago: Benedictine Abbey Press, 1962, pp. 80-92.

⁵ Marek Vlha, “Czech Soldiers in the American Civil War: Previous Research and New Perspectives,” *Kosmas* 22, No. 2 (Spring 2010), pp. 43-57.

⁶ Wright, Judy Feldtman, Ed., *Czechs in Gray – and Blue, Too!* San Antonio, TX: Judy Feldtman Wright, 1988; The Czech Heritage Society of Texas, *Texas Veterans of Czech Ancestry*. Austin, TX: Eakin Press, 1999; Texas Czech Genealogical Society. *Czechs in Uniform. A Tribute to Our Czech Veterans*. 2 vols. Texas Czech Genealogical Society,

none of the existing monographs relating to Czech Americans in US military service have come up with any significant military figures whose performance and role would be considered exceptional and extraordinary—beyond the call of duty.⁷

The purpose of this article is to show that Czech Americans have played a significant role in just about every military conflict in which the US was involved, some of the soldiers attaining high rank as officers. This is not a historical essay, nor a statistical account, but rather a tentative listing and narration of selected individuals who showed unusual bravery and who achieved a place of honor in the US military. It is organized by specific wars and follows the General Outline below. Apart from the actual natives of the Czech Lands, American descendants of Czech immigrants have also been included, as appropriate.

GENERAL OUTLINE

- I. American Revolutionary War
- II. Indian Wars
- III. War of 1812
- IV. War of Texas Independence
- V. Mexican-American War
- VI. Border War
- VII. US Civil War
- VIII. Korean Expedition of 1871
- IX. Spanish-American War
- X. Nicaraguan Campaign
- XI. World War I
- XII. Pearl Harbor
- XIII. World War II
- XIV. Korean War
- XV. Vietnam War

American Revolutionary War (1775-1783)

Starting with the Revolutionary War, the first known Czech immigrant in America, Augustine Herman,⁸ left numerous progeny, many of whom volunteered in the War, some playing an important role. The same is true about the descendants of another prominent Bohemian immigrant, Frederick Philipse.⁹

Richard Bassett (1745-1815), whose mother was a great great-daughter of

2010. 1007p.

⁷ Besides the mentioned books, see also: J. Čermák, *Dějiny občanské války s připojením zkušeností českých vojáků*. Chicago: A. Geringer, 1889.

⁸ Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., "Augustine Herman Bohemiensis," *Kosmas* 3, No. 1 (Summer 1984), pp. 139-148.

⁹ Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., "Český 'Vanderbilt' v Americe," in: *Postavy naší Ameriky*. Pražská edice, 2000, pp. 28-30.

Augustine Herman, was a veteran of the American Revolution and delegate to the Constitutional Convention of 1787. His most notable contributions during the American Revolution were his efforts to mobilize the state's military. Some sources credit him with developing the plans for raising and staffing the 1st Delaware Regiment, with his neighbor, John Haslet at its command. Known as the "Delaware Continentals" or "Delaware Blues," they were from the smallest state, but as some 800 men, were the largest battalion in the army. David McCullough in 1776 describes them "turned out in handsome red trimmed blue coats, white waistcoats, buckskin breeches, white woolen stockings, and carrying fine, 'lately imported' English muskets. Raised in early 1776, they went into service in July and August 1776. Bassett also participated in the recruitment of the reserve militia that served in the "Flying Camp" of 1776, and the Dover Light Infantry, led by another neighbor, Thomas Rodney.

When the British Army marched through northern New Castle County, on the way to the Battle of Brandywine and the capture of Philadelphia, Bassett "appears to have joined his friend Rodney in the field as a volunteer." Once the Delaware militia returned home after the British retired from the area, Bassett continued as a part-time soldier, assuming command of the Dover Light Horse, Kent County's militia cavalry unit.¹⁰

Edmund Jennings Randolph (1753-1813) was a great great-grand son of Augustine Herman. He was an American attorney, the seventh Governor of Virginia, the second US Secretary of State, and the first United States Attorney General. He was born to the influential Randolph family in Williamsburg, Virginia and educated at the College of William and Mary. After graduation he began reading law with his father John Randolph and uncle, Peyton Randolph. In 1775, with the start of the American Revolution, Randolph's father remained a Loyalist and returned to Britain; Edmund Randolph remained in America where he joined the Continental Army as aide-de-camp to General George Washington.¹¹

David Ross (1755-1800), b. Prince Georges Co., MD, desc. f. Augustine Herman. Appointed by Gen. Washington major of Grayson's additional continental regiment in Jan. and served until Dec. 1777. After the war he practiced law and managed his family's extensive estates in Frederick, MD. From 1786 to 1788 he was a delegate to the Continental Congress from Maryland.¹²

Thomas Marsh Forman (1758-1845), also Herman's descendant, was a native of Rose Hill, Cecil Co., MD. He joined Smallwood's Regiment as a cadet shortly before the battle of Long Island, the following winter was commissioned First Lieutenant in the Eleventh PA Regiment. Subsequently became Captain in his Uncle David's Continental Regiment, and in 1779 succeeded James Monroe as staff officer to Maj. Gen. Lord Sterling. He served in the legislature in 1790-1800,

¹⁰ Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr. "Signatář americké konstituce z české krve," in: *Postavy naší Ameriky*. Praha: Pražská edice, 2000, pp.42-44.

¹¹ Daniel Moncure Conway, *Omitted Chapters of History*, disclosed in the Life and Papers of Edmund Randolph. New York, 1888.

¹² *Biographical Directory of the U.S. Congress 1774-2005*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2006.

and during the bombardment of Fort McHenry in the War of 1812 commanded a brigade of militia. During Lafayette's visit to this country in 1824, Gen. Thomas Marsh Forman went with his carriage with four horses and two servants in livery to meet Marquis and took him in his carriage to Frenchtown where he took the steamboat to Baltimore.¹³

Gen. Thomas Marsh Forman had a brother Joseph Forman (1761-1805) who was a Colonel and who was later appointed US Consul to Amsterdam. His son Ezekiel, who was also in the military, became a Major.¹⁴

Benedict Brice (1749-1786) was born in Annapolis, MD. He was a great-great-grandson of Augustine Herman. He served as second lieutenant, Infantry, Eighth or Dover Regiment, Delaware Militia. The length of his service is not known. He was a farmer, merchant and owned stores in Greensboro, Caroline Co., MD.¹⁵

John Dockery Thompson (1743-1826) was born in North Sassafras Parish, Cecil Co., MD. He was a descendant of Augustine Herman. He was a Lieutenant Colonel, Bohemian Battalion, Cecil Co. militia, commissioned July 6, 1776. He was a planter and served in MD legislature and was also as justice.¹⁶

Henry Brockholst Livingston (1757-1823), b. NYC, desc. f. Frederick Philipse. Henry Brockholst Livingston was an American Revolutionary War officer, a justice of the Supreme Court of New York and eventually an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. At the outbreak of the Revolutionary War he was commissioned captain in the Continental Army and served as aide-de-camp to Gen. Philip Schayler, being attached to the northern dept. and ranking as a major. He was aide to Gen. Arthur St. Clair and participated in the siege of Ft. Ticonderoga and was present at the surrender of Gen. Burgoyne's army at Saratoga. He returned to Gen. Schuyler's army and was promoted Lt. colonel.¹⁷

Matthew Clarkson (1758-1825) was born in New York, NY. He was a great-great-grandson of Frederick Philipse. He was an American Revolutionary War soldier and a politician in New York State. The town of Clarkson in Western New York was named after him. He was a great uncle of Thomas S. Clarkson, a

¹³ Charles Forman, *Three Revolutionary Soldiers: David Forman (1745-1797), Jonathan Forman (1755-1809), Thomas Marsh Forman (1758-1845)*. The Forman-Bassett-Hatch Co., 1902; John Randolph, *Letters of John Randolph of Roanoke, to General Thomas Marsh Forman [1807-1826]*. Virginia Historical Society, 1941.

¹⁴ *Biographical Record of Eastern Shore*, 1898.

¹⁵ "Brice, Benedict (1749-1786)," in: *A Biographical Dictionary of the Maryland Legislature, 1635-1789*. By Edward C. Papenfuss et al. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979, vol.1, pp.163-164.

¹⁶ Thompson, John D. (Dockery) (1743-1786),"in: *A Biographical Dictionary of the Maryland Legislature, 1635-1789*, op cit., vol. 2, p. 816.

¹⁷ E. B. Livingston, *The Livingstons of Livingston Manor*. New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1910; Leon Friedman and Fred L. Israel, eds., *The Justices of the United States Supreme Court, 1789-1969: Their Lives and Major Opinions*. New York: Chelsea House, 1969.

member of the family who founded Clarkson University. He served in the Revolutionary War, first on Long Island, subsequently under Benedict Arnold. He was at Saratoga and, later, on the staff of General Benjamin Lincoln, was present at the surrender of Burgoyne at Savannah (1779) and at the defense of Charleston (1780). He was also present at the surrender of Cornwallis. After the War, Clarkson was commissioned brigadier general of militia of Kings and Queens Counties in June 1786 and Major General of the Southern District of New York in March 1798.¹⁸

Solomon Bush (1753-1795) was an American soldier, born in Philadelphia; son of Matthias Bush from Prague, one of the signers of the non-importation agreement (October 25, 1765). Solomon was an officer in the Pennsylvania militia, 1777-87. On July 5, 1777, he was appointed deputy adjutant-general of the state militia by the supreme council of Pennsylvania. In September, 1777, he was dangerously wounded in the thigh during a skirmish, and had to be taken to Philadelphia. When the British captured the city in December, 1777, he was taken prisoner, but released on parole. As he could not earn his living, being kept, on account of his wound, at his father's home (Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia), the council passed a series of resolutions, October 20, 1779, respecting him, and on October 27 of that year he was promoted to lieutenant-colonel, with pay in accordance with the rank. Bush was in destitute circumstances in later years, and on November 5, 1785, the council of Pennsylvania, under the presidency of Benjamin Franklin, ordered that a pension be paid him for his meritorious services. His brother, Jonas Bush, was on the roll of Revolutionary soldiers.¹⁹

Lewis Bush (1753-1777), b. Philadelphia, PA, a brother of the above, was also an American Revolutionary soldier. He received the commission of first lieutenant of the Sixth Pennsylvania Battalion (June 1776) and was made captain in the same month. He was transferred in 1777, to Col. Thomas Hartley's additional continental regiment and of this troop Bush was commissioned major March 12, 1777. He was a brave soldier, serving with distinction during many engagements. At the battle of Brandywine, Sept. 11, 1777, he received a fatal wound and died shortly after.²⁰

Sir Frederick Philipse Robinson (1763-1852), b. Highlands, near New York, NY, of Bohemian ancestry, desc. f. Frederick Philipse. Robinson came from an illustrious Virginian family; his grandfather was at one time President of the Council at Virginia. Robinson initially served in his father's regiment, the Colonel Beverley Robinson regiment (The Loyal American Regiment) before acquiring a commission in the 17th (Royal Leicestershire) Regiment of Foot. He saw service in the American War of Independence (serving for a period of time as

¹⁸ Cuyler Reynolds, *Genealogical and Family History of Southern New York and the Hudson River Valley*. New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1914, vol. 3, pp. 1026-1028; Hazel Kleinbach, *Highlights of Clarkson History*. Clarkson: H. Kleinbach, 1988.

¹⁹ H. S. Morais, *The Jews of Philadelphia*, 1894, pp. 22, 455-457; Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., "Early Jewish Immigrants in America from the Historic Czech Lands and Slovakia," *Review of the Society for the History of Czechoslovak Jews*, Vol. 3 (1990-91), pp. 157-179.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

a prisoner-of-war). The cessation of hostilities brought sad tidings to the Robinson family, as their property was duly confiscated by the fledgling U.S. government because of their unswerving loyalty to the British Crown. Robinson, having in the interim transferred to the 38th (South Staffordshire) Regiment of Foot, then served in England and Ireland before taking part in the expedition to the West Indies (1793), where he was present at the capture of Martinique, St. Lucia and Guadeloupe, but returned to England due to ill-health. Robinson subsequently spent the next few-years stationed in England, and by 1807 was a colonel, having commanded the London Recruiting District. Robinson later saw service in the Peninsular War (from 1812-1813), and as a Major-General commanded a brigade during the Battle of Vittoria, and it was Robinson's brigade that took the village of Gamarra-Mayor at the point of the bayonet, under a heavy curtain of French artillery and musketry fire. This redoubtable old soldier was to further distinguish himself at the Battles of San Sebastian, Bidassoa, Sicoa, the Heights of Cibour and at the Battle of the Nive, later taking over command of the 5th Division. His fighting days far from over, Robinson then served in Canada during the War of 1812 (1812-1815), being appointed Commander-in-Chief and Governor of Upper Canada, whereupon he became Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Island of Tobago (1816-1828). Robinson was promoted to rank of full General in 1841, and died at Brighton, Sussex, in January, 1852.²¹

Apart from the listed individuals, several of the female progeny of Augustine Herman and Frederick Philipse married some illustrious American figures, such as a member of the Continental Congress, a signer of US Constitution and the future Governor of New Jersey William Livingston (1723-1790), member of the Continental Congress John Cleves Symmes (1742-1814), the future Governor of Delaware Joshua Clayton (1744-1789), the President of the Continental Congress and the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court John Jay (1745-1829,) a member of the Continental Congress Jacob Read (1751-1816) and a Congressman and the future Governor of New Hampshire Jeremiah Smith (1759-1842),²² who all played a significant role in American Revolution.

Indian Wars (1775-1890)

John Rozier Clagett (1832-1902), b. Washington, DC, desc. f. Augustine Herman. Major US Army. Served on Crook's campaigns against Northern Cheyenne Indians (1876-77); in duty at St. Louis during riots (1877); on campaign against northern Cheyenne Indians (1878); campaigns against Ute Indians, CO (1880); Apache Indians, AZ (1892). Served on the second Philippine expedition (1898); engaged in assault and capture of Manilla (1898); defense of Manilla

²¹ *Gentleman's Magazine*, February 1852. pp 188–190; *The Journal of Ross Dix-Peek*, Feb. 26, 2010.

²² Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., *U.S. Legislators with Czechoslovak Roots*. Washington, DC: SVU Press, 1987.

against Tagalog Insurrection (1899); expedition to Sulu Islands (1899); commander of Home Battalion 25th Infantry after returning to US.²³

Winslow Malý (1843-d.), b. Bohemia. At the outbreak of the war was in Minnesota. Enlisted in Company E, Independent Battalion, Minnesota Cavalry, August 24, 1864; was in the western department; served in the northwestern frontier against the Indians and guarding frontier settlements; was at Fort Ripley, near the head-waters of the Mississippi River, and in November, 1865, he, with the whole command, was caught in one of the great blizzards of that section of the country; was badly frozen and eye-sight nearly destroyed, and the whole command came near being lost; was honorably discharged from service May 1, 1866. Maly then followed his trade of shoe-maker at Los Angeles, Cal., and was a member of Gelcich Post, No. 106, G. A. R., of the same place and was adjutant of his post.²⁴

Gustavus Becher (1844-1913), b. Plzeň, Bohemia. Scouts officer. He was brought by his parents to America in 1847 and by 1856 had settled at Columbus, NE. Becher came to know the Pawnees, for he was named lieutenant, under Luther North as captain, of a company of Pawnee scouts in 1867 which were of the battalion of scouts commanded by Frank North. The next year, Becker served under Fred Mathews of another company of scouts, this time protecting Union Pacific Railroad construction. Becker apparently was at the decisive victory over the Cheyennes at Summit Spring July 11, 1869. He later became a real estate broker and was elected to the state legislature in 1895 and died at Columbus, NE.²⁵

John J. Philipi (1856-1928), b. Prague, Bohemia. Lewiston (Idaho) pioneer who served conspicuously through the Nez Perce Indian War. He came to America, locating at Portland, Oregon. He enlisted in the cavalry of the United States Army, and shortly afterward the troop was ordered to Fort Lapwai to take part in the Indian War of 1877. Philipi was in the battle of White Bird. After his enlistment period was over, he came to Lewiston, ID with his family in 1886, and took up his residence there, remaining until his death.²⁶

War of 1812 (1812-1815)

Abraham Block (1780-1857), b. Bohemia. The 1812 Veteran and pioneer merchant in Washington, AR. He immigrated to this country at an early age. During the War of 1812, he fought with courage and distinction. With his wife,

²³ Francis Bernard Heitman, *Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army, from ...*, Volume 1, p. 302.

²⁴ William H. Ward, *Records of Members of the Grand Army of the Republic*. San Francisco: H. S. Crocker & Co., 1886, p. 456.

²⁵ Margaret Currey, *History of Platte Co., Nebraska*. Culver City, CA: Murray and Gee Inc., 1950; Dan L. Thrapp, *Encyclopedia of Frontier Biography*. Glendale, CA: A. H. Clark Co., 1988, pp. 84-85.

²⁶ *Eleventh Biennial Report of the Board of Trustees of the State Historical Society of Idaho*. Boise, ID, 1928, p. 90.

Fannie, he journeyed to Arkansas in the early 1820=s, traveling along the old Southwest Trail to claim the bounty land he was entitled to as a veteran. The Blocks arrived in Washington in 1823 and soon established the mercantile business that was to become one of the most prosperous in the state. By all accounts, he was one of the wealthiest men in Hempstead County. Block was generally believed to be the state=s longest-standing Jewish resident, Jews having been forbidden to reside in Arkansas during the period of Spanish control.²⁷

George Edward Mitchell (1781-1832) was born in Elkton, MD.²⁸ He was a descendant of Augustine Herman. An 1805 graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, he practiced medicine with his father in Elkton, Maryland from 1806 to 1812. He served in the Maryland House of Delegates from 1808 to 1809 and was president of the State Executive Council from 1809 to 1812. During the War of 1812 Mitchell was commissioned with the Third Maryland Artillery and saw action at York, Fort George, Fort Niagara and Fort Oswego; for his actions in defending the latter he was brevetted Colonel and presented a sword by the Maryland General Assembly. He resigned his commission on June 1, 1821. Mitchell served two consecutive terms in the US House of Representatives (March 4, 1823 to March 3, 1827) but chose not to run in the 1826 election. He was instrumental in inviting Lafayette to the US in 1824. After losing his bid for Governor in 1829, he was elected for two more terms in Congress and served from December 7, 1829 until his death. He was buried at Congressional Cemetery in Washington DC; there is also a cenotaph for him in his native Elkton.²⁹

Ezekiel Forman Chambers (1788-1867), also Augustine Herman's descendant, was a native of Chestertown, Kent Co., MD. In 1809 he was admitted to the bar and soon acquired a great reputation as a lawyer. During the war of 1812 he raised a volunteer company, of which he was captain. With this company he participated in the battle of Caulk's Field in the summer of 1814, and his bravery was especially mentioned in the official report of the battle. He attained the rank of brigadier general of militia after the war. In 1826 the legislature of Maryland elected him to the Senate. He was later appointed a judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland.³⁰

War of Texas Independence (1836)

In early December 1835, there is a record of one **Herman Ehrenberg (1815-1866)** who came to Nacogdoches, TX and fought in the siege of Bexar, the first major campaign of the Texas Revolution. He was one of a few men who escaped

²⁷ Carolyn Gray LeMaster, *A Corner of the Tapestry. History of the Jewish Experience in Arkansas, 1820s – 1990s*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1994, pp. 3-10.

²⁸ John C. Fredriksen "Mitchell, George E...", in: *American Military Leaders: From colonial times to the present*, Volume 2 Page 523.

²⁹ *Biographical Directory of the United States 1774-2005*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2006.

³⁰ *Biographical Record of Eastern Shore*, p. 467.

the Goliad Massacre. According to a translation of Ehrenberg's own account, after the command to kneel at the start of the shooting, he jumped up and, hidden by the gun smoke, dashed for the San Antonio River. On the way a Mexican soldier slashed him in the head with his saber, but Ehrenberg managed to get by him and jumped in the river crying, "The Republic of Texas forever!" When he was discharged from the Texas army on June 2, 1836, he received a certificate for part of a league of land but never personally claimed it. Since it was later (1880) awarded to his heirs from Teplice, Bohemia, he may have been of Bohemian origin. It should be possible to trace his Czech relation through the Texas court records.³¹

In February 1836, **Frederick Lemský (?-1844)** appeared in Texas. Not much is known about him except that he came from the Czech Lands and that he was a fifer in the four-piece Texas Army "band" at the battle of San Jacinto.³² He enlisted in the Texas army on March 13, 1836, and served in the company of William E. Howth and Nicholas Lynch. He was a musician in the army until December 31, 1836. He is said to have played "Come to the Bower" on the flute at the battle of San Jacinto. He then settled in Houston. On January 27, 1838, Lemský advertised in the *Telegraph and Texas Register*, offering his services as a music teacher and teacher of German and French. He was a charter member of the German Union of Texas, incorporated on January 21, 1841. In March 1842 the Brazos and San Luis Canal was being dug near the site of what is now the town of Oyster Creek in Brazoria County. Lemský was the employer of thirty men digging there. The work lapsed for a while but may have begun again in late 1843. In January or February 1844 Lemský drowned when a "hard norther" capsized the barge on which they were hauling corn. Lemský's body was recovered near Virginia Point, on the mainland side of Galveston Bay. According to the probate records in Brazoria County, "octave flute" and "1 keyed flute" were included in the inventory of his property. They were sold for \$2.25 at auction in June 1844.³³

Mexican-American War (1846-1848)

Anthony Michael Dignowity (1810-1875) was born in Kaňk, nr. Kutná Hora, Bohemia and was trained as mechanic. Somehow he got involved in the Polish revolution in 1831 and later immigrated to America. After his arrival in New York in 1832, he traveled southward and worked at a variety of occupations in various states. During an extended residence in Natchez, MS, he traveled to

³¹ Natalie Ornish, *Pioneer Jewish Texans* (Dallas: Texas Heritage, 1989). Diane M. T. Rose, "The Maps, Plans, and Sketches of Herman Ehrenberg," *Prologue: Journal of the National Archives* 9 (Fall 1977).

³² L. W. Kemp. "San Jacinto, Battle of" in: *Handbook of Texas Online*.

³³ Clinton Machann and James W. Mendel, *Krásná Amerika*, *op. cit.*, p. 24, 27; Donald W. Pugh, "Lemský, Frederick (?-1844)" in: *Handbook of Texas Online*, *op. cit.*; James A. Creighton, *A Narrative History of Brazoria County*, Angleton, Texas: Brazoria County Historical Commission, 1975; Sam Houston Dixon and Louis Wiltz Kemp, *The Heroes of San Jacinto*. Houston: Anson Jones, 1932.

Texas as far as San Antonio. He studied medicine under doctors Stone and Carrothers in Natchez and at the Eclectic Medical College of Cincinnati, after which he practiced medicine in Mississippi and at Tahlequah in the Cherokee Indian Territory of present-day Oklahoma. When the Mexican War broke out in spring of 1846, he hurried back to San Antonio with a group of Arkansas volunteers. He later became a successful doctor and businessman there, but in the 1850s his outspoken abolitionist views made him controversial. In 1859 he published an autobiography in English, *Bohemia under Austrian Despotism* to clear his name. He was one of the first Czech-born writers to publish in America. In his book Dignowity rails against the "tyranny" of American public opinion and criticizes the American legal system. Dignowity's reputation as a Unionist and abolitionist continued to plague him, and in 1861 he narrowly escaped hanging in the San Antonio plaza. He traveled by horseback to Washington, D.C., where he was employed by the federal government. His property was confiscated, and two of his sons were conscripted into the Confederate Army. The sons later escaped to Mexico, however, and joined the Union Army. Dignowity returned to San Antonio after the war and managed to recover his properties, but his health had been destroyed. He died in San Antonio on April 22, 1875.³⁴

There is some evidence that a Czech adventurer and globetrotter **Čeněk Páclt (1815-1887)** came through Texas, while taking part in the Mexican War of 1846. He was a native of Turnov, Bohemia where he learned the soap manufacturing and as an apprentice toured through Bohemia, Moravia, Austria and Hungary. He later abandoned his profession and got involved in the business of cutting precious stones. In 1846, he came to New York and on his way to New Orleans he presumably enlisted in the Army of the United States which had just (May 13) declared war on Mexico, his commitment being for five years. According to his own account he served in the army of General Winfield Scott (1786-1860). After the war he was sent to join the garrisons in Florida and in 1853 he was discharged and he then returned to Bohemia.³⁵

Francis B. Schaeffer (1819-1900), b. Baltimore, MD, desc. f. Augustine Herman. He served in the US Army before the Civil War. He served with distinction in the Mexican War and was honored by President Lincoln with the captaincy of the select National Riflemen, stationed in Washington at commencement of the Civil War. He subsequently, however, joined the Confederate Army. He was commissioned second lieutenant in the regular forces of the Confederate Army in 1861. He later transferred to the Trans-Mississippi Department. In September 1862, he was attached to the staff of Brig. Gen. Albert

³⁴ "The first Czech Pioneer," in: Henry A. Maresh and Estelle Hudson, *Czech Pioneers of the Southwest*. Houston, TX: South West Press, p. 41; Peter Palmquist and Thomas R. Kailbourn, *Pioneer Photographs from the Mississippi to the Continental Divide. A Biographical Dictionary, 1839-1865*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005, pp. 206-206.

³⁵ "Páclt, Čeněk" in: *Ottův slovník naučný*. Praha: J. Otto, 1902, vol. 2, p. 7; Oldřich Kašpar, "Adventurer Čeněk Páclt: a Czech Soldier in American Army" in: *Western World*, vol. 6, No. 5 (2005), pp. 32-33.

Pike. Promoted to major, Schaefer became the chief of artillery of defenses at Galveston, Texas. He received parole on June 22, 1865.³⁶

Border War (1854-1860)

August Bondi (1833-1907) was a soldier and patriot, one of John Brown's men. He was born in Vienna, his father being Hart Immanuel Bondi, a Jewish manufacturer of cotton goods from Prague, Bohemia. When only fourteen years of age he became a member of the Academic League and fought under Kossuth during the Hungarian war for liberty. For this he was exiled and in 1848 the family came to America. August spent seven years in teaching and in mercantile pursuits in Missouri and Texas. In 1855 he came to Kansas at a time when the opposition to slavery was crystallizing, and became an intense anti-slavery partisan. After remaining two weeks at Lawrence, he went down the Missouri River and back by land to acquaint himself with affairs on the border. With a partner, he "squatted" on a claim on the Mosquito branch of the Pottawatomie, in Franklin County. In the fall of 1855 he became acquainted with John Brown, and after the burning of Lawrence he joined the company of John Brown, Jr. When this force disbanded he did not return to his claim, but joined John Brown, Sr., and took part in the engagement at Black Jack. He was then with Brown in different raids along the border and at the battle of Osawatomie. In Feb., 1857, he laid out the town of Greeley, Anderson County, and was appointed postmaster there. From that time to the outbreak of the Civil War he kept the "underground railway" station at Greeley. In Oct., 1861, he enlisted in the Fifth Kansas regiment and was present in nearly all the actions in which the regiment was engaged. On Sept. 14, 1864, he was seriously wounded and made prisoner by the Confederates near Pine Bluff, Ark., but was left on the field. He was discharged in Dec., 1864, and in 1866 he located in Salina. Mr. Bondi held many offices in Saline County, such as probate judge, district clerk and postmaster, and was appointed a member of the state board of charities.³⁷

George Douglas Brewerton (1820-1901), desc. f. Augustine Herman. He was a soldier, writer and artist. He joined Stephenson's regiment of "California volunteers," in 1846, as second lieutenant, 1st United States infantry, 22 May, 1847, and first lieutenant in June, 1850. He is the author of *The War in Kansas: A Rough Trip to the Border among New Homes and a Strange People* (1856); *Fitzpoodle at Newport*; and *Ida Lewis, the Heroine of Lime Rock* (1869). He also published, through a New York firm, *The Automaton Regiment* (1862), *The Automaton Company*, and *The Automaton Battery* (1863). These devices for the instruction of military recruits were brought out when hundreds of thousands of

³⁶ Robert J. Trout, *Memoirs of the Stuart Horse Artillery Battalion*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 2010, Volume 2, p. 47 and especially the note on p. 178.

