

KOSMAS



N° 28.1

by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU)

KOSMAS ISSN 1056-005X

©2015 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 Hrabik Šámal (Oakland University)

Editorial Assistant: Joseph Albanese (The George Washington 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 iv

ARTICLES

Jan Patočka as a Critic of Thomas Masaryk's Philosophy, Politics, and History

By Zdeněk V. David 1

Antonín Dvořák and His Students at the National Conservatory: A Czech Composer's Contribution to an American Musical Style

By Judith Mabary 22

Separating Historical Truth from Fiction, Part One: Evaluating the Sources for Samo's Empire, the First Slavic Polity

By Matej Jančošek 36

Separating Historical Truth from Fiction, Part Two: Evaluating Samo and his Empire, the First Slavic Polity

By Matej Jančošek 51

Pavel Šramko (1743-1831): Love Expressed, Condemned, and Praised

By Gerald Sabo, S.J. 69

The Terezín Worlds of Lotka Burešová

By Anna Hájková 96

In Search of Vindication and Liberation: The Czechoslovak Republican (Agrarian) Party in Exile during the Paris Years (1948-1951)

By Mary Hrabík Šámal 102

At Home among Strangers: British-Born Wives in Czechoslovakia, (1945-1960)

By Kathleen Geaney 129

REFERENCE MATERIALS

Notable Czech-American Women in Arts and Letters

By Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr. 145

ESSAYS

The Sense of Mystery and the Learning Process in the plays of the Jára Cimrman Theatre

| | |
|--|-----|
| By Tracy A. Burns | 181 |
| BOOK REVIEWS | |
| Thomas Ort, <i>Art and Life in Modernist Prague: Karel Čapek and His Generation, 1911-1938</i>. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2013. ISBN 9780230113626, 276 pp. | |
| By Karla Huebner | 185 |
| Svěrák, Zdeněk. <i>Po strništi bos (Barefoot Across a Stubble Field)</i>. Prague: Fragment, 2013. ISBN: 978-80-253-1820-1, 92 pp. | |
| By Tracy A. Burns | 188 |
| Václava Jandečková. <i>Kámen: Svědectví hlavního aktéra akce “Falešné Hranice” u Všerub na Domažlicku (Kámen: The testimony of the main participant in the events of the “false border” at Všeruby in the Domažlice region)</i>. Domažlice: Český Les Publishers, 2013. ISBN 978-80-87316-35-1, 327 pp. | |
| By Mary Hrabík Šámal | 191 |
| <i>Letters from Readers in the Polish American Press 1902-1969: A Corner for Everybody</i>, Anna J. Jaroszynska-Kirchmann, ed. Theodor L. Zawistowski. and Anna J. Jaroszynska-Kirchmann, trans. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2014. ISBN-13: 978-0739188729. 583 pp. | |
| By Míla Šašková-Pierce | 194 |
| CONTRIBUTORS | 196 |
| Advice to Prospective Authors | 199 |

From the Editor

Hugh L. Agnew

The issue you hold in your hands is a double volume, including content both for Volume 27, No. 2 (Spring 2014) and Volume 28, No. 1 (Fall 2014). It is approximately double the size of its recent predecessors as a result, and goes part way to bringing our publication schedule more into line with the actual calendar. That process will be furthered by the appearance, hard on the heels of this double volume, of Volume 28, No. 2 (Spring 2015), which will be a special number completely dedicated to Jan Hus in honor of the six hundredth anniversary of his death at the stake at the Council of Constance in 1415, guest-edited by Associate Editor Thomas A. Fudge. We hope to continue to catch up to “time’s winged chariot” in the subsequent months, and we thank all our readers and subscribers (and contributors) for their continued patience.

Thanks are also due to the Institute for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies at the George Washington University’s Elliott School of International Affairs, and its director Professor Peter Rollberg, for the generous support that made it possible to employ an editorial assistant, Joseph Albanese, in preparing this double volume and the Hus commemorative issue.

The scope of subjects covered in this issue reflects again the wide range of interests enjoyed by our members and contributors. Zdeněk V. David turns his attention to the criticism of Tomáš G. Masaryk’s ideas about philosophy, politics, and history expressed over his intellectual lifetime by the Czech philosopher Jan Patočka. The latter’s contribution to the intellectual and philosophical life of Czechs (and Slovaks) in the last part of the twentieth century might be seen by some to rival even his illustrious subject’s impact. After learning about Anthony Philip Heinrich in the previous issue of *Kosmas*, we welcome a study of the impact of Antonín Dvořák’s tenure as director of the National Conservatory in the United States on the American students with whom he came into contact, in particular with leading African-American musical figures of the early-to-mid-twentieth century. Though the *maestro* may not have totally succeeded in creating a “national music” for the USA in the way he had imagined, his impact was definitely significant, as Judith Mabary’s article demonstrates.

The next contribution shifts gears to another era entirely: Matej Jančošek provides a two-part examination of the sources for, and what we might conclude from those sources about, the so-called Empire of Samo, often referred to as the “first Slavic (or Czech, or Slovak) state.” We welcome him as a first-time contributor and hope to hear from him again. Gerald Sabo, S.J., continues his interest in Slovak literature and literary documents with a discussion of an interesting memorial to his deceased wife by the Slovak Lutheran pastor and poet, Pavel Šramko. This to us seemingly innocuous tribute touched off something of a literary scandal, when other Lutheran writers attacked Šramko for the sentiments expressed in the work. Yet, as Professor Sabo shows, he was also not without his defenders. The discussion is accompanied by diplomatic editions of some of the texts.

Anna Hájková brings us into the twentieth century with a discussion of an engaging drawing created in the Terezín/Theresienstadt concentration camp by Lotka (Charlotte) Burešová, which gives her an opportunity to reflect on the transnational nature of the communities created in the camp and their later impact. Two other contributions concern the experience of the post-February era in Czechoslovak history. In a study thoroughly grounded on archival sources that she has either donated to, or will donate to, the Czech National Archive, Mary Hrabík Šamal discusses the activities of the Republican (Agrarian) Party in exile during the early years following the coup of February, 1948, when its base of operations was in Paris. In the second of these contributions, Kathleen Geaney provides a fascinating discussion of the life experiences of British-born women who married Czech and Slovak military men during the Second World War, and then followed their husbands to their new homeland. As one might expect, these experiences varied widely, and the window into a little known aspect of the social history of the era is fascinating.

Miloslav Rechigl continues his contributions detailing the achievements of Americans of Czech, Slovak, or Bohemian ancestry to the culture of the United States. This time his focus is on women in arts and letters (which he expands to include sports and broadcast journalism). He has produced an encyclopedia on these themes, under the title *Czech it Out: Czech American Biography Sourcebook*. And finally, Tracy A. Burns provides an essay on one of my favorite expressions of the quirky Czech sense of humor and self-deprecation, the Divadlo Jára Cimrmana. Book reviews by Karla Huebner, Tracy Burns, Mary Hrabík Šamal, and Míla Šašková-Pierce round out the contents of this volume. Suggestions for books to review, as well as offers to review books received, may be sent to Mary Hrabík Šamal, *Kosmas* Book Review editor, at her email address, maruska48@gmail.com.

ARTICLES

Jan Patočka as a Critic of Thomas Masaryk's Philosophy, Politics, and History

Zdeněk V. David

Patočka's attitude toward the teaching of Masaryk—just before and just after World War II—was mostly critical, reacting to Masaryk's views in philosophy (epistemology and metaphysics), theology, politics, and history. A lengthy hiatus of silence about Masaryk followed, when Patočka was assigned work on Jan Amos Comenius by the Communist regime. Subsequently (as noted in the latter part of this article), during the Prague Spring which culminated in 1968 and its aftermath until his death in 1977, Patočka significantly modified his views of Masaryk's political theory, historiography, and philosophy.

To begin with, Patočka tells us that his father, a secondary school teacher, treasured Masaryk's writings in his library and considered himself the President's disciple in the formation of his basic view on life.¹ Patočka himself apparently did not come into contact with Masaryk's teaching until his studies at the University of Prague. Then his view of Masaryk was strongly affected by the Professor of Philosophy, Emanuel Rádl (1873-1942). Rádl entertained a high respect for Masaryk's philosophy, yet he was ready to voice occasional dissent concerning some of Masaryk's concepts in politics, religious attitudes, and those aspects of positivism which were part of Masaryk's realism.²

Patočka never succeeded in meeting Masaryk in person. Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), his mentor during his periodic studies in Germany, tried to facilitate an encounter by giving Patočka a letter for the President in mid-1935. Masaryk, however, then eighty-five years old, was too ill to receive a visitor.³ During the fall of the same year, Patočka in turn tried to establish personal contact between Masaryk and Husserl, who had fond memories of the Czechoslovak President from their early student days in Vienna. It turned out, however, that Masaryk's illness again interfered, and his secretary Vasil Škrach was unable to arrange a visit.⁴

Early on, Patočka was engaged in research and writing on Masaryk. His first major study, "Masarykovo a Husserlovo pojetí duševní krise lidstva" (Masaryk's and Husserl's Concept of the Spiritual Crisis of Humankind) appeared in 1936, still in Masaryk's lifetime. Other studies followed in the post-World War II period, during the Prague Spring, and into the era of dissent in the 1970s. All his writings addressed Masaryk's intellectual life, with the one major exception of his study of Masaryk's public activism, titled "Masaryk v boji proti anti-Semitism" (Masaryk in the Struggle against Anti-Semitism). The work resulted from his assignment in the Ústav T. G. Masaryka (Institute of T. G. Masaryk) in Prague,

¹ Jan Patočka, "K filosofovým šedesátinám. S Janem Patočkou o filosofii a filosofech [1967]," in his *Češi I*, Sebrané spisy, 12 (Prague: Oikoymenh, 2006), 608.

² Patočka, "K filosofovým šedesátinám," 610.

³ Jan Patočka, "Vzpomínky na Husserla," [1976] *Češi I*, 637.

⁴ Patočka, "K filosofovým šedesátinám," 619-620.

where he was relegated between the Communist coup d'état of 1948 and the suppression of the Institute in 1954.⁵

Epistemology: Perception of the Real World

Patočka disagreed with Masaryk on the basic issue of learning to know the external world. Masaryk followed Plato and—in line with the Austrian philosophical tradition of Bernard Bolzano and Franz Brentano—considered sense perceptions as simply real without any additional philosophical speculation. Patočka, to the contrary, followed Edmund Husserl's phenomenology that regarded sense perceptions as mere phenomena, which needed validation through the process of subjective transcendence.⁶ Masaryk, in turn, resolutely opposed both phenomenalism and subjectivism in epistemology. Auguste Comte's phenomenalist epistemology was one of the principal reasons for Masaryk's parting ways with the French philosopher, whom he highly admired otherwise. He even more sharply condemned subjectivism in epistemology on ethical grounds, especially in German Idealist philosophy, as a root of evil in German philosophical and political tradition.

Patočka considered Masaryk's acceptance of the normally perceived world as real to be rather outdated. Masaryk's satisfaction with a view of the relationship between the subject and the object as a dualism reminded him of Descartes' old-fashioned, mild rationalism. To illustrate this dualism, he quoted from Masaryk's early work, *Sebevražda* [Suicide]:

a man is not a blind instrument of natural forces; we do not depend entirely and exclusively on the external world. Our consciousness, which confronts the external world, perceives the outside world according to its own laws... We and the external world are equally independent.⁷

The gap between Masaryk's and Patočka's views increased, when dissatisfied with the inability of Husserlian subjectivism to recognize "the hardness of reality," and "the irreducible otherness of the other," Patočka turned to Martin Heidegger to seek a non-metaphysical ontology through the asubjective or "perhaps transsubjective" phenomenology.⁸

Patočka regarded Masaryk's rejection of the subjective channel to the discovery of reality as his greatest weakness. He claimed that this attitude was

⁵ The study was not published during Patočka's lifetime; Josef Zúmr, "Patočka a Masaryk," *Filosofický časopis*, 39 (1991), 448-449.

⁶ Erazim Kohák, ed., *Jan Patočka: Philosophy and Selected Writings* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1989), 13.

⁷ Jan Patočka, "Masarykovo a Husserlovo pojetí duševní krise lidstva, 1936)," *Češi I*, 29, citing from Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem společenským moderní osvěty*, Spisy I (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2002), 183.

⁸ Kohák, ed., *Jan Patočka: Philosophy and Selected Writings*, 108; Jan Zouhar, "Jan Patočka a Masarykovo pojetí dějin," *Filosofický časopis*, 55 (2007), 460.

rooted in Masaryk's misconception (or the bogymen) of "Titanism," as a megalomania, produced by the German Idealist philosophy, which led to the intellectual crisis of modern humans. The focus on the self led to intellectual and moral isolation of the individual, who was then driven to self-destruction or to external destruction, in other words, to suicide or murder.⁹

In this connection Patočka strongly disagreed with Masaryk's assertion that the subjectivist bias had led to the deleterious influence of German philosophy (particularly of Idealism) on European and world history. This effect was epitomized in Hegel's thought, which went back to Kant and culminated in Nietzsche. Patočka strenuously objected to Masaryk's characterization of German idealism in general, and Hegel in particular, as the source of German belligerency and imperialism, and as the root of a theoretical justification of the use of physical force in international life. Patočka retorted that the Prussian state—that Hegel had lauded—was not in its early form, "the nest of mechanistic etatism and reaction which it later became."¹⁰ Patočka appealed to the post-World War II revisionist view of Hegel, mainly Eric Weil's study *Hegel et l'Etat: cinq conférences*, showing that the famous German Idealist had been disavowed by the Prussian authorities shortly after his death.¹¹

Patočka likewise objected to Masaryk's inclusion of Kant and Nietzsche within the ranks of the pernicious German thinkers. According to him, Masaryk misunderstood and misinterpreted Kant when he claimed that it was illegitimate to reflect on the noumena (the realities behind the phenomena). Even if noumena could not be known it was not impossible to think about them. There were other examples of awareness of the distinction between a phenomenon and the-thing-in-itself. For instance, Descartes maintained that the phenomenal human life had an intelligible substrate in "the immortal soul," and Franz Brentano reasoned likewise. These thinkers, however, went overboard when, like Brentano, they assumed—disregarding Kant's strictures—that by analyzing an inward given they could actually reach the substantial basis of the soul. Masaryk was also mistaken when he claimed that Kant postulated a sharp contrast between senses and reason. Patočka maintained that Kant held that a piece of knowledge (cognition) could not come purely either from senses or from reason, but from the harmony of the two (*souzněni*).¹²

As for Nietzsche, Patočka especially disputed Masaryk's assertion that Nietzsche "from an isolation of solipsism, escaped into the Darwinian view of the right of the stronger." According to Patočka, Nietzsche was never a solipsist and his metaphysics "of will to power was explicitly anti-Darwinian."¹³ Patočka

⁹ Jan Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," *Češi I*, 365; Jan Patočka, "Kolem Masarykovy filosofie nábožentví (1946)," *Češi I*, 402n416.

¹⁰ Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 358-359.

¹¹ Ibid. See also Eric Weil, *Hegel et l'Etat: cinq conférences* (Paris: Vrin, 1974), 12-13; and Eric Weil, *Hegel and the State*, trans. Mark A. Cohen (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 3.

¹² Patočka, "Kolem Masarykovy filosofie nábožentví (1946)," 404-405.

¹³ Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 360.

conceded that Nietzsche might be understood as a philosopher of German imperialism in his idea of the will-to-power, but not only of German imperialism, but of the modern assertive statehood in general. This domineering spirit grew from the power of the modern statehood in its industrial technocratic form, and it was manifest in the thought of mathematical natural science no less than in technology and in the state, which had its levers everywhere and which could mobilize every drop of energy.¹⁴

Aside from the question of subjectivism in the perception of the real world, the other major epistemological issue that Patočka criticized was Masaryk's concept of a comprehensive science that would provide an integrating umbrella for all the particular sciences. Masaryk proposed the discipline of "concrete logic" as the form of this integrating universal science. According to Patočka, Masaryk's idea of a synthesizing super-science was virtually synonymous with Comte's positive philosophy, and it was inspired by Comte's classification of sciences.¹⁵ In this connection, Patočka considered illusory Masaryk's distinction, derived from Comte, between the abstract and the concrete sciences.¹⁶ Likewise, he maintained that it was futile to search for—or to presuppose the existence of—an a priori logical system of sciences, as Masaryk, following Comte, presumed. Every science originated from its own existential or metaphysical needs and traditions. They all might seek to reach the union of a coherent single system, but that was an ideal yet to be attained. It was impossible to establish a final static classification of something that was in motion.¹⁷

Instead of Masaryk's "concrete logic," Patočka proposed metaphysics as the objective and universal foundation of all the sciences: "Metaphysics captures Being without distortion or cover: true, naked, and real. And this discovery, which is firm and definite, enables *eo ipso* a future objective grasp of the universal *in toto*, a total, universal, and objective science."¹⁸

Humanistic sciences have different metaphysical ideals than natural sciences, but both investigate reality in its objective side and then in its sensory manifestation. The metaphysical element in science is a guiding principle, not a substantive part of science. This principal ideal is a unified deduction of Being, namely "a singular ultimate architectonic scheme of nature."¹⁹

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 361-362.

¹⁵ Jan Patočka, "České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky)," [1974] in *Češi II*, Sebrané spisy, 13 (Prague: Oikoymenh, 2006), 356-57.

¹⁶ According to Comte and Masaryk abstract sciences treated laws which governed particular cases; concrete sciences were devoted to the study of the particular cases themselves. Jan Patočka, "Kolem konkrétní logiky," [1950?], *Češi II*, 13, 23.

¹⁷ Jan Patočka, "Kolem *Konkrétní logiky*. Dodatek," 395.

¹⁸ Patočka, "Kolem konkrétní logiky," 26.

¹⁹ Patočka, "Kolem *Konkrétní logiky*. Dodatek," 396.

Metaphysics: Free Will and Providence

In his critique of Masaryk's metaphysics, Patočka focused on the relationship between determinism and free will. He pointed out that Masaryk believed in man's free will, as well as in a teleological purpose, which governed both in history and in the world. Patočka approached this problem from several angles. He saw it as a sign of a deep conflict in Masaryk's view of man and of religion: a conflict between the naturalistic positivist view and man's moral responsibility, as well as one between Masaryk's scientific objectivism and his conviction that the world was personally ruled by Providence.²⁰ There was an inconsistency in Masaryk's basic positions. Providence, which governed the world and personal lives, was not compatible with the other aspect of his teaching: a positivist faith in lawful, strictly determined development. Actually, these two aspects were philosophically irreconcilable: "the finger of God" shown in events, in which there was logic (or meaning), going together with an actively responsible, free human being. In dealing with the relationship, Masaryk employed an inconsistent mixture of terms, such as Providence; purposeful meaning of events; and fateful connections revealed in accidental events.²¹ Thus Masaryk failed to reconcile the contrast between Providence and positivism. He did not establish a philosophical connection between the extremely personal providential "logic" of accidental events, and his "massive" positivistic naturalistic standpoint, in which philosophy included ethics, sociology, and politics.²²

Patočka's critics, in turn, have viewed his strictures of Masaryk's metaphysics as excessively pedantic. For instance, Erazim Kohák has claimed that he inappropriately attempts to fit Masaryk's thought into a rigid frame of strict logic and unambiguous definitions instead of understanding Masaryk's propositions as humanistic (not as scientific) statements from the viewpoint of informal logic (or *fuzzy logic*). The relation of an event to the flow of life need not be only causal, but also primarily motivational. In the latter case, there would be no conflict between determinism and freedom.²³ Actually, Masaryk himself recognized that the liberty of the individual was not compatible with social determinism when he discussed the problem within the Russian context in the case of Mikhail Bakunin.²⁴ A more probing view of Patočka's objection to the unreconciled dichotomy in Masaryk's teaching would point—instead of a concern with philosophical finesse—to the fact that Patočka did not share Masaryk's optimism that both nature and history supported the "ideal of humanity."²⁵ Inspired by the Herderian divinely-ordained goal of universal existence, Masaryk

²⁰ Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 348.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 356.

²² *Ibid.*, 357.

²³ Erazim Kohák, "Zdar a nezdar 'národní' filosofie: Patočka a Masaryk," *Filosofický časopis*, 55 (2007), 446.

²⁴ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa*, Vol. 2, Spisy 12 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1996), [1913], 23.

²⁵ Kohák, ed., *Jan Patočka: Philosophy and Selected Writings*, 40-41.

held onto the concept that the moral essence of humankind was continuous with the natural order of the cosmos. Patočka's call for transcendence, together with a sense of unavailability of God as a ground of meaning, led him—holding onto a Kantian perspective—to the perception of a fundamental discontinuity between the moral and the natural order.²⁶

More broadly, Patočka deplored Masaryk's insufficient concern with metaphysics in general. He pointed out that Masaryk attempted to explain the dichotomy in the providential and positivist positions as follows: "I have lived my metaphysics in art and especially in poetry... I have cultivated imaginativeness intentionally, but escaped unwanted fantasy with science and exactness." Patočka admitted that one can find metaphysics in poetry: "poetry contains an understanding of 'Being' (*jsoucno*), especially in man, which is outside the reach of that objective, exact, concrete realistic science." He insisted, however, that Masaryk had failed to perform the task expected from a philosopher: he failed to elaborate in a conceptual understanding the metaphysical sense of "Being" in poetry; this would have meant to elevate "the pre-theoretical grasp" of *jsoucno* to an intellectual concept.²⁷

Instead, Masaryk justified his avoidance of metaphysics by an alleged "fear of school philosophy," to which he referred as an anachronistic vestige of scholasticism. Patočka, in turn, labeled this assertion as nothing more than a superstition of the positivist era which assumed that, after the end of the second - metaphysical—stage in historical development, only positive philosophy—based on scientific objectivism—was legitimate.²⁸ Patočka, on the contrary, remained convinced that, despite what Masaryk had said, metaphysics, whether taken from the writings of philosophers or from the works of poetry, was necessary if one treated the problems of theology, of man and the world, or of finality and eternity.²⁹

There was one metaphysical concern, however, which Masaryk and Patočka had in common. Like Masaryk, Patočka was interested in Plato's concept of the soul and the related problem of immortality. Patočka, however, thought about man's experience of the soul's immortality in earthly life, rather than posthumously.³⁰ Masaryk, in his doctoral dissertation, "*Das Wesen der Seele bei Platon*" [The Being of the Soul in Plato], submitted in March 1876, instead treated Plato's idea of the soul with a focus on the soul's posthumous immortality.³¹

²⁶ Ibid., 23, 26.

²⁷ Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 357.

²⁸ Patočka, "Kolem Masarykovy filosofie nábožentví (1946)," 400-401; Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 357;

²⁹ Patočka, "Kolem Masarykovy filosofie nábožentví (1946)," 402.

³⁰ K. Sroda, "Patočka, Platón a nesmrtnost duše," *Filosofický časopis*, 39 (1991), 361.

³¹ Karel Čapek, *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem*, Spisy 20. (Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1990), 78; Otakar A. Funda, *Thomas Garrigue Masaryk: Sein philosophisches, religiöses und politisches Denken* (Bern: P. Lang, 1978), 25.

Theology: Theistic God and European "Theoria"

According to Patočka, both Masaryk and Husserl maintained that the lack of religious belief was the principal cause of the intellectual and moral crisis that afflicted the modern western man in the nineteenth and twentieth century. Masaryk identified the key symptom of the crisis in the spread of suicides, Husserl in a decline of philosophy that accompanied the decline religion.³² Masaryk advocated as a solution of the predicament the acceptance of a rational theism with beliefs in a personal God and in the immortality of human souls. Husserl expected a solution in the renewal of Europeanism (*evropanství*) as a renewal of rationality.

Masaryk's solution was unacceptable to Patočka. As mentioned earlier, he was raised by his father, the classical philologist Josef Patočka, who was a militant atheist. Thus, the son lacked a grounding in Christian theology and was not and could not be a believer.³³ He saw an inconsistency in Masaryk's view of religion that was analogous to the metaphysical problem of determinism versus free will. Masaryk upheld an optimistic outlook, which accompanied a religious man in his daily activities, on the one hand, and on the other hand, a theological view about the nature of God and the world, according to which God was elevated high above the world as an independent intellectual and absolute power.³⁴ Masaryk's objectivist concept of God, even if only as a scientific hypothesis (not as in scholasticism a metaphysical starting point) was untenable: "God cannot be a reality in the world by a causal nexus, as a first cause, which can be derived from natural processes." In fact, Patočka found especially objectionable Masaryk's account of the nature of God, presented in his conversations with Karel Čapek, as essentially derived from medieval scholasticism.³⁵ Patočka's attitude toward a religious cure of the intellectual crisis in general, and the epidemic of suicides in particular, had become even more negative by 1946. He pointed out that originally Christianity did not promise survival of individual souls after death; it only taught an eventual resurrection of the dead. Moreover, Patočka agreed with Nietzsche that Christianity, far from exuding an optimistic attitude toward life, instead placed the meaning of life outside the natural world. Hence it generated an attitude of nihilism, skepticism, and denial of a meaningful life. Specifically, it did not offer a plausible cure for suicides.³⁶

Not surprisingly, Patočka found Husserl's solution for the crisis of the modern man more palatable. According to him, Husserl—who like himself

³² Jan Patočka, "Masarykovo a Husserlovo pojetí duševní krise lidstva, 1936," *Češi I*, 25.

³³ Although in the 1950s, he showed an interest in the Unity of Brethren (J. B. Souček) and in the 1970s in the Roman Church (Josef Zvěřina); also he wrote in 1975 to Ludwig Landgrebe: "If there be a God and I believe that without God the world is unthinkable..." Kohák, ed., *Jan Patočka: Philosophy and Selected Writings*, 16-17.

³⁴ Patočka, "Masarykovo a Husserlovo pojetí duševní krise lidstva, 1936," 27.

³⁵ Patočka, "Masarykovo a Husserlovo pojetí duševní krise lidstva, 1936," 31-32. See also Čapek, *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem*, 256-263.

³⁶ Patočka, "Kolem Masarykovy filosofie náboženství (1946)," 408.

rejected a religious way out—saw the escape from the current predicament of modern humanity in the renewal of Europeanism (*evropanství*) as a restoration of rationality. He highlighted the concept of an unprejudiced “theoria,” a comprehensive teleological idea, the bearer of which were the inhabitants of Europe, and it was thanks to that idea that this carrier would become not only the master of the earth and of the world

but also the determiner and explainer of all the global ideals. Europeanism was the greatest rationalizer of all ideals; all ideals received a new illumination through Europeanism’s thought of independent and unprejudiced theory that brought clarity and consistency into all the aspects of life.³⁷

However, Patočka found even Husserl’s recipe inadequate for the cure of the modern intellectual crisis. It was not enough to derive intellectual optimism from the teleological idea of European culture. It was necessary to actively seek a realization of European ideals and to do so with an inspired dedication that emulated the example of great men like Masaryk and Husserl.³⁸

Masaryk, however, did offer a ray of hope to Patočka with his emphasis on the importance of faith. Patočka seized on this point and sought to utilize it for the support of his own position. He pointed out that faith in its confidence did not rely on theories, but represented a practical stand. In other words, it did not rest on arguments that flowed from theories, but instead it generated theories that would explain the world in its entirety. Since Masaryk constantly emphasized that faith should be critical, such criticism should aim precisely at discarding false theological rationalism and posit faith on “an energetically subjective stand” [na stanovisku energicky subjektivním]. According to Patočka, not even Husserl—who was still alive at that point—had yet reached this solution.³⁹ Thus, Patočka arrived counter-factually at a point of (mis)using Masaryk for the support of his own concept—embedded in his asubjective phenomenology—that is in support of his own idea of radical subjectivism as a key to the understanding of the real world.⁴⁰ It was an understanding of the non-metaphysical ontic reality that defined Patočka’s cherished concept of negative Platonism.⁴¹

Politics: The Nature of Democracy

Patočka, like Masaryk, thought of philosophy as having a practical purpose to serve as a guide to politics. In the language of phenomenology, politics served as a path to the essence of authentic life, in other words, to the so-called natural world.