³⁷ William E. Connelley, *Standard History of Kansas and Kansans*. Chicago: Lewis Publishing Company, 1918; Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., "Čeští spojenci a spolubojovníci Johna Browna," in: *Postavy naší Ameriky. Praha: Pražská edice, 2000, pp. 56-58.*

untrained soldiers were eagerly studying the rudiments of the art of war, and were extensively used in connection with the regular books of tactics.³⁸

US Civil War (1861-1865)

Alexander Eisenschiml (1832-1888), a native of Měčín, near Plzeň, immigrated to America in 1848, when revolutionary sentiments grew rife in Austria. Upon landing in New York, news reached the boat that gold had been discovered in California, crew and passengers alike immediately decided to head for San Francisco. After an adventurous career in California and Nevada he gave up prospecting and turned soldier. In 1861 he joined the Illinois regiment and saw action at Shiloh, the crucial battle fought between the Union soldiers under Grant and the Confederates under Johnston and Beauregard. But the reality of war quickly induced him to resign his commission. Thereafter during the remainder of the war he became an Indian scout. After witnessing what happened to his comrades in capture by the "bloodthirsty" Indian tribe, he also quit the Indian Service. Taking out his citizenship papers in Nevada, he left the west and turned to the peaceful occupation of running a meat market in Chicago.³⁹

Edmund Ross Colhoun (1821-1897), b. Chambersburg, PA, desc. f. Augustine Herman. Naval officer. He was a rear admiral of the United States Navy, who served during the Mexican-American War and the American Civil War. He was appointed a midshipman on 1 April 1839. He served during the Mexican War with Commodores David Conner and Matthew Perry at Alvarado and Tabasco. During the Civil War he served on both the North and South Atlantic Blockading Squadrons, had command of the monitor Weehawken, and was commended for his participation in the bombardment and capture of Fort Fisher, North Carolina, from December 1864 to January 1865. He commanded the South Pacific Squadron (1874-5), Mare Island Navy Yard (1877-81), and retired from the Navy on 5 May 1883. Two destroyers were named USS Colhoun in his honor.⁴⁰

James Chatham Duane (1824-1897), b. Schenectady, NY, desc. f. Augustine Herman. Military engineer, was with McClellan's army on Potomac during Civil War, made important contributions with his organization of engineer battalion and engineer equipage. Was chief engineer of the army of the Potomac. Was brevetted colonel of US Army for distinguished service and later made chief

³⁸ Jourdan Houston, "George Douglas Brewerton (1827-1901): Pioneer Artist of Territorial New Mexico," *New Mexico Historical Rev.* 73, No. 3 (1998), 207-233; Jourdan Moore Houston and Alan Fraser Houston "California on His Mind: The Easel and Pen of Pioneer George Douglas Brewerton," *California History* 81, No. 1 (2002), pp. 2-23.

³⁹ Guido Kisch, *In Search of Freedom*, London: Edward Goldston, 1948, pp. 107-108.

⁴⁰ John Howard Brown, *The Cyclopaedia of American Biography: Comprising the Men*. John H. Lewis Co., 1899, vol. 2, p. 120; Rossiter Johnson, ed., *Twentieth Century Biographical Dictionary of Notable Americans*; Edmund Ross Calhoun Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.

of engineers of US Army with the rank of brigadier general.⁴¹

Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar (1825-1894) was born near Eatonton, Putnam County, Georgia; he was desc. f Augustine Herman. He graduated from Emory College and then practiced law and served as state legislator in Georgia and Mississippi. When Mississippi seceded from the Union and joined the Confederacy on January 9, 1861, Lamar raised, and funded out of his own pocket, the 19th Mississippi Volunteer Infantry and was elected Lieutenant Colonel. In May 1862, Colonel Lamar, while reviewing his regiment, fell with an attack of vertigo, which had previously disabled him, and his service as a soldier was ended. After this he served as a judge advocate and aide to his cousin, Lt. Gen. James Longstreet. Later in 1862, Confederate States President Jefferson Davis appointed Lamar as Confederate minister to Russia and special envoy to England and France. When the Civil War was over, he returned to the University of Mississippi where he was a professor of metaphysics, social science and law. He was also a member of Mississippi's constitutional conventions. After having his civil rights restored, following the war, Lamar returned to the House in 1873, the first Democrat from Mississippi to sit in the U.S. House of Representatives since the Civil War. He served there until 1877. Lamar would go on to represent Mississippi in the U.S. Senate from 1877 to 1885.⁴²

Samuel Sprigg Carroll (1832-1893), b. Takoma Park, MD; desc. f. Frederick Philipse. He was a career officer in the United States Army who rose to the rank of brigadier general during the American Civil War. He was most known for his service as the commander of the famed "Gibraltar Brigade," an infantry brigade in the Army of the Potomac that played a key role during the defense of Cemetery Hill during the Battle of Gettysburg, as well as in repulsing a portion of Pickett's Charge. He was appointed brigadier general of volunteers and retired at regular rank of major general.⁴³

Benjamin Franklin Jonas (1834-1911), b. Williamsport, KY, of Bohemian ancestry. As a boy, he moved with his parents to Quincy, Illinois, where his father became a Republican state legislator and postmaster, and was acquainted with Abraham Lincoln. Despite his family's strong connections with the Republican Party, Benjamin Jonas cast his lot with the South in the Civil War. In 1862 he enlisted in the Confederate Army and served in the Washington Armillary until 1863; appointed sergeant major and later adjutant of the Armillary regiment commanded by Col. Beckham and served throughout the Civil War. After the war, he returned to New Orleans and became active in state politics as a Democrat. In 1865, he was elected to the state House of Representatives, serving until 1868, and in 1872, he was elected to the State Senate. In 1879, he was

⁴¹ "Brigadier General James Chatham Duane," in: *Portrait and Profiles of Chief Engineers.*; "Memoir of James Chatham Duane," in: *Transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers*, vol. 39 (1898), pp. 686-690.

⁴² Edward Mayes, *Lucius Q. C. Lamar: His Life, Times, and Speeches*. Nashville, 1896.

⁴³ Ezra J., Warner, *Generals in Blue: Lives of the Union Commanders*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964.

elected to the U.S. Senate, and served from 4 March 1879 to 3 March 1885.⁴⁴

His four brothers also served in the Confederate Army, ⁴⁵ all becoming officers just as he was. His oldest brother Charles H. Jonas (1834-) served at the 12th Arkansas Infantry as Captain. In July 1863, he was captured at Port Hudson in Louisville and imprisoned in New Orleans, and eventually sent to Johnson's Island, where he was kept as prisoner of war, at the time when his father was dying. President Lincoln, who was a good friend of Jonas' family, issued conditionally a personal order in May 1864, allowing "Charles H. J. Jonas... a parole of three weeks to visit dying father, Abraham Jonas, at Quince, Illinois. June 2, 1864." He arrived in time to say good bye to his father before he died. Captain Jonas honored his parole and remained prisoner of war until his exchange in March 1865.

Henry Bryan (1835-1879), b. Savannah, GA, desc. f. Augustine Herman. Prior to the Civil War, Henry Bryan was employed as a broker. During the Civil War, Bryan served as a staff officer. In July and August of 1861, Bryan was a volunteer aide de camp for Brigadier General John B. Magruder. On September 4, 1861, he became a captain and Brigadier General Magruder's aide de camp. He became Major General Magruder's assistant adjutant general on January 14, 1862. After briefly serving on the staff of Major General David R. Jones in May of 1862, Bryan rejoined Major General Magruder's staff as a major and an assistant adjutant general. Bryan's left arm was wounded at the battle of Malvern Hill on July 1, 1862. By late 1862, Bryan had joined the staff of General P. G. T. Beauregard as an assistant adjutant and inspector general, a position that he would hold in Charleston, South Carolina - albeit not necessarily with General Beauregard—until he was paroled on April 26, 1865. Following the war, Bryan was employed as a broker and banker.⁴⁶

Rochus Heinisch (1835-1914), b. Newark, NJ, of Bohemian father. He was educated in private schools, and was brought up in manufacturing and business pursuits, following the cutlery business in his father's factory. At the age of seventeen he joined the Putnam Horse Guards, a famous battalion of mounted men, commanded by Major Heinisch, the father of Rochus. Subsequently he joined Company B, Newark City Battalion, and during the war enlisted as a private soldier in Company A, Twenty-sixth New Jersey Volunteers. He was afterward elected second lieutenant and was promoted first lieutenant in the field. He participated in the several engagements of his regiment, and was a faithful and a brave soldier. At the advance of the Twenty-sixth across the Rappahannock on June 5th, Lieutenant Heinisch was one of the very first to enter the rebel earth

⁴⁴ Robert N. Rosen, *The Jewish Confederates*. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 2000, pp. 148-153; *Biographical Directory of the U.S. Congress 1774-2005*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2006.

⁴⁵ Robert N. Rosen, *The Jewish Confederates*. Columbus, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2000.

⁴⁶ Bryan Family Collection, Family History Series, Eleanor S. Brockenbrough Library of The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, VA.

works. At the expiration of his term of service he reentered business life, and served two terms in the House of Assembly of the New Jersey Legislature.⁴⁷

Emanuel Woodic (1836-), b. Bohemia. Arrived in America in 1854, landing in New York. In 1856, he enlisted in the US Army. He participated in the Mountain Meadows Massacre and managed to be one of its few survivors. He served throughout the Civil War. He fought in several battles, including the battle of Bull River, Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, the Wilderness, Spotsylvania, Cold Harbor and Petersburg. After being honorably discharged, he moved to Michigan.⁴⁸

John Marshall Brown (1838-1907), b. Portland, ME, desc. f .Frederick Philipse. He was appointed by Pres. Lincoln captain and Assistant Adjunct General of ME volunteers and served in SC and FL. He commanded regiment at Totopotomy and Cold Harbor and preliminary movements at Petersburg, where he was severely wounded. At discharge he was brevetted colonel and brigadier general.⁴⁹

Leopold Karpeles (1838-1909), b. Prague, Bohemia. He entered Service, US Army in Springfield, MA. In 1870 earned the Medal of Honor during the Civil War for heroism, May 6, 1864 at the wilderness Campaign, VA. Color Sergeant Leopold Karpeles was instrumental in turning the tide of the May 1864 Wilderness Campaign, that saw his 57th Massachusetts Regiment suffer the highest casualties. Some historians consider this Civil War battle as the turning point, when the North began its slow march toward victory. In 1870 he was awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions that day. He fought at Spotsylvania Courthouse on May 10, 12, and 18, 1864. At the Battle of the North Anna, on May 24, Karpeles was badly wounded. He refused to relinquish the flag and be evacuated until he fainted from loss of blood. Karpeles spent most of the next year in military hospitals, and was discharged in May of 1865. He settled in Washington after the war and was rewarded, for his military service, with a job in the post office, which he held until his death in 1909.⁵⁰

Jacob Greil (1839-1900), b. Bohemia. He came to America in 1856; was a clerk at West Point, Ga., for two years; located in Chambers County, where he clerked until 1860; and went into the dry goods business at Milltown. At the outbreak of the War of Secession, he enlisted in the US Army, becoming fourth sergeant of Co. D, Fourteenth Alabama infantry regiment, then commanded by

⁴⁷ William H. Shaw, *History of Essex and Hudson Counties, New Jersey*. Philadelphia: Everts & Peck, 1884, p. 599.

⁴⁸ Guido Kisch, *In Search of Freedom, op. cit.*, pp. 24-25 and p. 107.

⁴⁹ Henry Chase, Ed., *Representative Men of Maine*. A Collection of Biographical Sketches. Portland, ME: The Lakeside Press, Publisher, 1893.

⁵⁰ Simon Wolf, *American Jew as Patriot, Soldier and Citizen*. Philadelphia, PA: The Levytype, 1895, p. 106, 204-206; Warren Wilkinson, *Mother, May You Never See the Sights I Have Seen: The Fifty-Seventh Massachusetts Veteran Volunteers in the Army of the Potomac, 1864-1865*. New York: Morrow, 1990; Ruth Winegarten and Cathy Schechter. *Deep in the Heart: The Lives and Legends of Texas Jews*. Austin: Eakin Press, 1990); Mark Odintz, "Karpeles, Leopold" in: *Handbook of Texas Online, op. cit.*

Col. Thomas Judge, and afterward by Col. Bayne. After two years' service, he was made commissary sergeant, serving as such until February, 1864, and taking part in the battles of Williamsburg, Va., Seven Pines, seven days' fight around Richmond, second Bull Run, Antietam, Frazier's Farm and many minor skirmishes. At the end of the war, he was acting commissary with the rank of captain. After leaving the service, he settled at Montgomery; entered the retail grocery business in which he remained until 1872.⁵¹

Oliver C. Bosbyshell (1839-aft. 1898), b. Vicksburg, MS, of Bohemian ancestry. He first enlisted in April, 1861, and then re-enlisted again in September, as second lieutenant, Forty-eighth Regiment, Pennsylvania Infantry. He embarked with his regiment on the 11th of November, 1861, for Hatteras, North Carolina. When the attack was made on New Berne, General Burnside detailed six companies of the Forty-eighth to accompany his forces, in which expedition Bosbyshell served as acting quartermaster of his regiment. Afterwards he was made acting adjutant of the Forty-eighth. He was next promoted to the first lieutenantcy, and afterwards to the captaincy, of Company G. Captain Bosbyshell was engaged at Bull Run, at Chantilly, at South Mountain, at Antietam, and at Fredericksburg. In the spring of 1863 the Ninth Corps was ordered west, and Bosbyshell was made provost-marshal at Lexington, Ky. He took part in all the fights in East Tennessee: was in the battles of Blue Springs, Campbell's Station, and the siege of Knoxville. Returning on veteran furlough to Schuylkill County in January, 1864, he helped recruit the ranks of the decimated command. The Ninth Corps, after re-organization, moved into Virginia by way of Washington. Bosbyshell was detailed by Colonel Sigfried as acting Assistant Adjutant General, First Brigade, Fourth Division, Ninth Army Corps. In this capacity Colonel Bosbyshell served through Grant's campaign, beginning at the Wilderness and ending at Petersburg. During his service he was commissioned major of his regiment. He was mustered out of service Oct. 1, 1864.⁵²

Ronald Slidell Mackenzie (1840-1885), b. New York, NY, desc. f. Frederick Philipse. Civil War Union Brigadier General. He was 1862 graduate of the United States Military Academy, where he was first in his class. Posted with the Engineers he served through most of the campaigns of the Army of the Potomac, in July 1864 he was commissioned Colonel of the 2nd Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery. During Major General Philip Sheridan's 1864 "Valley" campaign he commanded a brigade in the 6th Corps and was wounded at the Battle of Cedar Creek. After his recovery he was commissioned a Brigadier General of Volunteers and given a division of cavalry under Sheridan, serving with great distinction. General Ulysses S. Grant later said, "I regarded Mackenzie as the most promising young officer in the army." At the end of the Civil War he was brevetted Major

⁵¹ Thomas McAdory Owen, *History of Alabama and Dictionary of Alabama Biography*. Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1921, vol. 3, pp. 707-708.

⁵² *Officers of the Volunteer Army and Navy who served in the Civil War*, published by L.R. Hamersly & Co., 1893; John W. Jordan, *Colonial and Revolutionary Families of Pennsylvania*. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1911, pp. 1024-1028.

General of Volunteers and brevetted Brigadier General in the Regular Army. On March 6, 1867 he was commissioned Colonel of the 41st United States Infantry and on December 15, 1870 was given command of the 4th United States Cavalry. Post-Civil War he had a distinguished career as an Indian fighter in the west. Wounded in 1871 during an engagement with Indians, it was his seventh wound while in the service. He retired on disability in 1884.⁵³

Ronald Mackenzie had two brothers -**Alexander Slidell Mackenzie, Jr. (1842-1867)**, a lieutenant commander in the Navy, and **Rear Admiral Morris Robinson Slidell Mackenzie (1848-1915)**.⁵⁴

Alexander Slidell Mackenzie, Jr. (1842-1867) was appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy in 1855, graduated in June 1859 and was assigned to the newly-completed steam sloop-of-war Hartford. During the next two years, Midshipman Mackenzie served in that ship with the East India Squadron. Promoted to Lieutenant in August 1861, he was an officer of the gunboat Kinco during the conquest of the lower Mississippi River in 1862. Later transferred to the South Atlantic Blockading Squadron, Mackenzie served off Charleston, South Carolina, in the steam frigate Wabash and monitor Patapsco, taking part in combat operations against Fort Sumter and Morris Island. Later in the Civil War he commanded the gunboat Winona, also in the waters off South Carolina. In July 1865 Mackenzie received the rank of Lieutenant Commander and soon began a second Far Eastern deployment in Hartford. He was killed in action on 13 June 1867, during a punitive expedition ashore in southern Formosa. The Navy has named three ships in honor of Lieutenant Commander Alexander Slidell Mackenzie.⁵⁵

Morris Robinson Slidell Mackenzie (1848-1915), b. NYC, desc. f Frederick Philipse. Graduate of US Naval Academy, he was promoted through grades from ensign in 1868 to rear admiral, US Navy (1906). He served on the various stations and duties, including being Commander of Prairie (1898-1900), USS New York (1901); Navy Yard, Portsmouth, NH (1903) and inspector-in-charge of 3rd lighthouse district (1905).

John Watts de Peyster (1821-1907), b. New York City; desc. f. Frederick

⁵³ Robert G. Carter, *On the Border with Mackenzie, or Winning West Texas from the Comanches*. Washington: Eynon Printing, 1935); Lessing Harold Nohl, Jr., *Bad Hand: The Military Career of Ronald Slidell Mackenzie, 1871-1889*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1962; Michael D. Pierce, *The Most Promising Young Officer: A Life of Ronald Slidell Mackenzie*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993; James Weldon Smith, *Colonel Ronald Slidell Mackenzie and the Apache Problem, 1881-1883*. M.A. Thesis, Texas Tech University, 1973; Ernest Wallace, *Ronald S. Mackenzie on the Texas Frontier*. Lubbock: West Texas Museum Association, 1964); Ernest Wallace, ed., *Ronald S. Mackenzie's Official Correspondence Relating to Texas*. Lubbock: West Texas Museum Association, 1967, 1968. 2 vols.

⁵⁴ *The New York Genealogical and Biographical Record*. New York: Mott Memorial Hall, April 1881, vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 111-123 (see especially p. 118).

⁵⁵ Information from the Department of the Navy, Naval Historical Center, Washington Navy Yard.

Philipse. He was a student and author of war, an indirect participant in the Civil War, rising to the rank of major general. In his later years he became a philanthropist, leaving his name on a number of buildings and institutions. He was well educated, having received M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. He was one of the organizers of the New York City Police and Fire Departments, and was active as a volunteer fireman himself. He was also active in the New York State Militia, and was promoted to brigadier general in 1851. At the State level he also served as Judge Advocate General, and later Adjutant General, before he resigned over a conflict with New York Governor Myron Clark in 1855.

At the start of the Civil War, de Peyster was already in his forties. He did offer his services to the Union Army, but was rebuffed, probably for younger candidates. His three sons did serve in the Union Army during the war, and his namesake, John Watts de Peyster, Jr., actually rose to the level of brevet brigadier general. During the Civil War, de Peyster wrote a series of articles on war tactics, and some of these tactics were adopted and proved to be practical in the field of battle. For his indirect contributions to the Civil War, the State of New York later elevated de Peyster to brevet major general.⁵⁶

John Watts de Peyster, Jr. (1841-1873), b. NYC, desc. f. Frederick Philipse. Soldier. He joined the staff of Gen. Philip Kearny and participated in the Battle of Williamsburg. He was a major in the first NY artillery and later served on the staff of Gen. Peck.

Frederick de Peyster, Jr. (1843-1874), b. NYC, desc. f. Frederick Philipse. He was a soldier who did duty both in the line and staff during the Civil War. He was with Gen. B. F. Butler when with some 800 men of the 8th NY and 6th MA Militia, he accomplished his celebrated occupation of Baltimore. He also performed outstanding service at the first battle of Bull Run and in the 4th corps on the Peninsula. For his conduct at Bull Run he was brevetted major U.S.V. and colonel.

Johnston Livingston De Peyster (1846-1903), b. Tivoli-on-the-Hudson, NY, desc. f. Frederick Philipse. He was brevetted major and Lt. col., U.S.V. and colonel, N.Y.V. by the State of NY in 1867 for hoisting the first real American flag over Richmond, the Confederate Capital.

Edward Rosewater (1841-1906), b. Bukovany, Bohemia. Founder of the Omaha. Nebraska *Bee*, was not just a prominent newspaperman but also served as a telegraph operator just before and during the Civil War. His posts and responsibilities brought him close to some of the war's leading military and political figures on both sides. After various assignments, e.g., in Alabama and Tennessee, he was sent to work as a telegrapher in Washington, D.C., at the War Department. There he met President Lincoln, the Secretary of State and other prominent figures. On January 1, 1863, Rosewater was given the responsibility by

⁵⁶ Lewis Hamersly Randolph, *Biographical Sketches of Distinguished Officers of the Army and Navy*. New York: Henry E. Huntington Library, 1905, pp 82–88.; Frank Allaben, *John Watts de Peyster*. New York: Frank Allaben Genealogical Company, 1908.

President Lincoln to telegraph the Emancipation Proclamation to the world.⁵⁷

Joseph Benedict Greenhut (1843-1918), b. Prague, Bohemia. He came with parents to Chicago in 1852. After working in the south in the tinsmith and coppersmith trade, he came north in 1861 and on April 17, in response to President Lincoln's first call for troops to aid in the preservation of the Union, he enlisted as a private in the Twelfth Illinois Infantry, the first Chicago regiment to respond to the call to arms. Greenhut was the second to enlist from the city of Chicago. Within two months he was promoted to sergeant and served until seriously wounded in the battle of Fort Donelson. When his wound had healed he recruited a company of infantry of which he was elected captain. The company was assigned to the Eighty-second Illinois Regiment and subsequently he was made chief of staff of the brigade. He served in some of the most important battles of the Civil War, including the battles of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville and Gettysburg. He was made adjutant general and chief of staff of 3rd Brigade, 3rd Div. of the 11th Army Corps and took part in the campaign and battles of his brigade in Tennessee continuing in active duty until 1864 when his health failed and he was allowed to resign. Upon recovery, Greenhut devoted himself to mechanical pursuits and later started in the distillery business in Peoria, IL from which he realized a magnificent fortune. When President McKinley and his entire cabinet visited Peoria in 1899, they were all guests of the Greenhuts.⁵⁸

Korean Expedition of 1871

William F. Lukeš (1847-1923), b. Dolní Pertoltice, Bohemia. He was a United States Navy sailor and a recipient of America's highest military decoration—the Medal of Honor—for his actions in the 1871 Korean Expedition. William F. Lukes enlisted in the U.S. Navy from Tianjin, China and served as a Landsman on board USS Colorado in Company D as part of the Korean Expedition. On June 11, 1871, during the capture of the Han River forts on Ganghwa Island, the leader of the American attack, Lieutenant Hugh McKee, was mortally wounded. Landsman Lukes and two other sailors, Seth Allen and Thomas Murphy, attempted to rescue Lt. McKee but encountered heavy resistance. In the course of the ensuing hand-to-hand fight, Allen and Murphy were killed. Lukes suffered a severe cut to the head but continued to fight; he survived the engagement. For his actions on that occasion, Lukes was awarded the Medal of Honor. Before leaving the Navy, William Lukes obtained the rank of Seaman. He died at the age of 76 and is buried in Los Angeles National Cemetery, Los Angeles, California.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Seymour "Sy" Brody, "Edward Rosewater: Served As Telegrapher For President Lincoln," in: *Jewish Heroes and Heroines of America*. Hollywood, FL: Lifetime Books, 1996; Guido Kisch, *In Search of Freedom*, op. cit., pp., 107, 135-126.

⁵⁸ James Montgomery Rice, *Peoria City and County, Illinois: A Record of Settlement*. Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1912, vol. 2, pp. 464-468.

⁵⁹ "William F. Lukes, Medal of Honor Recipient." 1871 Korean Campaign. United States Army Center of Military History.

Spanish-American War (1898)

Samuel Reed Colhoun (1846-1920), b. Philadelphia, PA, desc. f. Augustine Herman; son of Edmund Ross Colhoun. He was Capt. S.C., US Navy, on duty (1869-1908). He served on the Marion when she rescued the shipwrecked crew of the Trinity from Heard Island in the Antarctic. Served on the Oregon when she made her world famous run from Bremerton, WA to Cuba and in all her fighting in the Spanish-American War. He became paymaster in the US Navy.

Edward David Taussig (1847-1921), b. St. Louis, MO, of Czech ancestry; his father Charles immigrated to St. Louis from Prague. He was appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy in 1863, during the Civil War, and was educated at that institution during the next four years. He graduated in June 1867 and commissioned in the rank of Ensign in late 1868. His early sea service was perhaps most remarkable for his time as an officer of the gunboat Wateree when a tidal wave washed her far inland at Arica, Chile, on 13 August 1868. As a Lieutenant during the 1870s and 1880s Taussig was stationed at a number of shore stations and in several ships, among them the Washington Navy Yard's receiving ship Relief and USS Trenton, flagship of the European Squadron, and spent some years on survey duty. The latter work continued well into the 1890s, when he was a Lieutenant Commander.

Promoted to the rank of Commander in August 1898, Taussig commanded the gunboats Bennington and Yorktown on the Asiatic Station, among other assignments. Between 1902 and 1908, Captain Taussig's commands included the receiving ship Independence and battleships Massachusetts and Indiana. He also attended the Naval War College, was Captain of the Yard at the New York Navy Yard and was Commandant of the Norfolk Navy Yard and the Fifth Naval District. In May 1908, while serving in the latter positions, he attained the rank of Rear Admiral. Retired in November 1909, Rear Admiral Taussig was recalled to active duty during World War I as Commandant of the Naval Unit at Columbia University. The destroyer USS Taussig of 1944-1974, was named in honor of Rear Admiral Taussig.⁶⁰

Nicaraguan Campaign

Emile Phillips Moses (1880-), b. Sumter, SC, of Czech ancestry. He attended Sumter schools, South Carolina College and the Georgia School of Technology, and in 1903 took the examination for admittance to the US Marine corps. He was sent to the training camp for officers at Annapolis and received his commission in early 1904. He was a member of this famous military school in the Nicaraguan

⁶⁰ "Rites for Admiral Taussig."Special to Washington Post. *The Washington Post*. Washington, D.C., Feb 2, 1921. p. 3; "Rear Admiral Edward D. Taussig, USN, (1847-1921)," Department of the Navy, Naval Historical Center, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC.

campaign and has seen extensive service on both sides of the Pacific and along the Atlantic seaboard. He was entrained for port of embarkation for France when the armistice caused the order to be countermanded. He was commissioned a major of Marines in 1918. Advanced through the grades to major general (1942). Commander, Marine Barracks, Parris Island, SC (1941-44). Contributed largely to development and adaptation to military use of the amphibian tractor and to design and use of ramp on landing boats.⁶¹

World War I (1914-1918)

Alexander Rives Skinker (1883-1918), b. St. Louis, MO, desc. f. Augustine Herman. Captain Alexander R. Skinker was a Medal of Honor Recipient during World War I. He graduated from Washington University in St. Louis in 1905 before becoming commissioned as an officer in the United States Army. He was awarded the medal while leading an attack on German pill boxes in the Hindenburg Line in which he was subsequently killed. His Medal citation read: Unwilling to sacrifice his men when his company was held up by terrific machinegun fire from iron pill boxes in the Hindenburg Line, Capt. Skinker personally led an automatic rifleman and a carrier in an attack on the machine-guns. The carrier was killed instantly, but Capt. Skinker seized the ammunition and continued through an opening in the barbed wire, feeding the automatic rifle until he, too, was killed. Place and date of his action: Cheppy, France, September 26, 1918.⁶²

Robert Eugene Steiner (1862-1955), b. Greenville, AL, of Bohemian ancestry. Served as captain, Greenville Guards and major, 2nd Regiment of Alabama National Guard; raised regiment of cavalry (1916) and appointed colonel and served with it on Mexican border. Promoted to brigadier general, National Guards (1917) and brigadier general of US Army (1917). Commander, 62nd Infantry Brigade. During the war returned in command of the 31st div. Also brigadier general on reserve by President (1919).⁶³

Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright (1864-1945), b. New York City, desc. f. Frederick Philipse. Served in the 12th Infantry of the NY National Guard, attaining rank of lieutenant colonel (1889-1903); also served in the war with Spain as captain of the 12th regiment of NY Volunteers. During First World War served in the 27th Div. throughout its entire service (1917-19), and was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for his bravery.⁶⁴

Joseph Knefler Taussig (1877-1947), b. Dresden, Germany, of Czech

⁶¹ Yates Snowden, ed., *History of South Carolina*. Chicago and New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1920, vol. 4, p. 46.

⁶² Walter B. Stevens, *Centennial History of Missouri: One Hundred Years in the Union, 1820-1921*. St. Louis and Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1921.

⁶³ Thomas McAdory Owen, *History of Alabama and Dictionary of Alabama Biography*. Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1921, vol. 4, p. 1619.

⁶⁴ *Biographical Directory of the U.S. Congress 1774-2005*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2006.

ancestry; the son of Rear Admiral Edward D. Taussig. He was a Vice Admiral in the United States Navy. He entered the United States Naval Academy in 1895. As a midshipman, he served on the flagship New York during the Battle of Santiago de Cuba in the Spanish-American War. Following his graduation, in 1899 he was assigned to Newark and participated in the China Relief Expedition during the Boxer Rebellion. After 2 years as a naval cadet, he was commissioned Ensign 28 January 1901 to begin a series of promotions and distinctions that would underscore his service to the Navy.

In July 1916, after serving in battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and on staffs afloat, he took command of Division 8, Destroyer Force, the first group of American destroyers sent abroad during World War I. After crossing the storm and gale filled Atlantic, Comdr. Taussig was asked by the Commander in Chief of the Coasts of Ireland when he would be ready for sea. Taussig replied in the now famous words; "We are ready now, Sir." He received the Distinguished Service Medal for World War I service. After the war he continued to serve the Navy at home and abroad.