³⁷ Patočka, “Masarykovo a Husserlovo pojetí duševní krise lidstva, 1936,” 24-25. See also Jan Zouhar, “Jan Patočka a Masarykovo pojetí dějin,” *Filosofický časopis*, 55 (2007), 463, citing from Jan Patočka, *Tři studie o Masarykovi* (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1991), 10.

³⁸ Patočka, “Masarykovo a Husserlovo pojetí duševní krise lidstva, 1936,” 33.

³⁹ This was written in 1936, when Husserl was still alive.

⁴⁰ Patočka, “Masarykovo a Husserlovo pojetí duševní krise lidstva, 1936,” 32-33.

⁴¹ Zouhar, “Jan Patočka a Masarykovo pojetí dějin,” 460.

Incidentally, one may note that, in his assertion on the practical tie of philosophy with political life and its contiguity with the natural world, Patočka differed substantially from Husserl. Husserl did not consider philosophy as such a guide—it was not to provide direction for practical life, but rather its mission was to turn man's mind to transcendental reflection.⁴²

Patočka positively assessed Masaryk's concept of politics in two main respects. First, it was his view that democracy as an embodiment of the humanitarian outlook had a deep ethical core. His humanitarianism insisted on the recognition of human finitude, and sought to establish a positive feeling among humans. Members of the community were admonished to be always conscious of the need for ethical relations with their fellow citizens. In their interactions they were to realize that each and every human being was a possible companion, giving and receiving, within a context of ethical principles that were ultimate and eternal.⁴³ Second, Patočka stressed that Masaryk's concept of democracy included a warning against the manifestations of human hubris which raised its ugly head whenever man succumbed to self-satisfaction and selfishness. In a democratic state there was to be no usurpation of higher authority by a mere man. Patočka considered this injunction especially relevant to the situation following World War II—plagued by the rise of Soviet totalitarianism.⁴⁴

Largely as an obverse of these virtues, Patočka likewise highlighted the pitfalls that Masaryk avoided in his concept of democracy. First, Masaryk did not entertain the shallow sentimentalism typical of nineteenth-century humanitarianism that in a carefree over-optimism failed to anchor its teaching in any ultimate and eternal values. Second, Masaryk rejected "classical liberalism," which atomized society and promoted a pitiless pursuit of individual interests.⁴⁵

In tracing the roots of the ethical principles which, according to Masaryk, were to govern the proper functioning of democracy, Patočka sought the answer in the characteristics of Anglophone religiosity. He located the quintessence of Masaryk's political ethics in American Puritanism, a religion that inculcated in the believer a deep sense of discipline. This attitude was grounded in a firm belief in the ontic reality of Being (*jsoucno*), and the sense of discipline was then viewed as in harmony with that reality. Patočka called upon the witness of Alexis de Tocqueville to support his assertion that in the Anglophone world this religious orientation, in fact, operated as the moral bearing force of democracy. Where Puritanism imposed inner discipline on man, it became possible to have political freedom. In that situation, members of society would not misuse this freedom to oppress each other, but instead they would seek to protect the freedom of every individual so that everyone could make use of his opportunities as everybody else could.⁴⁶

⁴² I. Šrubař, "Asubjektivní fenomenologie, přirozený svět a humanismus," *Filosofický časopis*, 39 (1991), 414-415.

⁴³ Jan Patočka, "Masaryk a naše dnešní otázky 1946," *Češi I*, 89.

⁴⁴ Patočka, "Masaryk a naše dnešní otázky 1946," 89, 91.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 87, 89-90.

⁴⁶ Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 349, 355.

In Patočka's opinion, Masaryk, in an unwarranted way, went on to graft the democratic ideal, derived from the American experience, onto the mentality of the Czech National Awakening, but he claimed that this mentality was an intellectual heritage from the Bohemian Reformation of the sixteenth century. In actuality, his concept of democracy was based on American Puritanism, not on the legacy of the Czech religious movement, in spite of what he had maintained in his studies, *Česká otázka* (*Czech Question*) and *Jan Hus* (both in 1895).⁴⁷ In the second place, Masaryk did not only assert a continuum between the democratic character of the National Awakening and the mentality of the Bohemian Reformation. Rather in a grand case of circular reasoning, he went on to link the allegedly autochthonous Czech democracy with American democracy from which, according to Patočka's assertion, Masaryk had derived (perhaps unwittingly) the historically-rooted concept of Czech democracy, in the first place.⁴⁸

For Patočka, the second and final step of historical misrepresentation was spelled out in Masaryk's characterization of the meta-historical meaning of World War I in his book *The World Revolution* (*Světová revoluce*). For Masaryk, the war was a contest between theocracy and democracy. Democracy replaced theocracy in all fields of life: politics, philosophy, science, religion. In particular, the entry of the United States into the War transformed the struggle into a contest between democracy and theocracy; the struggle became a revolution, moreover, a global one. Not surprisingly, the historically-based Czech democracy fitted perfectly with the global movement toward the final victory of democracy, which was epitomized by the United States.⁴⁹

Historiography

According to Patočka, the non-metaphysical approach, like that of Brentano, prevented Masaryk from adopting Comte's three stages of historical development: theological, metaphysical, and positive scientific. Instead he postulated two phases: 1. non-critical, authoritarian, and mythical; and 2. critical, empirical, and scientific. The basic contrast of historical development was formulated by Masaryk as theocracy (authority, myth, metaphysical philosophy) against democracy (scientific method, Protestantism, empiricism).⁵⁰ Democracy therefore was not just a political form of the state, but also the theistic metaphysics corresponding to the moral character of human reality. This metaphysics was at the same a solution of the crisis of modern man generated by the transition from the theocratic to the democratic stage, such as postulated by both Masaryk and Husserl, as was mentioned earlier.⁵¹

⁴⁷Jan Patočka, "Vzpomínka a zamyšlení o Rádlovi a Masarykovi," [1974] *Češi II*, 326; Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Česká otázka. Naše nynější krize. Jan Hus*, Spisy 6 (Prague: Masarykův ústav, 2000).

⁴⁸ Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 355.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 349, 355.

⁵⁰ Patočka, "Kolem Masarykovy filosofie náboženství (1946)," 398-99.

⁵¹ Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 349.

Patočka's reservations concerning Masaryk's interpretation of Czech history, as well as of the history of World War I, were already touched upon. In his treatment of Masaryk's historiography, Patočka went on to sum up Masaryk's dubious propositions. Masaryk asserted that the meaning of Czech history was embodied in the legacy of Jan Hus, the Unity of Brethren, and John A. Comenius. Czech history aimed at the same goal as world history, oriented toward the ideals of human freedom, equality, and brotherhood. Thus, Masaryk in fact maintained that the particular type of the democratic ideal, which Patočka had identified with Puritanism, was especially characteristic of the outlook of the Unity of Brethren. Subsequently, the Brethren's strong moralism and their non-scholastic and non-theological religious tradition could reappear without any problem in the National Awakening, as well as in the views of František Palacký and Karel Havlíček.⁵² For Masaryk, the notorious battle of the White Mountain in 1620 represented merely an outdated victory of the theocratic principle which simply helped to trigger, as a reaction, the rise of the opposite democratic principle in the Awakening.⁵³

According to Patočka, Masaryk's interpretation of World War I in his book *World Revolution (Světová revoluce)* created the false, albeit influential, impression that most of the world's issues had been confronted and resolved.⁵⁴ The spurious correlation between world democracy and Czech democracy made Czech history intellectually inseparable from world history. Thus, Masaryk's philosophy of World War I was simultaneously an unwarranted and overambitious attempt to create a Czech national philosophy and make it a part of philosophy in general, thus elevating it from its modest marginal status to universal significance. This philosophy also became relevant to a resolution of the modern man's intellectual crisis, as Masaryk had defined it previously.⁵⁵

Eventually, history proved Masaryk's interpretation of World War I to be incorrect. In less than twenty years, world democracy found itself in a great crisis. Not only states where democracy was new, but others, especially Italy, turned to dictatorship. The United States, which Masaryk regarded as a major contributor to the new global organization of humanity, rejected the League of Nations and turned its back on Europe. Masaryk himself looked askance at the Bolshevik revolution in Russia.⁵⁶ Thus World War I did not resolve the predicament of the modern world's crisis by bridging the gap between theocracy and democracy. In Masaryk's terms—which Patočka used on this occasion—sickly subjectivity jumped over into the objectivity of force application with even more horrendous results in World War II than in its global precursor.⁵⁷ Patočka concluded that Nietzsche emerged as a superior interpreter of history to Masaryk. He did not analyze just one war like Masaryk, nor did he envisage a rosy democratic future

⁵² Jan Zouhar, "Jan Patočka a Masarykovo pojetí dějin," *Filosofický časopis*, 55 (2007), 467.

⁵³ Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 349.

⁵⁴ Patočka, "Masaryk včera a dnes (1946)," *Češi I*, 92-93.

⁵⁵ Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 355-356.

⁵⁶ Patočka, "Masaryk včera a dnes (1946)," 94-95.

⁵⁷ Josef Zúmr, "Patočka a Masaryk," 452.

for mankind. He embraced a comprehensive view of modern times as a warlike era, an era of conflicts and revolutions, and—in the intellectual area—the dominance of a permanent and escalating nihilism.⁵⁸

In Patočka's eyes, Masaryk was no more successful in his attempt to develop a national Czech philosophy of history and to make it an integral part of a global historical movement. Masaryk was essentially a moralist and his moralism was philosophically incompatible with positivist objectivism. Hence he could not make a decisive step toward a national philosophy or radically revise the existing modern philosophical tradition. Thus, his attempt to integrate Czech history into universal world history had to fail.⁵⁹ In addition, the very idea of the philosophy of a national history had become an anachronism. It might have been useful during the national awakening and its aftermath, when it was supposed to strengthen Czech national consciousness and encourage the Czech intelligentsia through the historical vision of a glorious continuity. Above all, a philosophy of history postulating a permanent national character always proved to be a baseless endeavor. In actuality, a national history tended to be discontinuous. This was especially true of the Czechs, whose society during the Awakening was fundamentally different from that which had existed prior to the Battle of the White Mountain of 1620.⁶⁰

What particularly touched a raw nerve in Patočka concerning Masaryk's historiography was Masaryk's theory of the interplay between subjectivism and objectivism in history. While the President had considered intellectual, and specifically philosophical, subjectivism the root of evil in politics and in world events - as we saw - for Patočka philosophical subjectivism was the path whereby the philosopher could reach the real world and the authentic Being. Although Patočka admitted that Masaryk arrived at the nexus between subjectivism and suicide/murder independently, he also pointed out that Masaryk was aware of Dostoevsky's treatment of the same topic.⁶¹ As a concluding judgment, Patočka declared that Masaryk's interpretation of history was more sociological rather than philosophical. With his focus on the murder/suicide complex, he belonged among the sociologizing philosophers (like Anna Arendt). His analysis was based on social behavior, not on an analysis of philosophical concepts.⁶²

⁵⁸ Zúmr, "Patočka a Masaryk," 453. See also Zouhar, "Jan Patočka a Masarykovo pojetí dějin," 469; Patočka "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 351-352.

⁵⁹ Zúmr, "Patočka a Masaryk," 453.

⁶⁰ Jan Patočka, "Filosofie českých dějin," *Sociologický časopis* 5 (1969), no. 5, 462; see also Zouhar, "Jan Patočka a Masarykovo pojetí dějin," 469-470.

⁶¹ However, he found inappropriate Masaryk's criticism of Dostoevsky's seeing the impetus to suicides in causes other than a philosophical predicament; Patočka, "Kolem Masarykovy filosofie nábožentví (1946)," 395, 406-407.

⁶² Patočka, "Kolem Masarykovy filosofie nábožentví (1946)," 399-98.

The Effect of the Prague Spring

The Prague Spring of 1968 and its aftermath affected Patočka's thought significantly.⁶³ Among other modifications, it led him to somewhat soften his censorious attitude towards Masaryk's historical thought, especially concerning his perception of Czech distinctiveness in European and world history. The political liberalization enabled Patočka to resume University teaching in 1968 and leave his places of previous academic exile, where he had been relegated after the Communist Coup of February 1948, especially the Pedagogical Institute of J. A. Komenský of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (1954-1957), and an editorial position in the Philosophical Institute of the Academy (1957-1968). After failure of the Czechoslovak liberalization, he was forced to retire for the second time from University teaching in 1972. In retirement he was active for the rest of his life in clandestine lectures and seminars, and after the establishment of the dissident organization Charter 77 in 1977, he served one as of its spokesmen, together with Václav Havel.⁶⁴ As early as 1968, he had advocated a restoration of the Masaryk Institute (Masarykův ústav), closed by the Communist government in 1954, to examine the relevance of Masaryk's teaching to post-World War II conditions. Inspired by the Prague Spring, he especially called attention to the study of Masaryk's concept of the democratic character of Czech and Slovak politics that distinguished Czechoslovakia from its Central European neighbors. Among the errors and inadequacies that also should be examined, this time Patočka pointed out the Czech-Slovak relationship, as well as the broader issue of the multinational state.⁶⁵

Against his previously harsh judgments of Masaryk's philosophy of Czech history, Patočka softened his attitude in the 1970s. According to him, in criticizing Masaryk's historical interpretation, Josef Pekař and his colleagues failed to realize that Masaryk's idea of Czech history was his personal ideal which was created not for the past, but for the future. Pekař and his allies had nothing to offer for the future, all they could do was just to research the past.⁶⁶ This continued the line of thought that Patočka had developed in 1969, when he noted that—long before Masaryk—Bernard Bolzano had also suggested continuity between the modern ideals of the Enlightenment and the Bohemian religious movement of the fifteenth century that took a stand “against spiritual despotism and enforcement.”⁶⁷

⁶³ Kohák, *Jan Patočka: Philosophy and Selected Writings*, 106-107.

⁶⁴ He died in the same year. Jiří Gabriel and others, eds., *Slovník českých filozofů* (Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1998), 435-436.

⁶⁵ Jan Patočka, “O potřebě obnovit činnost Ústavu T. G. Masaryka,” 1968, *Češi II*, 251.

⁶⁶ Patočka, “Vzpomínka a zamyšlení o Rádlovi a Masarykovi,” 327; Patočka, “České myšlení v meziválečném období (Koncept přednášky),” [1974] *Češi II*, 348, 368.

⁶⁷ Bernard Bolzano, *Über das Verhältniss der beiden Volksstämme in Böhmen. Drei Vorträge im Jahre 1816 an der Hochschule zu Prag gehalten*, (Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1849). Reprint (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1969), cited by Jan Patočka, “Česká filosofie a její soudobá fáze,” (1969) *Češi I*, 310.

Patočka also now admitted that Masaryk's special philosophy of the war in *Světová revoluce* (The World Revolution) had a deep connection with his early views that he had expressed starting with his book on Suicide (*Sebevražda*) in 1881. It formulated a nexus between suicide and murder as expressions of extreme subjectivism and objectivism, which Masaryk probably derived—according to Patočka—ultimately from Dostoevsky. The Germans, as bearers of extreme subjectivism, turned to the opposite of extreme objectivism in the form of warfare and mass killing, which found expression in German militarism. Patočka noted that this formulation was a very effective propaganda for the Allied cause, but now he admitted that, in the case of Masaryk, the invective was not just an ad hoc propagandistic tool, but the result of previous deep philosophical and sociological reflections.⁶⁸

Perhaps the most remarkable shift from the mid-1940s to the mid-1970s in Patočka's views on Masaryk's political theory and historiography was on the relationship between Anglophone Puritanism and the Bohemian Reformation in the rise of the Czech tradition of democracy. As mentioned earlier, in 1946 Patočka asserted that Masaryk's idea of democracy was based on American Puritanism (not on the Bohemian Reformation). It did not represent a legacy of the Bohemian Reformation despite what Masaryk claimed in *Česká otázka* and *Jan Hus*.⁶⁹ In 1974, though, Patočka was ready to revise his views and to admit that there, in fact, had existed similarity between the ethos of Puritanism and that of the Unity of Brethren. The ideology of the Brethren, according to Patočka's altered view, was not unlike the previously cited de Tocqueville's characterization of religiosity which had given rise to free politics in the eighteenth century in North America. This outlook led the internally disciplined people to create a political system which avoided a hierarchical structure.⁷⁰ In elaborating on the linkage between Puritanism and the Brethren, Patočka pointed out that Masaryk refurbished Palacký's philosophy of the Czech nation by adding to the salient features of the Bohemian Reformation. The basis was the Taborite defense of the truth with fire and iron, and if that did not work, then the ideology of the Unity of Brethren. The result was a historical ideal that combined Puritanism and heroism as an ideal of the Czech nation.⁷¹ It is relevant to speculate that Patočka's latter-day emphasis on the kinship between American Puritanism and the teaching of the Unity of Brethren owed much to his immersion in the study of J. A. Comenius during the mid-1950s. After all, the Puritans' interest in the Brethren had led to the report, possibly apocryphal, that the presidency of Harvard College in New England's Massachusetts was offered to Comenius in the 1640s.⁷² Finally, it can

⁶⁸ Patočka, "České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky)," 352-353.

⁶⁹ Patočka, "Pokus o českou národní filosofii a jeho nezdar (1946)," 349, 355.

⁷⁰ Patočka, "České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky)," 379-380.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 351-352.

⁷² Samuel E. Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), 243-245. On the ties between the Brethren and American Puritans, see also Zdeněk V. David, *Finding the Middle Way: The Ultraquists Liberal Challenge to*

be pointed out that Masaryk himself had called attention to a relationship between the North American colonies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and modern constitutional democracy. He argued that the charters of religious liberty in the colonies served as a model for political constitutionalism.⁷³

Post-1970 Criticism

Despite the adoption of a more benign attitude toward Masaryk's teaching, during the Prague Spring Patočka maintained a markedly critical attitude, especially upon the onset of the Communist "normalization" in 1970. This critique ranged widely across Masaryk's philosophy, political theory (national state and theocracy), historiography (Nietzschean re-interpretation) and epistemology (asubjective phenomenology). Perhaps most striking was Patočka's reinterpretation of the tenor of Czech history as a reversal of Masaryk's formulations.

Philosophy

Even in the 1970s, Patočka's overall assessment of Masaryk as a philosopher remained remarkably low. He appeared skeptical about the general value of Masaryk's philosophy, asserting that the President had not introduced even a single new speculative idea or principle. Surprisingly, he called Masaryk basically a metaphysician.⁷⁴ This rather startling assertion seems to be formed within the context of Patočka's argument against Masaryk's existentialism. He decisively rejected these claims of Masaryk's existentialism by such interpreters as Milan Machovec. It is in rebutting them that Patočka presents Masaryk as a metaphysician, presumably for his adherence to ontic realism, an essentialist position which was inconsistent with the existentialist outlook.⁷⁵ Patočka also called attention to Franz Brentano's qualification of Masaryk's engagement with philosophy. According to Edmund Husserl, then Masaryk's fellow student at the University of Vienna, Brentano opined that Masaryk was mostly interested in the practical effect of philosophical doctrines and in their political consequences, but not in the doctrines themselves. This interest led Masaryk specifically to the study of Marxism and its impact on Russian politics.⁷⁶ Advancing this criticism by

Rome and Luther (Washington, D.C. and Baltimore: Woodrow Wilson Center and Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 367.

⁷³ Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa II*, Spisy 12 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1996). [1913], 324.

⁷⁴ Patočka, "České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky)," 353, 355.

⁷⁵ Patočka, "Vzpomínka a zamyšlení o Rádlovi a Masarykovi," 332. See also Milan Machovec, *Tomáš G. Masaryk* (Prague: Melantrich, 1968), 50; and Milan Machovec, *Tomáš G. Masaryk* (Prague: Riopress, 2000), 39-40.

⁷⁶ Patočka, "České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky)," 358.

Patočka seems rather surprising, since he himself believed in the use of philosophy as a background to political activity.⁷⁷

Patočka was critical of Masaryk's *Sociální otázka* (The Social Question), while giving Masaryk credit that he interpreted Marxism as a philosophy, and endorsing Masaryk's stress that socialism could not exist without democracy. At the same time, he asserted that Masaryk identified Marx's teaching with that of Engels. Subsequently, he repeated his stricture that Masaryk interpreted Marxism one-sidedly from the viewpoint of Engels, while neglecting the specificity of Marx's views.⁷⁸ In addition, Patočka exaggerated Comte's influence on Masaryk when he claimed that the President derived from Comte the idea of an unrevealed but proven religion [*náboženství nezjevené a dokázané.*] This is a puzzling assertion inasmuch as, to the contrary, Masaryk rejected, even ridiculed, Comte's religious ideas, especially the worship of Humanity as a Grand Être.⁷⁹ Very late in his own life, in a letter of December 14, 1976 to Milada Blackstadová, he made a rather uncomplimentary statement about Masaryk as a philosopher: "Masaryk did not understand Kant—even if he borrowed (unwittingly) much from him—and even much less did he understand Dostoevsky."⁸⁰

Politics: Multinational State

The failure of intellectual liberation and the democratic optimism engendered by the Prague Spring led Patočka to revert to some of his earlier criticism, perhaps even in a harsher form. Masaryk's idea of Czechoslovak statehood and his historical interpretation of the significance of World War I again became Patočka's targets. His concern with the multinational character of Czechoslovakia was apparently sharpened by the assertion of Slovak nationalism in the Prague Spring and its aftermath. Patočka agreed with Emanuel Rádl that Masaryk erred in basing the idea of the Czechoslovak state on the concept of the nation as defined by Herder and Palacký; such a concept was untenable in a multinational state which could exist only as a civic state, not a national one.⁸¹ Especially in view of the large German population, Patočka maintained that Czechoslovakia should have become an ethnically neutral civic state, instead of a national one.⁸² He conceded that perhaps Masaryk might have originally conceived of the reconstruction of central Europe as a multinational federation (as in his pamphlet *New Europe*), but circumstances did not permit such a solution.⁸³ Nevertheless, he

⁷⁷ See above in the section: Politics: the Nature of Democracy.

⁷⁸ Patočka, "O potřebě obnovit činnost Ústavu T. G. Masaryka," 249; Patočka, "České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky)," 358, 378.

⁷⁹ Patočka, "České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky)," 357.

⁸⁰ Jan Patočka, *Korespondence s komeniology*, 2 vols., *Sebrané spisy*, vol. 21. Prague: Oikoyemenh, 2011, 198.

⁸¹ Patočka, "Vzpomínka a zamyšlení o Rádlovi a Masarykovi," 328; Patočka, "České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky)," 364.

⁸² Patočka, "České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky)," 366.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 381.

used strong words to assess the establishment of Czechoslovakia originally as a national (rather than a civic) democracy. The failure to achieve an agreement among equal national components violated Masaryk's cherished principle of following "Jesus not Caesar"—the prevalence of moral over political considerations—and ultimately Czechoslovakia as a national state could be considered a "falsehood" (*lež*).⁸⁴

Even in the 1970s, Patočka continued his criticism Masaryk's view of World War I as a world revolution. He was particularly dubious about Masaryk's concept of theocracy, applied to the quasi-absolutistic regimes of the Austrian, German and Russian empires. According to him, the derivation of governing power from divine grace had lost its theological meaning and had become an empty formula by the start of the twentieth century. Unsurprisingly, he continued to strongly disagree with Masaryk's view of a relationship between philosophical subjectivism and belligerence that had characterized German participation in the War. Above all, Patočka scored Masaryk's optimism about the final victory of democracy in the world in 1918. Instead, Europe saw a rapid rise of totalitarian systems, first of all, Italian Fascism and Soviet Bolshevism.⁸⁵ Returning to his critique of Masaryk's Czechoslovakia as a national state, Patočka rather startlingly maintained that Czechoslovakia, as a civic democracy, could have withstood the challenge of Munich, and even if it succumbed, the country would have gathered moral capital for the future as a model of a multinational state.⁸⁶

Historiography: Nietzschean Interpretation

The reference to Munich, advocating military resistance to Germany in 1938, signaled Patočka's latter-day Nietzschean turn⁸⁷ that he developed with respect to Czech history in a series of letters to his German friend, Hildegard Ballauff, in the early 1970s.⁸⁸ In outlining his fresh concept of Czech historical destiny in his letters "What are the Czechs?" Patočka expressed regret that unlike the Germans, the Poles, and the Magyars, the Czechs lacked a gentry class and consequently strong, self-confident individuals. Also, Masaryk's personality begins to receive a new interpretation from Patočka, who characterizes him as such a strong, self-confident individual, but also hastens to stress his exceptionality within the Czech

⁸⁴ Patočka, "České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky)," 380, 381.

⁸⁵ Jan Patočka, "Co jsou Češi?" [-1973] *Češi II*, Sebrané spisy, 13 (Prague: Oikoymenh, 2006), 318-319.

⁸⁶ Patočka, "Co jsou Češi?" 321.

⁸⁷ Kohák, "Jan Patočka: A Philosophical Biography," 111-112.

⁸⁸ Erazim Kohák identifies Hildegard Ballauff as the widow of Patočka's German colleague and a friend; Kohák, "Jan Patočka: A Philosophical Biography," 111. Miloslava Holubová in her memoirs touching on Patočka, *Necestou cestou* (Prague: Torst, 1998) 362, 365, 368, states that Hildegard, whom she identifies as "pani B.," eventually returned to her husband after the end of her friendship with the Czech philosopher.

milieu, in which he was a striking exception, as well as isolated and without followers.⁸⁹

As Kohák points out, Patočka then in his historical interpretation shifts “from Masaryk’s ideal of nurturing human growth to Nietzschean-like assertion of greatness.”⁹⁰ The difference between small and great nations was not in size, but in vision. Czech greatness lay neither in the Bohemian Reformation nor in the humanistic philosophy of the Czech national awakening, but in the thrusts to empire building under Přemysl Otakar II (1253-1278) and Emperor Charles IV (1346-1372).⁹¹ The Bohemian Reformation, in fact, led to a wasteful scattering of national assets and thus undermined the greatness of the proper Czech political design.⁹² As for the National Awakening, it involved a rise of hitherto obscure plebian classes that retained Czech language, but lacked any aspiration to greatness. It was a community of “liberated lackeys” (*osvobozených sluhů*).⁹³

As for Masaryk himself, his own greatness—according to Patočka’s reinterpretation—was not in his humanistic philosophy, but in his aspiration to a Nietzschean like aristocratic greatness realized in his foundation of a state.⁹⁴ For his daring assertion, Patočka sought a measure of support in the interwar writings of Emanuel Radl, who had drawn parallels between Masaryk and Nietzsche. Like Nietzsche, Masaryk sought to combine modern criticism and science with immediate contact with the ultimate reality—that is “with the reality, which is not the empirical reality of the things around us, but which is somehow the ultimate, on which everything is based.”⁹⁵ Patočka extolled Masaryk’s courage in his campaign against the superstition of ritual murder, which aroused deep public hostility, causing him to abandon plans for the establishment of his own political party, and was disrupting his university lectures.⁹⁶ Finally, Masaryk appears as a veritable Nietzschean *Übermensch* in Patočka’s laudatory assessment of Masaryk as he emerged from World War I: “Masaryk was brave, decisive, after deep consideration a man acting with consistency and according to principles.” He was highly exceptional within the constrained and limiting Czech conditions.⁹⁷

⁸⁹ Patočka, “Co jsou Češi?” 259.

⁹⁰ Kohák, “Jan Patočka: A Philosophical Biography,” 111-112.

⁹¹ Patočka, “Co jsou Češi?” 269-272.

⁹² *Ibid.*, “Co jsou Češi?” 275-276.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 303. See also Kohák, “Jan Patočka: A Philosophical Biography,” 111-112.

⁹⁴ Kohák, “Jan Patočka: A Philosophical Biography,” 111-112.

⁹⁵ Patočka, “České myšlení v meziválečném údobí (Záznam přednášky),” 354-355. See also Emanuel Rádl, “Masaryk a Nietzsche,” in *T. G. Masarykovi k šedesátinám* (Prague, 1910); also Emanuel Rádl, *Úvahy vědecké a filosofické* (Prague: Grosman and Svoboda, 1914).

⁹⁶ Patočka, “Co jsou Češi?” 322. Patočka had previously described Masaryk’s action against the anti-Jewish superstition in great detail in his study of early 1950s: “Masaryk v boji proti antisemitismu,” [1950-54], *Češi II*, 33-112.

⁹⁷ Patočka draws a contrasting non-Nietzschean image of Eduard Beneš, who was “an ambitious, diligent and loquacious average individual.” Patočka, Jan, “Co jsou Češi?” 318.

Epistemology: Asubjective Phenomenology

Originally, Patočka had advocated Husserl's phenomenalist subjectivism which he had embraced in opposition to Masaryk's realist objectivism. Yet, Patočka was not ultimately satisfied with Husserl's epistemological solution. After the failure of the Prague Spring by 1970, Patočka intensified his critique of the subjectivism of Husserl's phenomenology and expected to supersede Husserl by an asubjective and dialectical phenomenology.⁹⁸ According to Patočka, Husserl could not free himself from the grasp of the phenomena as something immanent even in transcendence. Hence the identity of what is manifested in the phenomena remained hidden.⁹⁹ In this dilemma, Patočka turned to Martin Heidegger for help, according to whom the phenomenon was not constituted subjectively, but the subjective self could discover its potential through an exploration of the phenomena.¹⁰⁰ Hence Patočka wished to determine the phenomenological field which provided the setting for the manifestation of Being that emanated from the subjective self. He wished to make transparent the process of the manifestation of Being (synonymous with the natural world), whereby it becomes a phenomenon.¹⁰¹ The uncovering of "Being" in its hiddenness led to dissatisfaction with the sense data. This dissatisfaction, in turn, led to the desire for "the not-given," "the idea." The idea is neither the Being, nor is it a Being of a higher order, it is a kind of "Non-Being," it is a negative—a challenge to go beyond the positively given, the challenge of freedom (hence Negative Platonism).¹⁰²

In the end, it is fair to say that Patočka failed to deliver a monistic epistemology. According to Balázs Mezei, he offers a version of weak dualism between subject and object that he had criticized in Masaryk. His philosophy maintains—explicitly or implicitly—a connection with the subjective basis.¹⁰³ Moreover, the Heidegger-inspired a subjective phenomenology, according to Patočka, led to the discovery (through the interplay of the subject and the phenomena) of an ontic reality which, however, lacked a metaphysical content. As noted, Patočka called this process of discovery a negative Platonism.¹⁰⁴ For Masaryk, it would be another futile, even risky, effort to explore the Kantian noumenal realm—as previously exemplified by German philosophical Idealism. One may be tempted to agree with Masaryk that the search for a noumenal reality beyond the phenomena was likely to produce bizarre results. His turn to Heidegger in epistemology, like his turn to Nietzsche in historiography, thus tended to further distance Patočka from Masaryk during the oppressive darkness

⁹⁸ Kohák, "Jan Patočka: A Philosophical Biography," 106-108.

⁹⁹ Šrubař, "Asubjektivní fenomenologie, přirozený svět a humanismus," 407.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 407-408.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 409.

¹⁰² Zouhar, "Jan Patočka a Masarykovo pojetí dějin," 460.

¹⁰³ Balázs Mezei, "Patočkovovo místo v klasické fenomenologii," in Ivan Chvatík, ed., *Mýšlení Jana Patočky očima dnešní fenomenologie* (Prague: Filosofia and Oikoymenh, 2009), 61.

¹⁰⁴ Zouhar, "Jan Patočka a Masarykovo pojetí dějin," 460.

of the Communist Normalization ironically preceding the liberating sunshine of the Velvet Revolution.

Patočka and Masaryk

Despite Patočka's at times sharp criticism of Masaryk's philosophy, in the final analysis what bound them together was stronger than what separated them. Although some have suggested the dominant impact of Jean-Paul Sartre, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, or Emmanuel Lévinas, it was Masaryk with his legacy of metaphysical realism that particularly influenced Patočka. This was within the context of the Austrian philosophy, which was characterized by a strong anti-idealistic Aristotelianism reflected in the works of Bolzano and Brentano. Patočka had thorough knowledge of the philosophical work of Thomas Masaryk, and he was fully aware of the intellectual connections among Brentano, Masaryk, and Husserl within the framework of the Austrian philosophy.¹⁰⁵ In addition, Erazim Kohák points out that the stress on the influence of Husserl on Patočka tended to obscure the strength of Masaryk's role. This happened despite the fact that Husserl himself recognized, particularly toward the end of his life, that both men were joined together by the philosophical lore which they had imbibed during their common studies in the University of Vienna. The inadequacies in the exploration of the "shared tradition of Czech-Austrian Enlightenment humanism" were in large part accountable for obscuring the fabric of philosophical connections in East Central Europe.¹⁰⁶

That is, however, not to say that there were not significant differences which were rather paradoxically rooted in a schism in the very same Austrian philosophical tradition, and which accounted for much of Patočka's subsequent criticism. This divergence derived from Husserl's phenomenalist departure from the strict realist attitude of Bolzano and Brentano. Masaryk followed the realistic empiricism of Brentano and Bolzano, while Patočka remained a follower of Husserl's phenomenism. Moreover, the subjective approach, which for Patočka, as well as Husserl, was key to finding the ontological truth embedded in the phenomena, for Masaryk, to the contrary, epistemological subjectivism was a pernicious route, leading its practitioners to a vacillation between despair and belligerency, which Masaryk exemplified in the consequences of German metaphysical Idealism from Kant through Hegel to Nietzsche and Karl Hartmann, culminating in World War I. The epistemological schism tended to obscure what was common to both Masaryk and Patočka. The schism was, in fact, deepened by the fact that Patočka endorsed Husserl's rejection of the rational theism that both Brentano and Masaryk had embraced.¹⁰⁷

Patočka's severe critique of Masaryk's philosophy of history and its theologically based optimism was largely based on the contemporary situation of international relations. It was especially after the collapse of the Prague Spring

¹⁰⁵ Mezei, "Patočkovovo místo v klasické fenomenologii," 51, 60-61.

¹⁰⁶ Kohák, "Jan Patočka: A Philosophical Biography," 10, also 10n9.

¹⁰⁷ Mezei, "Patočkovovo místo v klasické fenomenologii," 51, 60-61.

that this critique reached a crescendo, when all democratic and optimistic perspectives seemed to collapse. Moreover, retrospectively it was then applied to the collapse of the Versailles system that was the basis of Masaryk's optimism concerning the final victory of democracy. This seemed to be diametrically contradicted by the temporary rise of German National Socialism and the apparently persistent existence of Russian Bolshevism. The bitterness of disappointment largely accounted for the Nietzschean turn in Patočka's philosophy of history. Only the arrival of the Velvet Revolution a dozen years after Patočka's death opened new perspectives for the realization of Masaryk's bright vision of a global victory of democracy, and enabled Václav Havel to resume Masaryk's political legacy.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ Jaroslav Opat, *Slovanský přehled*, 3/1990, cited by Zumr, "Patočka a Masaryk," 454.

Antonín Dvořák and His Students at the National Conservatory: A Czech Composer's Contribution to an American Musical Style

Judith Mabary

Explaining the cultural contributions of late Romantic composer Antonín Dvořák (1841-1904) must consider a variety of influences extracted from German, Czech, and American musical traditions. Defining both the man and his music extends this consideration even further. He was not only one of the most significant Bohemian national artists, but “a simple Czech musician” by his own admission,¹ as well as a devoted family man, deeply religious in his convictions, severely agoraphobic in his later years, reticent in discussing his music, and a teacher of composition, although in the opinion of some of his students, not always the most informative in his instructions.² Nevertheless, in 1892 Antonín Dvořák was selected for the responsibility of training American composers to create a truly distinctive American style, one that he came to believe should have its foundation in the rich musical tradition of the African American.

By the beginning of the 1890s, American classical music was still heavily indebted to the European model. Efforts from American composers to create a musical style that could be unmistakably associated with the New World were limited to a few isolated examples where indigenous musical material was still couched within a European framework. This fact of American culture led Mrs. Jeannette Meyer Thurber in 1885 to establish the National Conservatory of Music in New York City as a venue where aspiring composers could be trained on American soil with the goal of creating a distinctive national style. As a young woman, Jeannette Meyer (1850-1946) had been sent by her parents to study at the Paris Conservatory. After completing her education and returning to New York, she married, at age nineteen, millionaire Frances Beatty Thurber, a highly successful grocery wholesaler. With her passion for arts education and the financial status to make her dream of an institution reminiscent of her own experience a reality, she founded the National Conservatory, with help from her husband, who was also a lover of music, and several powerful investors, notably Andrew Carnegie, William Vanderbilt, and August Belmont. Located at 126-128

¹Letter from Antonín Dvořák to Bohumil Fidler (January 9, 1886), in *Antonín Dvořák: Korrespondence a Dokumenty 1885-1889*, vol. 2, ed. Milan Kuna (Prague: Editio Supraphon, 1988), 123. Dvořák referred to himself in this manner in a letter dated January 9, 1886 to choirmaster and fellow composer Bohumil Fidler in Přeborn.

² Harry Rowe Shelley, “Dvořák as I Knew Him,” *The Etude*, 31/8 (August 1913), 542. Shelley relates his own experience as a composition student of the master during the latter's sojourn in the United States: “A favorite expression was, ‘No bad notes. Beethoven never had any bad notes,’ he would say, meaning useless doublings, foolish extravagances, repetitions and the like. For his decisions he would give no reasons. ‘I do not know,’ was the answer when asked why he had said ‘yes.’ ‘But it is so,’ he would add, and so it was for all time.”

East Seventeenth Street in two converted adjoining houses,³ Thurber's brainchild was to provide the means and venue to foster a spirit of American music. The Conservatory existed first as part of a cultural network, as well as a feeder organization, with the newly-formed American Opera Company, founded by Thurber to provide, as soon as possible, opportunities for native singers entirely to the exclusion of foreign talent and for American audiences at reasonable prices, with all productions to be delivered in the English vernacular.⁴ The two organizations were part of a much larger plan in which they would act as truly national cultural entities with branches in major cities throughout the United States.⁵ In the first meeting of the stockholders of the American Opera Company held at the National Conservatory of Music on February 25, 1886, a statement prepared by Thurber was read in which she proclaimed that the time had come for America to free herself from absolute dependence on foreign talent.⁶ In a later address, she pondered further that it was a wonder "that a nation noted for its liberality in educational matters should have been so long without a musical university and a national opera."⁷

The National Conservatory's first semester (Fall 1885) forecast its future success with eighty-four students enrolled.⁸ After the opera's first season, the Conservatory directed efforts to becoming a more comprehensive educational institution, finally breaking ties with the opera company, which would quickly meet its demise from overly ambitious productions coupled with poor financial management. Again inspired by her own experience at the Paris Conservatory, Thurber wanted to offer a musical education to talented students from across the country, regardless of their sex, race, financial situation, or other factors that had prevented large segments of the population from access to conservatory training in the past. Thus women and minorities, along with students with physical disabilities, were welcome. Although general tuition was not free, amounting to \$100 per semester,⁹ full scholarships were available for the most talented and needy students. Recipients signed a contract to contribute to the Conservatory one quarter of any income over \$1,000 per year for five years that they earned

³ Emanuel Rubin, "Jeannette Meyers [sic] Thurber and the National Conservatory of Music," *American Music* 8/3 (Autumn 1990), 295.

⁴ Emanuel Rubin, "Jeannette Meyer Thurber (1850-1946): Music for a Democracy," in *Cultivating Music in America: Women Patrons and Activists since 1860*, ed. by Ralph P. Locke and Cyrilla Barr (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 139. See also: "The American Opera: What Mrs. Thurber Says about the Season's Plans," *The New York Times* (August 8, 1886), 3.

⁵ For additional information on the American Opera Company, see Rubin, "Jeannette Meyer Thurber (1850-1946): Music for a Democracy," 139-47.

⁶ "American Opera Organized: The Plans and Promises of the New Company," *The New York Times* (February 26, 1886), 4.

⁷ "The American Opera: What Mrs. Thurber Says about the Season's Plans," 3.

⁸ Emanuel Rubin, "Jeannette Meyer Thurber (1850-1946): Music for a Democracy," 147.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 149.

professionally after graduating.¹⁰ Students were often unable to pay back these loans, however, prevented from doing so by their own low salaries as minorities or their failure to pursue income-producing careers at all, as was often the case for women, who elected marriage instead.

Despite the noble cause for which the Conservatory stood, funding and proper staffing was an ever-present concern. The Thurbers spent much of their own money to finance the enterprise, and although with increased success came additional donor support, Mrs. Thurber knew that the key to the future of the Conservatory lay with the faculty who taught there. She expended great effort in identifying and attracting teachers with enviable reputations in their respective fields, a body of professionals extended considerably in later years, with such notables as James G. Huneker (piano) and Victor Herbert (cello) joining the faculty in 1889, and Horatio Parker (organ) in 1892. While faculty positions were or would be admirably staffed, a director was lacking due to the recent break from the failing opera division, when the existing director, Belgian baritone Jacques Bouhy, returned to his career in Paris in 1889.

By 1891, Antonín Dvořák had achieved an enviable reputation as a composer and teacher in his homeland of Bohemia and, through the efforts of Johannes Brahms, who had become a significant supporter of his music, his popularity had been extended to Western Europe. In late spring of that year Dvořák received a cable from New York with an offer of \$15,000 annually for two years to act as director of the National Conservatory. He declined. Thurber continued to draw upon the tenacity that had made the Conservatory a success and pursued Dvořák with numerous communications. After some negotiation, Dvořák conceded to her terms, serving as director from 1892 until 1895. Thurber clearly wanted the Czech master as a figurehead, one who was already a recognized authority on creating a national music. His duties were comparatively light—a few public appearances conducting concerts and teaching composition. Only the most talented students were accepted into his advanced class, a concession to Dvořák's demand. According to the goals of the Conservatory, students were not to be disqualified on the basis of gender or race and, therefore, included Caucasian women and African-American men. Dvořák also inspired and was inspired by other young Americans with whom he came into contact at the Conservatory, notably Harry Thacker Burleigh (1866-1949), the African-American baritone who became Dvořák's copyist and who sang spirituals for him on demand. Burleigh was also responsible for introducing African-American composer and violinist Will Marion Cook (1869-1944) to Dvořák in the summer of 1893; Cook joined Dvořák's composition class in September.¹¹

¹⁰ The National Conservatory of Music of America Agreement by Student, a facsimile of which is provided in Merton Robert Aborn, *The Influence on American Musical Culture of Dvořák's Sojourn in America* (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, June 1965), 246.

¹¹ For additional information on the meeting, see Maurice Peress, *Dvořák to Duke Ellington: A Conductor Explores America's Music and Its African-American Roots* ([New York]: Hold That Tyger, Inc., 2004; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 31-32.

When Dvořák had fulfilled his two-year contract, Thurber was unable to offer a renewal to equal the original agreement. Although reluctant to accept another term at a reduced salary, preferring to stay at home in Prague and his beloved retreat at Vysoka, he finally relented, and agreed to serve for another year as the Conservatory's director. Despite many difficulties, it was during this period, from 1892-1895 with Dvořák at the helm that the Conservatory began to establish a reputation for an American brand of music.

The strong opinions Dvořák held regarding the creation of a uniquely American musical voice, one of Thurber's mandates, is well documented. On May 28, 1893, in a letter to the editor of the *New York Herald*, Dvořák echoed Thurber's original goal that

the new American school of music must strike its roots deeply into its own soil. There is no longer any reason why young Americans who have talent should go to Europe for their education. It is a waste of money and puts off the coming day when the Western world will be in music, as in many other things, independent of other lands... A fresh proof of the breadth of purpose involved in this Conservatory is the fact that it has been opened without limit or reservation to the Negro race.¹²

Earlier in the letter, Dvořák made the controversial proclamation that he found a solid foundation for a new national school of music in African-American melodies. He continued with an assessment of American students and a logical argument for the Conservatory's existence: "I find good talent here, and I am convinced that when the youth of the country realizes that it is better now to stay at home than to go abroad, we shall discover genius, for many who have talent but cannot undertake a foreign residence will be encouraged to pursue their studies here. It is to the poor that I turn for musical greatness. The poor work hard; they study seriously."¹³ Dvořák was, as he admits later in the letter, drawing upon his own experience as the son of poor parents; he had fought his own battles against great odds [not the least of which was national prejudice] to achieve his present reputation.¹⁴ With this personal awareness, it is hard to imagine that Dvořák would not have felt a genuine kinship with many of his talented, yet socially outcast pupils.

While male Caucasian students were in the majority in his composition classes, these courses were also a proving ground for women and African-Americans. His first female pupil was Laura Sedgwick Collins (c.1859-1927). Dvořák is said to have been impressed with her abilities, praising her work as "real American music—creative, not imitative."¹⁵ Collins divided her training and her subsequent career between music and the theatre, working as composer,

¹²"Antonín Dvořák on Negro Melodies," *New York Herald* (May 28, 1893), 31.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Musicians from Bohemia were regarded by the artistic elite in Western Europe as provincial, capable of being good performers and writing attractive tunes, but of little else.

¹⁵Stella Reid Crothers, "Women Composers of America-45: Genius of Laura S. Collins Revealed in Many Varied Forms of Music," *Musical America* 11/22 (April 10, 1910), 19.

actress, and singer. Following the trend of most women artists of the earlier nineteenth century, she devoted her compositional efforts primarily to song, writing not only the music but many of the texts as well. She was notably active in political causes and wrote numerous patriotic songs for such organizations as the Daughters of the American Revolution in New York State. Her most significant contributions to the future of American music came not only from her own compositional and philanthropic efforts, however, but in her role as the only female charter member of the Manuscript Society of New York, formed in 1889 with the mission to “advance the interests of American musical compositions.”¹⁶

Another of Dvořák’s female students was Clara Anna Korn (1866-1940). By the time she entered the Conservatory on a scholarship in 1891, just before Dvořák arrived, she had already enjoyed a brief career as a concert pianist. She was compelled to focus on composition, however, when none other than Russian composer Petr Ilyich Tchaikovsky, on seeing some of her work, urged her to continue composing. From 1893-1898, she was herself a member of the Conservatory’s faculty, teaching classes in music theory. Her compositional output was wide-ranging, extending from opera and chamber music to piano works and songs. She was a passionate advocate for women composers, encouraging them not to confine their efforts to music for the domestic or social sphere, as had been the assigned lot for female artists in the past, but to write for larger ensembles.¹⁷ Although these women had reasonably successful careers and worked diligently to improve conditions for women artists and for American music in general, their impact on future generations of American composers when compared to that of their male colleagues was more as enablers than as models.

The goal of the National Conservatory was to provide a musical education not only for women but for other underrepresented groups. The organization was particularly successful in offering enrollment to African-American pupils, who represented approximately one quarter of the total student body at the turn of the century.¹⁸ Of the greatest importance as Black nationalist artists were Harry Thacker Burleigh (1866-1949) and Will Marion Cook (1869-1944).

Based on a communication from Burleigh, Cook met Dvořák for the first time in 1893 at the World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago.¹⁹ Dvořák was there to conduct for the fair’s Bohemia Day and Will Marion Cook was on hand for his

¹⁶ Florence Edith Clinton Sutro, *Women in Music and Law* (New York: Author’s Publishing Co., 1895), 9. Within twelve years of its founding, membership in the society had reached 967 musicians and lovers of music. For additional information on this society, see Sumner Salter, “Early Encouragements to American Composers,” *The Musical Quarterly* 18/1 (January 1932), 76-105.

¹⁷ Most of the information on Clara Anna Korn was derived from Pamela Fox, “Clara Anna Korn,” in *The Norton/Grove Dictionary of Women Composers*, ed. by Julie Anne Sadie and Rhian Samuel (New York: W.W. Norton, 1994), 253.

¹⁸ Peress places the number at 150 of six-hundred plus students. Maurice Peress, *Dvořák to Duke Ellington*, 22.

¹⁹ The event was so-named to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the arrival of Christopher Columbus in America.

music that would be performed on what was billed as Colored People's Day—Burleigh was to sing selections from Cook's opera *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Cook had already enjoyed an enviable musical training before beginning his study with Dvořák, having attended Oberlin Conservatory to study violin and journeyed to Germany to work with the renowned violinist Joseph Joachim, who had also collaborated with and was a good friend to Brahms. According to Cook, he did not enjoy an amiable relationship with Dvořák, "I was barred [for a while] from the classes at the National Conservatory of Music because I wouldn't play my fiddle in the orchestra under Dvořák. I couldn't play; my fingers had grown too stiff. Dvořák didn't like me anyway; Harry Burleigh was his pet."²⁰ Except for this evaluation late in his life, Cook was strangely silent about his interaction with Dvořák. In fact, his complaint quoted here probably has little to do with Dvořák and everything to do with being branded as a superior violinist (for a Black man).²¹ Dvořák had, in fact, reserved his greatest praise for a white student, Maurice Arnold Strothotte, who will be discussed later.

Despite Cook's perception that his teacher was playing favorites, he certainly would have been in agreement with the master's attitude toward African-American tunes and the importance he believed the tradition held in creating an American musical style. After leaving the Conservatory, Cook turned his compositional efforts not to a Western classical tradition informed by indigenous music, however, as Dvořák would have naturally advocated, but to more popular genres, notably two of the most important early Black-cast Broadway musicals—*Clorindy, or The Origin of the Cakewalk* (1898), the first musical with an all-black cast, and *In Dahomey* (1903), the first full-length black musical comedy to play in a major Broadway theatre.²²

It should be noted that it was always Cook's ambition to bring the music and musicians of Black America into public awareness and appreciation, without resorting to imitating the music of whites, ambitions not entirely in opposition to Dvořák's hope for America's music. Cook was successful in increasing the credibility of Black music for the stage, steering it away from the imagery and exaggeration found in the minstrel show, toward a more sophisticated style. Yet he still retained some of the musical elements, such as syncopation and expressions betraying a vernacular dialect that would have signaled the Black tradition to a white audience. Selected song titles from *Clorindy* will serve to

²⁰ Will Marion Cook, "Clorindy, the Origin of the Cakewalk: How the First All-Negro Show Landed on Broadway in 1898," *Theatre Arts* 31 (September 1947), 61.

²¹ Duke Ellington tells the story in his autobiography that on reading a review of a concert he had performed in Carnegie Hall, in which the reviewer had lauded him as the world's greatest Negro violinist, Cook went to see the reviewer. He smashed his violin across the reviewer's desk, proclaiming "I am not the world's greatest Negro violinist. I am the greatest violinist in the world!" Duke Ellington, *Music Is My Mistress* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1973; repr. Da Capo Press, 1976), 97.

²² *Clorindy* premiered on the Casino Theatre's roof garden, located at 39th and Broadway in New York; *In Dahomey* opened at the city's Olympia Theatre located at Broadway and 44th Street.

make the point, titles such as “Darktown is out tonight” and ”Who dat say chicken in dis crowd,” both of which became popular as independent songs. In his obituary as it appeared in the *Chicago Defender* in 1944, Cook was lauded as epoch-making for his contributions to popularizing African-American music.²³ His death was described as the end of a “brilliant era of Negro show life;” his life as a “phenomenon to many because he turned his extremely fine classical musical education to the development of the Negro idiom.”²⁴

Cook’s career extended beyond composing, to working in performance settings with ensembles that promoted African-American music and musicians, both at home and abroad. He served as chorus master and assistant conductor for New York’s Clef Club orchestra, an organization of African-American musicians founded by James Reese Europe in 1910 as the first all-African-American orchestra. Cook’s New York Syncopated Orchestra, founded in 1918, was also made up entirely of black musicians, all formally attired, playing and singing a variety of music from light classics to spirituals to ragtime, much of which was written or arranged by Cook himself.

Cook’s dedication extended to those around him as well. His wife Abbie Mitchell is quoted in Cook’s obituary as confirming that “he was always ready to help anyone with talent whether he was Negro or white. His whole heart and soul and being were dedicated to making the Negro realize his possessions.”²⁵ It is also worth noting that the great swing pianist and bandmaster Duke Ellington studied composition with Will Marion Cook and would remember him fondly in his autobiography.

Although Cook exhibited unmistakable jealousy in describing Burleigh as Dvořák’s pet, the two worked together in later years. There was, however, a special relationship that developed between Burleigh and Dvořák, cultivated by Dvořák’s attraction to good melodies wherever they occurred. In his book *Dvořák in America* author Joseph Horowitz relates details of the first meeting between Dvořák and Burleigh in a fanciful version of a dialogue between the two, which is probably not far removed from the facts themselves:

One day Dvořák received a note informing him of a first-year student at the National Conservatory, an African-American from Pennsylvania. He was not a candidate for Dvořák’s composition class—his technical knowledge of music was still weak. But it had been arranged that Dvořák would hear him sing. The day arrived and with it, in Dvořák’s office, a young man with a mustache. He met Dvořák’s gaze with frankness and respect. ‘Are you Mr. Harry Burleigh?’ ‘Yes, Doctor, I am he.’ ‘And what do you plan to sing for me this morning?’ ‘I plan to sing “Go Down, Moses.”’ [Whereupon he sat at the master’s] piano and proceeded to sing it. His voice was a firm and resonant baritone. He enunciated every word distinctly, with meaning and force. . . . [When he had finished, Dvořák, with tears in his eyes, asked him] ‘How do you know this, Mr. Burleigh?’ ‘From my grandfather.’ . . . [And] how were you able to

²³ Ramona Lowe, “Death of Will Marion Cook Seen End of Brilliant Era of Negro Show Life,” *The Chicago Defender* (July 29, 1944), 2.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*

afford to come to New York, to study music here at the Conservatory?... 'Friends and neighbors helped out with the train fare. And Mrs. Thurber gave me a scholarship.' 'Could you use some pocket money?'... [Burleigh affirmed he could.] 'Can you copy music?'... 'I could learn.' 'Mr. Burleigh, would you like to be my assistant? I need a copyist, a musical secretary. But I would insist on one condition.... That you would have to sing for me—on request.'²⁶

The deal was settled—Dvořák had his secretary and a direct conduit to authentic African-American spirituals, and Burleigh had his pocket money.

Burleigh's effect on Dvořák is confirmed by the composer's own words from 1895, when he again advocated the use of African-American melodies as the inspiration for a truly national music. "I was led to take this view partly by the fact that the so-called plantation songs are indeed the most striking and appealing melodies that have yet been found on this side of the water.... The most potent as well as the most beautiful among them, according to my estimation, are certain of the so-called plantation melodies and slave songs."²⁷ Burleigh stated himself that although he was not Dvořák's student, he was with him almost constantly and that he loved to hear him sing the old melodies.²⁸

Among Burleigh's most notable specific influences on Dvořák is the presence of a portion of a spiritual in the New World Symphony, a spiritual that the musical secretary had sung to his employer. Burleigh recalled in 1918:

There is a tendency in these days to ignore the negro elements in the "New World" Symphony, shown by the fact that many of those who were able in 1893 to find traces of Negro musical color all through the Symphony, though the workmanship and treatment of the themes was and is Bohemian, now cannot find anything in the whole four movements that suggest any local or Negro influence, though there is no doubt at all that Dr. Dvořák was deeply impressed by the old Negro Spirituals and also by the [Stephen] Foster songs. It was my privilege to sing repeatedly some of the old Plantation songs for him at his home in E. 17th St., and one in particular, "Swing Low, Sweet Chariot," greatly pleased him, and part of this old Spiritual will be found in the second theme of the first movement of the Symphony.²⁹

The musical resemblance of the opening phrase of the spiritual, minus its first few notes, when compared with the theme to which Burleigh refers, leaves little doubt that Dvořák had the song in mind.