In 1922 his ship, Cleveland, rendered assistance to the victims of an earthquake and tidal wave in Chile. He served at the Naval War College, from 1923 to 1926. He also saw duty in the Bureau of Navigation, as Assistant Chief of Naval Operations, and as Commandant, 5th Naval District, in addition to commanding a battleship division and cruiser scouting force. Vice Admiral Taussig retired in 1941, but was recalled to active duty in 1943 to serve in the office of the Secretary of the Navy until 1 June 1947, only a few months before his death.⁶⁵

Henry Delp Styer (1862-1944), scion of one of the first Czech families to settle in Colonial Pennsylvania, was a member of the West Point class of 1884. His first military posts were in the west, including Utah, where he was assigned to Indian duty part of the time, and to service as the professor of military tactics at Utah Agricultural College in Logan for part of the time. He served in the Philippines during the Spanish American War, and again several years later. He commanded Fort Niagara for a time, and served on the Mexican border during the tense years of the Mexican Revolution. Other duty posts included Trenton, New Jersey, and Camp Lewis, near Tacoma, Washington. Perhaps his most exotic assignment came in 1918, during the Russian Revolution. The Russian Bolshevik faction had signed a separate peace with Germany; the German army withdrew from the Russian front, and the Russians turned full time to their internal battles. Because the Russians had been allies of the Western Powers contra the Germans, huge stocks of weapons and other supplies had been shipped to Russia, largely from Russia's east coast at Vladivostok where the supplies could be ferried across Asia via the Trans-Siberian railroad. Now the Western Powers became worried

⁶⁵ "Joseph K. Taussig," Dictionary of American Naval Fighting Ships, Department of the Navy, Naval Historical Center, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC; Joseph K. Taussig, *Three Splendid Little Wars. The Diaries of Joseph K. Taussig. 1889-1901*. Naval War College, 2009.

that those supplies would fall into the hands of warring Russian factions that would turn them over to the Germans. The U.S. Army's 27th Infantry Regiment, commanded by Col. Styer, was already in Siberia, and was rushed to Vladivostok to take charge of those supplies, in the midst of an international military and diplomatic stew of various Russian factions, and troops from Britain, Canada, Czechoslovakia, China, Italy, France, and Japan. It is of interest that he was later awarded Czechoslovak Military Cross.⁶⁶

Pearl Harbor

Claude Charles Bloch (1878-1967), b. Woodbury, KY, of Bohemian ancestry. He entered the US Naval Academy in 1895. He volunteered for active duty in the Spanish-American War, serving aboard the U.S.S. Iowa before he graduated in 1899. During the Boxer Rebellion in 1900, he was a member of the China Relief Expedition. In World War I, Bloch served as navigator on the U.S.S. Arizona and he was in command of the U.S.S. Plattsburg, transporting troops to France. He received the Navy Cross in 1918. From 1923 to 1927 Bloch was chief of the Bureau of Ordnance at the gun factory of the Washington naval yard. He was promoted to rear admiral and from 1927 to 1929 he was at sea commanding the U.S.S. California. In 1930-31 Bloch was stationed at the Newport, RI torpedo station. In 1933 Bloch was judge advocate of the Navy. From 1927 to 1930 he was commander-in-chief of the US fleet and was promoted to admiral. Bloch was commandant of the Hawaiian Sea frontier, 14th Naval District, at Pearl Harbor when the Japanese attacked in December 1941. In investigating the Japanese attack. The Roberts committee cleared him of any dereliction of duty. He remained in command until April 1942. He retired in 1945 with the rank of four-star admiral.⁶⁷

World War II (1939-1945)

Wilhelm D. Styer (1893-1975), b. Salt Lake City, Utah; son of Brig. Gen. Henry Delp Styer. Wilhelm Styer graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1916 and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant of Engineers. He served in the Pancho Villa Expedition from 1916 to 1917. Styer also served in France during World War I. From 1919 to 1920 he served on the staff of the Office of the Chief of Engineers in Washington, D.C. Styer received a bachelor's degree in civil engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1922.

During the 1920s Styer served in New York City as Executive Officer of the

⁶⁶ "Gen. H. D. Styer at Milestone: Man Who Led American Troops Into Siberia to Observe 80th Birthday," *Los Angeles Times*, September 21, 1942.

⁶⁷ Gordon W. Prange, *At Dawn We Slept: The Untold Story of Pearl Harbor*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1981; John E. Kleber, *The Kentucky Encyclopedia*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1992, p. 88; Claude Charles Bloch Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

Army Corps of Engineers' First New York District, as the district's Chief Engineer, and as an Engineer in Europe for the American Battle Monuments Commission. In 1931 Styer was appointed District Engineer for the Corps of Engineers district headquartered in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He was assigned as Assistant Engineer for Maintenance at the Panama Canal in 1936, and in 1938 he was assigned to the Construction Office of the Army's Office of the Quartermaster General. From 1940 to 1942 Styer was Deputy Chief of Construction for the War Department, receiving promotion to Brigadier General. General Styer was Deputy Commander in Chief and Chief of Staff of Army Service Forces from 1940 to 1942 and was promoted to Major General in 1942. From 1942 to 1945 Styer was a member of the Military Policy Committee, a group that included Admiral William Henry Purnell Blandy (1890–1954) and Brigadier General Leslie Groves (1896–1970). The MPC oversaw Development of Substitute Materials (DSM), the project that studied atomic energy during World War II and was later renamed the Manhattan Project. Styer was promoted to Lieutenant General in 1944. In 1945 Styer was named Commander in Chief of US Army Forces–Western Pacific, based in Manila, Philippines. In this assignment he chaired the tribunal that tried and convicted General Tomoyuki Yamashita (1885–1946) for war crimes, and he signed Yamashita's execution order. General Styer also chaired the tribunal that tried General Masaharu Homma (1887–1946), the Japanese conqueror of Bataan and Corregidor, for war crimes, and ordered Homma's execution. General Styer retired from the Army in 1947. He died on February 26, 1975 in, Coronado, California, and his remains were cremated at Coronado Mortuary. General Styer's medals and decorations included two awards of the Distinguished Service Medal.⁶⁸

Apollo Soucek (1897-1955), b. Lamont, OK, of Czech ancestry. Naval officer, advanced to captain and commanding officer to flag rank, and eventually to Rear Admiral. Qualified as naval navigator. He was a crack Navy test pilot and onetime holder of altitude records for sea and landplanes. "Annapolis-man" Soucek, member of a famed Navy flying team (brother Zeus was a retired lieutenant commander turned aircraft-industry executive), was air officer of the carrier Hornet when it launched the Doolittle B-25 raid on Tokyo in 1942, later commanded Task Force 77 in Korean waters. Established world's aircraft altitude record at 39,140 ft (1929); seaplane 38,800 ft. (1929), reestablished world's altitude record, any type aircraft 43,166 ft (1930). Commandant of aircraft carrier U.S.S. Franklin D. Roosevelt as a captain (1945). Commander, Fleet Air Wing One (1946-47). Appointed assistant chief naval operations for aviation planes (1949-51), chief of the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics (1953-55).⁶⁹

Richard Smykal (1900-1958), b. Chicago, IL, of Czech ancestry. Army

⁶⁸ "Wilhelm Styer, General, 81, Dies: West Pacific Commander Executed Yamashita," *New York Times*, February 28, 1975; "WW II General Dies at 81: Native Utah," *Salt Lake Tribune*, February 28, 1975.

⁶⁹ Apollo "Sockem," Soucek, Davis-Monthan Aviation Field Register, First Municipal Aviation Field in the U.S.

officer, advanced through ranks to major general. Served in China, Burma, India Theater and in Europe during World War II. As assistant chief of staff to the late Lt. Gen. Joseph Stilwell in Burma, General Smykal won the Legion of Merit for organizing supply and transportation for Stilwell's fighting forces. During 26 months in the China-Burma-India theater, General Smykal served as deputy chief of staff for the Chinese combat command and later as commander of a joint army-navy task force in south China. Following reorganization of the Illinois National Guard after the war, General Smykal was appointed assistant commander of the 33rd Division. Later he rose to command the division and the entire guard, retiring in March 1951, with the rank of lieutenant general. Chicago Mayor Daley called General Smykal an "outstanding public servant." Head of his own home building firm, General Smykal had served as acting Illinois state architect, acting city building commissioner, and chairman of the community conservation board from its creation Jan. 1, 1956, until ill health forced his retirement last October.⁷⁰

George J. Dufek (1903-1977), b. Rockford, IL, of Czech ancestry. US Naval officer. In 1925 he served aboard the battleship Maryland and was later assigned to submarine duty. Afterwards he began flight training and was designated a naval aviator in 1933. In 1939 he volunteered for Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd's third expedition to the Antarctic and was given the job of navigator on their old sailing vessel. During World War II, he helped to organize US amphibious assaults on Africa, Sicily and southern France and commanded an anti-submarine task force in the Atlantic that was credited with sinking the last German submarine in that war. In the Korean War, he commanded the aircraft carrier Antietam. After 1955 Dufek commanded Operation Deep Freeze, which provided support for U.S. International Geophysical Year research programs, and in 1956 he became also U.S. Antarctic Projects Officer. In 1956, he became the first American to set foot on the South Pole. After retiring in 1959 he became Director of the Mariners' Museum in Newport News, Virginia.⁷¹

Henry B. Lederer (1920-), b. Bridgeport, CT, of Bohemian ancestry. He attended New York University and joined the Army Air Corps in 1942 as an Aviation Cadet. His training was on P47 Thunderbolts. He was afterwards assigned to the 361st Fighter Group, 376 Fighter Squadron. After transfer to 374 Fighter Squadron he was in Bottisham, England, flying escort to B17's and B24's, plus ground support missions. In January of 1944 he was involved in the 361st first combat encounter, which was a fight with about 40 Me109's. He shared a victory in this battle. Henry flew 305 hours of combat and received the DFC with two OLC's and the Air Medal with two OLC's. He was an "Eager Beaver" and the first to finish his tour of duty and be rotated home. He had completed 92 missions. After the war he taught aerial gunnery at the Suffolk Army Base in Westhampton NY. He also held several US mechanical and design patents.... and then he opened

⁷⁰ Ex-CBI Roundup. *China-Burma-India*, vol. 12, No. 3, May 1958., p. 13.

⁷¹ George J. Dufek, *Operation Deepfreeze*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1957; George Dufek Papers, Special Collections Research Center, Syracuse University Library, Syracuse, NY.

his own jewelry manufacturing business in 1946 and was the founder of the jewelry firm that made jewelry with the Lady Ellen hang tags.⁷²

Joseph Svojger, Jr. (1919-1945), b. Fort Worth, TX, Served in Europe during World War II and fought in Normandy, France, Germany and Belgium. Wounded in action in 1944. Received the Silver Star for gallantry in action and Purple Heart Medal. Killed in action in Belgium, January 19, 1945.⁷³

Herman Willard Kiihnl (1922-2007), b. of Bohemian ancestry. He was born to the late William Valentine Kiihnl and the Edna Johnson Kiihnl in Teasdale. During WWII he was a member of the U. S. Army Rangers' 2nd Battalion which scaled 100-meter cliffs at Pointe du Hoc between Utah and Omaha Beaches on D-Day in France to knock out heavy artillery pieces defending the beaches. He received the Purple Heart, Combat Infantryman Badge, E.A.M.E. Camp Medal and two Bronze Stars. He was a member of Jackson Grove Church of Christ, and the VFW. He was also a receiving clerk for Kimberly-Clark Corp for 38 years in Memphis.⁷⁴

Korean War (1950-1953)

Arthur Hanket (1924-2007), b. Cleveland, OH, of Czech ancestry, was US Army Brigadier General who served in Korea and Vietnam. He was West Point graduate and served in Italy and Trieste after World War II. He was with a combat engineer group in Korea in 1954, commanded a battalion of the 101st Airborne Division and was the deputy brigade commander of the division's 2nd Brigade. General Hanket received two master's degrees, one in engineering from Harvard University and one in international affairs from George Washington University. He also graduated from the US Army War College.

William R. Jecelin (1930-1950), b. Baltimore, of Czech ancestry. He joined the United States Army from that location. After attending training he was sent to fight in Korea as a Sergeant in Company C, 35th Infantry Regiment, 25th Infantry Division. On September 19, 1950 his company was ordered to secure a ridge that was occupied by Korean forces they attacked as ordered but the first attempt to take the hill failed. They tried a second time and this time Jecelin led his platoon through heavy enemy fire advancing to the base of the cliff where the attack was stopped again due to enemy fire. He determined that a direct assault was the only way to gain control of the hill so he began firing his rifle and throwing grenades at the enemy position, calling to his men to follow him. The American troops were able to make it to the crest of the hill before being forced to take cover from enemy fire, before attempting another assault. They attached bayonets for hand to hand combat and were able to defeat a portion of the enemy before being forced to take cover after receiving fire from another group of enemy forces in the area.

⁷² Robert Bailey, "Sting of the Yellowjackets."

⁷³ Czech Heritage Society of Texas, *Texas Veterans of Czech Ancestry*. Austin, TX: Eakin Press, 1999, pp. 281-282.

⁷⁴ Death record and obituary for Herman Willard Kiihnl from Sardis, TN, in: Tribute.com.

When they began attacking this new group, one of the enemy soldiers threw a grenade at the incoming Americans and Sergeant Jecelin dived on the grenade, smothering the blast with his body, saving the lives of the other American soldiers but was killed in the blast. For this action he posthumously received the United States military's highest decoration for bravery, the Medal of Honor. His body was returned to the United States after his death and buried in Bohemian National Cemetery.⁷⁵

Emil Kapaun (1916-1951), b. Pilsen, KS of Czech ancestry. Father Emil Kapaun was the most highly decorated military chaplain in United States history. He graduated from Conception Abbey Seminary College in Conception, MO, in June 1936. He then attended Kendrick Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO. After serving in the Pilsen area under the Catholic Diocese of Wichita, Fr. Kapaun joined the Army in July 1944, and was assigned to Camp Wheeler, Ga., where he and one other chaplain ministered to approximately 19,000 service men and women. He later went to India and served in Burma, and was made captain in 1946. He returned to the United States later that year and was discharged, then went to The Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C., where in 1948 he earned a master's degree in education. In September of that year, he re-enlisted in the Army. After serving as chaplain at Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas, Fr. Kapaun was stationed near Mt. Fuji, Japan, and in July 1950 went to South Korea as part of a large invasion. During that time he administered to the dead and dying, performed baptisms, heard First Confessions, offered Holy Communion and celebrated Mass from an improvised altar on the hood of an Army Jeep. He was awarded the Bronze Star in September 1950. In October and November of that year, Fr. Kapaun and his unit were surrounded and overrun by the Chinese army in North Korea. Fr. Kapaun allowed his own capture by staying behind with the wounded when the Army retreated, then risked death by preventing Chinese executions of wounded Americans. According to many reports by survivors of the POW camp, Fr. Kapaun was a man of great humility, bravery, love and kindness. He worked to keep morale high among the troops and was a source of great spiritual comfort and inspiration. He ministered to the sick and wounded despite the fact that his own feet were badly frozen, and found or stole food wherever he could to keep his fellow prisoners from starving to death. His own condition worsened, however, and he developed a blood clot in his leg. He refused treatment by his captors and died in 1951, and was buried in a mass grave near the Yalu River. He was posthumously awarded a citation for the Distinguished Service Cross and in 2013, the Medal of Honor, by President Barack Obama on April 11 during a White House ceremony. The Cause for the Canonization of Father Emil Kapaun, was officially opened in 2008.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ "William R. Jecelin," reference.ca Free Online Reference Site and Encyclopedia; Military Times Hall of Valor; Korean War Medal Recipients.

⁷⁶ Elizabeth Ann Barkett, *Heroic Catholics of the Twentieth Century*. SJW; Ann Ball, *Faces of Holiness: modern saints in photos and words*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing, 2004, Volume 1.

Ernest Richard Kouma (1919-1993), b. Dwight, NE, of Czech ancestry. He was a Korean War Congressional Medal of Honor Recipient. He served as a Sergeant 1st Class in Company A, 72nd Tank Battalion, US Army. In the early hours of September 1, 1950, Sergeant Kouma was a tank commander engaged in supporting infantry elements at the Naktong River, Korea. A withdrawal was ordered when an enemy force estimated at 500 crossed the river and launched an attack against the infantry positions. Sergeant Kouma discovered that his tank was the only obstacle in the path of the assault when he gave orders to his crew to open fire. Holding his ground, he manned the .50 caliber machinegun mounted on the rear deck of the tank and remained in position throughout the night, fighting off repeated enemy attacks. After more than 9 hours of constant combat, he was able to withdraw his vehicle to friendly lines after killing an estimated 250 enemy soldiers. For most conspicuous gallantry, he was promoted Master Sergeant and awarded the Medal of Honor on June 4, 1951.⁷⁷

Robert E. Simanek (1930-), b. Detroit, MI, of Czech ancestry. Robert Ernest Simanek, who threw himself on an enemy grenade to save his comrades, was the 36th Marine to receive the Medal of Honor for heroism in the Korean War. The United States' highest military decoration was presented to him by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in a White House ceremony on October 27, 1953. Simanek, who was so badly wounded by the grenade that he was later retired, was serving with Company F, 2nd Battalion 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division, when the action occurred on August 18, 1952. His patrol had gone well forward of friendly lines to occupy an outpost when the Marines ran into a trap. He had earned two battle stars by the time he was wounded. In addition to the Medal of Honor and Purple Heart, he was also awarded the Korean Service Medal with two bronze stars; the United Nations Service Medal; and the National Defense Service Medal.⁷⁸

There was another Congressional Medal winner of Czech ancestry from this period, who was presented the medal posthumously 2011, almost 60 years after his death. His name was **Henry Svehla (1932-1952)**, son of a Czech immigrant from New Jersey. By June 12, 1952, Svehla was a private first class serving in Korea as a rifleman with Company F, 32nd Infantry Regiment, 7th Infantry Division. On that day, his platoon came under heavy fire and he charged forward to attack the enemy. When a grenade landed amidst his group, he smothered the blast with his body in order to protect those around him. He was killed in the explosion. His remains have never been recovered. For these actions, Svehla was awarded the Medal of Honor by President Barack Obama on May 2 during a White House ceremony. His sisters Dorothy Mathews and Sylvia Svehla accepted the medal on his behalf.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Medal of Honor recipients: Korean War. United States Army Center of Military History.

⁷⁸ Peter Collier. *Medal of Honor: Portraits of Valor beyond the Call of Duty*. New York: Artisan, 2005.

⁷⁹ "An American Hero: PFC Henry Svehla: Help Bring Him Home," *GeneaBlogie*, Wednesday, February 06, 2008; "Pres. Obama Awards Medal of Honor to Belleville Army Veteran Killed in Korean War," *topix Local News: Belleville, NJ*, Monday, May 02, 2011.

Vietnam War (1960-1975)

Frank A. Herda (1947-1968), b. Cleveland, OH, of Czech ancestry. Specialist Fourth Class, US Army. Awarded Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life in Quang Trang Province, Republic of Vietnam, June 29, 1968.

Herda joined the Army from his birth city of Cleveland and by June 29, 1968 was serving as a private first class in Company A, 1st Battalion (Airborne), 506th Infantry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division (Airmobile). During an enemy attack on that day, near Dak To in Quang Trang Province, Republic of Vietnam, Herda smothered the blast of an enemy-thrown hand grenade with his body to protect those around him. He survived the blast, although severely wounded, and was subsequently promoted to specialist fourth class and awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions. Herda published the juvenile sword and sorcery novel, *The Cup of Death: Chronicles of the Dragons of the Magi* in 2007.⁸⁰

Unclassified

Laddie Stupka (1878-1946), b. Cleveland, OH, of Czech parents who immigrated to America. A peacetime recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor for service in the United States Navy. He was a native of Cleveland, but originally enlisting in the U.S. Navy in 1899 at New York. Stupka was serving as a Fireman, 1st Class aboard the USS Leyden when the Civil War-vintage vessel foundered in a heavy fog off the coast of Rhode Island and sank 21 Jan. 1903. Stupka survived and received the Medal of Honor for “seaman-like” qualities in times of emergency on 26 Dec. 1903. He was buried in the Maryland National Cemetery in Baltimore.⁸¹

Jerry Vrchlický Matejka (1894-1980), b. Nelsonville, TX, of Czech ancestry. He graduated from the University of Texas in 1916 and received a regular commission as a Second Lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps. He was detailed to the Signal Corps in 1920, served in the Panama Canal Department, and then graduated from the Signal School in 1930. In August 1940 General Matejka was assigned to General Headquarters of the United States Army, and in May 1941, as a member of the Special Observers Group, was transferred to the United Kingdom. After returning to the States, in July 1943, Matejka had a tour of duty in the Office of the Chief Signal Officer. In December 1945 he came to Fort Monmouth as Commanding General of the Eastern Signal Corps Training Center. Upon deactivation of the Center, Matejka became the fourteenth Commanding Officer of this post and served in that capacity until June 1947. He subsequently (1947-50) was named Chief Signal Officer of the European Theater of Operations

⁸⁰ Medal of Honor Citations, U.S. Army Center of Military History; Military Times Hall of Valor.

⁸¹ Military Times Hall of Valor.

and deputy chief of staff, Allied Forces Central Europe (1953-55). General Matejka retired as a Major General on 31 October 1955 after more than thirty-eight active years of Army service. He died in May 1980.⁸²

Coral Wong Pietsch, b. Waterloo, IA. She was born to a Chinese immigrant and a Czech American mother. She was a Brigadier General in the United States Army Reserve and also the first “Asian” American woman to reach the rank of Brigadier General in the United States Army. Initially earning a bachelor's degree in theatre, and later a master's degree in drama, she went on to attend the Catholic University of America to attend law school. There she would meet her future husband, an army officer who was also attending to become a lawyer.

Commissioned into the Judge Advocate General Corps in 1974, she was assigned to Eighth Army in Korea then to Fort Shafter, Hawaii, completing her active duty requirement, and transferring to the Army Reserves. After active duty, she settled down and began to reside in Hawaii with her husband and became a civilian attorney for U.S. Army Pacific. While a reservist she had been deployed to Johnston Atoll, Japan, the Philippines, Washington D.C. and Iraq. She was a chair commissioner of the Hawaii Civil Rights Commission, with her term expiring while deployed.⁸³

Conclusion

The evidence presented in this study speaks for itself. It must be apparent to anyone reading it that American Czechs and their descendants were no novices in the US military. They seemed to participate in most, if not all, US military conflicts and were always ready when the President issued the call for arms. Many of them attained the high officer ranks and a significant number of them were recipients of the most prestigious national award, the Congressional Medal of Honor. To be sure, this study should not be viewed as the end, since further research will, no doubt, uncover additional men and women of Czech extraction who excelled in the US military.

⁸² History of the Commanding Officers at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey and the U.S. Army CECOM, Life Cycle Management Command. Fort Monmouth, NJ, 2007.

⁸³ Lt. Col. Randy Pullen, “Waterloo to Washington: The Long Journey of Coral Wong Pietsch,” American Forces Press Service, US Department of Defense, Washington, DC.

The Antichrist in the Slovak Writings of Hugolín Gavlovič (1712-87)

Gerald J. Sabo, S.J.

Hugolín Gavlovič (1712-87) was a prominent Baroque author in Slovak literature.¹ Not surprisingly, since he was a Franciscan priest, his twenty-odd distinct autograph writings in prose and poetry—some quite extensive—are virtually all associated with religious material and themes. That one such theme was Jesus Christ's opponent in salvation history, the Antichrist, does not at first seem unusual. Yet in all his writings, there are simply two, quite modest instances concerning this apocalyptic figure. Indeed, although Gavlovič's extensive poetic work *Škola Kresťanská* (The Christian School, completed in August, 1758, more than fourteen thousand syllabic verses) focuses on the "four last things" (death, judgment, hell, and heaven), where some comment on the Antichrist could have readily been included, no such mention was made. Rather, a four-page sermon among more than two hundred autograph sermons in his collection *Kamen ku pomocy* (The Rock for Help, recording "completion" date May 4, 1779—870 numbered + 29 (unnumbered) introductory pages) is one of Gavlovič's two considerations of the Antichrist.² The other is a rough-draft autograph of sixty syllabic verses entitled "*Antichristus*" (Antichrist) which was documented and correctly attributed to Gavlovič in the 1980s.³

¹ For a brief biography of Gavlovič and comments on his writings in English, see "GAVLOVIČ, Hugolín" in *Slovak Biographical Dictionary*, ed. Augustín Maťovčík et al., 1st English ed. (Martin and Wauconda, IL: Matica slovenská and Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc., 2002), 97. For a more detailed biography, compilation of his writings, and comments on these in Slovak with related bibliography, see "Hugolín Martin Gavlovič," Vševlad Jozef Gajdoš, O.F.M., Ph.D., *Františkáni v slovenskej literatúre* [Franciscans in Slovak Literature] (Cleveland: Prvá Katolícká Slovenská Jednota, 1979), 67-71.

² The date May 4, 1779 on this work's title page marks probably Gavlovič's "completion" of a clean autograph of this sermon collection. At present, there is no indication or even way of determining when individual sermons were actually composed and perhaps publicly presented; some may have been delivered as sermons during Gavlovič's pastoral activities. The autograph of *Kamen ku pomocy* is preserved at the Slovenská národná knižnica (Slovak National Library) in Martin, the Gajdoš collections, signature number 155 AH 1. In reproducing text by Gavlovič, I have eliminated the usual dot over any lowercase "y" which was for Gavlovič simply an orthographic practice with no grammatical significance. Otherwise, Gavlovič's text is a diplomatic rendition, *i.e.*, a transcribed version of exactly what Gavlovič wrote in the original autograph.

³ According to Gizela Gáfriková, A.[nastázia] Šarlušková found this undated rough-draft autograph at the then Matica slovenská, now the Slovenská národná knižnica (Slovak National Library) in Martin, signature number 37 JJ 60 ("Životopisné a bibliografické otázky Hugolína Gavloviča [Biographical and Bibliographical Question Marks [concerning] Hugolín Gavlovič]," *Slovenská literatúra*, vol. 34, no. 6 (1987), 549). For a recent study of "*Antichristus*," see Timotea Vráblová's "Hugolín Gavlovič a tema Antikrista [Hugolín Gavlovič and the Theme of Antichrist]," pages 51-61 in *Literárne dielo Hugolína Gavloviča (1712-1787) v súradniciach dobovej duchovnej kultúry a vzdelanosti Zborník zo seminára Bratislava, 11. novembra 2002* [The Literary Work of Hugolín Gavlovič /1712-1787/ in the Coordinates of the Period's Religious Culture and Scholarship; A Collection [of Articles] from a Seminar [in] Bratislava November 11,

After a brief biography of Gavlovič and appreciation of the Antichrist figure, I present a detailed examination of Gavlovič's sermon on the Antichrist that strikingly contrasts with a contemporary sermon on the same theme by Gavlovič's fellow Franciscan, Pavlín Bajan (1721–92), another prominent author and composer at this time.⁴ Such a comparison between the two sermons shows Gavlovič's far greater, much more detailed commentary on the Antichrist. Evidently, Gavlovič was quite engaged with this figure. Why, then, was there such a striking difference in commentary on the Antichrist between these contemporary Franciscan preachers? Gavlovič could have simply included relevant Biblical passages with a few further comments as did Bajan in his sermon, but instead Gavlovič included many more details on the Antichrist, his activity and era. Could Gavlovič's focus on and extensive consideration of the Antichrist have been a reaction to the negative circumstances affecting the Franciscan order in the Austrian Empire, especially in the 1770s? If so, then for Gavlovič the era of the apocalyptic figure of the Antichrist probably seemed to be unfolding before him during this decade as he was also compiling a clean copy of his sermon collection among his other writings. Gavlovič's rough-draft sixty verse "*Antichristus*" further evidences his definite fascination with the Antichrist and together with his sermon on the Antichrist probably dates from this same period. Thus, these two quite distinct Gavlovič writings are related in not only theme but also time.

From 1745 until his death in 1787, Gavlovič suffered from a pulmonary, tuberculosis-like illness.⁵ Even so, all of his many writings in Slovak and Latin were realized during these years of varying physical health. Nearly all his writings reflect his activity as a Franciscan priest; some of these are even specifically dedicated to Franciscan Tertiaries—lay people who follow the Franciscan religious lifestyle in their secular lives—work such as *Valaska Škola* (The

2002], ed. Gizela Gáfriková (Bratislava: Serafín, 2004). At the conclusion of this essay is a diplomatic edition of the "*Antichristus*" with an English translation as well as comments and crossed-out text in footnotes. Although Vráblová provided a transcription of these verses in her article cited above, her transcription has a number of textual discrepancies with Gavlovič's original manuscript, and is somewhere between a diplomatic edition and rendition in modern orthography.

⁴ For a brief biography of Bajan and comments on his writings in English, see "BAJAN, Juraj (Pavlín)" in *Slovak Biographical Dictionary*, 18. Besides his many musical compositions with related Slovak and Latin texts, Bajan compiled four extensive volumes of manuscript sermons for the liturgical year—some four thousand pages. For a more detailed biography, compilation of his musical compositions and writings, and comments on these in Slovak with related bibliography, see Všeň Vlad Jozef Gajdoš, "Pavlín Juraj Bajan," *Františkáni v slovenskej literatúre*, 34–38.

⁵ Celestín Lepáček, "Život a dielo P. Hugolína Gavloviča 1. ["The Life and Work of P. Hugolín Gavlovič 1.]" in *Výročná zpráva súkr. gymnázia rádu sv. Františka [...] v Malackách* [Annual Report of the Private Gymnázium of the Franciscan order [...] in Malacky], [no.] 5 (1931/32), 6–7, 10 and Gizela Gáfriková, "Životopisné a bibliografické otázky Hugolína Gavloviča ["Biographical and Bibliographical Question Marks [concerning] Hugolín Gavlovič]," *Slovenská literatúra* 34 (1987, no. 6), 548–561; here 554, 556–57.

Shepherd's/Valach's School) and *Škola Kresťanská* (The Christian School). Through his writing activity Gavlovič sought to enable Catholic Christians to nurture a good relationship with God and their fellow human beings as they journeyed toward an eternity that came with temporal death. Yet given the opportunities in a number of Gavlovič's writings for the Antichrist to be mentioned, it is quite noteworthy that this apocalyptic figure is found only in *Kamen ku pomocy* and "*Antichristus*."

According to Mauro Rodríguez, the figure of the Antichrist in the Judaeo-Christian religious tradition is "one opposed to the work of God, especially that accomplished in Jesus the Messiah (Christ)."⁶ Implied or direct references to this figure are found in only a few Biblical books. Passages in the Hebrew Scriptures or Christian Old Testament are largely apocalyptic, where there is expected to be a "final great struggle between the forces of good and evil between those faithful to God (the true Israel) and those hostile to Him (mainly identified with the pagan nations). The struggle is to culminate in the eschatological battle in which victory will be won by God Himself intervening on behalf of His people to the accompaniment of cosmic signs and disturbances."⁷ In the Christian New Testament—primarily the Book of the Apocalypse or Revelation, the term Antichrist does not appear, yet here the struggle "now has specifically Christian features, not only in that it is the Christian Church that is being persecuted and Christ who overcomes, but also in that the hostile forces are in many ways a blasphemous parody of elements in the Christian dispensation."⁸ Whatever the challenges, God or Christ overcomes these on behalf of those committed to Him.

The typical format of sermons in *Kamen ku Pomocy* is as follows. At the very beginning of a sermon, its theme is briefly stated in Slovak, and then there follows a citation from a Biblical book of the Vulgate (Latin) Bible with chapter and sometimes even verse number indicated that sets the sermon's focus; a Slovak rendition of this Biblical citation immediately follows. For these five sermons of *Kamen* concluding the liturgical year, the Biblical citations are from the Gospel of Matthew, chapter twenty-four where Jesus speaks on the Mount of Olives to His disciples about various occurrences at the end of temporal human history. After the sermon's introductory comments, Gavlovič briefly expresses his "*Propositio*" (Proposed consideration) about what he will be presenting in the remainder of the extensive sermon. Brief marginal statements function like outline headings for the related textual comments in the main body of the sermon. Each sermon usually comprises four quite lengthy textual pages.

In *Kamen ku pomocy*, Gavlovič discusses the figure of the Antichrist in the first of five sermons for the last Sunday of the liturgical year—in effect, the concluding sermons for the Christian liturgical cycle. In this first sermon, Gavlovič devotes nearly three of four very lengthy textual pages to the Antichrist.⁹ His theme is: "*O Ancy=kristowi. a o nekterem znameni pred Sudem poslednim.*"

⁶ "Antichrist," *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967), vol. 1: 616.

⁷ Rodríguez, "Antichrist," 616.

⁸ Rodríguez, "Antichrist," 616.

⁹ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 801–03.

(About the Antichrist, and about a certain sign before the last Judgment.).¹⁰ The Biblical reference is verse fifteen of Matthew's twenty-fourth chapter: "*Cum [ergo] videritis abominationem desolationis [, quae dicta est a Daniele propheta, [...]]*" (When [therefore] you see the abomination of desolation [which was expressed by the prophet Daniel]).¹¹ Gavlovič translates the Latin into Slovak as "*Když uzriete ohavnost spustateňi.*" While in his introductory comments, Gavlovič draws on the apocryphal "Fourth Book of Esdras"¹² for descriptions of temporal human history associated with the "last judgment day," Gavlovič notes that this book of Esdras is not "canonical," and so leaving it "with respect," he invites the reader to turn to Christ's words, citing again from Matthew 24, here verse 3—the request of Christ's disciples: "Tell us, when will this be, and what will be the sign of your coming and of the close of the age?" Christ responds concerning the signs for that time, the most frightening of which is the "*ohavnost spustateňi*" (abomination of desolation) prophesied by "Dan.[iel] 9. v.[erse] 27." Indeed, many of the Holy Fathers say that this abomination is understood as the "*Ancykrist*" (Antichrist); this same figure St. Paul called the "person of sin and son of perdition" in "2Thes[s]al.[onians] 2[:3]" ("*homo peccati filius*

¹⁰ The themes of the remaining four sermons for the last Sunday of the liturgical year are: 2nd sermon—"O Trube Angelskeg, a o wskrysseni Tela" (About the Trumpet [call], and about the resurrection of the Body, *Kamen* 805); 3rd sermon—"O Doline Josaffat, o Sude a o Sudcowi, a o wigeweni hyrchuw a zahanbeni wszech hyrssnikuw" (About the Valley of Josaphat, about the Judgment and about the Judge, and about the revelation of sinners and the shaming of all sinners, *Kamen* 809); 4th sermon—"Pan Buch żadneho netresce podle Sprawedliwosti, dokud ho nagprw nenapomene podle Milosrdenstwí" (The Lord God does not punish anyone according to Justice, until he first does not admonish him according to Mercy, *Kamen* 813); and 5th sermon—"Kto nechce użiwati milosrdenstwí Bosku ku Spaseñi, a hressi na ñem zakladagice: ten okusy Sprawedliwost Bosku ku zatraceñi" (Who does not want to avail oneself of God's mercy for Salvation, and sins depending on it [God's mercy], he will experience God's Justice to perdition, *Kamen* 817). Appropriately, then, these four themes and sermons concern events AFTER the temporal activity of the Antichrist in Christian Biblical understanding, presented in the first of these concluding sermons..

¹¹ This and other Latin Biblical citations are from the Vulgate Bible, *Biblia sacra juxta vulgatum clementinam, nova editio*, eds. Alberto Colunga, OP and Laurentio Turrado, 4th ed. (Madrid: Biblioteca de autores cristianos, 1965, here page 985). The phrases "*abominatio desolationis*," "*abominatonem in desolationem*," and "*abominatio in desolationem*" are found in the Book of Daniel 9:27, 11:31, and 12:31 respectively. The Biblical verses cited by Gavlovič for the remaining four sermons, also from Matthew, chapter twenty-four, are as follows: Sermon 2, verse 31; Sermon 3, verse 21; Sermon 4, verse 25; and Sermon 5, verse 21. Thus Matthew 24:21 is cited for three of the five sermons (one, three, and five).

¹² The Fourth Book of Esdras for the Vulgate (Latin) Bible is the Second Book of Esdras in the Apocrypha section of the *New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha Revised Standard Version*, eds. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger (New York: Oxford UP, 1977), 23–62. The verses on which Gavlovič drew would be especially twenty to twenty-eight in chapter six on pages 34–35 of the Apocrypha section of this Bible edition.

perditionis”),¹³ the prophet Daniel called this figure a “monster” “[chapter] 7 [verses 7 and 19ff]” (“*bestia quarta*/the fourth beast”), and Christ called him “*ohawnost*” (“*abominationem*/abomination”) in “Matt.[hew] 24. v.[erse] 13[actually verse 15].”¹⁴ In his “*Propositio*,” Gavlovič indicates that there follow two parts for the remainder of the sermon: the first is “*o Ancykristowi*” (about the Antichrist) and the second “*o nekterych znamenich*” (about certain signs), which in effect repeats what he wrote as the sermon’s theme at its very beginning.

As noted earlier, the marginal statements in a Gavlovič sermon are like outline headings for that sermon, highlighting passages of comments. In this first sermon for the last Sunday of the liturgical year, the marginal statements before the “*Propositio*” summarize in effect the focus of this sermon: “*Znamení Sudu z Ezdrasse*” (Sign(s) of Judgment from Esdras), “*Znamení Sudu u S. Matussa w kap. 24*” (Sign(s) of Judgment in St. Matthew in chap.[ter] 24), and “*Ohawnost gest Ancykrist*” (The Abomination is the Antichrist). After the “*Propositio*,” Gavlovič sets off the first part of the sermon (“*Prwna Stranka*”) as focused on the Antichrist.¹⁵

Fourteen marginal statements describe the Antichrist, his actions and effect on others during the Antichrist’s time of activity. The first marginal statement—“*O Ancykristowi*” (About the Antichrist)—includes comments, some of which are referenced according to Scripture passages and certain Church Fathers such as Sts. Augustine and Jerome.¹⁶ Gavlovič described various “actions” the Antichrist would take such as showing zeal for the Law of Moses, being acknowledged as the Messiah sent from God, and attracting many peoples to himself; he would “be named Antichrist because he will fight against Christ and all Christians and also against God.” Indeed, Gavlovič noted that “in his own name he will have this number 666, that is, six hundred sixty-six [as referenced in the] Apoc.[alypse] 13. v.[erse]18,” which in Christian numerical scriptural tradition is related to the Roman Emperor Nero (ruled 54-68).¹⁷ The second marginal statement continues in this vein: “*Ancykrist zwede ku sebe mnohich y krestanuw*” (The Antichrist will seduce to himself many even Christians).¹⁸ Thus, not just Christians but, because the Antichrist will be a lover of the Law of Moses, Jews also will flock to him, whom he “shall magnify with honor. He shall make them rulers of many and shall divide the land for a price Dan.[iel] 11.[:39].” “*Ancikrist bude bohatty*” (The

¹³ *Biblia sacra*, 1141.

¹⁴ In the text of the sermon (*Kamen* 801), Gavlovič wrote the Matthew reference as verse thirteen not verse fifteen, of chapter twenty-four as he had cited in his initial Biblical reference for this sermon just half a page above.

¹⁵ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 801.

¹⁶ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 801.

¹⁷ This numerical interpretation on verse 18 in the Book of the Apocalypse (Revelation) is found on page 1505 of the *New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha Revised Standard Version*, eds. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger (New York: Oxford UP, 1977). English translations of cited Biblical passages are based on this English-language Bible.

¹⁸ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 801.

Antichrist will be rich—marginal statement 3), as is corroborated in Scripture: “he shall become ruler of the treasures of gold and silver and all the precious things Dan.[iel] 11.[43].”¹⁹ For this, many Christians will deny Christ and disgrace their faith, acknowledging the Antichrist as the Messiah and God. Yet as Gavlovič notes, “Wretched is he who [...] will abandon eternal salvation.” For “*Mnozi y krestane odstupu od Krysta*” (Many even Christians will step away from Christ—marginal statement 4).²⁰ Since “pious Christians will not allow themselves to be led away from Christ’s faith [...], he [the Antichrist] will cruelly afflict, torment, and torture them. Blessed are they who die for Christ.” For as Christ himself expressed: he “who loses his soul for my sake will find it” [Matt. 10:39]. And concerning those who will follow the Antichrist, Gavlovič notes that St. John the Evangelist predicted: “it was allowed to make war on the saints and to conquer them Apoc.[alypse] 13. v.[erse] 7),” and likewise the prophet Daniel: “And he [the Antichrist] will prevail against the Saints. Dan.[iel] 11.”²¹

“*Ancykrist skazy wssecko naboženstw*” (The Antichrist will ruin all religiousness—marginal statement 5) and “*Ancy=krist poznamena swogich znamenim*” (The Antichrist will mark his own with a sign—marginal statement 6) set off further comments.²² Now the Antichrist “will demolish all Christian churches, burn books and writings related to salvation, forbid to Christians religiousness, Sacraments, holy Masses, Divine praises, and uproot all crosses.” He will “proclaim himself god, [...] and order under pain of death that all would reverence him as god.” “Indeed Enoch and Eliass [Elijah] will come to announce repentance, but they will also be tortured by the Antichrist, and [for] half of the fourth day will lie on Jerusalem’s streets without burial.” Even more, “he will then mark all his followers on the forehead or on the right hand with a definite marking or seal in which these words will be announced: *Nego Jesum Zapiram Ježisse a potupugem Krysta* [I deny Jesus [Latin and Slovak] and dishonor Christ].” Without this mark no one will have freedom, will not be able to sell or buy anything, thus be able to live in the world. This is the great torment predicted by Daniel: “There shall be a time of trouble such as never has been since there was a nation till that time Dan.[iel] 11. [actually 12:1].” As was also prophesied by Christ: “There will then be tribulation which has not been since the beginning [of the world] Matt.[hew] 24[21].” This will all happen to the bad and good as St. John the Evangelist says: “[And he said to me, ‘Do not seal up the words of the prophecy of this book for the time is near. Let the evildoer still do evil, and] ‘the filthy still be filthy,’ [and the righteous still do right, and] ‘the holy still be holy’ Apoc.[alypse] 22[11].”

“*Anci=krist bude Pisma wkladati o sebe*” (The Antichrist will interpret Scripture about himself—marginal statement 7) and “*Ancikrystowe zazraki welike, ale ffalessne*” (The Antichrist’s miracles [are/will be] great but false—marginal

¹⁹ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 802.

²⁰ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 802.

²¹ This verse is referenced by Gavlovic as from chapter 11 of the Book of Daniel, but the cited Latin words are closer to Daniel 7:21 (*Biblia sacra* 862).

²² *Kamen ku pomocy*, 802.

statement 8) continue the Antichrist's description.²³ Thus will the Antichrist interpret, express, and demonstrate that "all the Scriptures and Prophets spoke of him and made known his coming as that of the rightful Messiah, and as proof of this he will perform great miracles by a diabolic power which will all be false as St. Paul says: 'The coming of the lawless one by the activity of Satan will be with all power and with pretended signs and wonders' 2Thes[s]l. [onians] 2[:9]." The Antichrist will confer "power to perform such false miracles to his many followers as Christ says: 'For pseudochrists and false prophets will arise and show great signs and wonders' Matt.[hew] 24. v.[erse] 24." Gavlovič then lists a number of natural occurrences that various Christian writers have noted for the Antichrist's period of activity; however impressive these happenings will be, all are really false signs. Even so, many will abandon God and Christ as Christ predicted: "[They] will show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect Matt.[hew] 24. v.[erse] 24," from a verse cited earlier by Gavlovič.

"*Kratke Panowani Ancikristowe mnoho zleho spusoby*" (The Antichrist's short reign will realize much evil—marginal statement 9) highlights again scriptural writers that Gavlovič has cited before.²⁴ According to him, the Antichrist will reign merely for half of a quarter of a year ("*za pul čtvrtá roka*," for forty-five days) as supposedly noted in Dan.[iel] 12:11.²⁵ And to corroborate that the Antichrist will lead the whole world into the desert, Gavlovič cites Matt.[hew] 24[:22]: "And if those days had not been shortened, no human being would be saved." Gavlovič then cites St. Paul's Second Letter to the Thessalonians concerning the appearance of the Antichrist: "'Until will be revealed the man of sin, the son of perdition who opposes and exalts himself against every so-called god' 2Thes[s]al. [onians] 2[:3-4]." Relatedly, in a question Gavlovič poses the tenth marginal statement: "*Prec[č]o Buch Ancikrysta na swet dopusti[?]*" (Why will God allow the Antichrist into the world[?]).²⁶ His answer is again based on St. Paul's Second Letter to the Thessalonians: "This will happen to the godless so that they would believe the lies of the Antichrist when they did not want to believe Christ's truth, and so in their godlessness would be judged: 2Thes[s]al.[onians] 2[:9-11]." ²⁷

Marginal statement eleven begins a long passage of comments with various questions posed to Gavlovič's reader in relation to the Antichrist: "*Mnozy*

²³ Both statements are in *Kamen ku pomocy*, 802.

²⁴ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 802–03.

²⁵ Daniel 12:11 notes "and from the time that the continual burnt offering is taken away, and the abomination that makes desolate is set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. [And verse 12] Blessed is he who waits and comes to the thousand three hundred and thirty-five days"—thus the difference between the times of the two verses is forty-five days, in effect, the temporal extent of the Antichrist's activity: *New Oxford Annotated Bible*, 1087. The forty-five day extent of the Antichrist's time of activity is mentioned in comments for marginal statement fourteen (*Kamen ku pomocy*, 803); see below Note 32.

²⁶ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 803.

²⁷ In the Vulgate (Latin) Bible/*Biblia sacra*, the relevant verses are nine through eleven (1147), but in the *New Oxford Annotated Bible*, the verses are nine through twelve (1438).

zpiragu Ježissowi ne slowem, ale skutkem” (Many deny Jesus not by word, but by deed).²⁸ “Would you deny Christ and his power, follow the Antichrist, allow to be imprinted on your body or right hand the diabolic sign ‘*Nego Jesum Zapiram Ježisse*’ [I deny Jesus]?” Gavlovič responds that “I think that you would say: rather would I suffer a thousand brutal deaths, than deny Christ, and follow the Antichrist to perdition.” A citation from John’s First Epistle is Gavlovič’s responsive supporting material. “Children, it is the last hour [... and] the antichrist is coming. 1Joan.[John] 2[:18].” Marginal statement twelve focuses on the precursors of the Antichrist: “*Ancikryst ma swogich predchudcuw*” (The Antichrist has his own precursors).²⁹ “Christ had one precursor St. John the Baptist, and then he will have two Enoch and Eliass [Elijah], but the Antichrist will have many precursors,” among whom will be pagans, Turks, and those “who do not believe in Christ, disgrace and reject him,” as well as “all the heretics who tear themselves from Christ’s faith and do not want to keep Christ’s teachings.” Other precursors of the Antichrist are “all godless Christians who by bad example, by bad teaching draw away others from Christ, untie them from his commandments when with delightful speeches, or forcibly or with money they bind them to sin and godlessness.” For is he not a “precursor of Antichrist who leads another into drunkenness, theft, lust, and all sorts of sins” and leads him “away from Christ and eternal salvation?”

In marginal statement thirteen, Gavlovič addresses his reader: “*Snat’ y ty skutkem zapirass Ježysse*” (Perhaps even you deny Jesus by deed).³⁰ As Gavlovič explains, “you deny Jesus whenever you transgress Jesus’s commandment, whenever you give yourself or another to that deathly sin, for already in that way you do not love God and Jesus, from him through sin you step away and [cause] shame.” For one can acknowledge himself “to be a Christian and remember Jesus, but by deed” deny him when one does not “live in a Christian way as St. Paul says about such persons: ‘They profess to know God, but they deny him by their deeds’ Tit.[us] 1[:16].”

Marginal statement fourteen concludes Gavlovič’s discussion of the Antichrist: “*Ancikrist bude pul čtwrta roka panowati .na wrchu Oliwetskem zahiñe*” (The Antichrist will reign for half a quarter of a year. on Mount Olivet will he perish).³¹ When the Antichrist “will fulfill half a quarter of a year [some forty-five days] in a cruel rule of the world, he will gather together many a great number of people on Mount Olivet”—echoing the “Antichrist’s brief reign” of marginal statement nine.³² From there he “will ascend to the heavens; and when he will be carried forth through a diabolic power high into the clouds, there Christ will kill him, as St. Paul says: The Lord ‘will slay him with the Spirit [breath] of his mouth’ 2Thes[s]al. [onians] 2[:8].” Thus will “he fall, rot, and forever perish,

²⁸ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 803.

²⁹ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 803.

³⁰ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 803.

³¹ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 803.

³² See above (Note 25), Gavlovič’s reference to this time period in remarks related to marginal statement nine.

but so that all those following him would not perish whom in some way or other he drew to himself, then there will not be a judgment day, but the merciful God will grant them yet forty-five days for repentance, Dan.[iel] 12. v.[erse] 13 so that everyone can make repentance.”³³ “And God will grant you [the reader] a sufficiently long time so that you would repent and not taste God’s dreadful Judgment.”

Like Gavlovič, his contemporary fellow Franciscan Pavlín Bajan (1721–92) created and compiled four extensive autograph volumes of sermons for the liturgical year. In the volume for just after Easter Sunday through the last Sunday of the liturgical year (then known as the twenty-fourth Sunday after Pentecost), Bajan offered four sermons for the last Sunday of the liturgical year, the last sermon of which concerned the Antichrist.³⁴ As stated in the list of *propositiones* for all the sermons at the end of this manuscript volume, for this Sunday the “proposed consideration” is “*De Signis, adventu, et persecutione Antichristi*” (The Signs, coming, and persecution of the Antichrist).³⁵ Yet Bajan’s consideration of the Antichrist is markedly much more limited with far fewer supporting Biblical references—definitely not the detailed description of Gavlovič who seems almost obsessed with the apocalyptic figure of Antichrist.

The format of Bajan’s sermon differs from that of Gavlovič’s. After introductory comments, the remainder of a sermon comprises Bajan’s “*Confirmatio*” (Confirmation) of what he has introduced. Unlike the other sermons for this last Sunday of the liturgical year as well as virtually all other sermons in Bajan’s collection which comprise six textual pages, this fourth sermon on the Antichrist that concludes the liturgical year and volume covers *eight* textual pages.³⁶ Like Gavlovič, Bajan begins with a Scriptural reference for the sermon which is immediately translated into Slovak. Perhaps not so surprising, the Scriptural reference for Bajan’s four sermons for this last Sunday of the liturgical year, like that for Gavlovič’s five concluding sermons, is the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew’s Gospel, where Christ is discussing the end time with his disciples; here it is Matthew 24, but actually verse 21 which is not indicated: “*Erit tunc tribulatio magna qvalis n*[on] fuit ab initio mundi!*”/Bude techda až suženj welike gakeho nebilo od počatku sweta” (There will be great tribulation such as had not been from the beginning of the world).³⁷ However, quite

³³ Daniel 12:13 reads in the *New Oxford Annotated Bible*: “But go your way till the end; and you shall rest, and shall stand in your allotted place at the end of the days.” with commentary on the verse: “The promise that Daniel will have a place in that final consummation” (1087).

³⁴ The manuscript volume with the sermon on the Antichrist is entitled [...] *Devoti Sermones in Dominicis omnes a Dominica in Albis usque ad finem anni* ([...] Pious Sermons for all Sundays from the Second Sunday of Easter [Season] till the end of the year), and is preserved at the Slovenská národná knižnica in Martin, the Gajdoš Collections, signature number 155 AC 1.

³⁵ *Devoti Sermones*, 1174.

³⁶ This fourth sermon on the Antichrist is on pages 1116–23 of *Devoti Sermones*.

³⁷ The citations from Matthew twenty-four for the preceding three sermons are: Sermon 1, verse 31; Sermon 2, verse 19; and Sermon 3, verse 26, while the fourth and last sermon on

differently from marginal statements in Gavlovič's sermon that are like outline headings for Gavlovič's comments in the body of his sermon, the marginal statements for Bajan's sermon indicate simply the Scriptural and other religious-related sources that support Bajan's remarks in the body of his sermon. One of the traditional signs before Judgment Day is the appearance of the Antichrist and his persecution of good Christian people. Indeed, as supportive material for his introductory comments, Bajan cites twice more the twenty-first verse from Matthew 24 that has set this sermon's tone about the Antichrist's tyrannical rule and persecution.³⁸

At the beginning of the "confirmation" section of the sermon, Bajan notes that the Antichrist will arise "before Judgment Day, and as shown in the Old and New Testaments, as godless, cruel, and deceptive for the whole world," coming from the tribe of Dan.³⁹ For this Bajan cites "Genes[is] 49[:17]" from the Vulgate (Latin) Bible, where the Patriarch Jacob on his deathbed noted about his son Dan: "Dan shall be a serpent in the way, a viper by the path, that bites the horse's heels so that his rider falls backward."⁴⁰ (Gavlovič also attributes the Antichrist's origin from the Israelite tribe of Dan, but rather supports this assertion with reference to chapter seven of the Book of Apocalypse where the tribe of Dan is not listed for those among the one hundred and forty-four thousand chosen to be saved.)⁴¹ Bajan cites various Biblical passages to support his comments (some of these are not directly related to the Antichrist nor are cited by Gavlovič), yet like Gavlovič, Bajan significantly draws on St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians but especially the prophet Daniel concerning the time of the Antichrist: 2Thessalonians 2[:3–4], "The rebellion comes first, and the man of lawlessness is revealed, the son of perdition, who opposes and exalts himself against every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God;" Daniel 7[:25], "He shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High."⁴² For the "Antichrist will propagate his kingdom through riches."⁴³ And "the Antichrist will then primarily through riches seduce people and greatly raise himself up;"⁴⁴ Daniel 11[:39], "those who acknowledge him he shall magnify with honor. He shall make them rulers over many and shall divide the land for a price;" Daniel 11[:43], "He shall become ruler of the treasures of gold and of silver, and all the precious

the Antichrist has verse 21. Thus, each of Bajan's four sermons has a distinct verse from Matthew's twenty-fourth chapter.

³⁸ *Devoti Sermones*, 1116–17.

³⁹ *Devoti Sermones*, 1118.

⁴⁰ *Biblia sacra*, 43.

⁴¹ *Kamen ku pomocy*, 801.

⁴² Both citations are on page 1118 in *Devoti Sermones*.

⁴³ *Devoti Sermones*, 1118.

⁴⁴ *Devoti Sermones*, 1119.

things;⁴⁵ and Daniel 11[:1], “And there will be a time such as had never been since nations began.”⁴⁶

Toward the end of his sermon, Bajan expresses himself most effusively. He exclaims: “O most unfortunate times when Antichrist will rule over the world! For truly will it be: ‘Erit tunc tribulatio magna!’”—once again Matthew 24:21 without indicating the scriptural source.⁴⁷ And soon after, he expresses an apostrophe to Jesus: “O most sweet Jesus [...] this Antichrist is striving to wipe away [zhladit] your H[oly] Name, We don’t want to consent to this blaspheming, rather here in his Praise to suffer death and die.”⁴⁸ As he concludes his sermon, Bajan writes: “And this is my simple statement! in which for your affection I presented these terrible signs and especially the deception and cruelty of the Antichrist so that you would recall if not the entire year at least this last Sunday these frightening matters which will be realized before Judgment Day.”⁴⁹ Again, citing 2Thessalonians 2[:7] “For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work,” he notes that the “trotter [horse] of the Antichrist is one [and] every sin! Simply if you wish constantly to be joined with Christ, fear sin like fire, and if you would do violence, with the help of God put out all your strength and do not consent to anything.”⁵⁰ His concluding words express his most fervent view and desire: “I am a Christian! [And] when they deny Christ, will I attach myself to the Antichrist? Not at all! I don’t want [this]! I do not consent! May the Antichrist be lost! and may he be [as far away] from me, just as from all creation. Praised be the Lord Jesus Christ now and always forever and ever. Amen.”⁵¹ And right after these last words of the sermon appears the notation “*dic. Szak. 1762.*” (preached in the Skalica [Franciscan house] 1762).⁵² Finally, on the inside of a concluding decorative illustration for this sermon, Bajan wrote in Latin that “in 1775 I finished this work of Sermons in the venerable Skalica house so that in its other time it may also serve to preach to [my religious] Brothers who esteem the Word of God.”⁵³

⁴⁵ *Devoti Sermones*, 1119.

⁴⁶ *Devoti Sermones*, 1121.

⁴⁷ *Devoti Sermones*, 1122.

⁴⁸ *Devoti Sermones*, 1122.

⁴⁹ *Devoti Sermones*, 1123.

⁵⁰ *Devoti Sermones*, 1123.

⁵¹ *Devoti Sermones*, 1123.

⁵² At the end of the first sermon for this last week of the liturgical year, Bajan noted “*dic. Szak. 1766*” (preached in the Skalica [Franciscan house] 1766;” at the end the second sermon, Bajan noted “*dic. Szak. 1768*” (preached in the Skalica [Franciscan house] 1768;” at the end of the third sermon there is no indication of its public presentation. Thus, for the order of sermons, Bajan wanted that the one concerning the Antichrist be the very last for the liturgical year, though its public presentation was the earliest (1762) of three with indicated dates of presentation.

⁵³ *Devoti sermones*, 1123. Thus, his clean-copy writing or simply recording of these sermons was in 1775, though at least three of the preceding four sermons had been presented in public during the 1760s.

From the preceding discussions of Gavlovic's and Bajan's sermons, the Antichrist is clearly a much more striking figure of interest for Gavlovič than for Bajan. Gavlovic's detailed focus on the Antichrist and his activity surpasses Bajan's rather modest presentation on this apocalyptic figure. The sermon reader comes to know far more who the Antichrist is and what actions or happenings are associated with him from Gavlovič's comments than from those by Bajan. Yet besides the sermon, Gavlovič also realized a rough-draft verse writing of sixty fourteen-syllable, pair-rhymed verses with marginalia entitled "*Antichristus*." Many of these verses confirm Gavlovič's almost obsessive concern with the Antichrist. The first thirty-five verses with marginalia set the background for this climactic period in human history that introduces Gavlovič's major focus on the Antichrist. Indeed, the last twenty-five verses with marginalia enhance the delineation of the Antichrist in Gavlovič's sermon. The Antichrist will kill Enoch and Eliass [Elijah] (verse 36) who will preach about him (verse 38). Then the Antichrist will devastate truth, torment believers who will become martyrs, while others will be seduced, forsaking truth, and "loving themselves," not God (verses 39–44). Godlessness, falsehood, privation, and no peace will be the lot of Christ's believers (verses 45–48). Pity the progenitor of this accursed apocalyptic figure destined to rise up against God and the people, and after a brief reign of much fury, "he will be buried in hell for eternity" (verses 49–60). Given all that Gavlovič wrote about the Antichrist in sermon and verses, what, then, could have affected this Franciscan to create so detailed a depiction of this apocalyptic figure, so different from Bajan's much simpler, pious sermon presentation? Could historical circumstances experienced by Franciscans in the Austrian Empire during especially the 1770s have influenced the Franciscan Gavlovič to create his so graphic and engaging depiction?