Burleigh knew the old tunes from his grandfather, a former slave who had gained his freedom even before the beginning of the Civil War. As young boys, Burleigh and his brother Reginald used to accompany their maternal grandfather,

²⁶ Joseph Horowitz, *Dvořák in America: In Search of the New World* (Chicago: Cricket Books, 2003), 48-52.

²⁷ Antonín Dvořák, "Music in America," *Harper's* (February 1895), 432.

²⁸ Harry T. Burleigh, "The Negro and His Song," in *Music on the Air*, ed. Hazel Gertrude Kinsella (New York: The Viking Press, 1934), 186-89.

²⁹ Harry Burleigh, Philadelphia Orchestra Program Book (February 1911) as quoted in Michael B. Beckerman, *New Worlds of Dvořák: Searching in America for the Composer's Inner Life* (New York: Norton, 2003), 127-28.

Hamilton Waters, as he walked through Erie, Pennsylvania lighting the lamps at night. Nearly blind, the old gentleman needed his grandsons' eyes and nimbleness to complete his job. As they walked, Waters sang spirituals he remembered from his own youth as a slave, and the boys soon learned to sing them as well. Yet the voice with which Burleigh sang for Dvořák several years later may not have been what would be expected if this were his only musical background. Burleigh had received classical training in voice before coming to the Conservatory and his method of singing likely reflected this study. Nevertheless, the power of the spirituals was still evident, greatly impressing Dvořák as the voice of a noble people.

Burleigh had a greater impact on the acceptance by early twentieth-century patrons and concertgoers of the African-American tradition of the spiritual than any other student with whom Dvořák had contact. By the late 1890s he was beginning to be known for his arrangements of these traditional tunes as art songs and for his composition of new works as well. His arrangements also played a vital role in making the Negro spiritual popular for concert performance among white performers, such as the famous Irish tenor John McCormack, as well as African-American performers, such as Marian Anderson, who sang with the Metropolitan Opera, and Paul Robeson, best known today for his rendition of "Ol' Man River" in the Broadway musical *Showboat*.

Burleigh's commitment to the place of the spiritual in African-American identity never slackened, as shown in his letter to the general public that appeared in *The Chicago Defender* on November 18, 1922, as a plea against "debasement in jazz" of this musical treasure. "These melodies are our prized possession. They were created for a definite purpose and are designed to demonstrate and perpetuate the deepest aesthetic endowment of the Race. They are the only legacy of slavery days that we can be proud of—our one priceless contribution to the vast musical product of the United States."³⁰ When Burleigh died in September 1949, Roscoe Simmons, writing for the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, described him as among the most renowned singers and musicians in the United States, "whose genius broke down the color line."³¹

Listed by several scholars as another of Dvořák's African-American students was Maurice Arnold Strothotte (1865-1937), who eventually shortened his name to Maurice Arnold. An examination of birth and death records, however, found his race listed as white, with both parents—Arnold Strothotte and Anna Graiser—born in Germany.³² Arnold had traveled extensively and studied in both the United States and Europe before coming to the Conservatory, where he was enrolled in

³⁰ "Harry Burleigh Bemoans Misuse of Folk Songs," *The Chicago Defender* (November 18, 1922), 8.

³¹ Roscoe Simmons, "The Untold Story," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (October 23, 1949), 56.

³² "New York, New York City Municipal Deaths, 1795-1949," index, *FamilySearch* (<https://familysearch.org/ark:/61903/1:1:2WGF-X8H> : accessed 29 May 2015), Arnold Strothotte in entry for Maurice Arnold Strothotte, 23 Oct 1937; citing Death, Bronx, New York, New York, United States, New York Municipal Archives, New York; FHL microfilm.

Dvořák's advanced composition class and also taught harmony. He was, in fact, incorporating African-American influences into his own music several years before beginning study at the Conservatory.³³ His most well-known work was the *American Plantation Dances* for orchestra from 1893, which he conducted on the New York Herald Free Clothing Fund concert held January 23 of the following year, on which many of the Conservatory's African-American students performed. As was the case for Dvořák's student Clara Korn, Arnold also served on the Conservatory's faculty. In fact, many of the Conservatory's students were listed as faculty at some point in their professional lives, their employment likely a stipulation of their student agreement.³⁴

Dvořák believed that of his students, Arnold had the greatest potential. "I take only those far advanced in composition. . . . The most promising and gifted of these pupils is a young Westerner, Strathotte [sic] by name, a native of St. Louis. A suite of 'Creole Dances' written by him, and which contain material that he has treated in a style that accords with my ideas, will be given in New York during the winter."³⁵ Discussion of Arnold's work when it was performed as part of the Clothing Fund concert supports Dvořák's statement, "These dances were written upon the lines laid down by Dr. Dvořák as being essential for the foundation of a national school of music. In other words, the characteristic features of negro music have been closely studied and adapted for use in serious composition."³⁶ Not unexpectedly, however, Dvořák's belief that America's music should be built on African-American melodies met with staunch resistance from certain quarters. Even among his own students, there was reluctance to accept these traditions as musical material for incorporation into the European classical form. In the often-quoted article "Real Value of Negro Melodies," which appeared in the *New York Herald* May 21, 1893, Dvořák is quoted as saying,

Among my pupils in the National Conservatory of Music I have discovered strong talents. There is one young man upon whom I am building strong expectations. His compositions are based upon negro melodies, and I have encouraged him in this direction. The other members of the composition class seem to think that it is not in good taste to get ideas from the old plantation songs, but they are wrong, and I have

³³ Maurice Peress, *Dvořák to Duke Ellington*, 44.

³⁴ The copy of the student agreement provided in Aborn's dissertation, dated October 29, 1887, includes in Paragraph 2 language regarding a three-year requirement for the student to make their services available to the Conservatory, under the names of the American Opera Company or the National Opera Company, still in existence at the time. Merton Robert Aborn, *The Influence on American Musical Culture of Dvořák's Sojourn in America*, 246.

³⁵ "For National Music: Dvořák, the Great Bohemian Artist, Explains His Ideas," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (August 13, 1893), 29. Dvořák mistakenly referred to Arnold's *American Plantation Dances* as "Creole Dances."

³⁶ "Dvořák Leads for the Fund," *New York Herald* (January 24, 1893), 10.

tried to impress upon their minds the fact that the greatest composers have not considered it beneath their dignity to go to the humble folk song motifs.³⁷

Maurice Peress found less of innovation and more of convention in Arnold's work, however, describing his *American Plantation Dances* as "trying to paint an African American landscape using a European palette, thus canceling out many of the unique qualities in Negro music that first attracted Dvořák."³⁸ Nevertheless, Arnold did create what Dvořák had been brought to the Conservatory to foster—a classical tradition of distinctively American music where, in Arnold's case, he utilized the spirit, if not the tunes themselves, of Black America. On leaving the Conservatory, Arnold continued to compose, his efforts spanning several genres, including opera, ballet, orchestral and chamber music, and songs. His most lasting reputation, however, was arguably through his association with Dvořák and the National Conservatory, where he was at the forefront of the successful integration of African-American and European traditions.

Another of Dvořák's students of disputed lineage was Edward B. Kinney (1863-1950). Presumed to be African-American, perhaps due to his position as organist and choirmaster of St. Philip's Free African Church at 161 West 25th Street in New York, the 1900 United States census lists him as white.³⁹ Kinney's choir also performed at the 1894 benefit concert for the *New York Herald's* Free Clothing Fund, where the Conservatory's philosophy of inclusiveness was also proudly displayed in the other performers who took part: Soprano Sissieretta Jones (known as the "Black Patti" and the only soloist not a student at the Conservatory) was featured in the "Inflammatus" from Rossini's *Stabat Mater* with members of St. Philip's choir, announced in the program as under the direction of Mr. Edward B. Kinney, a pupil in Dr. Dvořák's composition class.⁴⁰ Dvořák's arrangement of Foster's "Old Folks at Home" was performed by the Conservatory orchestra and African-American chorus, with solos taken by Jones and Harry Burleigh. The day following the performance, an article appeared in the *New York Herald*, describing the concert as: "a unique program. Each soloist, with one exception, belonged to the colored race. This idea was due to Mrs. Thurber."⁴¹ Edward Kinney, one of only two of Dvořák's composition students to be singled out for special recognition on the concert, spent much of his career as organist and

³⁷ [James Creelman], "Real Value of Negro Melodies," *New York Herald* (May 21, 1893), 28.

³⁸ Maurice Peress, *Dvořák to Duke Ellington*, 48.

³⁹"United States Census, 1900," index and images, *FamilySearch* (<https://familysearch.org/ark:/61903/1:1:MSVG-CJB> : accessed 29 May 2015), Edward B. Kinney in household of Edward B. Kinney, Borough of Manhattan, Election District 15-16 New York City Ward 17, New York County, New York, United States; citing sheet 24B, family 438, NARA microfilm publication T623 (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, n.d.); FHL microfilm 1,241,100.

⁴⁰ "Hear the 'Old Folks at Home,'" *New York Herald* (January 23, 1894), 11.

⁴¹ "Dvořák Leads for the Fund," *New York Herald* (January 24, 1894), 10. The exception was a young pianist, Miss Bertha Visanska, who, according to the program, performed a "Hungarian Fantasie" by Liszt, likely his Fantasy on Hungarian Folk Melodies, S.123.

choirmaster in a number of New York's churches, including St. Philip's. It was in these capacities that he had the greatest impact; his compositions were secondary, producing no lasting influence.

Among Dvořák's other white students who took up the banner that African-American music held within it the seeds of a unique American style was William Arms Fisher (1861-1948), whose most well-known contribution today is the so-called spiritual "Goin' Home." Here is an instance where an artist's most recognizable work is representative of only a small fragment of his overall career. Fisher was responsible only for the text and arrangement of this song. As is well known, the music belongs to Dvořák and comes from the second movement Largo of his Symphony No. 9 "From the New World." In terms of his professional career, Fisher became a music editor and director of publications, finally advancing to the position of vice president, for the well-established Oliver Ditson Company, a publishing firm that traced its lineage back to Revolutionary War veteran Ebenezer Batelle's Boston-based bookstore, established in 1783. Fisher is also recognized as an early historian of America's music, with publications such as *Notes on Music in Old Boston* and *The Music that Washington Knew*. As an arranger, he set numerous indigenous tunes, including spirituals.⁴² He also served as president for two organizations vitally important to advancing America's music, the Music Teachers National Association and the Music Publishers' National Association.

* * *

As has been shown, the realization of Dvořák's goal with which Thurber had entrusted him—the creation of a national music by American composers, which he thought could best be represented by relying on African-American music—produced a diverse range of outcomes. In their varied career paths, the students highlighted here embody the span of these responses—from composing original works combining both European and indigenous traditions, as was the case for Maurice Arnold; to distributing African-American music via the publishing industry with William Arms Fisher; along with performing and making arrangements of tunes associated with the history of slavery via Harry T. Burleigh; and extending as far as the Broadway stage with Will Marion Cook. In the white-dominated theatre scene of his day, Cook succeeded in advancing images rooted in vaudeville and the minstrel show through a more sophisticated musical language. Nevertheless, the period demanded a price for his success in that to insure a steady stream of audiences he resorted to many of the colloquialisms and other identifiers of the Black race imposed by white observers.

Dvořák's students also left their own impressions of the master who had encouraged them to write what they knew. All had come with significant musical

⁴² *Notes on Music in Old Boston* (1918) and *The Music that Washington Knew* (1931) were both published by Boston's Oliver Ditson Company, where Fisher began employment in 1897. In 1926, Fisher edited a critical edition of *Seventy Negro Spirituals*, which was published by the same firm.

training; their enrollment in Dvořák's advanced composition class was possible only with a demonstrated previous knowledge of music theory. Harry Rowe Shelley (1858-1947) recalled that "To be a successful student under the direction of this man, a thorough knowledge of preliminaries was necessary—on these no time was ever spent by him."⁴³ Shelley spent the majority of his career as a church organist, but was also known in his own works as a superb melodist. He praised his teacher in these words: "He was a great man and rose from being a street player upon a violin . . . [to become] one of that group of immortal composers whose music is the divine inheritance of the world."⁴⁴

From the considerably younger Camille Zeckwer (1875-1924), who would go on to become the Director of the Academy of Music in Philadelphia as well as a composer in both large and small-scale genres, came the image of a man committed to superior work but gentle in his admonishing of a wayward pupil.

Many a time he would throw my innocent manuscript on the floor and savagely grind his heels into it, while punctuating the performance with grunts like those of a wild boar. With such a safety valve, his temper would soon evaporate, and he would pick up the offending manuscript almost tenderly, and compliment me on a few bars that had miraculously escaped the devastating heel.... He always seemed to me like a second father: a good, kindly, devout man, with a clean-souled admiration for all that was beautiful in art and life. Simple as a child he was, but ever with a confidence in his own opinions.⁴⁵

Shelley confirmed Zeckwer's analysis: "Dvořák was a child of nature in the class room, where his decision in the greatness of matters musical was absolute; once his mind was made up nothing could alter his views."⁴⁶ Dvořák had earned the right to be dictatorial, and in the eyes of his students, was. Yet Zeckwer also recalled a gentler side, once the flaring of temper was past.

Dvořák's position at the Conservatory was, after all, a difficult one. He expressed the role that had been assigned to him in a letter dated October 17, 1892 to Josef Hlávka, then president of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague. "Americans expect great things from me, and the main thing is, that I show them the way to the promised land, to a new and independent art—in short, to create a national music.... It is certainly a great and beautiful task for me, and I hope that with God's help I will be lucky enough to do it.... I'm very eager to see how things will develop."⁴⁷

If Dvořák could have lived to see the accomplishments of his students, he likely would have been both satisfied and exasperated with their efforts. Not all would work to create an American style of music on a classical model as they had

⁴³ Harry Rowe Shelley, "Dvořák as I Knew Him," *The Etude* (November 1919), 694.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ Camille W. Zeckwer, "Dvořák as I Knew Him," *The Etude* (November 1919), 694.

⁴⁶ Harry Rowe Shelley, "Dvořák as I Knew Him," 694.

⁴⁷ Letter from Antonín Dvořák to Josef Hlávka (October 27, 1892), in *Antonín Dvořák: Korespondence a Dokumenty, 1890-1895*, vol. 3, ed. Milan Kuna (Prague: Editio Supraphon, 1989), 162-63.

been trained, while maintaining the identity of what Dvořák viewed as a noble indigenous art. Such could be said of Will Marion Cook. Yet many would gain acceptance for the African-American tradition that far exceeded what Dvořák was able to accomplish. Perhaps, upon retrospective examination, he would have awarded Harry Burleigh, his friend and copyist, the greatest praise over any of those in his advanced class. Despite the circumstances of a conservatory system (whatever its aim) and a cultural environment where the European aesthetic continued to hold sway, Dvořák worked diligently to create, as much as he was able, the national music of which he spoke. Through his own works and those of his students, he left an indelible mark on America's music. From the astute and unbiased perception of this self-avowed "simple Czech musician" came the ability to see in the fertile soil of the African-American musical tradition what, at the time, others could not.

Separating Historical Truth from Fiction, Part One: Evaluating the Sources for Samo's Empire, the First Slavic Polity

Matej Jančošek

The history of Samo's Empire (623-658 CE), the first polity of the Slavs, is surrounded by mystery. The fifth and sixth century for Europe was dominated by the complicated historical era known as the Migration Period. Vast numbers of Hunnic and Turko-Tatar nomads began migrating westwards for various hypothetical reasons. This led to the collapse of classical civilization, which had been evolving in Europe for millennia. "Barbaric" peoples, who lived in remote places of northern Eurasia and Eastern Europe, pushed by the nomad hordes, now arrived in the rich Roman provinces. Quickly, a syncretism between their own traditions and the Roman culture that they found in their new homes developed. The Slavs who migrated into East Central and Western Europe were forced to change in order to survive. Samo's Empire emerged as a result of these changes taking root.¹

An important step that must be undertaken in order to attempt to separate truth from fiction is the historiographical criticism and analysis of the sources through which Samo entered folklore and textbooks on history and politics. After having done that, we can be more self-confident when attempting to separate truth from fiction surrounding the unclear circumstances of Samo's Empire, his ascent

¹ In addition to the other sources cited in the footnotes, the historical literature reviewed for this contribution includes the following: *Kronika Slovanů Helmold z Bosau*, trans. Jan Zdichynec, (Prague: Argo, 2012), Michal Prno, *Korene národa Slovákov: Samova ríša, hrob Mikuláša - Metoda, pád Veľkej Moravy*, (HELA, 2006), Michal Lutovský and Naďa Profantová, *Sámova ríše*, (Prague: Academia, 1995), Ján Steinhübel, *Nitrianske kniežatstvo počiatky stredovekého Slovenska: rozprávanie o dejinách nášho územia a okolitých krajín od s'ahovania národov do začiatku 12. storočia* (Bratislava: Veda, 2004), Matúš Kučera, *Môj štát, moja vlasť* (Bratislava: Perfekt, 2004), Dušan Třeštík, *Mýty kmene Čechů (7.-10. století)*, (Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2003), Herwig Wolfram, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum: das Weissbuch der Salzburger Kirche über die erfolgreiche Mission in Karantanien und Pannonien*, (Wien: Hermann Böhlau, 1979), Zdeněk Měřinský, *České země od příchodu Slovanů po Velkou Moravu*, volume 1 (Brno: Libri, 2009), Ján Pauliny, *Arabské správy o Slovanoch: 9.-12. storočie* (Bratislava: Veda, 1999), Francis Dvorník, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*, (London: Polish Research Centre, 1949, 2nd ed. Gulf Breeze, Fla.: Academic International Press, 1974), Gerard Labuda, *Pierwsze państwo słowiańskie. Państwo Samona* (Poznan: Księgarnia Akademicka, 1949), Nikolai Karamzin, *Istoriia gosudarstva Rosiiskogo (1816-29, Rpt. Rostovskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1989)*, Bruno Krusch, ed., "Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii Scholastici libri IV. cum Continuationibus," *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum, Volume 2, Fredegarii et aliorum Chronica. Vitae sanctorum* (Hannover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1888), "Gesta Dagoberti I. regis francorum," in *Magnae Moraviae fontes historici*, II, (Brno: Universita J. E Purkyně, 1966), Luděk Galuška, *Slované: doteky předků: o životě na Moravě 6.-10. století* (Brno: Moravské zemské museum, 2004), Manfred Eggers, "Samo-'Der erste König der Slawen.' Eine kritische Forschungsübersicht," *Bohemia* 42 (2001): 62-83.

to power and the features of the socio-political situation of the Slavs in that period. To evaluate Samo's Empire, we must untie the knot of vague and loosely related information we have on Samo and that period, to lay out the cultural, economic and political realities that could support and logically justify the existence and nature of this polity and thus draw conclusions about the evolution of Slavic identity.

Evaluation of the first Slavic polity can shed more light on the shaping of the modern Slavic nation states, because the "heroic" period of the sixth and seventh centuries was the moment of the crystallization of a new mediaeval civilization, taking shape in Europe. Slavic political ambitions, social structure, changing of primordial culture and values, and regional and linguistic differentiation, began developing in these centuries. This was the time of the forging of mediaeval Europe, on the basis of which stands our contemporary civilization.

Analysis of the Sources

The sources from which we learn of Samo are not many. First and foremost, there is the *Chronicle of Fredegar*, which was completed in the seventh century in Burgundy. This work is the main source through which history knows about Samo. Unlike the other sources, this is the only one that was compiled during or shortly after the events which it describes. Fredegar mentions Samo in three chapters. Extensive references about him can be found in chapter 48, where Fredegar describes how Samo arrived in the Slavic lands, how he fought a war with the Avars and the Franks, and how he was chosen as king of Slavs. In chapter 68 we can read how Samo's quarrel with Dagobert emerged and how they fought a war. In chapter 75 there is one reference to Slav invasions of Thuringia, ordered by Samo. In addition some references to Slavs, even though not directly about Samo, can also be found in chapters 52, 74, 77, and 87.

The second source is the *Gesta Dagoberti regis*, which was compiled around 835 in the monastery of St. Denis near Paris. *Gesta* is a work compiled in order to record and celebrate the deeds of the Merovingian king Dagobert, a contemporary of Samo. The need to compile such a work is also linked to the French cult of St. Dagobert, which flourished in the eighth to ninth century. However the author has confused Dagobert I with Dagobert III, and draws a large part of his narrative from the *Chronicle of Fredegar*. Even his references to Samo are largely just a stylistically processed remake of what can be found in Fredegar. The deviations from the original text in Fredegar may have been caused by the attempt of the author of *Gesta* to glorify and praise Dagobert.

The third and last of the primary sources which record the existence of Samo and his Slavic empire can be found in a Salzburg compendium called *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*. The text appeared around the years 871-72 at the initiative of the Salzburg archbishop Adalwin, in order to prove the missionary work of Salzburg in converting the Bavarians and Carinthians to Christianity, and therefore to justify the archbishop's ecclesiastical rights over these two regions. However, although we find new sources of information, other information in this

source was demonstrably intentionally distorted. In *Conversio*, Samo is identified as a Slav who ruled among the Slavs of Carinthia, and his war with Dagobert is described as a punitive expedition of the Frankish king, ending with Frankish victory, which, as we know, is historically incorrect.

The first historian to attempt to clarify the differences between Fredegar and *Conversio* was the Czech Jaroslav Goll.² Goll advanced the hypothesis that the *Conversio* must have been drawn directly out of Fredegar, due to the similarities in the text structure. According to Goll, the differences occurring in *Conversio* must have been a result of changes, such as often occurred in mediaeval sources when they were compiled or rewritten, mostly to correspond to the bias of the writer. However, in his conclusion Goll could not state with full certainty whether *Conversio* was written directly using Fredegar or just indirectly. Information in *Conversio*, such as calling Samo the lord of Carinthia, does not necessarily have to imply any distortion, since Fredegar did not mention such information at all. But the change of Samo from a Frank into a Slav and the short description of Dagobert's victory are not negligible points, especially since we know that there was an active interest on the part of the Salzburg compiler to defend the claims of the Salzburg archdiocese to ecclesiastical sovereignty over Carinthia. The Frankish origin of Samo could serve as a tolerable polemical argument in support of these claims; therefore it is difficult to understand why the author of *Conversio* would want to turn his compatriot into a hated Slav. That is why the bias that Goll emphasizes is not immediately apparent.

However, in an attempt to improve on Goll's conclusions, a Slovene historian, Ljudmil Hauptmann, tried to defend the trustworthiness of the author of *Conversio* by noting that at the time of the compilation of the work, the Chronicle of Fredegar would not be the only source from which the author could access information on Samo.³ It is not outside the realm of possibility to posit the parallel existence of an oral tradition, which might have been the source from which the writer of *Conversio* knew of Samo's rule in Carinthia, previously unknown to Fredegar. While trying to defend the author of *Conversio*, Hauptmann also reminds us, as is written in Fredegar, that only the Austrasians under Wogastisburg were defeated, while the Alamans and Langobards were victorious. Since Carinthia was the only Slavic territory neighboring the Langobards, their victory had to have taken place in Carinthia. Hauptmann writes: "He who saw in Samo the lord of Carinthia, as the Salzburg writer did, could not read out anything else, but that Samo was defeated."⁴ Hauptmann also mentions another possibility. The *Gesta Dagoberti regis* also mentions that Dagobert was victorious in the Frankish-Slavic war. If the Salzburg writer was using the information directly from *Gesta*, then the responsibility for the distortion falls on *Gesta* and not on

² Jaroslav Goll, "Samo und die karantanischen Slaven," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 9 (1890): 443-46.

³ Ljudmil Hauptmann, "Politische Umwälzungen unter den Slowenen vom Ende des 6. bis zur Mitte des 9. Jh.," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 36, (1915): 246-249.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 248.

Fredegar. Hauptmann also claims that it would be wrong to consider that changing Samo into a Slav would better support the claims of the Salzburg archdiocese to Carinthia. The writer did not have to amend the text for this kind of purpose, since Fredegar, who mentioned Samo's Empire as the property of king Dagobert, had done it already. Thus it would be a more viable argument to advance the claim of the Salzburg archdiocese to ecclesiastical sovereignty over Carinthia than to turn Samo into a Slav. In summary, Hauptmann rejects intentional distortion by the author of *Conversio* and defends the trustworthiness of the source regarding the reign of Samo in Carinthia, as the Salzburg archdiocese could have had access to information from the church chronicles in Carinthia from that time, which Fredegar could not.

A similar analysis was carried out by another Slovene scholar, Milko Kos.⁵ He claims that there were three sources influencing the author of *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, namely the Chronicle of Fredegar, oral tradition and the *Gesta Dagoberti regis*. He defends *Conversio*, saying that the author tried to compile the information from all three sources and tried to reproduce it into a monolith of the most probable version of the story. He says that if there was a local tradition in Carinthia about Samo's reign, we should definitely trust it. Another critic of Goll was George Vernadsky, who argues that the similarity of the text in Fredegar and *Conversio* might be purely coincidental. He cites examples of literary stylistic analysis, where in many cases, the words used could have been employed by any chronicler independent of any others.⁶ Given the academic debate that took place at the beginning of twentieth century, we can agree that for all practical purposes we have two groups of sources available, all of which are anchored in some local tradition, only with the difference that Fredegar was a contemporary of Samo and *Conversio* was written some 250 years later.

Other mediaeval sources that mention Samo include the *Historia Francorum* by Aimon of Fleury (from the beginning of the eleventh century), *Vita sancti Virgilii* (from the twelfth century) and *Auctarium Garstense* (from the thirteenth century). They all represent only passive extracts from Fredegar (*Historia Francorum*) or indirectly from *Conversio* (*Vita s. Virgilii* and *Auctarium Garstense*).

It is important to note that none of the historians above convincingly established the contention that the oral tradition, from which the author of *Conversio* supposedly drew his information, confirmed that Samo was indeed a Slav. Gerard Labuda is of the opinion that we should not consider *Conversio* trustworthy and that calling Samo a Slav and placing the center of his realm into Carinthia is a result of some misinterpretations of the author of *Conversio* himself.⁷ He goes on to claim that the potential source of the local oral tradition is

⁵ Milko Kos, "K zgodovini kralja Sama in njegove dobe," *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino* 7, (1928): 196.

⁶ George Vernadsky, "The Beginnings of the Czech State," *Byzantion* 17 (1945): 315-328.