During the period of the 1770's, Slovak Franciscans were undergoing severe difficulties in their religious life and activities. In the Austrian Empire, during the reigns of Maria Theresa (ruled, 1740–80) and later her son Joseph II (ruled alone, 1780–90), Franciscans "were ruthlessly cut off from their superiors in Rome and subjected to episcopal jurisdiction and government inspection. In 1770 it was made illegal to enter a religious order before the age of twenty-four; [even more,] in 1771 alms collecting and all other activities outside the convent were prohibited."⁵⁴ Such limitations seriously affected Franciscans, their activities and houses. A few years later, even lay people (men and women) who wished to be religiously associated with the Franciscans as members of the "third order or Tertiaries" were devastatingly effected. "In 1776, a decree of Maria Theresa forbade the reception of new [Tertiary] members,"⁵⁵ thus eliminating the continuation of a significant branch of Franciscans. What a blow this must have been to Gavlovič, who earlier in his writing activity had devoted a good number of works to this lay group of Franciscans, among which were his two quite extensive poetic autographs *Valaská Škola* (The Shepherd's School) and *Škola*

⁵⁴ Lazaro Iriarte de Aspuz, O.F.M. Cap., *Franciscan History; The Three Orders of St. Francis of Assisi*, tr. Patricia Ross (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1979), 386.

⁵⁵ Iriarte, 497.

Krestanská (The Christian School).⁵⁶ Such an extremely negative atmosphere for Franciscans may well have moved Gavlovič to incorporate into his thinking and writing, for the first time apparently, some appreciation of the Antichrist's role in salvation and contemporary history as perhaps evidenced in his own real-life situation. Indeed, Gavlovič's late 1770s clean-copying of an extensive sermon on the Antichrist's presence in human history could well have prompted the writing of his sixty-verse "*Antichristus*." Such verses, then, could well come from this late 1770s period, as Gavlovič and his fellow Franciscans experienced one government stricture after another. While the sermon provided an apt opportunity to express his horror of the Antichrist and the latter's activity, the rough-draft verses confirmed his definite focus on that apocalyptic figure. Yet even more than Gavlovič's striking portrayal of the Antichrist and his activity is that these two writings are so distinctively "unique" among Gavlovič's extensive and numerous religiously related writings in which that apocalyptic figure could well have received significant attention and discussion but did not—except for these two rather modest instances.

⁵⁶ For an extensive discussion of *Valaská Škola* (The Shepherd's/Valach's School, completed in March, 1755, nearly eighteen thousand syllabic verses) in relation to *Škola Krestanská* (The Christian School, completed in August, 1758, more than fourteen thousand syllabic verses), see my article "*Valaská Škola* (1755): What was Gavlovič Thinking?" in *Kosmas*, vol. 19, no. 2 (Spring, 2006): 38-52, plus four unnumbered pages of related illustrations. This article without the pages with illustrations was rendered into Slovak for the journal of the Slovak Catholic university in Ružomberok, *Disputationes scientiificae universitatis catholicae in Ružomberok*, vol. 7, no. 2 ([Spring] 2007): 4-18.

Antichristus

Hugolín Gavlovič

This is a “diplomatic edition” of Gavlovič’s “*Antichristus*,” i.e., a printed transcription of this autograph as written, with comments in footnotes. As this Gavlovič material is a rough draft—not Gavlovič’s usual extant clean-copy texts, some letters are difficult to distinguish, and at times an expected mäkčeň (softening) mark over some letter is missing. A letter in question is followed by square brackets with an alternate letter reading or the letter with a mäkčeň which may be missing. Given the difficulty in interpreting whether the initial letters of some words are upper or lowercase, both versions of that letter are included thus “P/p[...].” In a few instances it seems that Gavlovič has written lowercase “j” though it could be a poorly written “y.” In such instances the “y” is included in square brackets right after the “j.” Given that Gavlovič separated each group of twelve verses with a line, I have entitled such a division *koncept*, a term he himself created for such a poetic entity primarily found in his *Valaská Škola* and *Škola Kresťanská*—twelve, pair-rhymed verses of fourteen syllables each. Like the *koncepty* in those writings, “Antichristus” also has marginal statements, at times rhymed couplets. These marginal statements are reproduced in italic type in the following transcription. Gavlovič wrote a dot over the letter “y”—upper or lowercase, an orthographic practice with no grammatical meaning. In this diplomatic edition, the dot over the “y” has not been reproduced. Finally, in Gavlovič “ss” represents “š”; “w” is “v;” “ff” is simply “f;” and “g” can be either a “j” or “g.”

Antichristus

[Koncept 1]

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| [1] Sedem dni ge w gednem tydni, ssest su k Pracj[y] dane ¹ | <i>Sedmi Poc[č]et</i> |
| [2] A sedmy den ² k odpočynku k sluz[ž]be Boskeg mame. | <i>ge sic maly</i> |
| [3] Sedem Planet ge na Nebj gake su take su, | <i>Ale w sobe</i> |
| [4] Gakokoliw se zchadzagu take časy ne | <i>dokonaly.</i> |
| [5] Sedem daruw ge nebeskyh, y sedem Swatosti | |
| [6] Sedmj[y] Počet ge sic maly wssak w dokonalosti. | |
| [7] Wisse sedem wekuw c[č]lowek nemuže žiti | <i>Sedem wekuw</i> |
| [8] Nebo w Starosti dospeleg musy konec wziti. | <i>Sweta</i> |
| [9] I/J tento Swet sedem wekuw, ne wic trwat bude | |
| [10] Ktere se mu dokonagu P/pri ostatnem Sude. | |
| [11] Ten ssesty wek P/pred Sudnym dnem bude plny Psoty, | |

¹ Crossed out are the words “ge P/pracowitych” (is[are] work[days]).

² Crossed out is the word “ge” (is).

[12] Neb Ancikryst w celem swete Narobi klopoty.

[Koncept 2]

- [13] Gak dluho ten Swet ma stati mnozi rozgimaliI/J³ *P/pri//P/po⁴*
 [14] Ale o tem gistotnosti w Pismach nenechali. *Poslednem Sude*
 [15] Nekteri su w tem domneni z[ž]e rokuw ssest tise *Sweta neubude*
 [16] Muže swet tento trwati w celosti a ne wic.
 [17] Když ge ssest dni Pracowitych w tydni a ne wice,
 [18] Tehdy tento Swet ma stati Rokuw ssest tisece.
 [19] A⁵ sedmi den w odpoc[č]ynku bude na wec[č]nosti
 [20] Wssak newsseckym, gedine tym kteri žili w Cnosti.
 [21] A⁶ ponewac[č] podla Pisma zem na weky Stogi *Zem trwa*
 [22] Tehdy gistu skazu⁷ Sweta nechame w Pokogi. *na weky*
 [23] Z[Ž]e zem trwa po⁸ Sudnem dni z Pisma Poznawame
 [24] Ale c[č]o bude na zemi gistoty nemame.

[Koncept 3]

- [25] Kdyz[ž] Swet prigde ku skonani to gest k dni Sudnemu
 [26] Mnohe znameni predegdu⁹ cylice ku nemu. *Mnohe pred Sudem*
 [27] Mnohe¹⁰ K/krystus predpowedel, i/a¹¹ mnohe Prorocy *znameni*
 [28] Y na Nebi y na zemi wsse z prediwneg mocy. *P/prigdu nahle*
 [29] To¹² ge gedno, mnozy žide prigmu P/prawu W/wiru *krem domneni*
 [30] Bude Ancikryst wericih¹³ ssuz[ž]owat¹⁴ nad miru.
 [31] Prigde Enoch y Eliass P/pokani kazati
 [32] Mnohich z[ž]iduw w horliwosti ku Prawde obrati.
 [33] Abi wssecy nezhinuli w swem¹⁵ zatwrdlem blude *Znameni*
 [34] Mnohich Synuw Srdce k otcum¹⁶ nawracene bude. *Sudu*

³ The written capital “I” is indistinguishable from the capital “J.”

⁴ The letter or letters after the “P” are really not decipherable. Vráblová has decided these read “Pri,” though “Po” is possible.

⁵ The “A” is partially heavily written.

⁶ This “A” seems crossed out, yet is needed for the fourteen syllables in the verse.

⁷ Crossed out are the words “Tehdy gisty Poc[č]et” (Then the/a certain number).

⁸ The original word is “po,” but Vráblová transcribed “pri.”

⁹ The original word is “PREdegdu,” but Vráblová transcribed “NAdegdu.”

¹⁰ Above the beginning words of this verse, the following words are crossed out: “Te dwe budu Neggiste[?]gsse” (Those two will be the most certain).

¹¹ This probably one-letter word is undecipherable, and could be “i” or “a” as I have written for the transcription.

¹² Preceding “To” are the following words that have been crossed out: “Mnozy Z/z[Ž/ž]ida/e” (Many Jews).

¹³ The word “wericih” should probably be “wericiCh.” An “s” appears to be written very close to the “w” of this word.

¹⁴ While this word “ssuz[ž]owat” begins with two “s” letters for “š,” perhaps it should have been written simply “Suz[ž]owat.”

¹⁵ In the word “sweM” the “m” seems smudged out, perhaps from handling.

- [35] W Ragi Enoch y Eliass as¹⁷ posawat žyge
 [36] Potem Ancikrist P/pro Prawdu obuch dwuch zabige.

[Koncept 4]

- [37] Když Ancikryst preukrutne bude kralowati
 [38] Bude¹⁸ Eliass na Neho y Enoch kazati.
 [39] Ale gich nagprw Ancikrist P/pre Prawdu utrati *Kdyz[ž] Ancikrist*
 [40] Potem naproti wericim ukrutnoš[?–s]t obrati. *bude z[ž]iwi,*
 [41] Kteri semu¹⁹ zwest nedagu, bude gich trapiti *Mnohi*
 [42] A kteri se k nemu dagu bude gich chwaliti. *zemre spravdliwy*
 [43] Bude dost muc[č]edelnikow²⁰, apostatuw²¹ wice,
 [44] Mnozi Prawdu zanechagu, seba milugice. *Ancikrist swogu*
 [45] Bude Prawda w Potupeni, bezboz[ž]nost w hodnosti *ukrutnost wilege*
 [46] Wiučy Ancikrist swogich wsseckeg ffalessnosti. *na wericich*
 [47] Bude suženi welike bez wipowedeni *krystowich*
 [48] W tych dnoch krystowim wericym žaden P/pokog N/neni.

[Koncept 5]

- [49] Ach kde z[ž]e se ma zroditi ten smradlawy kwitek
 [50] Celemu Swetu ku sskode a ne na uz[ž]itek *Kdyz[ž] se*
 [51] Ktera ho porodi na Swet nesstasliwa matka *Ancikrist narodi*
 [52] Neb sspatna po neg zustane we Swete Pamatka *Wssecko zle w*
 [53] Kragina, Mesto, a y dum gehu narodzeni *Swete naplodi*

 [54] A y wssecek Narod gehu bude w zloreč[č]eni. *Wssecek Ancikrist*
 [55] Rok, mesic, tiden, a y den, hodina y c[č]wrt ta *w zloreč[č]eni*
 [56] Kdyz[ž] se poc[č]ne, y Narodi Nech bude P/proklata.
 [57] Proti Bohu se pozdwihe, a y P/proti lidu.
 [58] Wssem lidem Psota/u²² c[č]ynice sam P/prigde na bidu.
 [59] W kratkem swogem Panowani mnoho spacha zlosti
 [60] Potem bude Pochowany w Pekle na wec[č]nosti.

¹⁶ My reading is “otCUM.”

¹⁷ My reading for “as” is probably “aš” which equals “až.” Vráblová transcribed this as “až.”

¹⁸ Right after this word “Enoch proti ?Anci” (Enoch against Anti[christ]) is crossed out.

¹⁹ This should read “se [space] mu.”

²⁰ The original word is “muc[č]edElnikuw,” but Vráblová deleted a letter for “mučEDLnÍkuw” and added a mäččeň for “č” and a dlžeň over the “i”; thus, there were three variations from the original text.

²¹ The “o” in “apOstatuw” is my reading for an indecipherable letter.

²² It is hard to decipher the last letter of this word “Psoť,” but probably is “u.”

Antichristus

[Translation by Gerald Sabo, SJ]

[*Koncept 1*]

[Marginal statements:] *[The] Seventh Number is thus small, but perfect in itself. Seven ages of the World*

- [1] Seven days there are in one week, six are given for Work
- [2] And the seventh day we have for rest, for God's service.
 - [3] Seven planets are in Heaven, what kind they are such are they,
 - [4] However they come together, such times they bring.
- [5] Seven heavenly gifts there are, and [also] seven sacraments
- [6] The Number seven is thus small, however in perfection.
 - [7] A person cannot live more than seven ages
 - [8] For in mature Old age he must take/[find] an end.
- [9] And the World of seven ages will not last longer/no longer
- [10] Which [ages] are ending for him at the last Judgment.
 - [11] The sixth age before Judgment day will be full of Misery,
 - [12] For the Antichrist will wreak troubles in the whole world.

[*Koncept 2*]

[Marginal statements:] *And A/at//A/after the Last Judgment there will be no diminution of the World. Earth lasts forever*

- [13] How long this World is supposed to stay, many have contemplated
- [14] But about this [they have] left no certitude in Writings/Scriptures.
 - [15] Certain [persons] are of the opinion that six thousand years
 - [16] Can this world last entirely and no more.
- [17] When there are six Working days in a week and no more,
- [18] Then this World must stay six thousand Years.
 - [19] And the seventh day in rest will be eternity
 - [20] But not for all, only for those who lived in Virtue.
- [21] And because according to Scripture the earth stands forever
- [22] Then the certain destruction of the World we leave in Peace.
 - [23] That earth lasts after Judgment day we recognize from Scripture
 - [24] But what will be on [the] earth we have no certainty.

[*Koncept 3*]

[Marginal statements:] *Many signs will quickly come before [the] Judgment beyond imagining. Signs of the Judgment*

- [25] When the World will come to an end, that is to Judgment day
- [26] Many signs will precede leading to it.
 - [27] Christ predicted many [signs], also many Prophets
 - [28] Both in Heaven and on earth[—]all from a most wondrous power.
- [29] This is one [sign], many Jews will accept the T/true F/faith
- [30] The Antichrist will torment believers beyond measure.
 - [31] Elias and Enoch will come to preach R/repentance
 - [32] To turn many Jews in zeal to the Truth.
- [33] So that all would not perish in their hardened heresy
- [34] The Hearts of many Sons will be turned [back] to [their] fathers.
 - [35] In Paradise Enoch and Elias will live until that time
 - [36] Then the Antichrist will kill both of them F/for the Truth.

[Koncept 4]

[Marginal statements:] *When the Antichrist will be alive many just will die. The Antichrist will pour out/forth his cruelty on Christ's believers*

- [37] When the Antichrist will most cruelly reign
- [38] Enoch and Elias will preach about him.
 - [39] But the Antichrist first of all will lose them F/for the [sake of] the Truth
 - [40] Then will turn [his] cruelty against believers.
- [41] Those who will not allow themselves to be seduced, he will torment them
- [42] And those who will give themselves to him, he will praise them.
 - [43] There will be enough martyrs, more apostates,
 - [44] Many will forsake the Truth, loving themselves [not God].
- [45] The Truth will be in Disgrace, impiety/[Godlessness] in abundance
- [46] The Antichrist will teach/instruct his own all falsehood.
 - [47] There will be great affliction without [beyond] expression
 - [48] In those days for Christ's believers there will be N/no P/peace.

[Koncept 5]

[Marginal statements:] *When the Antichrist is born, he will generate All the evil in the World All the Antichrist [is] in accursedness*

- [49] Alas then where is that foul-smelling flower to be generated
- [50] For the whole World's harm and not for [its] benefit/usefulness
 - [51] Which unfortunate mother will beget him into the World
 - [52] For a bad Memory will remain in the World after her
- [53] The Country, City, and also his home of birth
- [54] And also his entire People will be accursed [in malediction].
 - [55] The year, month, week, and also the day, and that quarter [of the hour]
 - [56] When he/it begins, and she gives birth, May it/she be cursed.

- [57] Against God he will rise up, and also A/against the people.
[58] He will come for hardship, himself making want for all people.
[59] In his brief Reign he will perpetrate much rage
[60] Then he will be Buried in Hell for eternity.

ESSAYS

Spring 1945: A Memoir

Mary Hrabík Šámal

During the American bombing of Prague in late February 1945 and subsequent air raids, my mother and I had to run as quickly as we could to our apartment building's cellar and crouch wedged between the sacks of sprouting potatoes and the coal bin. Mother's well-honed political and protective instincts told her that she and her five year old child would be safer in my father's native village in southern Bohemia. The village was small (21 dwellings) as well as remote. Nested in the Šumava highlands, it was 15 kilometers from Klatovy and 25 from Domažlice. Nevertheless, the war found us there. We might have been safer, but safe we were not.

In the spring of 1945, traffic, both military and civilian, was especially heavy and chaotic in south west Bohemia. American forces were fast approaching the Czechoslovak borders. Their advance pushed the retreating Germans to join the Wehrmacht forces charged with defending that boundary sector. American bombers often flew overhead and succeeded in destroying the railway system. This forced the German soldiers to travel on foot or in their own vehicles. POW transports, "death marches" of labor camp prisoners marched eastward by their SS guards and civilians of various nationalities, fleeing danger or seeking the safety of home and family, clogged the roads.

Mother and I joined my grandparents and Aunt Marie at the family farms. Shortly after our arrival, I came down with hand-mouth-and-foot disease. I had sores in my mouth and an alarmingly high fever. The nearest hospital (Klatovy) was willing to send an ambulance for me, but they did not have enough gas for the trip. After much effort, my mother found the gasoline on the black market. The ambulance came to fetch me. The driver had to leave the road several times because he had spotted low flying planes. Ambulance or no ambulance, he feared that they were going to bomb the road. I remember three things about my hospital stay: doctors kept swabbing my mouth with a vile purple liquid, it hurt to eat, and I had only one toy, a building block set that had a horribly repugnant smell. It was the only toy my relatives managed to find in the empty Klatovy stores. Nobody had bought that set, I was sure, because its odor made it repulsive. After a week, the ambulance took me back to the village without incident.

While working in the fields, my aunt came across a half dead Russian. His name, she found out later, was Nikolaj Ševcov. She did not know whether he had deserted his Vlasov¹ or regular Red army unit or escaped from a German prisoner of war camp. He might also have been just a straggler from one of the two Russian armies. Of one thing, my aunt was absolutely certain: the man was in

¹ Andrej Vlasov was a Red Army general who claimed to oppose Stalin. His forces first tried to join the Germans and finally surrendered to the Americans.

distress and would die if she not to help him. She took him home, fed him and dressed him in whatever local garb she could find and started nursing him back to health. So Nikolaj Ševcov became “our Russian.”

Several weeks later as the family was eating supper, “our” Russian among us, we heard very sharp banging on the door. There stood two German officers. They had heard that we had a radio, and they wanted it. Yes, indeed we did have a radio. It was a gift from my uncle by marriage, Jan Jedlička. When Uncle Jan came to ask my grandfather for my Aunt Anna’s hand in marriage, the family legend went, he presented grandfather with the radio, and Anna was his.

Quickly, my aunt Marie put the two Germans and the radio into the front room. As soon as the coast was clear, she whisked “our” Russian to the attic.

The German officers, I suspect, did not know or appreciate the double irony of their situation. Two Czech national heroes whose portraits hung on the wall looked down upon them as they sat listening to the radio to ascertain the time and place of their unit’s surrender. The front room had reproductions of the paintings portraying Jan Hus in a somber black cassock defending his truth before a colorfully bedecked court at his heresy trial in Constance and Jan Sladký-Kozina, the leader of the seventeenth century Chod peasants’ revolt against their German lords. Moreover, while the family members seemed to go about their regular chores, tending their animals, garden and fields, the German officers did not know that above them, in the attic, a Russian soldier was hiding.

So we lived for several days with Germans in the front room and the Russian in the attic. Finally, the German officers and their contingent that had been camped by the creek at the other end of the village marched off. As they were leaving, one of the officers gave my aunt his binoculars and hung them on her neck. A German soldier ran up, yanked them off and carried them away.

We assumed that the German soldiers went to Všeruby about 18 kilometers away. There on May 4, 1945, Major General Wendt von Wietersheim surrendered his 11th Panzer division to Brigadier General Herbert L. Earnest, the commander of the 90th Infantry Division. The Czech author Zdeněk Roučka describes the scene thus:

In front of the amazed and combat worn American soldiers, all the 9,050 perfectly dressed and equipped men of Wietersheim’s division came forward to lay down their weapons, including 700 trucks, 300 cars, 120 off road vehicles, 85 half-track APCs, almost 40 tanks, and 59 artillery pieces. The whole act took 24 hours and, during the night, the long procession heading for Germany had to be illuminated by searchlights.

Of course, we missed this show, but the Americans did come to us. One May evening, two soldiers in a jeep pulled into our courtyard. They were part of the unit that liberated Domažlice, and Horšovský Týn, Kdyně and our village. The same two soldiers visited us several evenings in a row. Much to my aunt’s amazement, they, strapping and gruff men, always helped her with the dishes. They became “our” Americans.

I had my own reasons for loving “our” Americans: they brought me candy

bars. Often, they also brought along their friends, who also gave me candy bars. I developed a method for maximizing my gifts. Because I was still bed ridden and had a sore mouth, I could not eat the chocolates immediately. Thus, I would take proffered candy and quickly hide it under the comforter. This maneuver was accompanied with a smile and my very first words of English: "thank you." I strove for a very quick execution, for I was afraid, if the soldiers even suspected the size of my cache, they would stop bringing the candy.

"Our" Americans brought their doctor to see me. He met my Czech doctor at my bedside and bestowed an oral thermometer on him. The Czech doctor was very pleased. I was the first patient to have it inserted into my mouth. I was pleased too: the American thermometer was so much quicker and comfortable than the Czech one, which had to be cradled in one's armpit. After several days, the Americans and the candy left to advance to Pilsen and Rokycany.

The family now had a new obsession. Radio Prague was broadcasting the names of Czechs, who had been imprisoned in Germany and had survived the "march of death." The Germans had opened their prisons and labor camps and were forcing their prisoners to march quickly eastward without providing them with adequate food, water or clothing. The Gestapo had arrested my father, Martin Hrabík, in May 1940, about two weeks before I was born. Luckily, only some of his underground activities had been betrayed, and he was sentenced to five year hard labor. Family members took turns listening to the radio around the clock so that they would not miss my father's name should it be broadcast. For reasons that I could not fathom, they would not give me a shift. "I know my father's name," I insisted repeatedly, to no avail.

As soon as she heard my father's name, Mother made plans to go to Prague because that is where my father would go first. Since the trains were not running, Mother talked a cousin into taking her to Prague on the back of his motorcycle. She purchased enough gasoline on the black market for the trip, sewed a red cross on the back of a white coat, and off to Prague, they went! My father was not at our apartment. Mother had learned that General Josef Bartík, the Czechoslovak army's chief counter intelligence officer, was in Pilsen.²³ My father had worked for and with him from 1937 on. Mother went to Pilsen to see him. "If Martin can be found, I will find him," General Bartík promised her. He did not have to keep his word. Upon her return, Mother found Father in our apartment along with a group of political prisoners from Brno. They had saved his life by reviving him after he fainted in "the death march." The German guards often just shot prisoners who could not keep up or let them die at the side of the road.

Friends brought me to Prague. I was let into the dining room where six men were sitting around the table and told: "Your daddy is here! Pick him out." I went around the table and ruled out all of them with the exception of my father.

² Josef Bartík was one of ten intelligence officers whom General František Moravec, the chief of the army's intelligence section, took to London with him. The officers carrying all the sensitive intelligence files flew out of Prague one day before the Nazi occupation. Moravec and Bartík returned to Czechoslovakia with the Allies.

One was too young, another too old; one's hair was too blond, another didn't have enough of it. What really helped to pick out my father, I think, was that he was wearing the same clothes that he had in a photo that my mother kept on her writing table. Nearly every day, she would show it to me and say: "This is your Daddy!"

Eventually only my aunt and grandparents remained in the village. My mother and I were in Prague. The Germans and Americans had left. Finally, so did the Russian. He said he wanted to go back home.

Many years later, in the mid-1960s, Nikolaj Ševcov wrote to Radio Prague asking for help in locating the family that had saved his life. He remembered the name of the village but not their last name. They had a son who was a prisoner in Germany and a daughter who was a teacher (my aunt Anna), he recalled.

Radio Prague forwarded the letter to the local Communist Party organization. This group debated long and hard trying to decide whether to give the letter to my aunt Marie. To put it mildly, the Hrabík family was not in the Party's good graces. In the mind of the local Communists, it certainly did not fit the profile of someone who would take risks to save a Russian.

The Communist authorities had tried my father in absentia for his exile political activities. The sentence, I believe, was death. Although my father had refused to go into active politics after the war, he was on the list of people to be immediately arrested after the Communist take-over. Fortunately, his friend and fellow Nazi prisoner, Blažej Vilím, the Secretary General of the Social Democrat Party, warned him the day before the 1948 *coup d'état*. Pretending to go on a hunting trip, my father left Czechoslovakia the very next day. He always explained his decision by saying: "Having tasted Mr. Hitler's hospitality, I was not going to stick around for Mr. Stalin's." Once out of the country, he worked assiduously to free Czechoslovakia of Communism.

My Aunt Marie's political profile was not sterling either. She was arrested in 1953 and charged with attempting to break-up seventeen collective farms and helping people to illegally cross the border to West Germany. Among those whom she was accused of aiding was my mother with me and my two little brothers, one born in 1946 and the other in 1947. Aunt Marie's arrest left my four year old cousin and bedridden grandmother alone in the house. The court sentenced my aunt to one year of imprisonment, but she was released after serving four months. A presidential amnesty for mothers with small children applied to her. Like my father during the Nazi era, she was lucky. No one betrayed that she had helped more of my father's friends across the border than the authorities were able to ascertain.

From the letter that the local Communist Party organization in their wisdom decided to give my aunt, we found out that "our Russian" was not a Russian at all, but a Byelorussian. He travelled on foot through Poland, he wrote. It took him a year to reach home. When he got there, he discovered that his entire family had died. He was now living in the Urals. Why he did not say. We suspected that he had been in a labor camp because this is what the Soviet authorities did with the soldiers who had been separated from their units. The powers-that-be often did not

allow the former *zeks* to return to their original domicile. They had to remain close to where they had been imprisoned. Living in the USSR, he knew better than to write of such eventualities; living in Communist Czechoslovakia, my aunt knew better than to ask.

Over time the family lost the addresses of “our” two Americans. I would love to have talked with them when my English vocabulary consisted of more than the essential two words, “thank you.” We had never known or wanted to know the names of the two German officers. We never considered them “ours.”

Překlady básní Ogdena Nasha do češtiny¹

Věra Bořkovcová† and Jiří Weinberger

Ogden Nash a pokusy překládat jeho básně

(Frederick) Ogden Nash se narodil 19. srpna 1902 v Rye ve státě New York a zemřel 19. května 1972 v Baltimoru ve státě Maryland. Patří k nejslavnějším americkým básníkům a jeho verše měly díky výběru témat a neomezené hře se slovy světový ohlas. Přesto o něm v České republice skoro nikdo neví, učitele angličtiny nevyjímaje. Zůstal zde až donedávna prakticky neznámým autorem.

První vážnější pokus překládat básně tohoto autora do češtiny učinil v roce 2006 Jiří Weinberger, který v této práci pokračuje. O jeho přístupu k překládání velmi specifických, v americké angličtině dosti pevně ukotvených, básní si ještě podrobněji (byť nesystematicky) řekneme něco bližšího ve druhé části tohoto příspěvku.

Prof. Věra Bořkovcová, která žije v USA od roku 1952 a angličtinu (a v angličtině) studovala od svého dětství, je v tomto jazyce ovšem více než doma. Její vysvětlující e-maily sehrály při překladech Jiřího Weinbergera významnou roli.

Nejprve tedy – pro českou veřejnost: Kdo to byl Ogden Nash? Časopis *The Atlantic Monthly* ho označil za „boží dar pro Spojené státy“. Ve 20. století byl pokládán za nesporně nejlepšího amerického autora groteskní a nonsensové poezie, často satirické a vždy přitažlivé svými originálními rýmy a humorným obsahem.

Ogden Nash absolvoval St. George's School v Newportu ve státě Rhode Island a poději se tam stal učitelem. Strávil rok na Harvardské univerzitě a v roce 1925 zahájil svou kariéru spisovatele, nejprve v nakladatelství *Doubleday Page Publishers* a od roku 1932 v časopise *The New Yorker*. Během práce pro Doubleday uveřejnil svou první knihu pro děti *The Cricket of Carador* (1925), pak se ale věnoval poezii pro dospělé a v roce 1930 otiskl v *The New Yorker* svou první humoristickou báseň *Spring Comes to Murray Hill*. Svou první sbírku satirických veršů *Hard Lines* publikoval v roce 1931.

Celkem napsal Ogden Nash 19 knih humoristické poezie (1500 básní), byl tedy velmi plodným autorem. Mnohé z jeho básní, jako např. *Custard the Dragon* (1959), byly sice určeny dětem, ale jeho slovní hříčky a nonsensový verš oslovily všechny generace.