⁷ Gerard Labuda, *Pierwsze państwo słowiańskie. Państwo Samona* (Poznan: Księgarnia Akademicka, 1949), p. 48.

less valuable than the Chronicle of Fredegar. He compares Fredegar with *Gesta Dagoberti regis* and correctly mentions that the author of *Gesta* was set on making a work which would praise his hero Dagobert and glorify the king, by hiding all the misfortunes or mistakes Dagobert committed. However, *Gesta* completely disregards chapter 48 of Fredegar, which describes Samo as a Frankish merchant arriving in Slavic lands. This could have been done because that part of the history belongs to the reign of Dagobert's father Chlothar, and it was not important to the compiler of *Gesta*. It is regrettable, as it causes difficulties when analyzing *Conversio* and its version of Samo's origins. Nonetheless, *Gesta* does mention the Frankish-Slavic war, and agrees with Fredegar on the fact that both armies, the Langobard and the Alaman, were victorious and took with themselves many slaves. However, he adds that they took this victory *cum Dagoberto*,⁸ which would imply that Dagobert was physically with them, while Fredegar mentions that Dagobert was leading the Austrasian army against Wogastisburg, where he was defeated. This could have stemmed from the misinterpretation of the words in Fredegar: *Langobardi solucione Dagoberti...osteleter in Sclavos perrixerunt*,⁹ which the author of *Gesta* understood in the sense that Longobards came to help Dagobert directly and their victory must have been Dagobert's as well, therefore changing the text into *Langobardi ad solatium Dagoberti*. However, I am of the opinion that rather than a misinterpretation, it was an intentional distortion. In order to spare Dagobert the humiliating defeat and flight from the battlefield of Wogastisburg, the author of *Gesta* intentionally omitted the whole fragment regarding the Austrasians, and put Dagobert only into the role of assisting the Alamans and Langobards. Overall, we can be sure that the author committed two distortions: one in which he purposely omits chapter 48 of the Chronicle of Fredegar, leaving his readers without knowledge of who Samo was, and one in which he turns the half-victory of Langobards and Alamans into a personal triumph of Dagobert. Thus I consider *Gesta Dagoberti regis* as the least trustworthy source out of the three.

There is a possibility that the author of *Conversio* might have drawn information out of Fredegar, but it seems more probable that he only had *Gesta Dagoberti regis* and the local tradition at his disposal. If the author had drawn his information from Fredegar, he would probably not have omitted chapter 48 and used only the information in the other chapters. While Fredegar's chronicle states that Samo, a Frankish merchant, arrived in the lands of the Slavs at the time of the reign of king Chlotar, *Conversio* mentions that Samo, a Slav and a leader of the Carinthians, lived during the reign of king Dagobert and knows nothing more of the times prior to king Dagobert's ascent to the throne. If the author of *Conversio* did not have access to Fredegar, the only source concerned with Samo's background could have been the local oral tradition, which considered Samo as a

⁸ "Gesta Dagoberti I. regis francorum," in *Magnae Moraviae fontes historici*, II, (Brno: Universita J. E Purkyně, 1966), p. 17.

⁹ Bruno Krusch, ed., "Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii Scholastici libri IV. cum Continuationibus," *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum, Volume 2 Fredegarii et aliorum Chronica. Vitae sanctorum* (Hannover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1888), p. 155.

Slav. *Conversio* had no interest to lie by asserting that Samo was a Slav; quite the opposite. If the author of *Conversio* had read Fredegar and thus would have known that Samo was a Frank, it would suit his cause much more to make that clear, and thus he would rather have used the written source. But, knowing only that Samo was a Slav, he included it in his compendium. I believe that these reasons are logical and disprove of the thesis of Jaroslav Goll, who stated that *Conversio* was based on Fredegar due to precarious similarities in the text structure.

It is important to note that the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* deviates from the account in the *Gesta Dagoberti regis* in its description of the cause of the Frankish-Slavic war. Its version is different from Fredegar as well. Fredegar and the *Gesta* stated that Sycharius, an envoy of Dagobert, came to Samo to demand not only recompense for the injury caused by the killing of Frankish merchants by Slavs of Samo's realm, but also that Samo accept the suzerainty of Franks. War was declared as a reaction to the arrogant conduct of the negotiations on Sycharius' side. *Conversio* simply states tersely that the war was declared to avenge the death of Frankish merchants, who were killed as a consequence of Samo's direct order. Once Dagobert was victorious, he subjugated the Empire of Samo. There is no mention of Wogastisburg, just like in the *Gesta*.

I believe that this deviation is worthy of mention, as it proves that no single source gives exactly the same account, and this is why there is no agreement among the scholars studying this topic regarding as to which source is the most trustworthy. However, the structure of the text and the use of words in the *Conversio* do correspond more with *Gesta Dagoberti regis*, and even if some similarities with Fredegar might be seen, it might be the result of the legacy which *Gesta* inherited after drawing its information from Fredegar. Even the use of the words for the envoys, *negatiatores*, was identical in *Conversio* and *Gesta*,¹⁰ while Fredegar had *neguciantes*.¹¹ If we compare *Conversio* with the two written sources it could possibly have used, it is much more likely that it is based on *Gesta Dagoberti regis* rather than Fredegar.

There are two more items of information in *Conversio* that deviate from both of the older written sources, namely the Slavic origin of Samo and his being ruler over the territory of Carinthia. Since the second item is described neither in Fredegar nor in the *Gesta*, it is difficult to support or refute the assertion. But the statement that Samo was a Slav is again not present in either of the older written sources. At this point, a question arises, whether the author of *Conversio* did base his statement on some oral tradition that survived in Carinthia, or whether it was a hypothetical conclusion of the author, since it was not common that a ruler would be of different origin than his subjects.

¹⁰ *Gesta Dagoberti I. regis francorum*, p. 16; Herwig Wolfram, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, p. 40.

¹¹ Krusch, ed., "Chronicarum Fredegarii libri IV," p. 154.

Another historian, Ottokar Němeček, raises an interesting point in his analysis.¹² At the time of writing of the *Conversio*, Methodius, a Slavic missionary from the Byzantine Empire, who together with his brother Constantine (monastic name Cyril) invented the Glagolitic alphabet for the liturgical needs of the Slavs in Greater Moravia, received a license from Rome to establish his own archdiocese over all the Pannonian Slavs. If Samo were connected only to the Slavs of Carinthia, his subjugation by Dagobert would provide a reason for the Salzburg archdiocese to claim suzerainty over that region. If Samo were considered as the winner of the battle under Wogastisburg, who governed much vaster territories, it would be Methodius who would have a stronger argument to include Carinthia into his Pannonian archdiocese. These ecclesiastical conflicts should not be taken lightly, as they are a proof of the struggle for influence over that region between the Frankish and the Byzantine Empires. Therefore, it would make sense that the Byzantines would have chosen the historical account described in Fredegar, while the Franks would prefer the descriptions in the *Gesta* and *Conversio*. However, both the *Gesta* and *Conversio* were written at least two centuries after the events they describe, and both authors were writing their depictions with ulterior purposes. One sought to make king Dagobert a king-hero and the other was to support the rights of the Salzburg archdiocese over Carinthia. Thus we can conclude that the source with the fewest reasons to lie is the Chronicle of Fredegar.

Yet, we should still consider that if the *Gesta* systematically changed the historical facts, the question remains whether the *Conversio* was simply based on *Gesta Dagoberti regis*, filling in the missing information with material from oral tradition and village church chronicles, or whether the Chronicle of Fredegar was available to the author of *Conversio*, and he intentionally disregarded it, as it did not fit in with his purposes. If the first alternative were true, then it would imply that Fredegar either distorted the information already in the first half of the seventh century, or that his source was not entirely correct. That is why now we must look more deeply into the Chronicle of Fredegar itself.

Analysis of Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii Scholastici libri IV

The Chronicle of Fredegar is the only contemporary primary source describing the events surrounding Samo's life and rule that we have available. The work itself can be divided into two parts. The first is a compilation of other late Roman and early mediaeval chronicles, while the part including references to Samo and the Slavs neighboring the Frankish Empire is the original text, written by the so-called Fredegar. Historians believe that the original text was written in the course of the seventh century. Apart from references to Slavs, the history described in the original text gives important details concerning the history of the kingdom of Burgundy.

¹² Ottokar Němeček, *Das Reich des Slawenfürsten Samo* (Mährisch-Ostrau/Moravská Ostrava: Kittl, 1906), iii.

This compilation of chronicles is known today under the name of Chronicle of Fredegar. The whole chronicle is composed of the following parts: I, *Liber Generationis* and parts of the chronicle of Idacius; II, parts of the chronicles of Hieronymus and Hippolytus; III, History of the Franks by Gregory of Tours (only the first 6 volumes, up until the year 584); IV, the original "Burgundian" chronicle, and V, the chronicle of Isidore of Seville.

Three important questions need to be answered in order to reach a conclusion about the trustworthiness of this source. Who wrote it, where and when?

Who wrote the Chronicle?

Let us first approach the issue of authorship, which is the most essential of the three questions if we are to decide whether the author had any vested interests or motives to lie. The first part of the fourth book, the Prologue, acts as an epilogue to the previous writings, and explains how the author compiled his own chronicle, based on his own observations, on his memory, other oral sources and the knowledge which was available at the time. It is problematic even to ascertain the year at which the part of the work based on the author's memory starts, since the prologue mentions that the compilation work of books I-III was completed by the death of King Guntram of Burgundy in 592, while the actual events described in book IV start already after the death of Chilperic in 584.

The older conclusions made by historians studying Samo were that the Chronicle of Fredegar was written by one author named Fredegar, around the year 660 in the vicinity of Geneva or in the monastery of St. Marcel in Chalon-sur-Saône. Bruno Krusch was the first historian to challenge these conclusions by claiming that the Chronicle had been compiled not by one, but by three authors, in 613, 642 and 660 respectively.¹³ Krusch considers the first author to have written only chapters 1-39, up until the year 613, and according to his considerations, it must have been a second author who wrote of the betrayal of Brunhilda by Warnachar in chapters 40-42, due to the fabricated and loose narrative. He concluded that the split occurred between chapters 39 and 40, based on the fact that the dates up until 613 are given in the form of a year in the reign of the Burgundian monarch, while after 613 (at the beginning of chapter 43), they are given in the years of the reign of Frankish monarchs. Another of his arguments supporting the "multi-authorship" was the citation from the Prologue, where the author says that he used supporting chronicles to cover the history up until "the fall of the kingdom of Guntram."¹⁴ Krusch considers the fall of the kingdom of Guntram to have taken place in the year 613 and not 592, since, according to Krusch, the first author referred to the transfer of the crown of Burgundy to Theuderic II and his son Sigebert II as a continuation of the kingdom of Guntram. Only after the year 613, when the Burgundian royal court in Chalon-sur-Saône ceased to exist, does Fredegar write of the end of the kingdom of Guntram. Thus

¹³ Bruno Krusch, "Die *Chronicae* des sogenannten Fredegar," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 7 (1882): 247-351.

¹⁴ Krusch, ed., "Chronicarum Fredegarii libri IV," p. 123.

Krusch proposes that when the first author wrote the Prologue and mentioned that his compilation work spans until the end of the kingdom of Guntram, he actually ended book IV at the 39th chapter based on the supporting chronicles. However, a reason opposing the hypothesis that the era of 613-642 was written by a different author from his own memory, is that *Liber Generationis*, which was one of the supporting chronicles used, finishes its catalogue of the ancient emperors, Byzantine emperors and popes in the year 642. The last Byzantine emperor noted is Heraclius, who died in 641, and the last pope is John IV who died in 642. The text even mentions the next pope, Theodore I, but without stating how many years he held the office or when he died, implying that the supporting chronicles must have been compiled at the earliest during his papacy, which ended in 649. According to Krusch, the third author makes his appearance to include certain additional information in the chapters 36, 48, 81, 82, 87 and 88. Krusch considers these additions to be the work of another author because there are some references related to dates after 642 (such as the end of Samo's rule in 658), and because of the "Austrasian" nature of those chapters, where the author concentrates on the Pippinids, the future rulers of the Frankish Empire. This leads Krusch to believe that the third author must have been Austrasian and writing somewhere in Austrasia, for example in Metz, while the first two were of Burgundian origin, writing somewhere in the vicinity of Avenches and western Switzerland (*pagus Ultraioranus*, or "the land beyond the Jura").

Another group of historians take Krusch's conclusions as their starting point, but add their modifications. According to Gustav Schnürer, the first author who wrote the Prologue was responsible for the entire compilation, while the second and the third authors merely added modest contributions.¹⁵ Schnürer maintains that the first author was writing up until the year 625, since he sees him as the same person who added the Chronicle of Isidor of Seville, which ends in 624, to the compilation. Ferdinand Lot defends the hypothesis that the first and the second author were the same person.¹⁶ He bases this conclusion on a phrase in the Prologue *verbo huius nomenis Grego, quod Latini interpretatur Gesta temporum*,¹⁷ which comes from the explanations of etymology from the Chronicle of Isidore that was finished in 624. Another of his reasons was that the entire text of chapter 36 is based on *Vita s. Columbani* written by Jonas Bobiensis around 640. Lot's conclusions are well supported by a logical argument that the chronology of years, which changed from the years of the reign of Burgundian kings to those of Frankish kings, stems from the fact that the Burgundian crown ceased to exist. Owing to these arguments, Lot considers most of the Chronicle to have been finished in 642.

¹⁵ Gustav Schnürer, *Die Verfasser des sogenannten Fredegar-Chronik* (Freiberg: Commissionsverlag der Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1900), p. 154.

¹⁶ Ferdinand Lot, "Encore la chronique de Pseudo-Frédégaire," *Revue Historique*, 115, Fasc. 2 (1914): 305-337.

¹⁷ Krusch, ed., "Chronicarum Fredegarii libri IV," p. 123.

However, a panoply of other historians such as Marcel Baudot,¹⁸ Roger Collins¹⁹ or Walter Goffart,²⁰ defend the single authorship of the Chronicle, stating that Krusch's conclusions are based on accepting too many presumptions, including the presumption that *Liber Generationis* was not inserted by the first author only because he does not mention it in the Prologue, or presuming that the phrase "until the end of kingdom of Guntram" means the year 613, when the territory had already ceased to be a kingdom in 592, when Guntram died and the kingdom became someone else's. Even the references to the Austrasian Pippinids are not enough to consider Fredegar having two or three different narrators. The references to Pippinids do not have to mean that the author would pay specific attention to them. He included such information, as he would similarly include information regarding any other potentate in the top positions of the Frankish royal court. Baudot concludes that the hypothesis of the "Austrasian" final remake is not well supported and that we should accept that the chronicle was compiled after 659. Although the arguments challenging Krusch's hypothesis are many and varied, it is enough to note that a large part of the academic community disagrees with his contention that there were three authors of Fredegar's chronicle.

Having reviewed the spectrum of academic opinion on the matter, we can see that this issue cannot be definitively settled, since there is still plenty of space for academic debate and interpretations. I would like to consider a few more points before attempting to reach a certain conviction. If the Prologue to book IV is the work of one author, therefore it implies that the author is also responsible for the entire compilation of chronicles. This author of the compilation work of the chronicles must therefore be the only author of book IV, as Lot proposed, up until the year 642. Even Siegmund Hellman, after his detailed analysis of the stylistic and grammatical structure of Book IV, provides us with assurance that there are no differences in the first or the second half, such as would imply the contribution of another writer.²¹ The language in use throughout the whole book is Vulgar Latin, and as Goffart notes, the author uses the *Urkundensprache*, which would be used at that time only by someone who is versed in the legal framework of the Frankish Empire, meaning he could be a legal expert of the Merovingian court.²² Roger Collins as well correctly mentions—alone among all the critics—that Krusch's *Libri IV* in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (with which all the critics work), is not the original "Merovingian" manuscript, but a later copy from the Carolingian times, a hundred years later, from around 750-770. This could have

¹⁸ Marcel Baudot, "La question de Pseudo- Frédégaire," *Le Moyen Age*, 38, second series, 29 (1928): 129-170.

¹⁹ Roger Collins, *Die Fredegar-Chronikon*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica Studien und Texte vol. 44. (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2007).

²⁰ Walter Goffert, Review of Roger Collins, *Die Fredegar-Chronikon*, in *The Medieval Review* (online journal), <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/6500/09.02.08.html?sequence=1>, published September 2, 2008.

²¹ Siegmund Hellman, "Das Fredegar-Problem," *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, 29 (1934): 36-92.

²² Goffert, Review of Collins, *Die Fredegar-Chronikon*, loc. cit.

also caused some alterations and confusion in the interpretation of the chronicle. After reviewing many arguments, I can see that the Prologue and the compilation of the chronicles is the key to deciphering the authorship of Fredegar. As we can understand from the Prologue, the author tells us of the sources available for his use, and that he included his own knowledge of what he “heard and saw.” However, today we are sure that he did not mention all the possible sources he used, as we know that chapter 36 is taken in its entirety from *Vita s. Columbani*, and many other entries must have been enriched by information from various sources, such as the village chronicles found in Burgundy and others. The sources that the author had at his disposal supplied him with sufficient material until the years 613-615; after that, the written sources of information dried out. The period after the murder of young Sigebert II is less thoroughly covered, particularly up to the year 623. Therefore, if the author began relying solely on his memory, it is apparent that it ranged from the twenties of seventh century. In the period between 623-642 he also commits a few chronological mistakes, which would prove that he had no written information to rely on, but also that the times he is recording must have been long past (at least from the viewpoint of the life of the author).

The conviction I have arrived at is thus that there was only one author, possibly a monk and/or a Frankish legal expert compiling the whole chronicle, including book IV, but that he did not bring the chronicle into its final form. Nevertheless, in order to provide for his full profile, we need also to consider when and where the chronicle could have been written.

When was the Chronicle written?

After the previous analysis, it remains to determine whether the chronicle was written in 642 or at a later date. The reasons arguing in favor of the date of 642 are the following. The last chapters of book IV finish at years 642/643, and out of all the supporting chronicles included in the compilation it is the catalogue of popes in *Liber Generationis* that goes the furthest, finishing with pope Theodore I, who started his pontificate in 642; however the catalogue is not extended beyond that time. Furthermore, even though the writer was aware of the existence of three Byzantine emperors in the year 641, he did not include them in the catalogue. That could mean that the author of Fredegar was not the same author who wrote *Liber Generationis*, and, not wanting to compromise the work of someone else, he did not commit any changes to it, which would explain the discrepancies concerning the date of use of the other supporting chronicles as well. However, the fact that book IV contains references to events taking place between 642 and 658 can only bring us to two options: either there was an interpolation done around 660, or the entire book was written around 660.

To consider this question in more depth, these are the chapters containing references subsequent to the timeframe that is covered by the chronicle. In chapter 48, which is set in *anno 40. Regni Chlotariae*, meaning the year 623, the author mentions that Samo ruled for 35 years, which would mean until 658. Chapter 81, which talks about Byzantine affairs, mentions the rule of the emperor Constans II

(reigned 630-668) and the paying of tribute to Saracens, which would take us to years 654-658. Chapter 82 discusses Visigothic Hispanic affairs and finishes with the death of king Chyntasind (Chindasvinth), which took place in 653.

Because of these three chapters, historians today have had much difficulty in defining the date of the compilation. Labuda proposed a self-confident argument when he pointed to the contents of chapter 81.²³ There the author writes that he plans on writing the chronicle up to the date of the events of chapter 81, that is, until 658. Labuda observes that the events which go beyond year 642 deal only with Slavic, Hispanic and Byzantine affairs, meaning foreign realms. He believes that due to the chronicle-style narrative, the author included some foreign events in between the Burgundo-Frankish yearly entries. Furthermore, book IV does not have an epilogue. This shows that the author probably planned on continuing to write the book, but unfortunately stopped at year 642. If another person had written those interpolations, they would have been in new chapters and not between the sentences of the original chapters.

Considering the expression of the author's intention to continue the chronicle beyond the year 642, the extant information that does go beyond the timeframe of the chronicle would only make sense if it was the same person who planned on finishing the chronicle through the years 658-660. It could not have been another author writing an interpolation, but the original author himself who did not manage to extend it further. During the times which we are considering, the average lifespan of most people was much shorter than today, and if the author uses his own memory from 623 onward, it would mean that at the time of writing he was referring to events occurring almost 40 years earlier. It would not be a surprise if the author simply did not live long enough to bring his work to a final closing. Considering all these factors, I believe that the compilation of Fredegar was the work of a single author writing around the year 660.

Where was the Chronicle written?

In order to arrive at a final conclusion on the trustworthiness of the Chronicle of Fredegar we need to answer one last question: where was the chronicle composed? In the text itself, the author does not mention the location where he writes and thus the place of composition is open to academic debate.

A majority of the historians analyzing the chronicle was of the opinion that the author must be of Burgundian origin. Given the content of the chronicle, there is little doubt that it could have been otherwise. The information given in book IV concerns either major historical events of the Frankish empire, including those of foreign nature, or, and this applies to most of the recorded events, more local events concerning only the Burgundian kingdom. Therefore we can narrow our research to those places in Burgundy where the writer could most likely live and write. A great center of scholarship of the time could be found in the bishopric of Avenches, on the site of the old Roman settlement of Aventicum. However we

²³ Labuda, *Pierwsze państwo słowiańskie*, p. 83.

know that Avanches was destroyed in the sixth and seventh centuries, which forced the bishopric to move to Lausanne. The lack of security that Avanches offered, and the relocation of its most important institution away from the city, suggests that the accessibility of information in that area was not as sufficient as it may have been in other places of the region, and that, therefore, the probability that Fredegar was writing there is low. Another possible location for the composition of Fredegar's chronicle that historians in the past considered was Geneva. However at the time the important routes, along which merchants and information would travel, were running further north from Geneva and therefore there are not many valid arguments supporting this location either.

The most probable locations can only be those that were in the center of political affairs, which implies that they were on military and economic crossroads. A candidate for such a location could be Chalon-sur-Saône, capital of the Burgundian kingdom. There, any writer could have easy access to information from Burgundy, Austrasia and Neustria. Baudot proposes an interesting theory regarding this issue.²⁴ He argues that Fredegar might have been living at the court of the Burgundian kings in Chalon-sur-Saône up until the death of the last Burgundian king, Sigebert II. Baudot believes that the end of the royal court in 613 could explain the lack of information that Fredegar could remember and observe for the period 614-623/627. Only after the death of the Burgundian *majordomus* Warnachar (626, possibly as late as 628) could the author move to the Neustrian royal court in Clichy, where again he found himself in the center of political affairs, allowing him to record more comprehensive information.

However, Baudot believes that the author was writing in both Chalon-sur-Saône and in Neustria, due to the "Burgundian" nature of the first part of book IV and the "Neustrian" nature of the second part. After the analysis of the authorship I am not persuaded that the author was writing the chronicle throughout his lifetime, but rather in a few years around the year 660. Additionally, the Chronicle does not demonstrate such local "Neustrian" interest as it had in the "Burgundian" section. The fact that the author could live in more than one place must be noted, but there is a low probability that he would write his chronicle over such a long time and at different locations.

Gabriel Monod brings in two important arguments to support the thesis that Chalon-sur-Saône was the most probable place of the creation of the chronicle.²⁵ The author of the chronicle does not neglect to mention the role Chalon-sur-Saône played in any relevant event throughout the entire book and more importantly, he dedicates the first chapter of book IV to the construction of the basilica of St. Marcel built by King Guntram. Thus, Monod concludes that the author must have been a monk at the monastery of St. Marcel. The information that the author gives us regarding the monastery of St. Marcel demonstrates that he visited it personally, but he gave the date of its establishment incorrectly. He placed it into the twenty-fourth year of the reign of King Guntram (584), but today we know

²⁴ Baudot, "La question de Pseudo- Frédégaire," pp. 162-163.

²⁵ Gabriel Monod, "Du lieu d'origine de la Chronique dite de Frédégaire," *Jahrbuch für Schweizerische Geschichte*, 3 (1878): 156-158.

that the monastery of St. Marcel existed already by 578. If the author had been a monk at the monastery, we would expect a greater knowledge of its own history, bringing us to question even the probability of the alternative of Chalon-sur-Saône as the location for the chronicle's composition.

Labuda reached his conviction through analyzing chapter 58 of book IV, which describes how king Dagobert travelled through Burgundy.²⁶ Labuda found it unusual that the author had written so much regarding Dagobert's stay in Latona (today's St. Jean-de-Losne). According to Labuda, no other chapter contains as much local character as chapter 58. The descriptions of Dagobert's dealings in Latona are so detailed that nowhere else in the chronicle can we find such references. Such information could be known only to someone who was personally present in Latona at the time. Dagobert's stay in Chalon is mentioned, but in contrast to the description of the visit to Latona, the author is silent when it comes to describing what exactly he was doing there. Hence Labuda believes that the author personally observed Dagobert's travels through Burgundy from Latona.

Therefore the two most probable locations for the creation of the chronicle are Chalon-sur-Saône and St. Jean-de-Losne. Nevertheless, the arguments supporting Chalon as the candidate for the place of residence of the author are not necessarily refuted by the proposition of Latona. Latona is found 50 km away from Chalon, meaning that any important event taking place in Chalon could not escape the attention of someone living in Latona. Moreover, Latona itself was not cut off from the world, since there was a bishopric whose bishop took part in a synod in Paris in 614. Latona hosted a synod itself in 673-675, attended by 318 bishops. Latona's geographical location is thus no less valuable than Chalon's when it comes to movement of information. It was on the road between Aquitaine and Metz, the capital of Austrasia, and it was close to the borders of Austrasia, Neustria and the *pagus Ultraioranus* (western Switzerland), mentioned in chapter 90. Even the naming of western Switzerland as the "land beyond the Jura" implies that the person giving it that name lived to the west of the Jura mountain range. Information could quickly travel into this area also from Lombardy, since Lombards trying to travel to Clichy, Paris or Metz would have to pass through Burgundy, specifically along the roads where Chalon-sur-Saône and St. Jean-de-Losne are located. Close contact with northern Italy could also explain much of the foreign information the author obtained, especially regarding the Byzantines. Fredegar could collect the information on Slavs and Avars from Frankish merchants often passing through the area. Luxeuil, a monastery established by St. Columbanus, can also be found within 100 km from Latona, which would explain where the author got the information for the 36th chapter.

On the basis of these arguments I tend to agree with the scholars proposing that Latona, today's St. Jean-de-Losne, is the most probable place of residence of the author of the Chronicle of Fredegar.

²⁶ Labuda, *Pierwsze państwo słowiańskie*, pp. 308-309.

Summary Conclusion

To summarize the results of the preceding analysis, the most probable conclusion is similar to the one generally accepted by historians prior to Bruno Krusch's publication of the chronicle of Fredegar in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, where he developed his thesis of three authors. I conclude that the Chronicle of Fredegar was written by one author, in Latona, around the year 660. It was a draft of a work which the author planned on finalizing, but did not manage to complete, perhaps due to his death. This unfinished work thus allows for the many differing interpretations that the academic community has supplied us with.

The author of the chronicle was most probably a senior clerical figure who was well versed in the *Urkundensprache* (legal text speech) and who had a comprehensive catalogue of sources at his disposal to complete the chronicle. We assume his clerical position not only because most chronicles were compiled by clerics at the time but also due to the style in which the chronicle was written. Bearing in mind the active special interests of the authors of *Gesta Dagoberti regis* and *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, I conclude that the Chronicle of Fredegar is the most trustworthy source of the three.

The answer to the question of whether Fredegar distorted any information regarding Slavs and Samo, in my view, is most probably no. The author's main aim was to record the history of Burgundy within the context of the Frankish Empire until its end, and all the chronicle-worthy events that happened from there on. As a clerical figure from a bishopric in Latona, he or his supervisors would not have any motive to distort information about distant happenings in the Slavic lands (which were not of central importance to the work) and thus compromise the value of the chronicle.

The information required for analyzing the questions that I want to consider in the second part of this contribution concerning the persona of Samo and other circumstances determining his role in history are thus—according to the analysis above—most truthfully recorded in Fredegar. Even though the reasons why the *Conversio* made him into a Slav are still not satisfactorily answered, the academic community has good reason to discard this assertion and accept the account in Fredegar's chronicle, which depicts Samo as of Frankish origin. In the second part of this contribution, I will turn to a consideration of what can be determined about Samo, who he was, and what impact he had on the history of the Slavs of Central Europe.

Separating Historical Truth from Fiction, Part Two: Evaluating Samo and his Empire, the First Slavic Polity

Matej Jančošek

In conducting our sociopolitical analysis of the early Slavs in Samo's empire, it has been essential to postulate answers to a number of questions that inevitably arise from the uncertainty of the limited historical information at our disposal concerning the person of Samo and the structure of his empire. Having concluded in part one that the so-called Fredegar Chronicle is our most trustworthy source, we can undertake our analysis on the basis of the facts which Fredegar recorded.

First of all, we need to determine who Samo was and how he became the ruler of such a vast territory, in order to understand the situation of the Western Slavs (or the *Winidi*, as Fredegar calls them) at the beginning of the second decade of the seventh century, and elucidate their social structure and political aspirations. A particularly interesting challenge is to try to determine what phase of the state-formation process they were in, and how that influenced the sense of identity of the Slavs in the eyes of a contemporary.

Who was Samo and why did he emerge as the king of Slavs?

At the outset it is important to establish the facts that we can draw from *Chronicarum Fredegarii Scholastici libri IV*. In the first sentence of chapter 48 we read that the ruler in question was called Samo, and since all the other sources refer to him as Samo as well, we must accept that this is the name under which he was known. In that same sentence we read that he was *natione Francos* and that he came from *pago Senonago*. The sentence goes on to reveal that he was a merchant and that after assembling his caravan he went to trade among the Slavs called the *Winidi*. Further in the chapter we learn that the Slavs were neighbors of Avars and that Samo himself took an active part in the Slavic-Avar war on side of Winids, becoming their king because of his *uiletas*. The last fact we have about Samo is that he ruled for 35 years and adopted the traditions of old Slavs. He was married to 12 Slavic women, who gave him 37 children, 22 sons and 15 daughters.

Now that all the facts appear established, we can approach the tempting questions emerging from the narrative, the answers to which are much less certain. Those would be: what were the origins of Samo, why did he come to the Carpathian basin and why was he elected the king of Slavs? In order to find out who Samo was and what his background was, we must take a look at his name. 'Samo' in itself is a name that does not occur in this form among Frankish or even Slavic cultures, and therefore it has been a point of debate among historians who inquired into his ethnicity.

Some of the first Slavic researchers in the field, including František Palacký and Pavel Josef Šafařík, were of the opinion that Samo was a Slav, presuming the name was of Slavic origin. Palacký believed that it was a contraction of an archaic Slavic name Samoslav, which could have occurred among a Slavic tribe of Velets

who, according to him, dwelt by the river Waal in today's Netherlands and were incorporated into the Frankish Empire.¹ The polemic regarding Samo's ethnicity occurs because all that Fredegar wrote was "*natione Francos*," which would mean only that Samo was a subject of Frankish king, without specifying his ethnicity, probably because the writer did not know which tribe Samo belonged to within the multicultural Frankish Empire. Another notable supporter of the "Slavic" origin of the name Samo and thus Samo himself was Šafařík, who contends that the name Samo can be found among Slavs near the Baltic Sea, in the area of Prussia and Lithuania.² Franz Miklosich offers a variety of alternative names from which "Samo" could have been derived. He compared the name Samo with Sam, Sambor, Samborius or Samobor, a name given to a settlement, concluding that Samo must have been a name of Slavic origins.³ Others, myself among them, consider that "Samo" might also be related to the Slavic word for "self."

However there is also another school of thought assuming that Samo is a name of Celtic or more precisely Gallo-Roman-Celtic origin. This was proposed by Arnold Holder and further defended by Gerard Labuda. Holder was first to point at the fact that the prefix *Sam-* was widely used among Celtic tribes in Western Europe. We can see it in names such as Samorix, Samotalus and Samogenus or even as a suffix in names Segisamus, Trigisamus, Rigisamos and others.⁴ The hypothesis that Samo was a Celt has some logic and deserves greater exploration. The belief that Samo could have been a Romanized Celt is based on another hypothesis, namely that Celts survived in the Frankish Empire up until the seventh century. It is true that Roman rule of Gallia lasted several centuries and all cultures within its empire were Romanized to a considerable degree, but most of the Romanization occurred via administrative and military institutions. Deserts, mountains and thick forests maintained a significant degree of immunity from the influence of these institutions and thus from the penetration of Roman culture. It is possible that in places such as the Massif Central, Celtic communities using a language differentiated from Latin could have survived. Analogies can be drawn between Celts in Gaul and Polabian Serbs, who still spoke their Slavic tongue in the eighteenth century, despite having been under strong German cultural influence from the time of the Merovingian kings and politically subdued by the Holy Roman Empire during the times of Christianization.

Since we accept that Fredegar was not lying, we must also accept that Samo came from the Frankish Empire; however, it is more difficult to locate *pago Senonago* since such a domain did not exist in the Empire. This confusion partially stems from the "vulgarization" of Latin during the early-mediaeval

¹ František Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a na Moravě*, (1848-1876, rpt. Prague: B. Kočí, 1908), p. 27.

² Pavel Jozef Šafařík, *Sebrané spisy II. Starožitnosti slovanské okresu druhého*, ed. Josef Jireček (Prague: Bedřich Těmpešský, 1863), pp. 434-438.

³ Franz Miklosich, *Die Bildung der slawischen Personen- und Ortsnamen*, (1860, rpt. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1927), p. 94.

⁴ Alfred Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachsatz*, Vol. 2 (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1904), columns 1333-1347.

period. Bruno Krusch's contention is the most widely accepted. He says that *pago Senonago* could be a region around the city of Sens on the Yonne River (near Auxerre, Bourgogne), while Soignies in Belgian Hainaut/Henegouwen/Hennegau has also received prominence among scholars as an alternative location of *pago Senonago*. From a philological point of view *pago* may mean an administrative district or a homeland territory of a specific tribe. It is true that under the Roman Empire, there was a tribe of Senons living by the river Yonne, whose influence spread even to Orléans and Paris. At the end of the fourth century when Roman provinces in Gaul were broken down into smaller units, the one in which these Senons lived was known as *Lugdunensis Senonia*. *Pago Senonago* is therefore usually accepted as the land of Senons in northern France. This would disarm the arguments of Palacký, because Slavs did not live so far west as Sens and it was a region with a strong historical Celtic presence. If we follow the logic of these arguments and trust Fredegar for the laconic information he gave us, it seems most probable that Samo was a Celt by blood, a Gallo-Roman by culture and a subject of the Frankish Empire.

However solid this hypothesis may seem, there are two other possibilities, which reduce confidence in these conclusions. The first one is the possibility that Samo is not a name but an old Slavic ruling title Sam' in the meaning of self-lord, self-governor, accepted after his ascent to the throne. Similar analysis was attempted of the name Valluka, a contemporary of Samo and a Slavic Carinthian lord mentioned by Fredegar as well.⁵ The name Valluka might have been derived from "vladyka"—the ruler—or a Latin-Slavic combination of words "veľký dux" meaning great duke. If Samo was not his original name but a title accepted at the hands of the Slavic tribal chiefs, we cannot be so sure anymore of his Celtic origins, even if he came from the region of Sens.

Another possible theory is the derivation of the name from the Hebrew Samuel. Samo is still today a diminutive for Samuel in a number of Slavic languages such as Slovak and Czech. This possibility is supported by the fact that Jews were known at the time for their adventurous merchant ventures, often travelling to dangerous areas where others refused to go, trading along the old Amber Road and especially the intercontinental Silk Road, facilitating economic contact between western European culture with other civilizations as far away as the kingdoms of Bulgars and Khazars on the river Volga, naturally, via a vast Slavic territory. It is known that Jewish merchants were among the few who learned the old Slavic vernacular, and therefore were very useful in conducting and mediating trade operations with Slavs.⁶ The two possibilities mentioned above make it less probable that Samo was a Celt, as many scholars think, and if Samo is not the real name of a person but a title given to a king or other ruler, the probability that he was a Slav cannot be entirely rejected, as many have done. It is also not out of the question that Samo may have been of Jewish descent.

⁵ Krusch, ed., "Chronicarum Fredegarii libri IV," p. 157.

⁶ Ibn Hurdadbih *Kitáb al-masálik wa l-mamálik* (The book of journeys and kingdoms), in Ján Pauliny, *Arabské správy o Slovanoch: 9.-12. storočie* (Bratislava: Veda, 1999), p. 92-93.

Unfortunately, given the state of the sources, we cannot reach a definitive conclusion on this question, but only suggest the likeliest hypotheses.

Thus we move on to the question surrounding Samo's motivation to travel to lands of the Slavs in Central Europe. As we know from Fredegar, Samo ventured into the lands of Slavs in the fortieth year of the reign of Chlothar (623/624) and ruled among the Slavs for thirty-five years, that is, until 658/9. That would mean that Samo was young at the time of his travels and judging from the direction of the expedition, he must have been a courageous and ambitious individual. From Fredegar we also know that he "assembled a greater number of merchants,"⁷ which would imply that he was not a mere member or a leader of an armed escort but the leader of the whole trading caravan. The question is: What goods did the merchants carry and what did they want in return? It is not probable that Samo would set off on a long and dangerous journey into lands stricken by an ongoing conflict between the Slavs and the dreaded Avars, to barter for common agricultural goods such as furs, honey and wax, the traditional Slavic export.

The idea that these products would be the main items of trade with Slavs fits into the romantic conception often attributed to Johann Gottfried Herder, the father of Slavic studies, who offered the world a theory of the "*Taubennatur*" or the "dovish nature" of early Slavs.⁸ However, this cannot be accepted as truth, since Slavs, as one of the four culture blocs that built modern Europe (the other three being the Roman, Greek and Germanic) could not fall behind considerably in the art of war if they were to survive in a bloodthirsty Europe of the Migration Period. The Slavs were not much different from other tribes of Europe when it came to everyday struggles for survival. Parallel to their struggle with nature, they had to fight wars with other nations arriving in their territory, as well as fighting among themselves. Thus we dissolve another romantic illusion that the early Slavs lived in a pan-Slavic comradeship, as pan-Slavism is a phenomenon of modern history, emerging in the nineteenth century. However, there are moments in history when there was a voluntary amalgamation of interests of different Slavic tribes or nations (mostly because of a threat they could not handle alone) and one of these examples is Samo's Empire.

It is, therefore, more probable that the articles of commerce were weapons, slaves and luxury products from the Orient. Frankish weapons were in high demand among Slavs, who did have effective weapons, but not ones as well-crafted and deadly as those forged in Western Europe, where the people inherited pockets of knowledge from the ruins of the western Roman culture. Usually furs, honey and wax would not be of sufficient counter value for the Frankish merchants. The main source of energy at the time was human labor; therefore slaves were the most common barter article for goods of superior military character. We must not omit the consideration that there was a renewal of transcontinental trade along the Silk Road, which linked China, Central Asia and

⁷ Krusch, ed., "Chronicarum Fredegarii libri IV," p. 139.

⁸ Notably in the section on the Slavs in his *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*.

Europe, ending in the Carpathian basin in Central Europe. The flourishing of many Slavic cities, such as Kiev and Cracow, occurred in later centuries along this immensely long and valuable caravan route. It was the Avar khaganate that was in control of the main depot and the European outlet of the Silk Road in the Carpathian basin, thus obtaining vast amounts of money and luxurious products, such as silk, porcelain and rare spices. It is very probable that Samo's empire, once established, participated economically in the Silk Road trade, either having control of a certain section of the road or even the main depot, thus mediating in the transfer of highly priced luxury goods further west. This source of income could have been so significant that wars would be fought over it. Historians base these assumption on archeological findings of Central Asian, Persian and Byzantine ceramics, jewels and silk from the period on the territory of the Avar khaganate. Nevertheless, the true motivations for which Samo undertook such an ambitious journey will always remain in the sphere of speculation.

Why does Samo, with his caravan and some sort of military *utilitas* or usefulness, appear in the northwest of the Avar khaganate exactly at a time of heightening crisis, military confrontation and internal chaos? From the few sentences that Fredegar left us, it is not clear why a merchant would take such risks. The answer to this question is the key in clarifying who Samo was and what role he played in the emergence of first Slavic polity. What led the Slavic nobility to elect Samo as their king? What is that *utilitas* Fredegar mentions, but does not specify? We can only speculate whether it was his courage in battle or whether it was his numerous armed brigands that tipped the balance in his favor among the Slavs. The number of soldiers Samo brought with him would definitely not have been more than that of the Slavs who mobilized in their homeland. Neither could his usefulness lie in tactical mastery, bearing in mind that the Pannonian Slavs had fought against or alongside the Avars since that nomadic tribe arrived in the Carpathian basin in 567, and thus had a better opportunity to learn how to fight against them than Samo ever had. Even as a supplier of superior Frankish weaponry or for all of the various reasons mentioned above, it remains doubtful whether Samo, a foreigner, could have been elected as the first Slavic king on such grounds.

Personally, I am inclined to accept the arguments proposed by Nad'a Profantová and Michal Lutovský, who write that Samo might have been an instrument of Frankish external politics.⁹ In their view, he was intentionally sent to the border region between the Slavs and Avars in Pannonia in order to secure the support of the Austrasians against the Avars, who had been troubling both the Byzantine and Frankish Empires already for forty-five years, since their arrival in Central Europe. The Avars were a fearsome, mixed group of Turkic tribes, who were probably the greatest nightmare of early mediaeval Europe, second only to the Huns. They were very cruel and imperious, making themselves feared even in Constantinople. That explains the interest the Frankish empire had in overcoming

⁹ Michal Lutovský and Nad'a Profantová, *Sámova říše*, (Prague: Academia, 1995), pp. 27-30.

this catastrophe that galloped out of Asia. According to this theory, Samo was sent from the Frankish Empire to build a buffer state that would serve as a shield against nomads invading from the east. Other aspects of the situation provide support for this theory. In the same year that Samo arrived among the Slavs, Dagobert was appointed the king of Austrasia by his father Chlothar, at a time when the Avar khaganate was experiencing a crisis in which the Slavic subjects of the Avars rebelled against their masters. A few years later, when the envoy Sycharius met with Samo, the latter confirmed that indeed, his realm “belongs to Dagobert ... as long as he intends to preserve our friendship.”¹⁰ Samo appears to have assimilated with the Slavic culture well, as he married twelve Slavic women (probably daughters of nobles from various tribes to ensure the unity of the polity) with whom he had thirty-seven children. Since he remained as king of Slavs for the relatively long period of thirty-five years, he probably adopted their pagan beliefs. Nevertheless, there is a small chance that Samo might have been a pagan himself prior to his arrival in Pannonia, if the hypothesis of his Celtic origin was correct. If, however, he came from the “land of Senons,” he would have been most probably a Christian, since that area was strongly Christianized by the seventh century. And, as noted above, we cannot discard the possibility that he might have been Jewish.

In summary, Samo was a Frankish citizen, coming from *pagus Senonago* or the ancient province of Lugdunensis Senonia in the widest geographical sense. His Slavic identity cannot be firmly denied, however, it is very improbable that there were any Slavic tribes living in the area. He was most probably a Celt of Gallo-Roman culture or a Jewish merchant. His arrival among the Slavs earned him their respect and it was the first time in recorded history that we would hear of Slavs electing one ruler above all others, even Fredegar calling him *rex*, thus placing him on the same level of importance as the king of Austrasia, Dagobert. Whether Fredegar did this intentionally we cannot say, just as we cannot confirm any hypothesis, however rational and viable, since Fredegar did not pay attention to Samo extensively and *Libri IV* is the only source on Samo that we have. Unless archeological findings or other new written sources come to light, we will not be able to say with certainty whether the first Slavic historical figure was elevated to the position of first Slavic king by coincidence, diplomatic negotiations or battle fervor, or whether he was a merchant, a warrior or Dagobert’s diplomat. Yet, when speaking from the point of view of probabilities, I am of the opinion that he was a servant of Dagobert and acted on his orders, but changed his loyalty once the Slavs conferred upon him great honors and a new and better life.

Characterizing Samo’s Empire and the Slavs

Now that we have considered more thoroughly what is known about who Samo was and what the circumstances surrounding his success were, we can look deeper into the questions of Slavic political aspirations, their social order and

¹⁰ Krusch, ed., “Chronicarum Fredegarii libri IV,” Chs. 48 and 68.

cultural traditions, so as to complete the picture of the historical realities surrounding an evaluation of Samo's Empire. Thus, I will try to characterize Samo's Empire and the Slavs as they appeared in the sixth and seventh century.

The Period of Migration resulted in extraordinary changes for the entire European continent. The trekking of large nomadic and later even settled agricultural communities changed the ethnic and cultural composition of large territories in an extremely short time. The chain reaction of large-scale ethnic movement was observed particularly in the area of Central Europe, which became the venue of military conflicts during the transition from classical to mediaeval civilization in Europe. The arrival of Slavs in the Carpathian basin can be dated back to the end of fifth and the beginning of sixth century. The Carpathian basin was populated by Slavic tribes in two streams, which originated from the region northeast of the Carpathian mountain range. The bend of the Carpathian Mountains with its thick forests posed a barrier for the movement of entire tribes, which were forced to go around them. The northern stream entered through the Moravian Gate and by the valleys of the source of the river Vah. The southern stream was much more numerous as it included a mixture of Turkic nomads who brought with them many Slav subjects. Most of them, however, settled in rich Byzantine provinces (resulting in the establishment of Bulgaria)—but some crossed the Danube from the south and entered the Carpathian basin. There they absorbed the few remaining Germanic communities, assimilating them within their Slavic culture and traditions. This account reflects the mainstream consensus among scholars of early Slavic history, but it is important to mention that there is also the autochthonous theory, which proposes that Slavs were living by the Danube River since time immemorial and that the migration was merely a movement of eastern Slavic tribes towards their western kinsmen.

In 567 Avars arrived at the invitation of the Langobards, to destroy the Gepid kingdom. However, the Langobards left their territory in Pannonia in 568, allowing the Avars to establish their rule over the Carpathian basin and Pannonia. There the Avars came into contact with the Slavs, whom they subjugated. As we can read from Fredegar, the Avars behaved cruelly to Slavs, residing by force in Slavic settlements during the winter and requisitioning tribute from them. As a result of Avar winter visits among Slavs, a generation of Avar-Slavic crossbreeds was born. These crossbreeds were accepted neither by the Avar nor the Slav communities and they found themselves outside of the traditional family bonds. These "outlaws" had little other option than becoming mercenaries. They fought mostly as *befulci* of the Avars, which meant that they were considered as inferiors and were first-line soldiers fighting in front of the Avar ranks.¹¹ As explained by Fredegar, Avar tactics were to let the front-line Slavs take the brunt of initial action, and if they were unsuccessful, to come to their support; but when they were successful, the Avars charged in to take possession of the booty of war. We can observe Avars using *befulci* even at the attack on Constantinople in 626.

¹¹Gerard Labuda, *Pierwsze państwo słowiańskie. Państwo Samona*, (1949, rpt. Wodzisław Śląski: Templum, 2009) p. 324-33.

Although considered expendable auxiliaries, the Avar use of Slavs as *befulci* is how an organized military class emerged among Slavic agrarian communities.

Suffering in difficult living conditions and treated badly by the Avars, these Avar-Slav mercenaries began the rebellion in Pannonia against their Avar overlords. The result of this rebellion was the establishment of Samo's Empire, or more correctly, tribal union. Reasons why the success of this rebellion brought about the formation of a supra-tribal union with the characteristics of a state, instead of a simple independence from Avar neighbors, can be found in the nature of the rebellion itself. At the head of the uprising we do not see the old Slavic tribal aristocracy, but a new class of professional warriors who were not a part of any specific clan or tribe, joined by a seemingly powerful foreigner. Thus, for the first time, Samo's Empire politically unified the Slavs living in Pannonia, Slovakia, Moravia and Bohemia, thanks to which they did not have to fear the Avar Khaganate or Frankish Empire.

We should keep in mind that when the members of this tribal union were entering a common "empire," it would have been problematic to choose one of their warlords as a king to rule all others. We know that Slavs were not used to living in such an organization and did not submit themselves to the authority of a single ruler. Choosing from among their own would have probably evoked natural jealousy and internal conflicts. A capable foreigner, Samo, was therefore a welcome compromise. Additionally, we know that his interference in the uprising was a key to its success, through which he earned the gratitude and respect of all those who had shaken off the Avar yoke, thus granting him the necessary mandate. The tribes entering the union were probably all or most of the tribes found between the Avar Khaganate and Frankish Empire. This would mean Samo's Empire included Moravia and the principality of Nitra, but also northwestern Pannonia, between the rivers Enns and Raba (today's Burgenland, Lower Austria and Styria). His Empire grew in strength due to an alliance with the Czechs and union with the Lusatian Serbs under Dervan, who joined the union after Samo's victory against Dagobert. Like other similar developments during the Migration Period, the formation of Samo's Empire took place within an extremely short period of time. The Slavic uprising against the Avars, the migration of Croats and Serbs to the Balkans, and the formation of Samo's Empire all occurred between the years 623 and 625. These developments created a new balance of power, which secured peace. Taking into consideration the Avar assault on Constantinople with a great host of Slavic *befulci* in 626, we can assume that the Avars welcomed peace on their western frontier, too; otherwise they would not have been prepared to strike Byzantium, if the danger of a potential Slavic enemy in the rear had actually existed. Meanwhile Samo similarly relied on the non-interference of the Avars in order to challenge the Frankish Empire in an open war.

Samo—the first king of Slavs—was seemingly a talented leader, a wise strategist and most probably mastered the logistical expertise of experienced merchants. Hence, I am keen to assume that Samo was most likely also a capable geostrategist and geopolitician. The seat of power of Samo's Empire must have

been somewhere at the crossroads of important trading routes. The most important crossroad in the area of Samo's Empire was that of the Amber and Danube roads, guarded by an old Roman fortification, Carnuntum, and its extended outpost Devin, at the confluence of the rivers Morava and Danube. Devin was protected by the Danube and the Carpathians and thus offered a better defensive position against an attack from Pannonia than Carnuntum, which lies in flat fields on the south side of Danube. Devin is located at the borders of three core parts of Samo's Empire, Moravia, the principality of Nitra, and Pannonia. This location, being outside the center of influence of any of the mentioned tribes he ruled, only further supports the hypothesis that Samo chose it for its geostrategic location.

Similar analysis should be applied in regards to finding the position of Wogastisburg, a fortress under which the Austrasians were defeated during the Frankish-Slavic War of 631. Fredegar knew it under the name "*castro Wogastisburc*," the suffix of the name being Germanic. A Germanic name of the fortress would only emerge if German-speaking communities were living in proximity to it. The core of Samo's Empire—Moravia, Nitra, and Pannonia—bordered lands inhabited by German speakers (Bavarians) only on the river Enns. Wogastisburg was most likely therefore close to Bavaria, guarding the western route into his kingdom, which followed the Danube River. Suffixes "*burg*" and "*furt*" were Germanic terms for old Roman castles and fortifications. There was a Roman fortification at the confluence of rivers Danube and Aist, which used to be called Agasta. A fortress guarding Agasta would then be called Agastisburg, which could have been recorded by Fredegar as Wogastisburg.¹²

There are multiple theories on the location of Wogastisburg, but since this aspect is not central to the evaluation of Samo's Empire, I only mention the arguments that place it into Lower Austria, as they have more valid points. One of the other theories, which has many sympathizers, proposes that Wogastisburg was located somewhere in northwestern Bohemia. This is based on the contention that Bohemia was a core of Samo's Empire (which I consider improbable due to its distance from Pannonia, where the uprising took place) and that the Austrasians marched directly towards the territory of the most proximate allies of Samo, the Czechs. Unfortunately, none of the theories have been validated or invalidated by any relevant archeological findings.

Wogastisburg testifies that Samo was defending and ruling his empire from castles. The fortifications that were available to him were old Roman forts, similar to those found in the Frankish Empire, or wooden castles surrounded by a wooden palisade. Since Wogastisburg guarded the western entrance to Samo's Empire along the Danubian Road, similar defenses must have been erected or revitalized on other borders as well, especially with the Avar Khaganate.

¹² Ján Steinhübel, *Nitrianske kniežatstvo: Počiatky stredovekého Slovenska* (Budmerice: Rak, 2004), p. 33,

Characterizing the Early Slavs

Since Samo's empire was one of the earliest polities to emerge among the Slavs, characterizing the nature of early Slavic society and culture helps in evaluating its achievement. To begin with, how unified were the early Slavs? Should we think of one single group, or multiple groupings, and what were the factors that united them? The most important factor of Slavic unity was the common Slavic language. This common language remains the strongest argument that Slavs originated from the same genus and are all akin to one another. The first historical recording about the Slavs was made by the Byzantine writer Jordanes.¹³ In the sixth century he writes about one of the neighboring peoples that "even though their names are now changing according to various tribes and habitations, they are principally Slavs and Antes."¹⁴ This is the first time the name Slav is used in written historical texts.

We do not know precisely the derivation of the term "Slav," but philology supports argument that it was not foreigners who imposed it, but rather it was a name which the Slavs chose for themselves. Etymological arguments propose that the name Slav is derived from words "*Slova/Slava*," an archaic Slavic expression for "river," or that it is derived from the word "*Slovo*" meaning "word." This argument supposes that the Slavs gave themselves a name in an attempt to differentiate themselves from Germans. While Slavs were communicating by "word," the Germans were wordless to them and thus they called them "*Nemci*," deriving it from the word for "mute." This is reminiscent of the ancient Greek use of the term βάρβαρος—from which we derive "barbarian"—which was used to refer to non-Greeks, whose languages supposedly sounded like unintelligible babble ("bar-bar-bar...").

A good informant on old Slavic culture, conflicts, and society is Procopius of Caesarea (c. 500-c. 560). Information that he offers is considered to be truthful and reliable since he was writing at the imperial court in Constantinople, where he had an excellent supply of up to date information.¹⁵ According to the Byzantines, the Slavs were stout and strong. Their hair was neither white nor black and their skin slightly tanned. They did not ride on horses like the nomads of the East, but rather travelled by foot, being fast walkers. Procopius noted that all Slavs had one common language. The Slavs did not develop complex urban centers known from the classical world, but were all villagers. Procopius even says that they were not ruled by one individual, but have "always lived in a democracy." We should note that when Procopius mentions democracy, he does not mean the modern form of democracy, but rather an archaic socialist system, agricultural communism, based

¹³ Published in 1882 as Jordanes, *Jordani Romana et Getica*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, V/1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1882), edited by Theodor Mommsen.

¹⁴ Free translation from the citation in Kučera, *Můj štát, moja vlast'*, p. 50.

¹⁵ There were several other Byzantine authors who recorded valuable but fragmentary information on the Slavs. They include, apart from Jordanes and Procopius of Caesarea, Menander the Protector, Theophylactos Simokattes, and pseudo-Maurikios (Maurice), author of *Strategikon*.

on people's assemblies of the entire tribe. When the Slavs migrated into Byzantine territory, not only did the Byzantines accept such a system, but they even supported it. The tribal assemblies were a good opportunity for tax collection and recruitment into the Imperial army.

Nonetheless, the Slavic people, scattered across the countryside in villages and hamlets, found a way to organize "tribal centers" for themselves. They did it in the form of forts. Forts were a novelty in the organization of Slavic societies. Primarily, forts served them as a hideout or a defense point against external enemies. They would gather the cattle, women and children inside, while men would take defensive positions on the walls. Secondly, forts served for other societal needs such as sanctuaries for religious rituals or venues for greater assemblies, where people took decisions on their future. Information on the rituals and spiritual life of Slavs is sparse, but scholars say they were shifting from polytheism to monotheism, as we can see from the rising prominence of their highest god, Perun. Procopius writes: "They have one God, thruster of thunderbolts, who they consider as the only lord of all things, bringing him bulls as sacrifice and performing other sacred rituals."¹⁶ Procopius adds that they also worshiped rivers, spirits and other deities. Later on, the forts served as habitations for craftsmen and as trading hubs for merchants.