Přestože velmi obdivoval limeriky Edwarda Leara, v jejich stylu psal málo, tato forma se mu asi zdála příliš omezující. (*Limerik musí mít 5 řádek, rýmy vždy aabba.*) Nashův styl je originální a pro něj typický. Vždy se snažil, aby báseň byla srozumitelná dětem a až v druhém plánu i dospělým (to neznamená, že dítě a dospělý mají báseň vnímat stejně). Vymýšlel si nové formy a neologizmy, ale ty

¹ Tento příspěvek se skládá ze dvou částí: 1) Ogden Nash a pokusy překládat jeho básně (Věra Bořkovcová); a 2) překladatelova reflexe (Jiří Weinberger).

musely dítěti dávat smysl. Vezměte si např. jeho báseň *Hens and Roosters* (Slepice a kohouti). Každé dítě ví, že kohout říká (v angličtině) „Cock-a-doodle-doo“. Chce-li Nash, aby se to rýmovalo s „hoodlum“, udělá z toho „Cock-a-doodleum“. Jasně, že? Jak ale rýmovat „chuligán“ a „Kykyryký“?

Některé jeho básně, zejména politicko-satirické, mají několik stran, jiné, připomínající bajky, jsou velmi krátké. Nash se dokonce honosí nejkratší humoristickou anglicky psanou básní. Snad každý Američan zná

Breaking the Ice

“Candy is dandy / But liquor is quicker.”

Mnohé z jeho delších básní, zejména z poloviny dvacátého století, mají politická témata, ironizují politiky a poukazují na rozmanité tehdy aktuální události. To pro dnešního evropského čtenáře moc velký význam nemá. Jiné básně se vztahují k populárním písním, k literárním postavám a obecně užívaným rčením, což je pro překladatele a výběr jeho látky podobným problémem.

Pokud jde o mne, mám nejráději jeho krátké básně, často pojednávající o zvířatech a obsahující obecně platnou moudrost. Nashovy úchvatné neologismy, neotřelé rýmy, jemné slovní žerty a hry se slovy a také nádherný rytmus veršů, to je to, co mi z díla velkého autora imponuje nejvíc.

Vždycky jsem si myslela, že Nashova poezie je pro překládání příliš důmyslná a jedinečná. V Jiřím Weinbergerovi jsme ale našli člověka, který, jak se zdá, uvažuje a tvoří obdobně. „*Weinbergerovy překlady vzbuzují dojem, že nějak takto by Ogden Nash psal, kdyby uměl česky,*“ říkám v doslovu dvojazyčné knihy *Kdyby Ogden uměl česky – What if Ogden Could speak Czech.*

Překladatelova reflexe

Podívejme se na několik ukázek, u kterých si pamatuji, jak to při překládání bylo.

The Termite

**Some primal termite knocked on wood
And tasted it, and found it good.
And that is why your Cousin May
Fell through the parlor floor today.**

Primal termite, to je česky prvotní termit, ale v mluvené češtině takový obrat neexistuje. Co s tím? Naštěstí jsem si uvědomil, že i když v češtině nemáme zažitu představu, že by některý živočich mohl mít prvotního předka, v lidské historii takových prvotních předků máme spoustu. V české kotlině pak především Praotec Čecha. Tedy Praotec termit.

Parlor je salon. Ten v našich bytech moc často nebývá. A i kdyby byl, sotva

bychom mu tak říkali. Vzhledem k tomu, že jde hlavně o to propadnutí se, vybral jsem si předsín. Proč? Protože v předsíni se většinou stojí.

Zaklepal na dřevo? To se moc nehodí. Truhlář si sice zaklepe na prkna, která kupuje, aby zjistil, zda jsou zdravá, ale slyšíme-li v češtině, že někdo zaklepal na dřevo, napadne nás nejdříve, že mu něco dobře dopadlo. Tedy ne na dřevo, nýbrž na prkno? Singulár by naši pozornost odváděl kdoví kam jinam. Tedy plurál. Praotec termít zaklepal na prkna? Nelíbilo se mi to. Představil jsem si prkennou podlahu typické neodborně udržované české rekreační chalupy. Být termitem, zajásám a nezůstanu u osahávání povrchu. A půjdu tvrdě na věc: *Praotec termít se zavrtil do prken ...* aniž bych tušil, jak budu pokračovat. Dále už pracovala představa „jsem termít a zajímá mě celá hmota kolonizovaného prkna“. *Do prken / povrchem* už pak bylo nasnadě. *Praotec termít se zavrtil do prken / a našel pamlsek pod jejich povrchem.*

Sestřenka propadla...? To je ale náhoda! Vždyť May je česky bezmála Madla. Tedy zkusme: *Sestřenka Madla / podlahou propadla.* Že to bylo dneska, je důležité, ale to už se tam nějak zabuduje. Bohužel při žádném z těchto pokusů se mi do hry nehodil ani počet slabik, ani rytmus, ani přízvuky. Pak mě napadlo, že *That is why*, to je česky *A proto*. Čili z A plyne B. To je ovšem ekvivalentní výroku z non B plyne non A. V uvedeném záporu už to „hudebně“ fungovalo:

Termít

**Praotec termít se zavrtil do prken
a našel pamlsek pod jejich povrchem.
Jinak by dneska sestřenka Madla
podlahou v předsíni nepropadla.**

Některé z překladů mi daly hodně práce (měřeno v minutách přemýšlení i ve dnech s přestávkami mezi po sobě následujícími pokusy). Termít byl ale hotov za malou chvíli. Z popisu práce je patrné, že za to vděčím hlavně souběhu několika náhod.

Název knížky *Kdyby Ogden uměl česky* jsem při překládání považoval za svůj program. Nechodil jsem do žádného kurzu pro překladatele, nepřečetl jsem si o této vysoce odborné práci žádnou knihu. Jen jsem si řekl, že u tohoto typu poezie nemusí stát na prvním místě snaha převést věrně do cílového jazyka básnickovy myšlenky, ale raději jeho postoj ke světu a k jazyku.

Vzhledem k tomu, že se Nashův postoj ke světu a k jazyku odehrával v kulisách angličtiny, bylo nasnadě přeložit (as the primary concern) autorův postoj vůči angličtině a „odehrát ho v kulisách češtiny“. Například tak, že nejdříve ze všeho najdu český idiom (nebo zvukomalebné slovo nebo rým...), který by původního autora mohl zaujmout v češtině obdobně, jako to, co ho zaujalo v angličtině. To nalezené (idiom nebo zvukomalebné slovo nebo rým...) ovšem musí být v nějakém vztahu k výchozí myšlence původního verše (sloky, refrénu, celé básně) tak, abych měl šanci posléze převést do cílového jazyka i původní myšlenku.

Když v básni “The Purist“ končí Ogden Nash slovy

**Camped on a tropic riverside,
One day he missed his loving bride.
She had, the guide informed him later,
Been eaten by an alligator.
Professor Twist could not but smile.
“You mean,” he said, “a crocodile,”**

tak by někdo (some purist?) mohl překlad:

**Na soutoku dvou tropických řek
z hrudi mu unikl milostný vzdech.
Pomocník suše prohodil:
Milenku Vám sněd krokodýl.
Profesor ustál i tenhle nápor:
“Vsadím se, že to byl aligátor!”**

pokládat za velmi zkreslený. Vždyť Nashův profesor se v originále sází, že to byl krokodýl, kdežto týž profesor v překladu sází na aligátora.

Jsem přesvědčen, že Nashovi vůbec nešlo o zoologickou podstatu věci a že by s výměnou rolí mezi těmito dvěma predátory souhlasil – *if only he could speak Czech*.

Na třetím příkladu si ukážeme, jak může fungovat překladatelova intuice, jestliže v jeho hlavě hraje rytmus trochu větší roli, než je v kraji zvykem. Kdo píše písňové texty, asi se nebude divit.

**At midnight in the museum hall,
The fossils gathered for a ball.
There were no drums or saxophones,
But just the clatter of their bones,
A rolling, rattling carefree circus,
Of mammoth polkas and mazurkas.
Pterodactyls and brontosaurus
Sang ghostly prehistoric choruses.
Amid the mastodonic wassail
I caught the eye of one small fossil,
“Cheer up sad world,” he said and winked,
“It's kind of fun to be extinct.”**

Překládalo se mi to kupodivu lehce. Protože jsem věděl, že to v češtině bude písnička? Jsem nakloněn tomu věřit.

**Muzeum. Půlnoc. A v jedné z hal
zkameněliny mají bál.**

(Naštěstí máme v češtině i zkameněliny, nejen fosilie.)

**Hej vy tam v slzavém dnešní světě
vymřít je vlastně fajn . . .**

Dopsal jsem překlad poměrně rychle až sem a věděl jsem, že v češtině existuje sloveso, které se tam rytmem i rýmem hodí, tedy sloveso čtyřslabičné, se stejně dlouhými „notami“. Ale nejméně týden jsem si na něj nemohl vzpomenout. Vzpomněl jsem si.

Takto tedy vypadá česká písnička na Nashovo téma:

Intro: v rytmu Gmi Cmi Gmi Cmi D7
/: Muzeum. Půlnoc. A v jedné z hal Gmi Cmi Gmi Cmi
Zkameněliny mají bál.:/ D7 Gmi D7
Skřípou jim kosti prosty maziva Gmi Cmi Gmi Cmi
Bubny a sága jako zaživa D7
Mamutích tanců starobinec Gmi Cmi Gmi Cmi
valčíčky, mazurka, vodvaz, binec D7
Pterodaktyl a brontosaur tklivě nyjí Gmi Cmi Gmi Cmi
V prehistorických harmoniích Es7 stop dish. Gmi
Utkvěl mi pohled jedné z příšer Cmi
A taky oka mrk z té dávné říše: Gmi
Hej vy tam v slzavém dnešním světě D7
/: Vymřít je vlastně fajn, zcepeněte!:/ Es7 D7 Gmi

Hudbu složil Miloš Kysilka a písničku hrajeme (spolu s Hanou Tonzarovou) v Kabaretu Ogden N. Viz www.j-w.cz.

Slovo „zcepeněte“ (jak velmi dlouho leželo neuchopeno kdesi v mé v hlavě) mi reprezentuje dosti bohatý soubor zážitků, jednak z překládání básní Ogdena Nashe, jednak z psaní vlastních básniček, písňových textů a dokonce i povídek. Reprezentuje něco, co se nachází „za rohem“, kam ještě není vidět. Rytmus, vůni, tvar, konzistenci, chuť hledaného slova či fráze – a s odpuštěním - někdy také tušené myšlenky.

Jsem si vědom, že poslední odstavec zprávu o tom, jak jsem překládal Nashovy verše, srozumitelně nekorunuje. Nicméně, věřte mi, že kdybych ho vynechal, byla by má zpráva nejen nekorunovaná, ale také hrubě nekompletní.

Haně Tonzarové a Miloši Kysilkovi děkuji za skvělou spolupráci při hledání tvaru Kabaretu Ogden N., tvaru, který byl pro mne, podobě jako slovo zcepeněte, ukryt až někde za dalším rohem.

Markéta Jelenová a Michal Kosák mi zase pomohli připravit stejnojmennou knížku, vynalézavě reflektující atmosféru Kabaretu Ogden N. Viz <http://www.j-w.cz/index.php?site=knizni>. I jim patří můj dík.

A hlavně: prof. Věře Bořkovcové vděčím za obětavé e-mailování, ve kterém mi trpělivě objasňovala, co vlastně anglická slova, kterým rozumím, znamenají ve větách, kterým nerozumím. Bylo to s ní moc hezké popovídání, jakoby ani

neexistoval Atlantik mezi námi.

Translating Ogden Nash into Czech¹

Věra Bořkovcová† and Jiří Weinberger

Ogden Nash and Our Attempts to Translate his Poetry

(Frederick) Ogden Nash was born on August 19, 1902 in Rye, New York, and died on April 19, 1972 in Baltimore, Maryland. He is one of the most famous American poets, and his verses, thanks to his selection of themes and unlimited word-play, enjoyed world-wide renown. In spite of this, hardly anyone in the Czech Republic knows of him, English teachers not excluded. Here up to now he has remained a practically unknown author.

The first serious attempt to translate this author's poems into Czech was made by Jiří Weinberger in 2006, and he has continued his efforts down to the present. We will say something more detailed about his approach to translating these very specific poems, rooted deeply in American English usage, in the second half of this article.

Professor Věra Bořkovcová, who lives in the USA and has studied English (and in English) since childhood, is obviously more than at home in that language. Her explanatory e-mails played a significant role in Jiří Weinberger's translations.

So to begin with – for a Czech public, who exactly was Ogden Nash? *The Atlantic Monthly* once called him “God's gift to the United States.” In the twentieth century he was considered inarguably the best American author of grotesque and nonsense verses, often satirical and always attractive in their original rhymes and humorous content.

Ogden Nash graduated from St. George's School in Newport, Rhode Island and later became a teacher there. He spent a year at Harvard University, and in 1925 began his career as a writer, first with the publishing company of Doubleday Page, and then from 1932 with the journal *The New Yorker*. While working for Doubleday he published his first children's book, *The Cricket of Carador* (1925), but after that devoted himself to poetry for adults and in 1930 printed his first humorous poem, “Spring Comes to Murray Hill,” in *The New Yorker*. His first collection of satirical verse, *Hard Lines*, came out in 1931.

Ogden Nash published altogether 19 books of humorous poetry (1,500 poems), testimony to his productivity as an author. Many of his poems, such as *Custard the Dragon* (1959), were certainly intended for children, but they spoke to every generation with their puns and nonsense verses.

Although a great admirer of Edward Lear's limericks, he wrote few works in that genre; that form perhaps seemed too constraining to him. (A limerick must always have five lines, in the rhyme scheme *aabba*). Nash's style was original and typical of all his work. He always took pains to ensure that his poems could be understood by children, and only secondarily by adults (which did not mean that

¹ This contribution consists of two parts: 1) Ogden Nash and Our Attempts to Translate his Poetry, by Věra Bořkovcová; and 2) the translator's reflections, by Jiří Weinberger. Translated from the Czech by Hugh Agnew.

children and adults should understand the poems in the same way). He invented new forms and neologisms, but the always had to have meaning for children. Let us take, for example, his poem, "Hens and Roosters." Every American child probably knows that a rooster says, in English, "Cock-a-doodle-doo." Ogden Nash, wanting to rhyme with "hoodlum," turns that into "Cock-a-doodleum." Crystal clear, isn't it? But how should we rhyme, in Czech, *chuligán* with *kykyryký*?

Some of his poems, especially the political-satirical ones, are several pages long, but other, reminiscent of fables, are very short. In fact, Nash boasts probably the shortest humorous verse written in English. Perhaps every American knows

Breaking the Ice

"Candy is dandy / But liquor is quicker."

Many of his longer poems, especially from the mid-twentieth century, have political themes, commenting ironically on contemporary politics and referring to various contemporary happenings. For today's European reader they would not mean very much. Other works are related to popular songs, to literary figures and generally used figures of speech, which gives the translator similar problems with his selection of materials.

As far as I (Věra Bořkovcová) am concerned, I prefer his short poems, often dealing with animals and containing universally valid words of wisdom. Nash's breathtaking neologisms, novel rhymes, delicate word plays and puns and also the splendid rhythmical qualities of his verse, all these are what, from the works of this great author, impress me the most.

I had always considered that Nash's poetic works were too ingenious and unique to be successfully translated. In Jiří Weinberger, though, we have found a person who, it seems, thinks and creates in a similar way. "Weinberger's translations create the impression that Ogden Nash would have somehow written something like this, if he had known Czech," I say in the afterword to the bilingual book *Kdyby Ogden uměl česky – What if Ogden Could Speak Czech*.

The Translator's Reflections

Now let's look at a few examples for which I (Jiří Weinberger) can recall what it was like translating them.

The Termite

**Some primal termite knocked on wood
And tasted it, and found it good.
And that is why your Cousin May
Fell through the parlor floor today.**

Primal termite, in Czech that is *prvotní termit*, but in spoken Czech such an expression does not exist. What to do? Happily, I realized that even if in Czech we do not have any experience with the concept that some animal could have an original ancestor, we have plenty of such original ancestors in human history. In the Czech basin above all Praotec Čech. Therefore, Praotec termit.

Parlor is *salon*. In our apartments, such rooms are not at all common. And if they were, they would hardly be called *salon*. Considering that the main point is the falling through the floor, I decided to choose *předsíň*. Why? Because normally one stands in the *předsíň*.

Knocked on wood? That does not work too well. A carpenter knocks on wood, to be sure, when he is buying, to ensure that it is solid, but if we hear in Czech that someone “*zaklepal na dřevo*,” our first thought would be that something had worked out well for him. Therefore, not on wood, but on a floorboard? The singular number would misdirect our attention who knows where. Therefore, plural. Praotec termit knocked on floorboards? I did not like that. I imagined the wood plank floor of a typical, amateurishly maintained Czech recreational cottage. If I were a termite, I would start cheering and would not stop with touching the surface. And so I get right down to it: *Praotec termit zavrtal do prken ...* without the slightest notion how I’m going to continue. But the concept “I’m a termite and I’m interested in the entire substance of the colonized board” continued working away. *Do prken / povrchem* was pretty simple after that. *Praotec termit se zavrtal do prken / a našel pamlsek pod jejich povrchem*.

Your cousin fell? What a coincidence! After all, May is practically the same as the Czech Madla. So let’s try: *Sestřenka Madla / podlahou propadla*. That it happened today is important, but we can build that in somehow. Unfortunately, not one of those attempts worked for me, whether in number of syllables, rhythm, or accent. Then it occurred to me, *That is why* in Czech is *A proto*. That is, from A follows B. And that is obviously the equivalent of the expression from non B follows non A. And with that negation introduced, it functioned well “musically:”

Termit

**Praotec termit se zavrtal do prken
a našel pamlsek pod jejich povrchem.
Jinak by dneska sestřenka Madla
podlahou v předsíni nepropadla.**

Several of the translations were a lot of work (measured in minutes spent pondering and in days with breaks between successive attempts). The termite, however, was finished in a short time. From this description of the work, it is obvious that I have to thank mainly the confluence of a number of happy accidents.

I considered the title of the book *Kdyby Ogden uměl česky* to be my program in translating. I didn’t attend any courses in translation, and I didn’t read any books about this very specialized line of work. I only said to myself that in this

type of poetry the attempt to put the author's concepts faithfully into the target language need not stand in first place, but rather his approach to the world and to the language.

Considering that Nash's approach to the world and to language happened in an English setting, it was obvious to translate (as the primary concern) the author's position towards English and "play it in a Czech setting." For example, the very first thing I would do is to find a Czech idiom (or onomatopoeic word or rhyme...), that might engage the original author in Czech in a similar way as it engaged him in English. This discovery (idiom or onomatopoeic word or rhyme...) must obviously be in some relationship to the initial idea of the original verse (stanza, refrain, the entire poem) so that I would finally have a chance to transfer the original thought into the target language.

When in his poem "The Purist" Ogden Nash closes with the words:

**Camped on a tropic riverside,
One day he missed his loving bride.
She had, the guide informed him later,
Been eaten by an alligator.
Professor Twist could not but smile.
"You mean," he said, "a crocodile,"**

Then someone (some purist?) might consider the translation:

**Na soutoku dvou tropických řek
z hrudi mu unikl milostný vzdech.
Pomocník suše prohodil:
Milenku Vám sněd krokodýl.
Profesor ustál i tenhle nápor:
"Vsadím se, že to byl aligátor!"**

as very distorted. After all, Nash's professor in the original bets that it was a crocodile, while the same professor in the translations wagers on the alligator.

I am convinced that Nash was not concerned with the actual zoological heart of the matter, and that he would accept the swapping of the roles of these two predators – *if only he could speak Czech*.

For our third example, we'd like to show how the translator's intuition may function when rhythm plays a slightly larger role than is typical. Whoever has written a song lyric probably would not be surprised.

**At midnight in the museum hall,
The fossils gathered for a ball.
There were no drums or saxophones,
But just the clatter of their bones,
A rolling, rattling carefree circus,
Of mammoth polkas and mazurkas.**

**Pterodactyls and brontosauruses
Sang ghostly prehistoric choruses.
Amid the mastodonic wassail
I caught the eye of one small fossil,
“Cheer up sad world,” he said and winked,
“It's kind of fun to be extinct.”**

This one was surprisingly easy to translate. Perhaps because I knew that in Czech it would be a song? I'm inclined to believe it.

**Muzeum. Půlnoc. A v jedné z hal
zkameněliny mají bál.**

(Fortunately in Czech we have *zkameněliny* and not just *fosilie*).

**Hej vy tam v slzavém dnešní světě
vymřít je vlastně fajn....**

I finished up the translation relatively quickly up to this point, and I knew that there was a Czech word that fit the rhythm and rhyme, that is a four syllable word with the same long “feet.” But for at least a week I racked my brains in vain. I could not remember it.

This is the way the Czech song on Nash's theme turned out:

Intro: in rhythm Gmi Cmi Gmi Cmi D7
 /: Muzeum. Půlnoc. A v jedné z hal **Gmi Cmi Gmi Cmi**
Zkameněliny mají bál.:/ D7 Gmi D7
Skřípou jim kosti prosty maziva Gmi Cmi Gmi Cmi
Bubny a sága jako zaživa D7
Mamutích tanců starobinec Gmi Cmi Gmi Cmi
valčíčky, mazurka, vodvaz, binec D7
Pterodaktyl a brontosaur tklivě nyjí Gmi Cmi Gmi Cmi
V prehistorických harmoniích Es7 stop dish. Gmi
Utkvěl mi pohled jedné z příšer Cmi
A taky oka mrk z té dávné říše: Gmi
Hej vy tam v slzavém dnešním světě D7
 /: Vymřít je vlastně fajn, zcepeněte!:/ **Es7 D7 Gmi**

Miloš Kysilka composed the music and we perform the song (along with Hana Tonzarová) in the Cabaret Ogden N. (see us at www.j-w.cz).

The word *zcepeněte* (as it lay for so long somewhere in my head ungrasped) represents to me quite a rich collection of experiences, from translating Ogden Nash on the one hand to writing my own verses, song lyrics, and even stories on the other. It represents something that may be waiting “around the corner,” where it cannot yet be seen. The rhythm, the scent, the shape, consistency, taste of a

sought-for word or phrase and—with your indulgence—sometimes also just the hint of a thought.

I am acutely aware that the last paragraph of this essay on how I translated Nash's verses understandably is not its crowning glory. Nonetheless, believe me, if I had left it out my essay would not only not be crowned, it would be grossly incomplete.

I thank Hana Tonzarová and Miloš Kysilka for their wonderful collaboration on shaping the Cabaret Ogden N., a shape that was for me, like the word *zcepeněte*, hidden somewhere around the next corner.

Markéta Jelenová and Michal Kosák then helped me prepare the book of the same name, inventively reflecting the atmosphere of Cabaret Ogden N. You can view the book at <http://www.j-w.cz/index.php?site=knizni>. They also deserve my thanks.

And above all, I thank Professor Věra Bořkovcová for her tireless emailing, in which she patiently explained to me what English words that I understood meant in sentences that I did not understand. It was lovely chatting with her, just as though the Atlantic between us didn't exist.

Poisonous Chicken

Tracy Burns

I am dying, dying, I mutter. I'm in a hotel room in central Slovakia, where I've visited two chateaus in this picturesque small town. Yesterday I was healthy; today I have a fever and am throwing up everything I eat.

On the ceiling is a big brown spot. Or am I hallucinating? Tomorrow I have to return to Prague, where I live, and the day after that I have to go back to work. I am too sick, though, to manage the 12-hour train ride home.

Who can rescue me, take me back to Prague? I talk to myself aloud while I put a cold hand towel on my forehead. No one is listening to me because I am alone. I know only one person who lives nearby: my Uncle Ľubo, whom I met once, in 1992. When I lived in Washington, DC, he would often write to me and my parents, always inviting us to his hometown in the Low Tatra Mountains. When I moved to Prague 20 years ago, I traveled 12 hours by train to meet my only living Slovak relative.

I shouldn't have come here, I chide myself. A week ago I broke up with my long-time boyfriend, and I wanted to go far from Prague, very far. I had several days off work, so I came here. A mistake. Everything has been one big mistake.

My head is spinning. I have to vomit, but my legs won't move at all. Somehow I finally make it to the bathroom and then back to bed. I stare at the spot on the ceiling. It's bigger than it was 10 minutes ago and has even changed color from brown to black. Standing up slowly, I peer out the small window. It's snowing. The entire town is covered in snow.

Who can save me? In a moment I am back in the nearby city, but it isn't February, and there isn't any snow. Instead, it's a beautiful June day, as evening approaches. I'm at the train station, where for the first time I meet my Uncle Ľubo, a big muscular man, about 40 years old. He isn't smiling. My uncle only says, "*Ahoj*," using the informal Slovak form of hello reserved for people one knows well. Then he shows me where he has parked his old gray Lada car.

"What kind of work do you do?" I ask in my American-accented Slovak while Uncle Ľubo drives me through the historic town center to the suburbs, comprised of only ugly high-rises constructed in totalitarian architectural style.

"I'm a criminologist. This morning I was near the city Martin. Another murder. A lot of blood. A lot. But I found clues, evidence, even fingerprints. We're going to find him. We're going to find him," he says with more than a hint of enthusiasm.

"Great" is my reply.

We park in front of a clump of high-rises. Across the street is a shopping center, but everything is closed. "We live here," my uncle says and shows me an ugly, gray building in need of repair.

We take the elevator to the seventh floor. In the elevator: "I have a son, but he isn't home. He's almost always at his girlfriend's. I have a wife, too. I could also have a mistress, but for now I am satisfied with my wife. For now."

I don't answer. I am afraid. I wish that the elevator were bigger. I can't breathe well. I think I am suffocating.

All of a sudden the elevator stops. "We're here," says Uncle Ľubo.

Across from the entranceway is the living room with a brown couch, an orange armchair, a big television, and an ugly painting of a gray street in a town that is almost completely hidden in thick smoke.

"You'll sleep there," says Uncle Ľubo, showing me the sofa under the picture. "We watch TV until ten o'clock. Then you can go to sleep."

"Thank you."

A woman with a sad smile appears in the hallway. Pretty with a petite build, she is about 40 years old. "This is my wife Viera," my uncle informs me.

"Aren't you hungry? I cooked something." I have the feeling that her smile is glued to her face.

"I'm famished. Thanks."

I walk into the kitchen, a small space with a still-life painting of red wilted flowers above the sink. Viera places a plate with various pastries on the table.

"Our son Jakub would like to go to America. How much does a plane ticket cost?" asks Uncle Ľubo, placing his cellular phone on the table.

"I don't know. It depends. About 500 dollars. Maybe more, maybe less."

"That's a lot of money—for us. For you it's nothing."

I'm offended by Uncle Ľubo's comment. Nothing makes me angrier than the assumption that I must be rich because I'm American.

"For me it's nothing? Do you know how much I make teaching English?"

"At least you earn Czech crowns, not Slovak currency. And your parents often send you dollars."

"My parents don't send me anything. I don't have any dollars!" I retort as Viera offers me a poppy seed pastry.

"Thank you." I eat it and gaze out the window at the eyesore of high-rises.

My uncle's cellular phone rings. He listens intently for several minutes. Then: "Another murder. This one was committed a few blocks from here. I'll be back in a jiffy."

He returns about an hour later, and we all spend the evening in the living room, watching a film that takes place in Mexico. "How wonderful it would be to see Mexico with my own eyes! It's my dream!" admits Viera.

"We'll never get there. We'll never have enough money," Uncle Ľubo replies, self-pity punctuating his tone. "We don't even have a cottage. But at least we finally have democracy in our country," he adds bitterly.

"I have to go to the bathroom." This time it is Viera.

"No leads today. The murder took place a few blocks from here. In front of another high-rise. No one saw anything."

"That's too bad," I say. I want to go to sleep, but I have to stay up and watch the end of this stupid film.

"He was the same age as Jakub. Sixteen. Stabbed in the heart."

"That's a pity."

"It sure is," Uncle Ľubo agrees, sighing deeply.

I go to sleep at eleven. The next day I lie that I have to return to Prague, something urgent has come up.

In the doorway my uncle hands me a pack of paper tissues. "It's a gift from us," he says with irony. "We don't have anything else."

"Sure. *Dovidenia*." I say, choosing the formal form of "goodbye."

At the train station, far from their stuffy flat and the gray suburbs, I break into tears. I don't understand why my only living Slovak relative has to be so evil and jealous. I'm never coming back here, I decide, although I've heard that the nature surrounding the city is beautiful.

The day before yesterday I came back to central Slovakia, after such a long absence. Now I'm pondering over what would happen if I called Uncle Ľubo, if I told him that I was dying and urgently needed to be taken back to Prague.

I would rather think about what I did yesterday, when I was healthy. I visited both chateaus in the town. When I walked down the hill, I noticed a procession of people dressed in black. Carrying flowers, they approached the church. Two boys suddenly stopped in front of a wall of an abandoned building, placed their bouquets on the ground and urinated onto the brick wall. They didn't care if anyone saw them. When they had finished, they again joined the funeral procession.

I made my way into a coffeehouse on the main street, found a vacant table and took a quick look at the menu. When the waitress approached me, I had the feeling that we had met somewhere before.

"Don't you remember me?" she asked. On her face was a sad smile.

"You are —"

"Your aunt. Viera."

"Of course! How are you?" I quickly switched from the formal form of "you" to the informal one.

"Fine." There was a pregnant pause. "Ľubo and I broke up. I moved here, where life is calmer. What brings you here?"

"I have a few days off, so I came to take a look at this quaint town, which I had read about in a guide book."

"It is a quaint town. But it's also difficult to find work. Very difficult."

"Sure."

"My son's in England. He wants to travel all the time. His girlfriend's in London. Maybe he'll get married there. Have you decided what you want to eat?"