Mediaeval civilization borrowed many things from antique culture, but mediaeval city development was based on something new. Early-mediaeval cities sprang up as a result of a new economic system and new market conditions. Cities served as a free market, open to everyone who had something to sell or buy. Slavic forts became the basis of the Slavs' mediaeval cities and developed parallel to, but independent from, similar urban centers in other parts of Europe. Since the mediaeval city stood on a new basis, we cannot consider it as an import from the parts of Europe where Roman civilization thrived and left behind a vast network of infrastructure and urban settlements. The Old Slavic term for fort, "*grad*," and the Russian word "*gorod*" for city illustrate the fact that Slavic mediaeval cities retained an independent development.

In addition to the comments of Byzantine authors, we have other sources of information on the early Slavs. Arab merchants, explorers, and geographers also recorded essential information on the early Slavic environment. One of the Arab geographers who travelled among the Slavs was called Ibn Rusta.¹⁷ He wrote that Slavs shepherded pigs as others did sheep, that they had few or no horses, and that they mostly sowed millet. He also mentioned the widespread cultivation of beehives and production of honey and drinks made from it. He described that in their burial rituals Slavs burn their dead and that they all worshiped fire, which was a common practice of all Indo-Germanic cultures. Slavic habitations were dug into the ground, since they lived in cold lands and during winter it helped keeping warmth inside, which they produced by pouring water on red-hot stones. It is

¹⁶ Freely translated from the citation in Kučera, *Můj štát, moja vlast'*, p. 53.

¹⁷ Ibn Rusta, *Kitáb al-aláq an-nafisa* (The Book of Precious Rarities), in Pauliny, *Arabské správy o Slovanoch*, p. 98-99.

recorded that Slavs had various musical instruments such as flutes and string instruments.

Two other well-known Arabic authors writing about the early Slavs are Ibrahim ibn Jaqub and Al-Mas'udi. Ibn Jaqub writes that Turks and Jews trade with the Slavs bringing gold and precious goods, while buying slaves, furs and tin. He mentions that Slavs owned pieces of fabric that could not be utilized but had a fixed value and was used as a currency. They stored it in large quantities and it represented their fortune, since anything could be bought for it.¹⁸ This would explain why even today in the Slovak, Czech and Serbo-Croat languages the word for market is “*trh*” or “*tržište*”, which stems from the verb “*trhat/trgati*,” meaning “to tear.” Therefore markets were places where fabrics were being torn. Ibn Jaqub also mentions that Slavs provided a large dowry on marriage. The dowry is received by the family of the bride; hence, someone who has daughters gets rich and someone who has sons becomes poor. This dowry was considered a counter value for actually “buying” the bride, since she becomes part of the family of the husband. Polygamy was tolerated and richer individuals did have many wives. Ibn Jaqub continues to say that Slavs did not have a king and no one commanded them, but they did accept the moral authority of the elders. Slavs were brave in battle and if they would cease fighting among each other, no one could defeat them. They are outstandingly industrious on their fields, and in this aspect surpass other Northern nations. Interesting is Ibn Jaqub's reference to the diseases which Slavs suffer from. Those are predominantly measles and ulcers. The Slavs do not eat chicken meat because they believe it causes rashes. Instead of wine they drink brewed honey nectar. Ibn Jaqub also mentions that when the Slavs burned their dead, the ritual was accompanied by festive celebration and cheering, since they were happy that the Lord had finally accepted the dead into his mercy.

One paragraph from the Arab traveller and writer Al-Mas'udi (Abu al-Hasan Ali ibn al-Husayn al-Mas'udi) is particularly a noteworthy and suggestive for what it suggests about the early organization of the Slavs:

There are so many Slavic tribes that we cannot name and describe them all in this book. We already mentioned the king to whom all Slavic princes submitted. He was Magak, king of the Walinana nation. This nation was purely of Slavic origin and other Slavs highly respected it for its antiquity. Then there were quarrels between Slavs, their internal organization dissolved and separate tribes emerged.¹⁹

Other evidence has never been found to corroborate this information, but it serves as a suggestion that there was a legend alluding to the common ancestry of all Slavs. Walinana could also perhaps be an Arabic phonetic transcription of

¹⁸ Ibrahim ibn Jaqub al-Isrā'ili at-Turtuši, *Dikr as-Saqāliba* (Report on the Slavs), in Pauliny, *Arabské správy o Slovanoch (9.-12.storočie)*, p. 117-118.

¹⁹ Al-Mas'udi, *Murūğ ad-dahab wa ma'ādin al-gawāhir* (Meadows of Gold and Mines of Jewels), in Pauliny, *Arabské správy o Slovanoch*, p. 108.

Volhynia, which is a region currently between Ukraine and Poland, considered by some to be the original homeland of Slavs.

Ibn Hurdabih wrote about trade with Slavs and referred mainly to Jewish merchants.²⁰ He says that they learned Arabic, Persian, Greek, Frankish, Andalusian and the Slavic languages, travelling from Western Europe to China and back. From the West they carried slaves, weapons, and furs and from the East silk, cinnamon, and other spices and precious oriental goods. Most importantly he mentions that sometimes Jews travelled by the north road across Slavic lands towards the Caspian Sea, which must have ran across the territory of Samo's Empire. The information recorded by these Arab travellers still constitutes one of the richest contemporary sources on the life of early Slavic communities.

Another valuable source of information on the ancient Slavs is *Strategikon*, a war manual written in the sixth century by an anonymous Greek author known as Pseudo-Maurikios (Maurice). A chapter called "How to fight against Slavs, Antes and other similar tribes"²¹ gives us precious information on the character of Slavic warfare. In summary, *Strategikon* reveals to us that Slavs fought without armor, often only with trousers and belt. Their weapons were light, such as swords, spears and bows. They did not fight in closed ranks but preferred guerilla war tactics, being self-confident fighters in forests, valleys and especially in and around water. The author also describes what Slavs did with their captured enemies. Practices such as skinning, impaling on a stake, beating to death by sticks or burning alive in houses were common. This account runs counter to Herder's depiction of the "dove-like nature" of the Slavs. It is logical that the attitude of Slavs towards warfare could not have been much different from that of other European nations. The sixth and seventh centuries of the Common Era were a time when all the newcomers from the East were trying to defend their existence and independence on their newly occupied territories among other nations who were struggling for the same. It was a time of constant warfare, armed brigands, and warlords elected by their soldiers. The biggest honor of the time was to bring home a captured enemy and the biggest dishonor to die in bed. Who failed to defend his place on the map ceased to exist. Such were the societies that formed modern Europe after the collapse of Roman civilization in the West.

However, the culture of the Slavs was affected by new contacts with other cultures. The most significant exchange occurred with the German culture and the Roman cultures, which radiated from the Byzantine Empire. After the Migration Period, Slavs occupied vast new lands, coming into a closer contact with the advanced Mediterranean region. This is the time when the original Slavic unity started dissolving and differentiated tribal groupings emerged, which later crystalized into modern Slavic nations. Under this regionalization of Slavic groups, the basis for state-formation began. This element was new to the Slavs and was one of the most serious borrowings from the Roman culture. Even the tax

²⁰ Ibn Hurdábih, *Kitáb al-masálik wa l-mamálik* (The book of journeys and kingdoms), in Pauliny, *Arabské správy o Slovanoch*, pp. 92-93.

²¹ Kučera, *Můj stát, moja vlast*, p. 54.

collection system, an indispensable factor for the existence of a state, which was in practice until Charlemagne, was copied from a system already used in the Roman Empire. Due to the extent of the expansion of the Slavs and their successful struggle for existence, the sixth and seventh centuries are considered the “heroic” period of Slavic history.

If we look at the territory of Samo’s Empire, we see from history that the Slavs had to first digest the remnants of Germanic peoples and then defend themselves from incoming Heruls and later from Gepids and Langobards. However, the coexistence with these tribes was not as problematic as with Avars. The struggle against a common enemy united many tribes, which increased their military potential, but also formed the feeling of ethnic identity based on the philosophy: ours are friends; strangers are enemies. The Avar yoke was a crucial ingredient in the formation of a supra-tribal union, which we now call Samo’s Empire. These elements served as the basis for the formation of Slavic nations in their regionalized and differentiated conditions.

Culture and traditions may be more important to history than they initially seem. People do not only act as they must, their behavior determined by the economic and political realities, but also as they can, determined by the framework of their ideology, religion and culture. Culture and traditions are not historical events, but principles explaining the meaning of the world to people, thus influencing their thinking and decision-making. That is why societies defend their culture and cultivate it as their most valuable inheritance, against any risky change, since it is their most vital compass. People have lived cultivating their unique cultures for thousands of years and it is a habit still in practice today, despite the globalization of the world and acceptance of the Western technological advancements. Mythology, an inherent part of any culture, is a vital element in the thought structure of any society. It allows people to orient themselves in reality and helps them act according to some universal principles. Mythology tells people how the world was created and how it should remain, so that it does not fall into disorder and chaos. It therefore served people as a first form of constitution connected with rituals, which were meant to ensure that the order of things remains on the right course, as they were established in primordial times, by the acts of those who are worshiped.

Social order of Samo’s Empire

In his book *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, J.G. Herder, proponent of the romanticized Slavic “dove-like nature,” put forward the idea that Slavs loved peace, and for that reason they were not willing to form a permanent military organization. They did not, so Herder asserted, aspire to dominate other nations and live off their labor, but were common farmers and merchants. During the nineteenth century, scholars and the general public were deeply influenced by romantic ideals and visions of the social order of the early Slavs. These attitudes spanned the gamut from an idea of absolute equality (where all the men of the tribe would assemble and negotiate the affairs of the tribe) to the

view that the early Slavs were still savage people who had no social organization or even permanent settlements, as portrayed by Nikolai Karamzin in his famous *History of the Russian State*. Nonetheless, there was a general atmosphere that there always existed some social order within the framework of a family.

The framework of such families among the southern Slavs was called *zadruga*. Slavs living in a closer contact with Western culture, absorbing its progressive elements, were affected by individualization much sooner, leading to the weakening of the tribal "family" bonds. That means that the "family" among western Slavs was smaller than that of their eastern kin. *Zadruga* is thought to have been an extended family, made up of a few dozens of adults. They all shared their property equally, they had an elder whom they would obey and they organized the division of labor according to their own will.

Zadruga was an institution of purely agrarian societies, who gathered into larger unions in order to have better chances of survival in the face of threats from nature and other peoples. These unions naturally developed among blood relatives. To some, the *zadruga* represented an ideal and equitable form of agrarian communism. Nonetheless, an internal organization of extended families, called *zadruga* by the south Slavs, was not an institution of exclusively Slavic character. Germanic tribes, especially in the alpine regions, had an organization similar to the *zadruga* as well. The characteristics of a nation stemmed out of the character of natural habitat in which they lived, and only after the passage of time, under the influence of developing culture, would they differentiate from others. Since Germanic and Slavic tribes originated from a similar natural habitat, their primordial social structure was similar as well.

František Palacký, writing in nineteenth century, saw the Slavic agrarian organization as a role model for other nations.²² However, he was drawing his conclusions at the time when Herder's romantic vision of the Slavs persisted, and when the Manuscripts of Dvůr Králové and Zelená hora (RKZ) were still considered authentic.²³ Palacký wrote as fact that the earliest Slavs always lived in an equitable social system in which they did not have a sovereign lord or were not imposing their dominance over others (an interpretation that is no longer considered accurate). Public authority was based on the principles of religion and fatherhood. The moral authority of priests and elders was fully respected and order in the tribe revolved around these "natural laws." The transformation of this original establishment occurred after Slavs came into contact with Byzantine and Germanic cultures. The old values, however, came under siege especially due to gradual penetration of Christianity.

²² In *Dějiny národu českého* he envisioned a romantic version (which could very well have still reflected some truth) of their social organization, attributing to them many virtues.

²³ The famous Manuscripts of Dvůr Králové and of Zelená hora are today generally considered to be literary hoaxes, claiming to be a collection of authentic myths from the Slavic mythology. Unfortunately, we do not have any written primary sources on the early Slavic myths, but many nineteenth century historians drew inspiration from these spurious manuscripts.

Relationships within families served as basis during development of the tribal psychology and the culture of state-formation. Germanic tribes were known for their military character and their political ambitions of subjugating other tribes and the building of empires. Slavs evidently lacked this ambition, which we can observe from the lack of information on early Slavs. We have significantly less information on the old Slavs than we have on the old Germanic tribes, because they did not exert such military pressure on the advanced cultures in their neighborhood as the Germans did. This implies that the relationships in the families of Slavs were different to those of Germans, who very quickly developed an aristocratic class. The Slavic family was built on more humane principles, living in a more equitable environment, where they all had the same right to utilize the family's property. Despite the fact that the *zadruga* or the extended family, out of which first tribes crystalized, did not possess an exclusively Slavic character, we can already see the difference from the Germanic system in the attitude of members of these organizations to one another. That basic human feeling of coexistence with the family caused the differentiation from other nations originating in a similar habitat; hence we can talk about the emergence of an exclusively Slavic culture.

Nineteenth century historians believed that each nation had its unique characteristics. Based on historical experience in a natural habitat, each nation established its ideals and values. It is improbable that the old Slavs were strictly agrarian communities, or that they only fought in defensive wars. More likely it was the result of their humane system, which hindered the state-formation process. This phase of development comes only after their contact with other nations, especially the Germans, who were of militant nature and reached the required hierarchical structuring of the tribe earlier. Besides the differences in human character of Slavs and Germans, there were also differences in their tribal structures. While Slavs were more egalitarian, Germans were a hierarchical community with the classes of aristocracy and serfs. Unfortunately, this kind of tribal structure was more effective in the military field, so, in order for Slavs to survive as a linguistic group they had to adapt to this culture, accepting the mediaeval version of "Christianity" in the course of the ninth to the twelfth centuries, a Christianity which had less to do with the humanism of the New Testament than with the power consciousness of the Old Testament.

However, in view of the references to Slavic lords in the works of Procopius or Fredegar,²⁴ we have to keep in mind that at the time of the sixth and seventh centuries, the Slavs entered into a struggle for their self-preservation and were often at war. These lords were most probably elected warlords who were given a temporary mandate to command their tribe until the imminent danger had passed. Therefore, here we can postulate a hypothesis that the Slavs from time to time did live in a "military democracy" which was different in its character than their social order in peace. This regime eventually persisted with the emergence of a

²⁴ Procopius Caesariensis, *De Bello Gothico* and Krusch, ed., "Chronicarum Fredegarii libri IV," Chs. 48, 68, 72 and 75.

Slavic military class in the Avar khaganate, which served as a precondition to building their first state.

We should also be aware that the social order of the Slavs from their original homeland did not remain the same after their migration, because each group arrived at different geographic locations with different cultural influences and historical experiences. That is why it is difficult to determine to what degree the Slavs in Samo's Empire were already influenced after their experience in the Carpathian basin. Probably, their values began changing already, since they were willing to accept a king who was in command of a military class within the society.

Making a synthesis of all the factors above, we cannot give a clear and a definite answer to how the early Slavic societies developed, but an effort to search for the answer already shines some light onto the historical realities which never entered textbooks.

Conclusion

Samo himself was a noteworthy individual who went down in history as a heroic figure from the "heroic" period of Slavs of the sixth and seventh centuries, a man of great skill, ambition and fortune who appeared at the right time, in the right place, and whose life work influenced the political ambitions and social structure of the Slavs, who had lived in "agrarian communism" since time immemorial. However, his merchant profession might have played a bigger role in the circumstances. He was probably closely linked to weapon traders and as such was a tool of Frankish politics and its first *Drang nach Osten*, to establish a buffer state against devastating incursions from the East; probably with a mandate from Dagobert himself to promise the chieftains of the Slavs a military pact with Austrasia, establishing a significant weapons supply route to northern Pannonia, and guaranteeing that he would not wage war against them. This approach provides a logical explanation of why it was a foreigner who established this first Slavic polity, which the historians of the romantic era in the nineteenth century did not want to believe, because it felt "unnatural." Looking closely at the matter we can see that the Slavic population still obeyed their own elders and chieftains only, and that Samo was more of a guarantor of a mutual defense assistance pact between the warlords.

Nonetheless, he laid the foundations for the development of independent Slavic principalities in Pannonia (Moravia and Nitra), which emerged without having to be subjugated by a Turko-Tatar elite (such as Bulgaria) and could develop purely in the spirit of Slavic culture and traditions. Thanks to him, history recorded some of the little information about Slavic identity we have, due to an unfortunate disinterest of Christian chroniclers in keeping memories of the pagan peoples and their cultures alive.

In the light of the postulations made in the analytical part of this work, we cannot and should not consider Samo's Empire as a true state in the modern sense of the word. The core of his dominion consisted of the territories of Moravia,

northern Pannonia and the Principality of Nitra, upon which the war with Avars in 623 was fought. Other Slavic tribes were only in a loose bond to the central rule of Samo, characterized by taking oaths of brotherhood (which could explain why Samo had twelve wives) and contributing to a common coffer. In the evaluation of what Samo's Empire was, we must remember, that the basic attributes of a state, such as administration of a territory with a sufficiently developed economy necessary to upkeep a state apparatus, which would then present itself externally by the unity of its population and leadership, were at an initial stage of development among Slavs on the middle Danube. The social order was as well becoming characteristic of "military democracy," exacerbated by the arrival of the Avars, when warlords were elected by their soldiers. That is why instead of an empire it is more correct to term Samo's realm a typical proto-mediaeval *regnum* or a tribal union. Thus, Samo's *regnum* ceased to exist upon his death due to the underdevelopment of these principles and the unpreparedness of the Slavs to empower a dynasty. Nevertheless, in the first half of the seventh century Samo laid the foundations of political and economic development among Western Slavs and began the state formation process, resulting in the first true Slavic state of the Mojmir dynasty, the Great Moravia.

**Pavel Šramko (1743-1831):
Love Expressed, Condemned, and Praised¹**

Gerald Sabo, S.J.

Sometime after 1778, the Lutheran pastor Pavel Šramko (1743-1831) composed and had printed a memorial book (*Památka/Remembrance*) to honor his recently deceased young wife, Katařjna (hereafter Katařina) née Potoczky (1749-1778).² They had been married only eight and a half years, and as is readily evident from his memorial book, Šramko loved her very, very much. The reaction to this publication by certain prominent Lutheran clerics was quite critical, even severe and caustic concerning private and intimate details and such an effusive, public display of affection and grief by a fellow cleric. Indeed, the Slovak literary specialist Rudo Brtáň (1907-98) observed that Šramko's writing "outraged Slovak preachers and the [Banská] Štiavnica superintendent J.[án] Čerňanský with its human frankness (*svojou ľudskou úprimnosťou*) and erotic nudity [rawness] (*erotickou nahotou*)."³ The poetic criticisms of Šramko by Ján Čerňanský (1741-85)⁴ and Augustýn Doležal (1737-1802)⁵ exist as *odpisy*, that is, recordings of

¹ This study is a significantly revised and expanded version of a panel presentation given in Denver in November, 2000 at a convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, now the Association for Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies.

² For a detailed Slovak biography of Šramko, a list of and comments on his writings, and a bibliography about him and his works, see "Šramko, Pavel," *Slovenský biografický slovník* (The Slovak Biographical Dictionary), 6 vols. (1986-94), vol. 5 (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1992) 497-98. Also noteworthy regarding Šramko are the comments of Bohuslav Tablic (1769-1832) in his *Paměti Česko-slovenských Básnjřůw [...]* (The Remembrances of Czecho-Slovak Poets [...], 4 volumes, 1806-1812) in which he writes about Šramko: in modern orthography, *Paměti česko-slovenských básníkův alebo veršovcov* (The Remembrances of Czecho-Slovak Poets and Versifiers) (Bratislava: Slovenský Tatran, 2000) 182-85. Another rather detailed discussion of Šramko's biography is by Rudo Brtáň in "Satirický útok na Pavla Šramku, autora pietnej Života i smrti požehnanej [požehnaná] památky [Památka] ..." (A Satirical Attack on Pavel Šramko, Author of the Reverent Života i smrti požehnaná památka ...), *Pri prameňoch slovenskej obrodeneckej literatúry* (At the Wellsprings of Slovak [National-]Revival Literature) (Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, 1970) 349-57. As regards the surname of Šramko's wife, throughout Šramko's memorial book, her surname is usually rendered "Potoczky"—sometimes with a dlžeň over the "y"—whatever the grammatical case, in what would be the masculine form of her family's last name. Indeed, the wife of Šramko's good friend Michal Semjan, Terezya, signs her poetic composition lamenting the death of Katařina as "Terezya Semjan, Klementis rozená" (Terezya Semjan, born Klementis," also in masculine forms (Šramko's *Památka* page 172).

³ *Bohuslav Tablic (1769-1832): život a dielo* (Life and Writings) (Bratislava: Veda, 1974) 68-69.

⁴ For a detailed Slovak biography of Čerňanský, a list of his writings with comments, and a bibliography on him and his works, see "Čerňanský, Ján," *Biografický lexikón Slovenska*, (Biographical Lexicon of Slovakia), 5 vols. thus far (2002-13), vol. 2 (Martin: Slovenská

texts by others than the author, and survive as transcriptions in a number of manuscripts. In reaction especially to Čerňanský's poetic denunciation, an anonymous verse in defense and praise of Šramko was also recorded as an *odpis* that has been virtually unknown in Slovak literary history, but may well have been composed by the Lutheran cleric and poet Michal Semian (1741-1812) who was an extremely close friend of Šramko.⁶ This study, then, concerns all four verse texts associated with Šramko's effusively expressed love, a love that was summarily condemned but then also anonymously praised.

The full title of Šramko's memorial book is *Žiwota y Smrti požehnaná Památka [...] Katařjne Potoczky [...] 1778 dne 6. Prasynce* (The Blessed Remembrance of the Life and Death [...] for Katařina Potoczky [... who died in] 1778 on the 6th of December).⁷ The Památka comprises one hundred seventy-four

národná knižnica and Národný biografický ústav, 2004) 139-40. Also, Brtňan discusses Čerňanský's biography and his criticism of Šramko ("Satirický útok" 345-49).

⁵ For a detailed Slovak biography of Doležal, a list of and comments on his writings, and a bibliography about him and his works, see "Doležal, Augustín," *Biografický lexikón Slovenska*, vol. 2, 293. Also noteworthy are the comments of Tablic (1769-1832) in his *Paměti Česko-slovenských Básnjřůw [...]* (in which he writes about Doležal: in modern orthography, *Paměti česko-slovenských básnikov alebo veršovcov*, 147-49. For a brief English biography and some comments on Doležal's writings, see "Doležal, Augustín," *Slovak Biographical Dictionary* (Martin, Slovakia and Wauconda, IL: Matica slovenská and Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc., 2002) 70.

⁶ For a detailed Slovak biography of Semian, a list of and comments on his writings, and a bibliography about him and his works, see "Semian, Michal," *Slovenský biografický slovník*, vol. 5, 202. Also noteworthy are the comments of Bohuslav Tablic (1769-1832) in his *Paměti Česko-slovenských Básnjřůw [...]* in which he writes about Semian: in modern orthography, *Paměti česko-slovenských básnikov alebo veršovcov*, 196-201. Also, Brtňan discusses Semian's biography and his relations with Šramko and Katařina ("Satirický útok" 343-44, 352-53).

⁷ Exemplars of Šramko's Památka are preserved at the Slovenská národná knižnica (Slovak National Library) in Martin, signature numbers 29-P-9; 101-V-8; and SD2861. The latter is used for citations in this study and is complete, while the former two are missing crucial concluding pages. There are two further complete exemplars of the Památka at the Lyceálna knižnica (Lyceum Library) of the SAV/Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava, signature numbers "v teol. 5401 priv. [acquisition number] 4" and Lyc C XII 1.1.9. For information on all the exemplars of the Památka, I am grateful to Mgr. Magdalena Brincková, Ľubica Galuščáková, and Eudmila Šimková of the Slovenská národná knižnica in Martin, and Ivona Kollárová of the Ústredná knižnica (Central Library) of the Slovenská akadémia vied (Slovak Academy of Sciences) in Bratislava. According to Tablic, the Památka was supposedly printed in Prešov though no place of printing appears in the extant exemplars: *Paměti česko-slovenských básnikov alebo veršovcov*, 184. Although no date of completion/printing appears in the extant exemplars of the Památka, a reference by Michal Semian may afford some indication of that possible year-date. Šramko and Semian became lifelong bosom-friends at the lycée in Kežmarok during the school year 1762-63 (*Slovenský biografický slovník*, vol. 5, 202 and 497). In "signing" his elegiac verses on Katařina's death near the end of the Památka, Semian noted that he was Šramko's "Dewadtenácteletnj důwěrný Přjtel" (Nineteenth-year bosom Friend, emphasis added, Památka, page 171). Thus, 1762/63 plus nineteen may translate to 1781 or 1782 at the latest

pages of primarily poetic texts, most of them in twelve-syllable verses of similar feminine-rhyme quatrains, as well as some twenty-five pages of prose; all the texts are expressed in *bibličtina*, the Kralice Biblical Czech linguistic medium typical of such Slovak Lutheran literary writing.⁸ Besides his extensive comments on the ancestry and family, life and marriage, and illness and death of his wife, Šramko also incorporated several distinct poetic entities. Among these are his own verses for his and Katařina's wedding day (34-46), the congratulatory verses of his very close friend Michal Semian for that wedding day (60-68), Semian's further verses for Katařina's nameday of November 25, 1770 (70-73), the funeral verses of a certain pán Ambrosy⁹ (122-140), and finally, four concluding verse entities expressing their authors' great condolences to Šramko at his loss of Katařina: (1) by Michal Semian (168-71); (2) by the latter's wife, Terezya née Klementis (171-72); (3) by a certain Johannes Molitoris, a very close friend of Katařina who is associated with the Lutheran school in Prešov (172-73); and (4) by the unnamed rector of the Sabinov parish school, a "Přítel starodávný" (an old/long-time friend) (174).¹⁰ Near the end of the *Památka*, Šramko also included the twenty-five-page prose funeral sermon (141-65) of the Lutheran pastor Matej Šulek (1748-1815).¹¹

In his introductory verses for the *Památka*, Šramko admits that what he has done concerning his wife's death is "very little" (2). With this *Památka*, he wants to honor his wife's name so that "it would not finally disappear from the

as the possible completion or printing date of the *Památka*. Also, at the end of these verses, Semian notes that he is then "konrektor" (co-rector/head) of the Prešov Lutheran school; a post he held from 1775-82 (*Slovenský biografický slovník*, vol. 5, 202), thus within the 1781/82 time period. It is interesting that in footnote "h" (page 58 of the *Památka*) Šramko notes that Semian is "currently the co-rector of the Prešov parish school with whom [Šramko] has been living in a special Friendship and affection since [Šramko was] nineteen years old"—another confirmation of their very close friendship.

⁸ For detailed English commentary on *bibličtina*, see "Biblical language," *The Encyclopaedia of Slovakia and the Slovaks: A Concise Encyclopaedia* (Bratislava: Encyclopaedic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences/Veda, 2006) 75.

⁹ According to Šramko, this "Pán Ambrosy" was a "Sskole představený/Učitel" (head/principal of the [Paludza] school./Teacher, *Památka* 121). However, I have been unable to determine anything more about this person.