"Chicken with peaches and cheese, please."

"No pastries?" Viera tried unsuccessfully to smile.

"Not right now. Thanks."

I ate my lunch and gave Viera a big tip. Then I left.

I walked along the main street and gazed at the spires of the cathedral next to the statue of the Holy Trinity. It was snowing. The air was fresh.

When I woke up the next morning, I didn't feel well at all. Maybe from that chicken. My own aunt served me poisonous chicken. I am now dying of poisonous chicken.

I sneeze and swear to myself because I've run out of tissues. Under the bedside table I spot a telephone book. I quickly find his number in it. Then I pick up the receiver and dial.

"Hello?" I immediately recognize his deep and strict voice. I don't say a word. I hang up the phone and go back to bed. Before long I fall asleep.

The next morning I feel a little better. My fever is gone, and I have more strength, more energy. I eat breakfast and don't throw up anything afterwards. Then I pay, thank the receptionist and say goodbye.

While I'm waiting for the bus to the train station, I spot the two boys who had urinated against the wall the day before yesterday. Now they are chatting.

"You don't have a girlfriend!"

"Oh, yes I do!"

"You don't have anyone, you jerk!"

Just then the bus comes. It's full. Even though I have a long journey ahead of me, I smile. I'm glad I'm alone.

Editing *Kosmas*, 2000-2012

Clinton Machann

When the SVU Executive Committee appointed me editor in the spring of 2000, I knew this was going to be one of the most challenging assignments of my academic career. The bi-annual *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* is the only major academic, multidisciplinary, peer-reviewed journal in the English language that focuses on Czech and Slovak studies. Czech, Slovak, American, Canadian, and other scholars from around the world collaborate in soliciting, evaluating, publishing, reading, and discussing articles that deal with the field of “Czech, Slovak, and Central European Studies” within the larger field of Slavic Studies. The “Czech” and “Slovak” categories may seem quite specific and limited to those not familiar with the field, but national, political, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic issues associated with them can be quite complex, as illustrated by the historical “Czechoslovak” in the subtitle of our journal. And, of course, historical and cultural topics related to immigration and assimilation of Czechs and Slovaks—especially in North America—are central to the interests of *Kosmas* authors and readers.

It might seem odd that an English Professor at Texas A&M University would be considered for the position of editor, but in addition to my work in British Victorian literature I had published several books and articles on the subject of Czech-American history, literature, and culture—especially that related to the State of Texas, where my Moravian great-grandparents had settled as part of a surge of immigration in the decades following the American Civil War. It was not only the “Czech-American” connection that appealed to me, however. I knew that the bi-annual *Kosmas* had begun publication in 1982 and had over the years published scholarship in Czechoslovak history, politics, linguistics, art, and literature. In fact I had contributed an article on the old journal *Slovo a slovesnost* (published by the Prague Circle) to the Winter 1983 issue. As I read more recent issues, here is one striking example that appealed to me: during the critical period leading up to the Velvet Revolution of 1989, *Kosmas* published several articles by key dissidents—including the playwright, political prisoner, and future President Vaclav Havel—that still have considerable historical significance. As it happened, I had served as a “visiting professor” and Fulbright lecturer in the Department of English and American Studies at Charles University both just prior to and just after the Velvet Revolution, and I had a strong interest in political and cultural developments in Czechoslovakia.

Miloslav Rechcigl was President of SVU when I was appointed editor in 2000. He and other officers of the organization offered strong support as I began my work, and that strong support continued later with President Karel Raska and other officers. Through the years Mila Rechcigl himself has of course been one of the most prolific contributors to *Kosmas* with his massive historical and bibliographical work. And he is not the only SVU officer who has published a great deal in the journal. I am pleased to point out that one of the articles in “my” first issue in Fall 2000 was by Zdeněk V. David, who would soon become a

Senior Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center of Scholars. Among his many contributions to our journal are those articles in the series related to T. G. Masaryk, one of which appeared in the Spring 2012 issue. Other contributors to the Fall 2000 issue included James Ward, Joseph N. Rostinsky, H. Gordon Skilling, Susan Kresin, and David Z. Chroust. James Ward was on his way to earning an MA at the Jackson School of International Studies at the University of Washington. Joseph Rostinsky was Professor of European Civilization Studies at Tokai University in Tokyo, Japan. H. Gordon Skilling, at age 88, was Professor Emeritus at the University of Toronto, a political scientist who was widely acknowledged as an expert on Czechoslovakia. Susan Kresin was a lecturer in Slavic languages and literatures at the University of California-Los Angeles (and I understand that she still teaches Czech classes there). David Chroust at that time was Slavic Studies Librarian at A&M's Sterling Evans Library, and he was also the Managing Editor of *Kosmas*. A bit later I will return to the topic of Joseph Rostinsky's publications in our journal in order to illustrate in some detail the complex international context of what we have been doing. Many of you will have recognized the name of H. Gordon Skilling. In fact Skilling, who had previously published articles in *Kosmas*, would publish one last article in the next issue (Spring 2001), which appeared soon after his death in March of that year.

In addition to scholarly articles, the Fall 2000 issue also contained the text a speech by Vaclav Havel on the occasion of his "Civil Society Symposium," held in Minneapolis as part of an SVU conference in April 1999; my interview with the film director and photographer Jan Kaplan, famous for his documentary films, including *The Assassination of Reinhard Heydrich* (1994); excerpts from Peter Siska's new translation of an autobiography by Jan Chryzostom Korec, a Jesuit author and dissident who had led an "underground" Church movement in Communist Bratislava; and, of course, several book reviews. Kaplan was a Czechoslovak immigrant living in England, Siska a Czechoslovak immigrant living in Texas. Furthermore, Mary Hrabík Šámal, our Book Review Editor, was a Czechoslovak immigrant living in Michigan, and Managing Editor Chroust, now with me at Texas A&M, had immigrated to Cleveland with his parents when he was a child. I felt a little strange, as a fourth-generation American, in my position as editor. By the way, I want to point out that my first Assistant Editor, Arifa Ghani Rahman, a graduate student appointed by the English Department at Texas A&M, was an immigrant from Bangladesh, where she had earned BA and MA degrees in English at Dhaka University.

From the beginning, the supportive work of Managing Editor David Chroust, Book Review Editor Mary Samal, and the assistant editors appointed by my English Department was essential. David Chroust's linguistic knowledge of Czech, Slovak, Russian, and other languages, in addition to his technical knowledge of reference systems in academic scholarship, made him invaluable as a proofreader. Also, he continued to develop his interest in history, earning a PhD at Texas A&M 2009, and through the years has contributed significant scholarly articles to our journal, especially in the history of Czech-American journalism. Mary Šámal offered a sense of continuity, bringing her expertise as Book Review

Editor to the new situation, and of course her experience in writing, as well as reviewing, reviews was central to our mission as an academic journal. Through the years, she has contributed her own book reviews and essays to *Kosmas*, as well as editing reviews submitted by others. The assistant editors, beginning with Arifa, have been essential as well. As part of their job, they learn to use our Publisher software with facility, and I can assure you that this is not an easy thing to do. Some of the assistants have gone on to apply their experience to other positions: Arifa, for example, after leaving us, did fine work as managing editor for an online newsletter for several years, as well as freelance editing jobs.

Speaking of demanding and complicated jobs, the task of working with the SVU Treasurer and keeping subscription records and address files up to date is a challenging one. At the beginning, subscription orders and address changes were handled by Managing Editor David Chroust. Those tasks were later shifted to Subscriptions Editor Frank Safertal, who served for several years, and, later, Eugene Martin held this post.

Getting back to my historical perspective, the emphasis has always been on scholarly articles, especially on aspects of history and culture, but personal essays and occasional political speeches, creative work in fiction and poetry, interviews, letters and other features add to the variety of the format. Contributors to our journal come from a wide range of backgrounds, as already noted, and some—for example, Tracy Anne Burns, Zdeněk Salzmänn, Pavel Marek, Patrick Crowhurst, and Clarice Cloutier, in addition to some of the others I have already mentioned—have been especially prolific through the years. Of course in this short essay I cannot hope to cover my twelve years with *Kosmas* in any kind of detail, but I would like to illustrate my central point about the international scope of our “Czech and Slovak” coverage by returning to the example of Joseph Rostinsky, whose had contributed a brief article to the Fall 2000 issue. In the Spring 2011 issue, he and his co-author Kenji Hotta published a relatively short essay entitled “The Narrative Aspect of History: A Case Study of Texas Moravians.” After briefly discussing the backgrounds of the authors, I will comment on the significance of the essay in terms of an intricate pattern of collaboration by scholars in terms of ethnic, national and international relationships.

In 1969, Rostinsky, who had studied at Masaryk University in Brno, Czechoslovakia, left his country as a political refugee and entered the State University of New York at Albany. There he earned M.A. degrees in Russian and German before moving to Harvard University, earning another M.A. in linguistics—while also taking courses at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where his instructors included the eminent linguists Roman Jakobson, Morris Halle, and Noam Chomsky. Jakobson was an especially important influence and, acting on his advice, Rostinsky accepted a position at the University of Texas in Austin, where he taught courses in the Czech language and became involved in cultural programs related to Czech ethnicity, organizing a musical group known as the Czech University Singers. In 1976 he moved to Providence, Rhode Island, in order to complete his Ph.D. degree in Slavic languages and literatures—with a concentration in Czech—at Brown University.

In 1980 he took a position in the Department of European Studies (and later in the Department of American Civilization Studies, as well) at Tokai University in Tokyo, Japan, becoming professor emeritus in 2011. Through the years, as a professor of Japanese language studies and serving in the Tokai School of Civilization, School of Sport and Recreation, and School of Management, he taught a variety of courses in cognitive semiotics, cognitive linguistics, and cognitive management.

Hotta, Rostinsky's co-author, is a Ph.D. student in the field of Civilization Studies at Tokai. His dissertation, directed by Rostinsky, deals with the comparative study of the semiotic and cognitive function of sports in contemporary Czech and Japanese societies. He has spent several months in the Czech Republic studying the Czech language and conducting research. Through the years, Rostinsky himself has kept in close touch with Czech academic institutions, serving as visiting professor at Masaryk University (2003-2006) and Ostrava University (2007-2008), and maintaining his membership in various Czech academic and cultural organizations. In addition he has served as guest lecturer in institutions not only in the Czech Republic but throughout Europe (and in the U.S. and Canada as well). As the *Kosmas* essay demonstrates, he has also maintained an interest in Texas (in fact he has made arrangements for retirement homes in both Austin, Texas, and his native Moravia), and Hotta has followed his lead in developing his own interest in a distinctive "Texas Czech" ethnicity.

Now to the essay. The highpoint of Czech ethnic publishing in Texas came in the 1930s, and *Czech Pioneers of the Southwest* (1934), by Estelle Hudson and Henry R. Maresh, is one of the most important English-language sources for Texas Czech history. It is the subject of Rostinsky and Hotta's essay. Maresh (Mareš), who had figured in the institution of a Czech language program at the University of Texas at Austin, was a prominent Houston physician with family connections to many of the "pioneers." In spite of its title, it is exclusively concerned with the state of Texas. Its organization is sometimes awkward, and its narrative technique is inconsistent. It is, however, a valuable book, particularly because it records many accounts of the early life of Texas Czechs by first-generation and second-generation individuals, and it attempts to deal with all religious, fraternal, and other factions among the Czechs. Much important material is given as direct quotation in first-person narratives. *Czech Pioneers* is also interesting as an expression of Texas values and attitudes at the time it was written: ethnic identity joined with American patriotism and faith in material progress.

Rostinsky and Hotta acknowledge the importance of *Czech Pioneers* and the good intentions of its authors but point out problematic aspects of the book that readers should take into account. Because there are few references to historic documents relating to Czech immigration and social institutions (at that time generally unavailable in the state's research libraries), historical information is "overwhelmingly based on the oral tradition" (136), that is, personal memoirs by first-generation Czech-Americans with vague memories of the past or their children or other relatives with no clear understanding of historical facts. The

authors are in effect “*mythologizing*” the lives of the immigrants. For example, they draw a parallel between the Czech immigrants and the English Pilgrims in early America, but this obscures an important distinction: the Pilgrims came to Massachusetts “in order to realize their utopian version of the New Jerusalem dream in the New World” but the Czechs “landed at the coast of Texas in order to be culturally assimilated in the so-called *American melting pot*” (138).

Pointing out evidence that economic hardship rather than religious persecution in the homeland was the primary motive for immigration to Texas, Rostinsky and Hotta show how the “mythologized” narrative of *Czech Pioneers* in some ways is misleading, and they also observe that linguistic information given about the Czech language is unreliable. But perhaps the most interesting criticism of Hudson and Mareš is pointing out their failure to deal with the specific *Moravian* identity of the immigrants to Texas, as described above. In the European homeland the Moravians’ “culture and national consciousness had been substantially different from that of the Bohemians” (139). I want to make it clear that Rostinsky does not write from a personal point of view, but as a Czech-Moravian scholar who lived in Texas for a time, approximately a century after the peak of the original wave of Moravian immigration, and who taught the Czech language to university students—many of whom were descendants of the original immigrants—Rostinsky brings valuable insight to this topic, and his Japanese doctoral student Hotta obviously brings his own unique perspective to issues involving ethnic and national identity.

Kosmas was an appropriate venue for this essay for a variety of reasons. Of course I have a special interest in Czech immigration to the State of Texas and the development of “Texas Czech” ethnic identity. But, again, this article by a native Czech-Moravian serving as a professor at a Japanese university, and his Japanese doctoral student who had developed a scholarly interest in comparative studies of Czech and Japanese societies, strikingly illustrates the complex international context in which *Kosmas* functions as an academic journal.

I want to close with an observation that in “my” last issue of *Kosmas* in Spring 2012 there were memorial tributes to Václav Havel, who had died in late 2011, but the recent death of another “Czech hero” early this year also deserves our notice. Havel was in fact among Czechoslovak dissidents whose “banned” works were published by 68 Publishers, the institution founded by Josef Škvorecký and his wife in Canada in 1971. I have admired Škvorecký’s work as a publisher and a creative writer for a long time. When I organized a symposium entitled “Czech Music in Texas,” a “sesquicentennial” event in November 1986 celebrating the preservation and development of Czech music in my home state on the 150th anniversary of its independence from Mexico, I was fortunate to be able to include a presentation by this eminent Czech Canadian in the program. Škvorecký discussed “How I Wrote *Dvořák in Love*,” and of course *Dvořák in Love* is one of his best known novels. In extended personal conversations it was fascinating to talk with him and his wife about the situation in Czechoslovakia, and, needless to say, this experience reinforced my interest in topics that would

later lead me to my position with *Kosmas*. I am pleased to say that a short story by Škvorecký was included in the Spring 2001 issue of our journal.

In terms of the academic scholarship associated with *Kosmas*, as the Rostinsky and Hotta essay illustrates, collaboration between scholars—authors, readers, members of the editorial board—from various backgrounds dealing with related but distinctive national and ethnic traditions is guided by the principles of intellectual honesty and scholarly integrity. I will remember my years as editor of *Kosmas* with pleasure, and I look forward to reading this very special journal in the future, as I pass along my best wishes to the current editor, Hugh Agnew.

BOOK REVIEWS

Hájíček, Jiří. *Rustic Baroque (Selský baroko)*. Trans. Gale A. Kirking. Brno: Real World Press, 2012. ISBN: 978-80-905357-1-8, 200 pp.

Illustrating the persecution of farmers who did not readily join the collective farms in Communist Czechoslovakia during the 1950s, Jiří Hájíček's novel *Rustic Baroque* tackles a little explored theme in a fascinating way. Hájíček interweaves a mystery into the plot as 37-year old Pavel Straňanský, a loner who compiles family trees for clients, sets out to find what happened to Rozálie Zandlová during those harsh Stalinist years. This time, his job consists of more than rummaging through birth, baptism and death certificates as the names of the past take on faces, and Rozálie's story affects the present. Pavel finds himself part of that story, faced with a moral dilemma. Hájíček also shows that traits of Communist society, such as blackmail, have not changed. The Czech version of *Rustic Baroque, Selský baroko*, won a Magnesia Litera Award in 2006. *Rustic Baroque*, Hájíček's fifth book and third novel, is his first work to be translated into English.

The author skillfully portrays the hardships of private farmers with vivid, poetic descriptions and crisp dialogue. After 1948 when the Communist Party took control of the country, it reorganized agriculture according to the Stalinist model. The Communists wanted to do away with private farms and replace them with collective ones. They asked farmers to transfer their land, implements and animals to the collective farms and to become workers there. (Although the legal fiction was that the employees in common owned the collective farm.) Collectivization was very unpopular, especially among the well-to-do farmers to whom the Communists referred derogatively as "kulaks" and considered conspirators against the regime. To get their way, the authorities resorted to a full range of punitive measures available to the state. The consequences for those who did not voluntarily join the collective farms were dire. The Communist authorities carried out humiliating house searches. The children of the "kulaks" ran the risk of being expelled from school. A farmer could be imprisoned for merely not fulfilling a delivery quota. Those thought to oppose collectivization were often jailed on trumped up or for minor offenses. Many were expelled from their native villages and their property and livestock confiscated. Ultimately, those who refused to join the collectives voluntarily simply had their property taken away. By the 1960s, Czechoslovakia's agriculture was collectivized. The process, however, had severely damaged the moral fiber of the rural communities. Workers stole from the farms. Neighbors and colleagues informed on each other. Blackmail was commonplace. No one could be trusted.

Nearing forty, Pavel has no good friends and has been afraid to get close to anyone since his girlfriend Andrea left him. He banters with acquaintances from the village Touchov, where he lives with the elderly and absentminded stonemason Master Karásek. The main protagonist does not get along with his brother Vlastík and his sister-in-law Vladka. He resents them for not accepting Andrea because she was born and bred in a city and was an outsider in the village. The only connection he feels with the family homestead where Vlastík and Vladka

live is the scent of childhood he finds in the dusty village chronicles that he wrote as a child. Pavel is hesitant to get involved with Daniela, a tourist from Prague compiling her family tree, because she reminds him of Andrea. The main character feels an affinity for the names of his clients' ancestors and their farmsteads. His only real friend is his laptop, which he bought with the inheritance money his brother gave him. "It was everything to me," Pavel admits. (4) Daniela tells him, "You always talk about what happened in the past." His reply: "All these stories are still here. In the countryside, in the fields, in the houses with people who might not know them anymore" (49). Pavel's life is the forgotten history he finds in the chronicles of villages.

Pavel is faced with a moral dilemma that propels the plot forward. If he gives Mr. Šrámek, a former Communist and cooperative farm employee, the denouncement written by Rozálie Zandlová, Rozálie's son is sure to lose the upcoming election for mayor, and his career could be destroyed. Yet, if Pavel merely does his job, turns a blind eye to the issue and hands over the letter to Mr. Šrámek, he gets 50,000 Czech crowns, money he badly needs.

After searching for Rozálie's gravestone, Pavel discovers that she is very much alive, though now a fragile woman in her eighties. She claims she only informed the authorities that František Kubach, the man she was in love with, was illegally gambling at the sawmill. She was jealous because he went there to see a young woman named Lída. The Communists claimed that "kuláks" were conspiring against the regime at the sawmill. Another farmer, Jakub Jircha, was sentenced to five years in prison. Kubach got a suspended sentence. Rozálie was forced to leave the village with her illegitimate son.

Yet that is only Rozálie's truth. Pavel discovers that people can have different interpretations of the truth, different perspectives on the past. Daniela, Jircha's granddaughter, claims that Rozálie's denouncement gave the authorities the leverage they needed to kick Jircha out of the village and ruin him. Then there is the story of Jan Mařánek, who was pressured into joining a collective farm only to be branded as a class enemy. At the end of his life, he forgave the villagers for everything. Should the past stay as the past, and should old wrongs be forgiven?

Hajíček illustrates the idyllic nature of the south Bohemian countryside, where Pavel feels most at home:

I stood up and stretched my arms wide, letting the scented breeze pass through me. I was a tiny little point on the slope between the sky and the grass, drowned in the fragrant essence and the chirp of insects' wings. The intermingling of air and earth—that's the magic (109).

There are sharp contrasts between the scenes in the countryside and the scenes in Prague, where Pavel confronts Daniela. In south Bohemia it is scorching hot. He shows Daniela the south Bohemian villages that are dying out. When Pavel is in Prague, it is raining. In the capital city, he meets Daniela at the modern and impersonal shopping center, Flora Palace. While walking near the Žižkov Tower, he notices the contemporary, provocative and controversial art of David Černý – the grotesque sculptures of babies that seem to be climbing up the tower.

The dreamlike infants are climbing a structure that jars the beauty of Prague's skyline, a symbol of the Communist era, unable to reach adulthood, their growth stifled by this landmark of totalitarian rule. The outrageous babies also portray a bloated, surreal childhood.

Another significant theme deals with the statue that Master Karásek is finishing. It is to serve as a monument in the village because Touchov does not have a unique landmark. Thus, it will give the village an identity of its own. The sculpture looks like something different to each person, just as the "truth" in the Rozálie's case takes on different interpretations. Some think it looks like Leonid Brezhnev, others the Golem, still others believe it is King Kong. It turns out it is a sculpture of Master Karásek's brother who served as a dragoon in World War I, when he was killed.

Thanks to translator, Gale A. Kirking, the novel is very user friendly to novice readers of Czech literature. Kirking occasionally uses a Czech word in the text to give the novel more color, but then explains the context of the word at the bottom of the page. For example, he uses the words "*bytovka*" and "*panelák*" in the novel and explains that they are both apartment buildings, but a "*bytovka*" is made of bricks instead of concrete and is of a higher standard than a "*panelák*" (56). Occasionally sprinkling the text with Czech words gives the novel more ambiance and gives the reader a feel for the Czech language. It is not disorienting for veteran readers of Czech literature, either. Kirking also preserves Hájíček's minimalist language that also has poetic traits.

The term "rustic baroque" is itself filled with meaning. Near the beginning of the book, Daniela tells Pavel that she would like to see the rustic baroque houses in Holašovice, a UNESCO-acclaimed village in south Bohemia. Pavel claims that the village is for tourists and laughs. To him the most beautiful sights are the decaying villages he visits, where each farmstead tells a story. He considers the colorful houses in Holašovice to be mere empty shells, devoid of meaning. Yet "rustic baroque" comes up in another very different context, too. Jircha's former farmstead had been in the family since 1694 and at one time was rebuilt in rustic baroque style. Thus, the rustic baroque decoration was part of Jircha's identity.

Kirking has included four of Hájíček's stories from his 2004 book, *The Wooden Knife*, as well. The tales take place over a 10-year period, from 1986, shortly after the Chernobyl catastrophe, to 1996, when the first elections of the Czech Republic's Senate took place. The author vividly describes the banality and common events of village life and gives them profound meaning. In "Melancholy Leaves from Democracy's Autumn Trees," Hájíček portrays a village that has been virtually destroyed by floods. Only Gramps and the narrator Pavel are enthusiastic about the elections. When Pavel's former girlfriend, Taňa, tries to put a pair of panties in the ballot box, Gramps is outraged, viewing the incident as an offense to democratic principles. In "The Wooden Knife" 15-year old Michal is rejected by his older brother Petr, who tells him he is a loser and will never belong. He makes fun of the wooden knife that Michal keeps in his room. Michal is so attached to it because his father carved it for him 10 years earlier. Readers feel Michal's sense of rejection and sympathize with his tormenting teenage

emotions. “Horses are Supposed to be Buried” also concerns a 15-year old, Slávka, who has been infatuated with her step-cousin Robert after only meeting him once several years earlier. She discovers he has changed for the worst, and readers feel her loss of innocence and naivety as tears roll down her cheeks. In “Memories of a Village Dance in 1986,” Pavel wants to say the right, consoling words to Lída, whose mother has died, possibly due to the consequences of the Chernobyl tragedy.

In both the stories and the novel, village life is described poignantly, as south Bohemia—the decrepit farmsteads and idyllic countryside—comes alive for readers. Hajiček’s narration, from Pavel’s point of view, is top-notch, too. The relationships among characters are portrayed with a sensitivity and fragility that captures readers’ attention. Hajiček delves deep into the characters’ complex emotions. It is no wonder that the Czech original of the novel won the Magensia Litera Award. One can hope that the English translation will earn just as much recognition.

Tracy A. Burns

Fudge, Thomas A. *The Memory and Motivation of Jan Hus, Medieval Priest and Martyr*, Europa Sacra, 11. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2013. ISBN 978-2-503-54442-7. 291 pp.

Fudge, Lecturer in Medieval European History at the University of New England in Armidale, NSW, Australia, states right at the start that the famous Bohemian religious reformer, Jan Hus (circa 1369-1415) was not a proto-Protestant or a forerunner of Martin Luther. Instead, he was as “a medieval priest committed to the Latin Church and completely devoted to its reform. This unswerving devotion eventually led [him] to a rather precipitous downfall”(ix). The book grew out of a larger research project, which had yielded a previous volume, *Jan Hus: Religious Reform and Social Revolution in Bohemia*, International Library of Historical Studies, 73 (London: Tauris, 2010), and a third volume devoted to Hus’s persecution and trial will appear—just prior to the sixcentennial of his execution—in 2015. This impressive accomplishment was made possible by an anonymous grant by an American university that enabled the author to devote himself full-time to research and writing on the Bohemian martyr.

In probing the motivation of Hus, Fudge sums up the essentials under three rubrics: standing firm in the defense of truth, practicing the imitation of Christ, and preparing for martyrdom (33). At times the Czech reformer entertained unrealistic expectations of divine favor; even as his execution at the Council of Constance was approaching, he anticipated a miraculous intervention on his behalf (32). Above all, Fudge stresses a deep commitment to morality, as the dominant leitmotif of Hus’s career. Remarkably, although Hus was formally convicted of heresy, there were no charges questioning his moral character, although, as Fudge shows, accusations of immorality were almost automatically leveled against those tried for heresy in the Middle Ages (51-52). A sign of his

high moral standards was his refusal to recant heretical beliefs falsely attributed to him at the Council of Constance. He would rather suffer death than commit perjury (54-56).

A crucial factor in assessing Hus's motivation was his relation to the equally famous English religious reformer, John Wyclif, whom Hus always defended against charges of heresy. Nevertheless, Fudge notes—on the example of his commentary on Lombard's *Sentences*—Hus's caution in introducing Wyclif's ideas in his discourse. In part, he attributes this restraint to the reluctance of contemporary writers to cite by name medieval theologians—in contrast to the established Church Fathers of antiquity. The medieval upstarts, like Wyclif, could not be equated with the ancient stalwarts of Christian theology, like St. Augustine. (On this point, see also Zdeněk V. David, "Hus a anglická homiletika: Běda Ctihodný a Wyclif v Husových českých spisech," in Petr Hlaváček, ed. *O felix Bohemia! Studie k dějinám české reformace. K počtě Davida R. Holetona* [Prague: Collegium Europaeum, 2013] 65.) In this light, Fudge points out the absurdity of the assertions by Johann Loserth and his followers that Hus in his theological writings simply parroted Wyclif (76-77).

The author then devotes a chapter to Hus's detailed polemics against "the priest-cookmaster" that—according to Fudge—summarize his main religious critiques, yet had not been up to now sufficiently treated by scholars (86). Another chapter deals with the accusations of heresy against Hus by the prominent Michael de Causis, who portrayed Hus "as a dangerous wolf masquerading as an innocent lamb." The vehemence and picturesqueness of his attack was calculated to attract maximum attention and did, indeed, help to establish Hus's fame (or notoriety) on a European scale (109). Together with Štěpán of Pálec, de Causis was the principal architect of Hus's condemnation at Constance. Fudge relates in some detail the scandalous episodes of de Causis' earlier life (e.g., 115), and his later designs to disqualify Jan of Jesenice from legally representing Hus and to enlist the inquisitor Mařík Rvačka to develop damaging heresy charges (118-119). Fudge devotes considerable effort to an original reconstruction of de Causis' subsequent life, mostly from Austrian sources (128-133).

In the next two lengthy chapters (7 and 8) Fudge returns to his interest in the presentation of Hus in songs and in hagiography that he also treated in his earlier book *The Magnificent Ride* (1998). He tries to correct the insufficient attention by historians to the study of songs, which, he maintains, were a more effective instrument for spreading new religious beliefs than sermons or books (137). Fudge appeals to the views of his British mentor, Robert W. Scribner (1941-1998), to underscore the importance of oral culture in the transmission of religious ideas (148). Although certain popular songs attacked Hus, most were considered worthy of suppression in the early years of the religious reform by political and ecclesiastical authorities, as vehicles of heresies (141). They focused on a glorification of Hus, tending to draw parallels between his martyrdom and Christ's (157-159). The book offers extensive citations from their repertoire, a few in Latin, but most in Czech (regrettably without English translation). Turning to literature, Fudge compares and weighs the influence of several hagiographies of

Hus. Although he does assign pre-eminence to the *Relatio* of Petr of Mladoňovice (185-186), he also makes an effort to identify the elusive Jan Barbatus, and concludes his series of biographers with George the Hermit (206-207). The symbolic character of the varied literary portrayals comes into focus in the divergent depictions of Hus during his execution as joyous by his adherents, and as horrified by his opponents (209).

The book under review culminates in a multifaceted discussion of the Czech martyr's place in the Bohemian Reformation. It shows the steady fidelity of the church in Bohemia for the next two hundred years to the rather conservative theological and liturgical tenor of the Reformation in Hus's time. In sketching the ecclesiastical developments after Hus's death, the author likewise seeks to place both the theological moderates (the Utraquists) and the theological radicals (the Taborites, later the Unity of Brethren) into the perspectives of the Christian tradition and of contemporary times.

The study is solidly based on manuscripts and archival documents, the listing of which occupies several pages of the bibliography (254-258). The major sources of this documentation were the National Library in Prague, the National Museum Library in Prague, the Prague Castle Archive, and the Austrian National Library in Vienna; with lesser collections in Esztergom, Göttingen, Cracow, Leipzig, Lyon, Olomouc, Roudnice, Třeboň, and Vyšší Brod.

Although particularly in the last chapter, the author tries to justify his terminological usage in a sophisticated way, the book has a rather old fashioned tone in that it calls the Bohemian Church, which venerated Hus, "Hussite," a name used by its enemies, while recent historiography has tended to endorse the Church's official name of Utraquist (*podoboží*). (See, for instance, *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, 3 (2000), 11-13; *ibid.*, 5,1 (2004), 11-12.) Yet, it is fair to conclude that, on the whole, Fudge's book is a remarkable and well-written piece of scholarship and, together with the previous volume (published in 2010), distinctly updates Matthew Spinka's *John Hus: A Biography* (Princeton, NJ: 1968), up to now considered the standard treatment of Hus's life and work in the English language.

Zdeněk V. David, Washington, D.C.

Baer, Josette. *Revolution, Modus Vivendi or Sovereignty? The Political Thought of the Slovak National Movement from 1861 to 1914*. Stuttgart: Ibidem Verlag, 2010, xvi, 252 pp.

Josette Baer is a lecturer in political theory at the University of Zurich, Switzerland. Her particular focus is Slavic intellectual history, thus she is eminently qualified to produce this study of Slovak political thought. This is a very valuable addition to the small, but thankfully growing, number of works on Slovak national and intellectual development in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. While there has been general recognition of a Slovak national movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (for example Peter

Brock's 1976 volume *The Slovak National Awakening*, there has been very little attention paid to the thinkers and actors in this endeavor, outside of the recognized triumvirate of Ľudovít Štúr, Michal Miloslav Hodža and Jozef Miloslav Hurban. That there were other thinkers and voices is the central approach of this work. It is divided into two components: a relatively brief introduction to the history of the national movement in the time period, and at the end a very short conclusion. The far greater part of the book is devoted to the study of the works of six political thinkers/intellectuals who through their ideas and works contributed to Slovak national development. The six are Ján Francisci (1822-1905); Ján Palarík (1822-1870); Štefan Marko Daxner (1822-1892); František Viťazoslav Sasinek (1830-1914); Svetozár Hurban Vajanský (1847-1916); and Vavro Šrobár (1867-1950). For each, the same framework of analysis is followed: political goals, political legitimating and a life in brief. At the end (230-231) there is a very useful comparative chart. Most of these men are probably unknown outside of Slovakia; Baer acknowledges as much, pointing out that "only Francisci, Palarík and Vajanský have 'made it' to the Internet" (p. 233). Since she wrote this, the internet information has expanded, so all can be found, but only Daxner and Vajanský are identified in English.

As her title indicates, Baer examines the national movement of this period as one which faced basically three choices: revolution, as in the movements of 1848; *modus vivendi*, that is, attempting to work within the framework of the existing empire, especially after the *Ausgleich* of 1867 which greatly narrowed the range of options; and after 1900, the first steps toward a new orientation for the Slovaks which would lead, albeit not until the outbreak of World War I, to a vision of sovereignty. The Empire was the context within which the six men operated; this also determined the laws, constraints, policies, challenges facing the Slovaks. The three options reflect the broader historical developments of the region: the revolutionary era of the mid-century, the declining power and status of the Habsburg Empire *vis à vis* Europe and the increasing presence and activism of nationalist movements in the region. In addition to this, there was power politics that culminated in a war, which would dramatically change the situation of the peoples residing in the territories of the old Imperial powers.

Interestingly, the first three political thinkers examined were all born in 1822; all were in their mid-twenties when the revolution of 1848 took place. Francisci, Palarík and Daxner were engaged in the movement for the recognition of Slovak national rights and aspirations. Francisci and Daxner sought Slovak autonomy, but all three were imbued with nationalist aspirations and a pragmatic approach to Slovak opportunities. Palarík was more open to cooperation with Magyar liberals, expecting that this would provide a framework for Slovak national development. The failure of the 1848 revolutions meant that all three focused on building up Slovak national consciousness, through writing, publishing and trying to build educational opportunities for the Slovaks (Daxner, with his legal training, paid particular attention to this). All three, but especially Francisci and Daxner, were involved in the drafting of the *Memorandum of the Slovak Nation* of 1861 which called for the recognition of the Slovak nation and above all for Slovak linguistic

rights, including in administration and education. Francisci was engaged in a further effort, the establishment of the *Matica Slovenská* in 1862; it was dissolved by the Hungarian government in 1875. There were little concrete achievements from the *Memorandum*, and the *Ausgleich* of 1867 effectively ended expectations of internal change. Palarík died in 1870; Francisci and Daxner remained active in writing and in defending Slovak national identity in the face of Magyarization until their deaths in 1905 and 1892, respectively.

František Sasinek (1830-1914) was slightly older and thus less engaged in efforts at changing the structure of the empire; he was, however, a staunch advocate of Slovak linguistic rights, especially as the language of instruction; the following quote, cited by Baer, is a pointed critique of Hungarian language laws:

Do these Hungarian 'trained pedagogues' know the meaning of a 'circulus vitiosus' in education? It means that the Slovak youngster has already to understand Hungarian in order to learn Hungarian... Is this how 'scientific knowledge' should be achieved? (128).

Sasinek was actively involved with *Matica Slovenská* until its dissolution. His major contribution to the Slovak National movement was his engagement with writing Slovak history and compiling an impressive historiography of the Slovaks. Sasinek certainly falls into the *modus vivendi* category, but for all those engaged with Slovak aspirations, *modus vivendi* never meant acceptance of Magyarization. Sasinek in fact envisioned a system of power-sharing, based on the historic presence of both Magyars and Slovaks in the lands of the Hungarian Kingdom. As Baer points out, Sasinek called for the right of the Slavs to achieve the proclaimed nineteenth-century values of freedom, civilization and culture. Only if they had a voice and access to power could this be achieved.

Of the six thinkers considered in Baer's analysis, Svetozár Hurban Vajanský (1847-1916) seems the least engaged in systematic political theory. By the time he reached maturity, the *Ausgleich* of 1867 had been proclaimed and implemented; revolution was not an option, and the concept of *modus vivendi* seemed increasingly constrained into the narrow framework of surviving Magyarization. Perhaps that is why Vajanský in a sense returned to Romanticism, to a focus on Slavic art and culture and to a romantic pan-slavism. Not seeing any possibility of achieving change by direct action, Vajanský placed his hopes in the Russian Empire. His romanticized expectations of Slavic brotherhood as a path toward freedom and self-actualization were negated by the reality of Russian and European politics.

Vavro Šrobár receives the most attention of the six, perhaps because of the direct impact he had on the actual structure of Slovak political life. He comes of age in the closing decades of the nineteenth century and is therefore active in the period before and after World War I; hence his ideas are to an extent a product of the period, with new voices and options emerging. Šrobár was deeply influenced by the Czechs, especially Masaryk, but as Baer points out (p. 183), he was his own man and realized that there could not be a wholesale transfer of Czech political thought to the Slovaks. Yet, Šrobár remained committed, throughout his

entire life, to the principle that the best avenue for Slovaks to achieve the democratic and secular values that he espoused was through union with the Czechs. He believed it necessary to actively engage with the Slovak people, as did others such as Milan Hodža, his contemporary, in the rising agrarian movement. A fundamental framework for his thinking was Realism, which he saw as the basis for political and social organization and development. He tended to view the Czechs as rational and reasonable, while the Slovaks were much more under the sway of emotionalism. Perhaps such sweeping generalizations are the inevitable pitfall when pursuing a national awakening under constrained circumstances; certainly this strengthened his belief that Czechoslovakism was the only realistic avenue for the Slovaks. Šrobár was also highly critical of the power of the clergy in Slovak political life, especially of Andrej Hlinka. He saw this as an impediment to the modernization of the Slovaks. Baer also goes beyond the timeframe of her book, looking at Šrobár's ideas and actions in the new Czechoslovak state. His observations and explanations continue to be situated within the particular political theories he espoused. Šrobár was a significant figure in Slovak and Czechoslovak history; his post-1918 ideas and actions certainly merit future study.

In her careful study of the six Slovak nationalists, Baer had raised the question of why, in inter-war Czechoslovakia, was Hlinka's People's party the most successful among the Slovaks. This is a legitimate question, but the relatively narrow scope of this study could not really provide a sufficient answer. In her very brief conclusion, Baer provides a very tentative answer, claiming that the HSPP's success could be

explained by what one could call *the legacy of Vajansky*: an uncritical acceptance of authoritarian leadership, passivity in political decision-making and participation, the rejection of Western thought, perceived as *Czechoslovakist atheistic dominance* and the belief in the nation's spirit that was inextricably bound to the Catholic faith (232).

While these may be factors, it would also be necessary to actually examine the ideas and programs of Hlinka, the successes and failures of the Agrarians, the second largest political party among the Slovaks, the unitary, power-based political structure of the First Republic, as well economic issues which were root grievances shared by many Slovaks, irrespective of their political beliefs.

This caveat aside, Josette Baer has made a significant contribution to an understanding of the political goals and ideas of the Slovaks in a time of turmoil, change and the struggle for national survival. Her work deserves careful study and is a welcome contribution.

Susan Mikula, Chicago, IL

Donskis, Leonidas, ed. *Yet another Europe: Rethinking Milan Kundera and the idea of Central Europe*. New York: Rodopi, 2012. ISBN 978-90-420-3543-0. 215 pp.

Yet another Europe: Rethinking Milan Kundera and the idea of Central Europe applies to present day Central Europe the ideas about that region that Milan Kundera developed in his seminal *New York Review of Books* article. The work concentrates on the contemporary cultural politics of the countries in this region.

As the title indicates, this book deals with the geographical, cultural, and historical entity called Central Europe, which for the purposes of this work also includes the Baltic states, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Thus, *Yet another Europe* concerns itself with the successor states to the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Baltic region, that is the territory that became the victim of Nazi Germany's expansion and then after World War II fell into the Soviet Union's sphere.

The starting point for each essay in this volume is Kundera's article, "The Tragedy of Central Europe" published on April 26, 1984. There he defined Central Europe as the area geographically in the West and politically in the East and discussed the future impact of this fact on the region and Europe as a whole.

The thirteen essays and the editor Leonidas Donskis's foreword constitute a follow up to the seminar "Yet Another Europe and the Legacy of Dissent: Central Europe after 1984" held at Vytautas Magnus University at Kaunas, Lithuania, in October 2010. The book under review provides new perspectives based on the development of eastern flank of the European Union in the years from 1989 to 2011. It discusses how a quarter of a century has affected the ideas that Milan Kundera had elucidated.

The satellite states of the Soviet Union came out of their isolation in 1989. They had been cut off not only from Western Europe, but also from Eastern Europe. After all, the Communist authorities jailed East Europeans for any attempt to defect to the West, as well as for unsanctioned contacts within the Communist bloc, including unauthorized border crossings to other Communist countries. In the 90s, the countries considered in this volume joined the European Union, where their collaboration is unimpeded. The contributors to *Yet another Europe* address themselves to the contemporary states in the region and the modalities of collaboration among their intellectuals.

Before World War I within Austro-Hungary, the intellectual collaboration among the elites of Empire's many nations produced the literary and cultural corpus of Central Europe. This included arts, music, philosophy, literature and political movements, to mention a few. The cultural elites largely shared the common political aim of rational democracy outside the absolute power of the Empire. Except for the German speaking Austrians, many nationalities aspired also to a nation-based statehood not only outside of the Empire, but also independent of the German-speaking provinces of Austria.

After 1918 the Austro-Hungarian Empire ceased to exist, but the cultural

community was not dismantled. Regional collaboration continued. However, while no longer bound to Austria-Hungary, the successor states soon enough found that Nazi Germany, fascist states and a totalitarian Russia threatened their cultural and political independence.

Throughout the history of the Central European, the loss of agency has been an earmark of the regions' ethnic groups whether it occurred under the Austro-Hungarian Empire or other occupations. George Schöpfli points out that this historical loss of agency created the myth of the martyr nations. Nazi occupation and Soviet incorporation, whether the states in the region were considered an official ally or victims of an aggressor, were interpreted in the same way.

The joining of the European Union has been viewed as the rejoining of the historical cultural domain—in a sense the return to the cultural home. With the passage of time, however, Ineta Dabašinskienė contends, the European Union's intricate political dealings increased the complexity of the cultural and political situations that these new member states had inherited from Soviet domination. All this added to the political disorientation of the people. In some of these newly admitted countries, several political parties and their followers have presented the joining of the European Union as another loss of agency.

The new European nation-states joined Union for the sake of the common European idea of safeguarding peace and democracy, not an idea of political or cultural hegemony. Stefan Auer sees, therefore, a necessity to loosen the framework in order to reserve a democratic space for all the smaller nations within the Union.

Can the European Union survive if it does not include all its multi-layered aspects, Mitja Žagar asks. More specifically, the European Union needs to improve its diversity management and integration efforts, especially those of migrants and immigrants. Europe needs a responsive system that meets the needs and interests of divergent people and communities.

Rudi Rizman returns to a discussion of the role of East European intellectuals, who developed not only a new ideology, but also dealt with the concept of a civil society and its central role in the restoration of democracy. The mission of intellectuals, he notes, seems to be increasingly taken by politicians, who are more concerned with persuasion than with truths and the demands of democracy.

The historical pattern of homogeneity from which nation-states resulted has become inadequate in modern world politics and indeed in the world itself. The management of diversities seems the pivotal challenge for democracies in the post-nation-state environment. In this context, Stefano Bianchini argues, the inclusion of Central European countries in the Union has created an interculturality. This new paradigm for European integration competes with the homogeneity principles that nurtured people's self-perception for several centuries.

The nation-state is tied to the official language policies and language planning. Dabašinskienė notes that for almost two centuries national languages have served as markers of national and cultural self-identification. One language per nation was the unifying political goal. In present-day Europe, however,

multilingualism promises enormous potential benefits to its citizens and is seen as something that has to be preserved and developed.

Language planning policies need to be democratized. In nation-states, groups of experts (usually academicians) were assigned the watch over the purity of the official literary language. They alone could decide which language innovations were correct, functional and to be included in the official literary idiom. Under pressure of democratization, this language planning model is to be reviewed as codified languages need to reflect democratically changes in the popular usage.

The changed role of media after the political upheavals since 1989 and under the pressure of individualization through the internet is the focus of Aukse Balčytienė's essay. In Central and Eastern Europe, he points out, journalism was born from literary traditions that supported nations against occupiers. Media offered space for cultural consensus forming. The newly fragmented mass communication space needs to find new ways to facilitate common understanding, which makes possible common interpretations and practices, as well as a widely shared sense of legitimacy. It is precisely through shared knowledge and common ideals that communities can create common plans and agendas.

According to Krzysztof Czyżewski, Central Europe started to exist only after 1989. He asks whether the entity of Central Europe can function in a post-Holocaust, post-totalitarian, and post-modern territory. This cultural space, based on its past experience, should stress ethics over politics, and should oppose ideological mystification with a bold reference to reality. It should also replace distinctly demarcated borders with a space of coexistence.

Samuel Abrahám turns to the future, and inquires how much time is needed to establish European legitimacy, that is the formation of European culture in its political, literary and other dimensions. He calls for a new generation of politicians and thinkers, who will address the rising problems of political hypocrisy and hatred of rationalism, liberal democracy, human diversity, as well as individual freedom. Central Europe can learn from its past mistakes and should return to the ideals of its founding leaders.

In the conclusion, Rein Raud points out those thinkers who identify themselves with a subject endowed with a universal value offer a democratic alternative to political provincialisms. Restating Kundera's contention, Raun asserts that the East Central European intellectuals' questions are for the whole of Europe as well.

Yet another Europe: Rethinking Milan Kundera and the idea of Central Europe demonstrates that the cultural space of Central Europe exists and outlines some of its aspects. It also contributes valuable ideas to the wider discussion about the nascent culture of the European Union.

Mila Saskova-Pierce, Lincoln, NE

Jerczyński, Dariusz. *Józef Koźdoń (1873-1949): przywódca Śląskiej Partii Ludowej, a kwestia narodowości śląskiej na Śląsku Cieszyńskim i Opawskim w XIX i XX stuleciu* (Josef Koźdoń (1873-1949): The Leader of the Silesian

People's Party, and the Question of the Silesian Nationality in Teschen Silesia and Troppau Silesia during the 19th and 20th Centuries), Zabrze: Narodowa Oficyna Śląska, 2011, p. 290, ISBN 978-83-60540-08-4.

Since the mid-nineteenth century, a group of people in Austrian and Prussian controlled Silesia and later in Poland and Bohemia has been struggling for their recognition as a separate nation of Silesians. Their efforts, more or less intensive depending on the general political situation, have been opposed by other inhabitants of Silesia who considered themselves Polish, Czech, Moravian, or German. In Poland, the activities of the leaders of the Silesian nation revived after the fall of communism. In 1996, the Association of the People of the Silesian Nationality (Związek Ludności Narodowości Śląskiej) was established, but the Polish courts refused several times to recognize Silesians as a separate nationality. During the 2011 census in Poland, 847,000 people declared Silesian nationality as their identity (including 376,000 individuals who considered being Silesian their sole national identity).

The book under review is a tiny part of this struggle for the recognition of and autonomy for the Silesian nation. It is a biography of Józef Koźdoń, the founder and leader of the Silesian People's Party (Śląska Partia Ludowa), presented in the context of a history of the Silesian national movement in the former Austrian Silesia. Koźdoń was born in a peasant family in a village near Cieszyn (Těšín). His mother tongue was a local Silesian Slavic dialect. He received education in German language schools, including a teacher college. After his graduation, Koźdoń worked as a teacher and school director in German or German-Polish (*utrakwistyczne*) primary schools. Around 1905, he became active in the political life of Cieszyn Silesia. His most prominent political slogan throughout his entire life was "Silesia for Silesians."

In 1908, he established the Silesian People's Party and, in 1909-1918, served as a deputy to the provincial parliament of Austrian Silesia. After the fall of the Habsburg Empire, he desperately fought for an independent Silesian state or, at least, an autonomous Silesia within Czechoslovakia. During the Polish-Czech conflict over Cieszyn, he was active on the Czech side, and until the end of his life he considered the Polish national movement the most dangerous threat to the Silesian identity and sense of separateness. At the same time, he emphasized that Silesians were *deutschfreundlich* – friendly towards the Germans, and considered access to German high culture crucial to the Silesian national development. In 1919, Koźdoń became a member of the Czech Administration Commission for Silesia and, in 1923-1938, he was the mayor of Czech Cieszyn (Český Těšín) but, during the 1938-1939 partition of Czechoslovakia, the Silesian People's Party worked with the Sudeten German organization of Konrad Henlein. Koźdoń hoped that, after the fall of the Versailles System, one of his most desired scenarios would be realized: an autonomous united Silesia (Lower, Upper, Cieszyn, and Czech Silesia) within a great German Reich, uniting Germany and the former Habsburg lands.

During the Second World War, Koźdoń served as the President of the

Schlesische Volksbank (Silesian People's Bank) and became a member of the Upper Silesian Land Commission of the German Ethnic List, an institution that qualified applicants to the infamous *Volksliste*. In 1943, he became an honorary citizen of Cieszyn. In 1945, Koźdoń spent two months in a Czechoslovak concentration camp and, after a series of humiliating and traumatic experiences, separated from his family, died in a Catholic hospice in Opava (Czechoslovakia).

A history of the Silesian national movement and a biography of Koźdoń, constitute a dramatic, important, and fascinating story, worthy of a better book than the publication under review. Its author, one of the leaders of the Movement for the Autonomy of Silesia (*Ruch Autonomii Śląska, RAŚ*), is an amateur historian. He ignores basic rules of the historical profession. He concludes the introduction to his book in the following way: "I do not hide my views behind a façade of scholarship but, in an open and emotional way, I proclaim myself in favor of this side of the historical dispute, which opinions I share" (7). He does indeed. Jerczyński invested an enormous effort into this book, gathered an impressive amount of information, and then he wasted his own hard work and produced a propaganda pamphlet. The book is heavily biased and clearly anti-Polish. Its narrative is black and white: everything done by the Silesian nationalists was right; all the deeds of the Poles were wrong. Czechs and Germans, including the Nazis, were somewhere in the margin. Individuals who accepted Silesian national identity were honest, persecuted, and suffering. Those inhabitants of Silesia who decided to be Poles were renegades and traitors. Yet, it seems that the author has no problem with those Silesians who became Germans. Reading the text, it is frequently difficult to realize what facts really happened and what are Jerczyński's interpretations.

Moreover, the text is badly written, in some parts almost unreadable. The author mentions so many individuals that some fragments of this publication look like a phone book. The number of details, frequently unnecessary and irrelevant, is so huge that important matters disappear under an avalanche of minute facts and remain unanswered. Some quotations appear more than twice in the book. Angry polemics with historians disliked by Jerczyński disrupt the flow of his narrative. The author ignored completely all the important works devoted to the formation of modern nations, and there is no trace of any methodological framework in this text. *Narodowa Oficyna Śląska* (National Silesian Publishing House), an institution associated with the Movement for the Autonomy of Silesia, did a very poor job at editing this book. All the pictures are of a bad quality, and most maps, some taken from Google, are completely unreadable.

Silesians deserve respect and recognition. If they want to have a separate national identity, nobody should and can forbid them to do so. These are the rules of the civilized world. Yet, books like Jerczyński's pamphlet will not help them.

Piotr J. Wróbel, Toronto

Contributors

Věra Bořkovcová, a long time SVU member and SVU officer, passed away on Thursday, September 11, 2014, after a prolonged illness. After a teaching career of more than thirty years in the Department of Language and Foreign Studies at American University, where she taught Russian (sometimes Czech) language, linguistics, literature and drama, she retired as Associate Professor Emerita and since then devoted herself to her lifelong interests and avocations: theatre, poetry, literary translation, and SVU. Among her publications is *The Taste of a Lost Homeland*, a bilingual anthology of Czech and Slovak exile poetry written in America, which she compiled and edited for publication by SVU in 2002. Her present contribution to *Kosmas*, perhaps her final published work, reflects her continued interest in literature and translation.

Tracy 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 others. Her work in Czech has been published in *Reflex*, *Literární noviny*, *Listy*, and numerous other periodicals. Her articles in Slovak have been printed in the daily *SME*.

Zdeněk V. David has been a frequent contributor to *Kosmas* and is a leading authority on the Bohemian reformation and its philosophical influences on the Czech national renaissance. He also explores the philosophical background of Tomáš G. Masaryk's political thought, as in his contribution to this issue. He is currently senior scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC, where he was for many years the librarian. His book *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* was published in 2003, and followed in 2010 by *Realism, Tolerance and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening: Legacies of the Bohemian Reformation*.

Clinton Machann is a professor in the English Department of the College of Liberal Arts at Texas A&M University, where he teaches English literature with a special focus on nineteenth century British writers such as Matthew Arnold. He also has an abiding interest in ethnic studies and the experiences of Czech immigrants to the United States, and to Texas in particular. His publications on such themes include *Czech Voices: Stories from Texas in the Amerikán Národní Kalendář* (together with James W. Mendl), and *Czech Americans in Transition*. He was, as his contribution discusses, for many years the editor of *Kosmas*.

Susan M. Mikula is Professor of History and Acting Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at Benedictine University, with campuses in Illinois and Arizona. She has published and presented papers on various aspects of modern Slovak political history, including the work of Milan Hodža, Czech-Slovak relations in the First Republic, and, with Carol Skalník Leff, a major article on party systems in multi-ethnic states for *Slavic Review*.

Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr. is one of the founders and past President of many years of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU). He is a native of Mladá Boleslav, Czechoslovakia, who has lived in the US since 1950. In addition to enjoying a complete professional career as a biochemist, nutritionist and cancer researcher, he is an authority on immigration history from the territory of the former Czechoslovakia. He was instrumental in establishing the National Heritage Commission toward the preservation of Czech and Slovak cultural heritage in America. Among his many publications on Czech and Slovak topics are *The Czechoslovak Contribution to World Culture* (1964), *Czechoslovakia Past and Present* (1968), *Postavy naší Ameriky* (2000), *Czech American Historic Sites, Monuments and Memorials* (2004), *Czechoslovak American Archivalia* (2004), *Czech and Slovaks in America* (2005), and *On Behalf of Their Homeland: Fifty Years of SVU* (2008).

Louis J. Reith, earned degrees from Concordia Senior College, Concordia Seminary, Washington University in St. Louis, and Stanford University. After a professional career as a librarian in the humanities and rare books section of several universities, in particular at Georgetown University in Washington, DC, Reith retired to Seward, Nebraska, to help care for an aging mother, and to begin Czech language study with Prof. Mila Saskova-Pierce at the University of Nebraska in nearby Lincoln (see below). Dr. Reith is assisting the Special Collections Division at Love Library, University of Nebraska, to catalog a backlog of Czechoslovak materials, and helps History Department faculty to use Central European art, literature, music, and films in their classroom teaching and research.

Gerald J. Sabo, S.J. is Associate Professor of Slavic Languages and Literature at John Carroll University in Ohio. He is responsible for the Slavic (specifically Russian, Czech and Slovak) language area, and teaches both Russian and Slovak language courses. He also offers courses on Slavic literatures in English translation, which of course include many examples translated from Russian, Slovak or Czech literature. Professor Sabo's research focuses on the history of Slovak literature, a subject on which he is preparing a monograph, and he has a special interest in the works of Hugolín Gavlovič—an interest reflected in his contribution to this volume of *Kosmas*.

Mila Saskova-Pierce is Associate Professor of Russian at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. She holds an MA and PhD in Slavic and General Linguistics from the University of Kansas. Her research interests are in cultural history, teaching methodology, and Slavic linguistics. She has published articles on learning processes; American Czechs' cultural history; and Russian, Ukrainian, Slovak, Polish, and Czech languages in the United States. At present, she is researching the modalities of teaching foreign languages over the Internet.

Ursula Stohler is currently a post-doctoral fellow and member of the faculty of the Slavic Seminar in the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Zurich, Switzerland. She holds a PhD from the University of Exeter, England, and has also been a postdoctoral fellow of the Charles University in Prague. Her doctoral dissertation explored the reaction of Russian women writers in the first two decades of the nineteenth century to the prevailing conventions of nature, the feminine, and writing. Her research interests lie in Russian and Bohemian/Czech literature, gender studies, transcultural studies, and the digital humanities.

Mary Hrabík Šámal, *Kosmas* Book Review Editor, teaches at Oakland University in Rochester, Michigan. 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.

Jiří Weinberger is a Czech writer, poet, essayist, and also a project management consultant. He began publishing poetry with the 1995 collection *Povídá pondělí úterku*, which even though it overtly links up with Edward Lear's verse, also provoked recognition of a certain closeness to Ogden Nash. That link was made more explicit in the 2006 volume *Kdyby Ogden uměl česky / What if Ogden Could Speak Czech*, consisting of the translations of Ogden Nash into Czech, the genesis of which is the subject of the engaging essay co-written by Weinberger and the late Věra Bořkovcová (see above).

Alexander Wöll is professor at the Institut für Slawistik, Lehrstuhl für Ost- und Westslawische Philologie at the Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität Greifswald, where he has also served as Dean of the Philosophical Faculty for the last four years. A specialist in comparative Slavic literature, Professor Wöll has a number of publications and edited volumes to his credit, including his 2006 study of Jakub Deml, *Jakub Deml. Leben und Werk (1878–1961)*. His article in this issue is his first contribution to *Kosmas*.

Piotr J. Wróbel is a specialist in Polish history and Associate Professor at the University of Toronto. His current research focuses on national minorities in East Europe. He is the author or co-author of seven books and more than 75 articles about Polish, German, Byelorussian, and Jewish history published in Poland, Great Britain, and the United States. His current research focuses on the history of the Jews in Poland. Recent publications include *The Jews of Galicia under Austrian-Polish Rule, 1869–1918* (1994) and the co-edited volume, *Nation and History: Polish Historians from the Enlightenment to the Second World War* (2006).

Advice to Prospective Authors

Kosmas is an interdisciplinary journal devoted primarily to publishing scholarly research in all relevant fields on topics related to Czech, Slovak, or Central European affairs in general; memoirs or creative writing may also occasionally be published. Manuscripts submitted for review should normally be no longer than 25-30 pages, double spaced, with one-inch margins. Book reviews should be from 500-700 words, and should be formatted after the example of reviews printed here.

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 may be submitted in Microsoft Word format (.doc or .docx) or, if the author does not use Microsoft Word, in Rich Text format (.rtf). Authors should pay careful attention to diacritical marks for words not in the English language. Manuscripts should be submitted via email to the editorial address KosmasAgnew@gmail.com. Electronic submission is preferred. Contributions should be double-spaced for the entire text, including block quotations and notes. Book titles and non-English words should be formatted in *italic* font. Use notes (footnotes or endnotes) and not a “Works Cited” form for references. Transliterations of the Cyrillic alphabet should follow Library of Congress guidelines. Submissions will be edited to conform to standard academic spelling and usage in American English. For all other matters of style, the current edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* should be consulted.