¹⁰ Page numbers in parentheses from Šramko's *Památka* will follow citations or my comments about certain passages from the *Památka*. Also, part of Šramko's verses composed for his 1770 wedding day (*Památka* 34-45, plus comments on his verses for the *Památka*, 45-50) have been published in modern orthography in *Antologia staršej slovenskej literatúry* (An Anthology of Older Slovak Literature), eds. Ján Mišianik and Eva Tkáčiková, 2nd ed. (Bratislava: Veda, 1981) 700-01 and are entitled in Šramko's *Památka*: "Dobrovolný [...] pohřeb fenixa [...]" (The Voluntary [...] Burial of the Phoenix [...]) (pages 41-44 from the *Památka*).

¹¹ For a detailed Slovak biography of Šulek, a list of and comments on his writings, and a bibliography about him and his works, see "Šulek, Matej," *Slovenský biografický slovník*, vol. 5, 545. Also noteworthy are the comments of Bohuslav Tablic (1769-1832) in his *Paměti Česko-slovenských Básnjřůw [...]* in which he writes about Šulek: in modern orthography, *Paměti česko-slovenských básnikůw alebo veršovcov*, 189-96.

world/But at least survive in writings eternally” (2). He continues: “I know then that there will be found many such/Who will tear at [criticize] me with evil words;/Saying that this is not suitable for a Clergyman/To write this to his friend” (3). Yet “werna Láska/true Love” has moved Šramko to do this (4). By this writing, he contends that he is doing nothing bad, nor initiating anything new that would be offensive to God’s scriptures or in any way harmful to the community (4). His goal in honoring his spouse is to erect to her a “pamatny slaup/memorial column” (4). Indeed, he implores the reader: “please, do not begrudge her this honor [of the Památka]” (5). For he is certain without any error that “this composition will be dear to God and you [my readers]” (6). In conclusion, he asks God to bless him so that this simple writing would afford many readers an occasion to reflect upon death, and awaken them to the love of virtue (6). The remainder of the Památka is divided into four parts: Katařny Potoczký Rod (Family [Background] of Katařina Potoczký, 6-11); Katařny Potoczký vychowáváj (The Upbringing of Katařina Potoczký, 12-22); Katařny Potoczký Manželstw (The Marriage [and Married Life] of Katařina Potoczký, 22-101); and Katařny Potoczký Nemoc y Smrt (The Illness and Death [and Funeral] of Katařina Potoczký, 101 to, in effect, the end of the Památka).

Šramko’s Památka is a rather detailed chronicle-biography of his beloved wife.¹² He begins his narrative by describing her rather distinguished family background (6-11), and then in writing about her upbringing (12-22). He observes that “the beginning of her [Katařina’s] virtuous maidenhood [menstruation] happened, when she entered her fourteenth year, [... which matter] to acknowledge I hold for the aim of my writing” (17). He then continues by giving a detailed, laudatory description of Katařina’s physical characteristics—her appearance, personality, and her pleasing facial and body features (17-18). Indeed, among women her soul was more beautiful, her mind and wit sharper, ability keener, and memory quicker than the rest (19). Even more, Katařina “exercised herself in holy piety,/living in purity, she sought holiness,/she persisted in humility and humble quiet,/thus did she humiliate the world and its vanities” (20). While she had her temptations that caused her strife and torment of spirit, she triumphed with God’s help so that what her body wanted, she abased through the spirit, not allowing her tempters anything, thus preserving her pure maidenhood (21). However, Šramko is reluctant to continue to be so expansive in his praise of her so that so lengthy a reading will not weary anyone who would deem his words vain speech (21). His fervent wish is that God grant that all maidens would follow [Katařina’s] example, and behave as virtuously as she, not yielding to the world or the body, and thus would have everywhere good marriages (22). In the next section on Katařina’s married life, Šramko relates the circumstance that enabled Katařina and him to get married. On September 17, 1768, Šramko was invited to be rector or head of the Lutheran parish school in Paludza (22) (North-Central Slovakia).¹³ There he

¹² Please see a discussion of the literary genre of Šramko’s Památka near the end of this study.

¹³ Šramko was pastor in Paludza from 1773 to 1783 (see below). There in 1774, he had constructed a completely wooden church with a capacity of six thousand. According to an

taught Katařína's brother (23) who on one occasion became ill (25). At her mother's command, Katařína came to Paludza to care for her brother (25), whereupon Šramko began thinking about marrying her—unbeknownst to her: "Protoř žadal sem to od Boha srdečně,/Aby mně z nj spogil w towařistwj wečné [...] Ona toho wssého nic se nestravila" (So that I asked of God heartily that [God] would join me with her in eternal friendship/comradeship, [...] but) She did not guess any of all this/pages 26 and 27). In 1770, Šramko decided to ask Katařína's parents for her hand in marriage (28-29), and the two were married by the Paludza preacher, Jan Blásky (32). Then, Šramko incorporates in the Památka his own verses in celebration of his marriage to Katařína on July 2, 1770 (34-46).¹⁴ The introductory part of the long title of these verses conveys Šramko's personal joy at this event: "Dobrowolný a Smřt' w řivot promenujčy Pohřeb Fenixa, pod kterymř řivě se maluge Towariř[ř]twj Manřelské" [transcribed exactly according to the original] (The Voluntary and Changing Death into Life Funeral of the Phoenix [the mythological bird] beneath Whom the Married Friendship Is Painted in a Vivid Way, 34). For "the Phoenix has his own palm tree in the Syrian wasteland:/For me the Maiden grew up in the Potoczky valley;/He [the Phoenix] also gets here his life and perishes:/I in Potok [an allusion to Katařína's last name which relates to "potok/brook"], attaining other things" (42); indeed, "Potoczky Katička was that Little Palm,/By whom God's hand wrought this,/So that in one nest with me she would be joined,/And also kill her own aloneness [by living] with me" (43). Notably, Šramko's advice to the wayfarer to whom he addresses the pages after his wedding-celebration verses (46-50) is: "Ořen se: wssak ti to na zlé newypadne" (Get married: for that will not turn out badly for you, 49). At his wedding celebration, Šramko became ill and suffered severe pains (50) so that he trembled greatly, yet the newly married couple lay down together in the same bed that night (51-52). Indeed, Šramko poeticizes Katařína's own words whereby she affirms the appropriateness of such an action in fulfillment of "that's day's marriage promise" so that in lying down with her husband, she trustingly submits "herself to God's holy will" (53).

imperial regulation of 1681 "Protestants in eight Slovak districts were allowed to build wooden churches at two sites in the district and to keep a rectory and a school there." Eventually, there were seventeen locations in the eight Slovak counties for such Lutheran church buildings ("articular locations," *The Encyclopaedia of Slovakia and the Slovaks*, 31). Paludza was one such location in Liptov County. In the 1970s because of the construction of the Liptovská Mara dam, in the course of eight years this church was disassembled and moved to nearby Svätý Kríž, and consecrated again in 1982. For details of all this along with numerous color illustrations of this wooden church, see "Svätý Kríž-Lazisko: Evangelic Articular Church from Paludza," *Slovakia Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Monuments* (Bratislava: Simplicissimus, 2009) 666-67.

¹⁴ Part of Šramko's verses composed for his 1770 wedding day (Památka 34-45, plus comments on his verses for the Památka, 45-50) have been published in modern orthography in *Antologia staršej slovenskej literatúry*, eds. Ján Miřianik and Eva Tkáčiková, 2nd ed., 700-01 under the title "Dobrowolný [...] pohřeb fenixa [...]" (The Voluntary [...] Burial of the Phoenix [...]) from Památka (41-44).

Notably, Šramko would write about their marriage union: “Since true love joined us,/And from two intentions made one:/Thus did one [and] every matter favor us,/No difference disrupted our tranquillity” (56).¹⁵ Three days after his wedding-day illness, Šramko recovered, and in the coming weeks, he set about further enhancing the educational background of his wife. In preparing a letter for Michal Semian for Semian’s nameday (September 29, the Feast of St. Michael the Archangel), Šramko encouraged his wife to add her own words, and she composed eight verses that she wrote in the first person and which Šramko later incorporated into the *Památka*:

*Kladu y gá [Katařína] k těmto i.) [Šramko footnote] upřimné žádosti,
A winssugi Tobě, Příteli, radostj
Tolik, kolik w rybě se nalezá kostj;
U Boha y lidj žádané milosti.
Pán Bůh, nech Tě dlauze sstátného zdržuge,
Twé cesty nechat sám žehná a zprawuge,
Po pracech Condicy dobrau nech ssafuge:
Tak w den twého gména K. P. Ti winssuge. (58)*

(I too add to these i.) [Šramko footnote concerning his own verses]
[my] sincere wishes,
And desire for you, Friend, joys
As plentiful as bones in a fish;
[All] the graces desired [for us] by God and people.
May the Lord God long keep you fortunate,
May He Himself bless and direct to allow your ways,
May He manage well the conditions for [your] labors
Thus does K.[atařína] P.[otoczký] wish you on your nameday.)¹⁶

Besides sending his and Katařína’s wishes on Semian’s nameday, Šramko also informed him that he has gotten married (59). To this Semian responded with his own verses for their wedding day in varying syllabic formats, among which he draws not only on scriptural but also especially Classical references for literary enhancement. Šramko also incorporates Semian’s verses into the *Památka* (60-68). At Christmas of that marriage year (1770), Katařína became seriously ill but recovered (68). On June 10, 1771, she gave birth to their first child, a son they name Láclav (69). For Katařína’s nameday (November 25) of that year (1771), Semian composed additional verses that Šramko also incorporated into the *Památka* (70-73). Near the end of these new verses, Semian writes that “the magnanimous Matron [Katařína] can both weave/And also write Verses,/You have in the latter the generous example of [the Greek female poet, c. 610-c. 570

¹⁵ I am grateful to the late Norma Rudinsky for her help in smoothing the translation of verses cited in the 2000 presentation, some of which have been quoted in this study.

¹⁶ Translated by N. Rudinsky and G. Sabo.

BC] Sappho, and in the other/[the former, the legendary honorable Roman matron, early sixth century BC] Lucretia, both are memorable:/What these two did, You do [all] alone,/Sitting down to your tasks” (73).¹⁷

The first years of Pavel and Katařina’s marriage were marked by some joys but also many sad moments. On February 9, 1772, their young son Láclav suffered an epileptic attack and died; on May 24, 1772, Katařina’s beloved father died, and three days later her mother became very seriously ill but recovered (75). For her nameday in that tragic year (November 25, 1772), Semian sent Katařina verses of encouragement.¹⁸ He notes her recent sorrows (unnumbered page 1), but encourages her to “rejoice today [...] celebrating the day full of joy, [...] I implore God who can do everything that He would distance all evil happenings from You [both]” (unnumbered page 2). Semian then concludes with his wish for Katařina on her nameday: “I wish so that Your Health, Strength/And good Will be unchanged./In good Health, then, celebrate Dear Lady!/The Nameday for long years [as expressed by] Your Admirer” (unnumbered page 3). On December 7, 1772, another son, Pavel, was born (77-78). But then in 1773, Šramko was elected to become pastor in Paludza (October), and could no longer be head of the parochial school; this increased responsibility is something that truly saddened Katařina (79-80). Then in January, 1774, their second son died (80-81), causing further grief especially for Katařina. At this moment in their lives, Šramko quotes in versified form words that Katařina “for sure then often spoke” (81):

(How gratifying and dear a time for a Mother,
When she has lived [to know] that joy in [her] sons,
That [His] Imperial Highness [God] took a liking to them.
But this [is] a temporal honor, not lasting,

¹⁷ “Sappho (c. 610-c. 570 BC),” and “Lucretia (early sixth century BC),” *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Encyclopaedia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite* (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2011).

¹⁸ These verses by Semian are entitled: *Když, Urozená a Mnohovážná Matrona, Gegj Miřost, Pani Katařina Ssramko rozená Potoczký, [...] Výročitost slawného Gména swého Dne XXV Listopadu, Leta Páně 1772 swětít měla [...] upřjmný tento Wiřš Gegj Miřosti Mile Slaužjcy Kragan* (When the Noble and Much-important Matron, Her Grace, Lady Katařina Šramko, born Potoczký, [...] was supposed to celebrate the Anniversary of her glorious Name, the 25th day of November, the year of [our] Lord 1772 [...] this heartfelt Wish [is sent to] Her Grace [by a] Dearly Serving Countryman). An exemplar of this writing is preserved at the Slovenská národná knižnica (Slovak National Library) in Martin, signature SC 993. In “signing” this text, Semian wrote in a cryptogram: “Mile Slaužjcy Kragan (underlining added) which was for “Michal Semian Countryman.” In the verses for Šramko and Katařina’s wedding (Památká 60-68), Semian also did not actually sign his name but again used an M and S in a cryptogram where he wrote “Toho času w Hále Sakské Maudrosti Swaté Se Učjcy Kragan” (At this time in Saxon Halle a Countryman Studying Wisdom Holy, underlining added, Památka 60). And for the verses on Katařina’s nameday in 1771 (70-73), he “signed” “W Háli Mağdeburské Sstudyrugicy Kragan” (In Halle in Magdeburg Studying a Countryman, underlining added, Památka 70).

Because it passes away in a short instant,
 And changes into sorrowful torment,
 For through death [comes] the loss of imperial [God's] love.
 I have awaited more with my sons,
 When I gave them up to the King of kings,
 I have in the court of heaven [my] Láclav and Pálo,
 In glory which is both dignified and constant.
 I will then no longer grieve,
 Nor wail mournfully over their death,
 I could not live [to know] anything better after them [their death, than]:
 All is good that God deigns to do) (81-82.)¹⁹

In June, 1774, Katařína gave birth to a daughter, Klara Helena, whom she wanted to nurse herself, but her husband concluded that Katařína's milk was the cause of their children's epilepsy (82). Their daughter was nursed by others and thrived, and Katařína herself came to agree with her husband's view (83). On June 29, 1775 she gave birth to a son, to be named Peter Pavel (83). At this time, Katařína and Šramko make an extensive trip among her relatives and friends (86), while her mother manages their household, thus allowing her to meet and in effect part with those people for the last time (87). Once early in 1777, a woman in church suffered an epileptic seizure and was brought to the parish rectory in such a state that the sight of this woman greatly upset Katařína. Then, Šramko had Katařína bled, and from that time on she had poor health. Indeed, both their son and daughter suffered also from the falling sickness (epilepsy), which had a further negative affect on Katařína (88-90). On this occasion, she felt birth pangs, and gave premature birth in the seventh month to a daughter, Pauline, over the course of three days (91). Such a birth took a serious toll on Katařína, all the more when the child died nineteen days later (February 14, 1777) (92). Katařína became sick, then seemed to become better toward Easter, but in the end did not fully regain her health (93-95).

The year 1778 started well, but on March 18, Šramko was asked to be pastor at another parish; a prospect which greatly distressed Katařína (95-96). Then, on May 8 her sister died, yet in May Katařína gave birth to her sixth child, Johanna Katařína (96). At about that time, Matej Šulek arrived to be a teacher in Paludza; his presence had a good effect on Šramko and Katařína (97).

However, on September 1, 1778 Katařína's grandmother died, and wife and husband decided to visit Katařína's brother-in-law, husband of her deceased sister. At the sight of the town in which her sister died, Katařína "wailed bitterly" (98). In their various travels she met those of her husband's relatives whom she had not yet met, noting as she parted from them that she might "not see them again" (98-100).

At this point in the *Památka*, Šramko begins his commentary on Katařína's "illness and death" (101). By the Saturday after her Wednesday nameday

¹⁹ Translated by N. Rudinsky and G. Sabo.

(November 25, 1778), she was feeling very poorly, making her peace with all and making confession (102). On December 1, she went to church to pray, caught a chill, and then developed a fever. She retired to bed but her condition only worsened by the hour. In the evening, she told Šramko that she had to leave him (103). He had her bled, but she deteriorated further (104-05). At first she seemed to improve because of new medicine, but then her condition worsened again. On hearing that a certain female parishioner was to be buried, she said that she wants to hasten after her (106). Katařina recognized that she was dying (107), bids farewell to her young daughter (Johanna Katařina): “I entrust you to His [God’s] good guidance” (110), blesses her other daughter Klara and son Peter, encouraging Peter to act always as an “honorable Christian” (111-12). Matej Šulek responds to her request for a hymn (113). In taking off her wedding ring, through the poetic rendition of her husband she observes: “My dear, this [ring] was a sign of our marriage;/Now, when the time of my death has come,/I return it to you as a sign of my parting” (114). She then continues: “Now I should properly thank you,/to recall also your love and fidelity;/[...]/About this then you can be sure and secure;/That even in eternity you will always be appreciative to me [appreciated by?]/Now this is my wish, and indeed heartfelt,/That the eternal God would bestow on you everything good” (114). In his parting words, Šramko observed: “My dear Wife [...] I also then give You to that Glorious [Being] your heavenly Bridegroom [...], Go in peace, my Delight!, to Him” (115).

At around 10:45 that evening, Katařina sighed three times, and died at age twenty-nine years, two months, and twenty-three days, married eight and half years, the mother of six children, three of whom survived as orphans (117).²⁰ She was buried on December 8 (120), and at her funeral “Pán Ambrosy” read his “funeral verses” that Šramko also incorporated into the Památka (121). In these verses (122-30), Ambrosy lists many Old Testament women from Sara through Esther and Judith (123-25); for “such was [...] esteemed Potoczky Katka” (125). “Gratefully then, all looked at her always,/Who only knew Katařina Potoczky,/Who accepted kindness from her” (126). Then through Pán Ambrosy’s words (her funeral valedikcia/valediction), Katařina bids farewell to various persons, among them her husband, children, mother, sister, brother and other relatives, friends, her household domestics, the Church, and finally all persons in general—fifteen persons or groups (130-40).

This verse valediction is followed by Šulek’s prose sermon which extols Katařina especially in her marriage, her household management, and her Christian living (140-65). Šramko reproduces verbatim her tombstone addressed to the passerby that includes the dates of her birth, marriage, and death. He also highlights three virtues that distinguished Katařina: “Piety to God, Fidelity to [her] Husband, Affection toward All” (166); Šramko encourages the passerby to learn to dedicate his life to God and Neighbors in virtues till the passerby himself dies (167). In the concluding pages (168-74), the Přidavek (Addition), four good

²⁰ Actually, her age would be three, not two, months and twenty-three days, since Katařina was born on August 15, 1749 and died on December 6, 1778 (166).

friends express their own sorrow at Šramko's loss of Katařina: Michal Semian, Semian's wife Terezya, Johannes Molitoris, and the unnamed rector of the Sabinov parish school—all in Šramko's dominant poetic format in the Památka. Among many consoling words, Semian bids Šramko: "Don't weep, Brother dear in Christ! over this loss,/Rejoice that you had a Wife rich in virtues,/Who merited already here holy virtue,/So that before [her] time she was taken into the Glory of Heaven" (169); indeed, may "God grant you strength,/So that being a Widower, you could be courageous in Sorrow" (171). Terezya, Semian's wife who never personally met Šramko or Katařina (172), also seeks to console Šramko by noting that he knows "that Your dear soul has come to the goods,/That will benefit her in the heavens forever; [...] I [also ...] want [to be of] help to her Orphans, Your Children" (172). Molitoris suggests that "Let us Both together implore God [our] Lord,/That such news no longer befall us" as the death of your wife (173). The unnamed Sabinov rector observes that "lips are insufficient to console [... Šramko] in what the Lord of Earth and Heaven has laid on" him (174). Šramko's concluding words are a final quartrain entitled "Zawjřka" (Closing): "Go, Little Book! among people, and in Blessing/Keep this Memory of that Lady [about whom I have] written:/Flee the hands of those who for Gossip/Are capable; help then good [people] to cultivation" (174).

It is Šramko's misfortune that his well-meaning and genuinely sincere Památka became the target for negative words by fellow clerics, horrified at this loving husband's sensitive gesture to his deceased wife. Though the responses of Doleřal and Āerňanský are both critical of Šramko, the two differ in tone and length, indeed even in the number of their extant *odpisy*, which, as noted above, are recordings written by others than the author. Doleřal's censure comprises ninety twelve-syllable verses in feminine-rhyme paired couplets, yet is kinder in tone than the severe words of Āerňanský; Doleřal's reaction is extant in only one *odpis*.

Āerňanský's denunciation of Šramko comprises thirty-six twelve-syllable verses in feminine-rhyme paired couplets—a mere forty percent of the length of Doleřal's verse comments. Yet Āerňanský's stinging comments are extant in five *odpisy*—as if the severity of Āerňanský's words seemed to warrant more interest by others than Doleřal's well-meaning reprimand.²¹ Āerňanský's severity may not

²¹ In his article on Šramko's Památka and the latter's critics Doleřal and Āerňanský, Michal Eliáš cited stanzas from a letter in verse by Adam Chalupka (1767-1840), in which among various matters Chalupka indicates that he was making an exemplar of Šramko's Památka available to another Lutheran cleric for excerpting or transcription, yet imploring that cleric not to lose Chalupka's copy of the Památka ("Literární spor vo verřoch z konca 18. storoca" (Literary Argument in Verses from the End of the 18th Century), *Literární archiv*, vol. 8 (1971): 269-70). See also the transcription in modern orthography of the feminine-rhyme, eight-syllable paired couplet verses that comprise Chalupka's letter in verse but that Eliáš in his transcription combined into fifty sixteen-syllable verses: Michal Eliáš, "Rukopisný sborník poézie z roku 1821 [of Daniel Banko]" (Manuscript Collection of Poetry from the Year 1821 [of Daniel Banko]), *Literární archiv*, vol. 4 (1967): 98, 102-03. The last of these verses concern Šramko.

be that surprising, given his own history. In 1778 Čerňanský became superintendent (Lutheran bishop) of the “mining district,” situated in Banská Štiavnica, Central Slovakia. However, “probably because of his theological conservatism and dogmatism, his intransigence in questions of dogma and morality,” he was removed from that major position as well as from his pastoral charge in Banská Štiavnica in August, 1784.²² He would die some seven months later. Thus, Čerňanský’s written reaction to Šramko could well have been realized between 1781/82, the possible date of *Památka*’s completion/printing, yet before August, 1784 when he was no longer superintendent.

Doležal’s ninety verses are extant in one *odpis*.²³ These verses have the following heading: “Tohoto Duchowenstwj Generale nasledowal geden Setnjk a Pawla Schramku ssibal takto:” (A certain Centurion [Captain] of this General Clergy followed and lashed/whipped Pavel Schramko thus:). A plus sign in another ink at the word “Setnjk” relates to Doležal’s authorship in which a plus sign is placed after the above heading with text in another ink and another handwriting as follows: plus sign followed by “Augustinus Dolleschal [some single-line graphic] Knez Hibanský” (plus sign followed by Augustinus Doležal, [some single-line graphic] Priest of Hybe [Liptov area/North-Central Slovakia]). In comparison with the verses of Čerňanský, Doležal’s verse comments are moderately critical of Šramko:²⁴

Since he praised his wife among the churches,
 Šramko received well-known scars on his forehead. [...]
 God knows I don’t rejoice at your fall,
 But just give out sincere advice:
 Strike your breast and just nicely kneel down,
 And before the Lutheran clergy speak thus:
 I have sinned before you, indeed, even to my God!
 Lord, be merciful to sinful Šramko! [...]
 Shout, whistle, and beat the drum for the summoned village
 And publicly proclaim, that you are that sheep,
 Who about [around] bad and desolate villages

²² *Biografický lexikón Slovenska* (Biographical Lexicon of Slovakia), vol. 2, 140.

²³ This *odpis* is preserved in the Archiv literatúry a umenia Slovenskej národnej knižnice (Archive of Literature and Art of the Slovak National Library), Zbierka jednotlivín (Collection of Individual Items), akvizičné číslo (Acquisition Number) 82/2012.

²⁴ Michal Eliáš transcribed all ninety verses into modern orthography probably according to the loose *odpis* mentioned in the preceding Note (21) (“Literárny spor” 272-74). In Doležal’s text, the first word of every verse begins with a capital, while Eliáš transcribed every odd-numbered verse as beginning capitalized. Also, in Eliáš’s transcription there are a few errors. In verse 20, Eliáš transcribed “v potoku” which actually should be “v potoCE”; in verse 34, a mäččeň appears to be missing for the “Z” in “zaslauZil”; in verse 35, “SAmotná” (alone/solitary) should be “NEmotná” (mute); in verse 50, “raDu” should be “raDDu” (advice); in verse 71 “tÝch” should be “tÍh” (those/these); and in verse 73, “Učil” ([Ovid] taught) seems to be “Wčil” (now) which makes no sense in the text.

Has grazed on bitter, worthless weeds. [...]
 That Ovid taught you to burn for women,
 But did not influence you on how you should form pretty verse.
 Ovid himself, though a pagan, would flail you
 That you so detestably sprayed [with your saliva] the sublime Muses. [...]
 Roll away the stone of great scandal
 And place [your] papers on the burning flame.
 If then you yet remarry in your time,
 Sing to the Lord's Church with the sweetest voice [.]
 Love [your] wife wisely, let your darling little wife cook:
 [But] you hold the pen for the liturgy, pulpit, and altar.²⁵

Doležal's words are more like a well-meaning reprimand to a friend—quite different from Čerňanský's scathing denunciatory condemnation.

Čerňanský's harsh comments are extant in five *odpisy*. In comparing these five entities, the “complete” format of Čerňanský's condemnation comprises thirty-six twelve-syllable verses in feminine rhyme paired couplets; the first letter of the first word of every verse is capitalized. Thirty-two verses are the criticism proper, and verses thirty-three through thirty-six are Čerňanský's reaction to Šramko's very last quatrain (“Zawjrka”) in his *Památká* (p. 174). A Biblical epigraph as motto heads four of the *odpisy*—verse twenty-nine from the seventh chapter of St. Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians: “I mean, brethren, the appointed time has grown very short; from now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none.”²⁶ Understandably, among the various *odpisy* texts there are variations ranging from minor to significant—at times even in word order in certain verses.

In his article on Šramko and the latter's critics, Eliáš transcribed Čerňanský's first thirty-two verses and lists four of the five extant *odpisy*.²⁷ The first *odpis* is the “shortest,” a loose sheet that has thirty of the thirty-six verses, missing verses thirteen, fourteen, and thirty-two through thirty-six, (“K Zawjrce”/To/For a Closing), but has the Biblical motto indicated and expresses the latter half of that Biblical verse in Slovak.²⁸ This *odpis* concludes with the following: “Lusit serio Joh. Cs: Sup[?] vel sub [?]nom ejus alter eruditus [next line] Samuel Csernansky Banskeho Okoli Superintendent tyto Werše psal Sramkowi.” (Joh[annes]

²⁵ The cited verses are 1-2, 49-54, 67-70, 73-76, and 85-90. Translated by N. Rudinsky and G. Sabo.

²⁶ See *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha Expanded Edition Revised Standard Version*, eds. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger (New York: Oxford UP, 1977) 1386.

²⁷ Eliáš transcribed Čerňanský's verses on page 272 of his “Literárny spor” (1971) article, and listed the four *odpisy* in endnote 5 on page 275.

²⁸ Along with the *odpis* of Doležal's verses, this is one of two *odpisy* of Čerňanský's verses on loose sheets that are preserved in the Archív literatúry a umenia Slovenskej národnej knižnice (Archive of Literature and Art of the Slovak National Library), Zbierka jednotlivín (Collection of Individual Items), akvizičné číslo (Acquisition Number) 82/2012.

Cs[ernansky] Sup[intendent] plays seriously or under his name another scholar [next line] Samuel Csernansky [Ján's brother] Superintendent of the Mining Region wrote these verses [of the *odpis*] to Šramko). This first *odpis* has the most textual variations among all five *odpisy*. The second *odpis* comprises three loose sheets, the first thirty two verses on two sheets and then on a third loose sheet, the remaining four verses headed by “K Zawjrce” (To/For a Closing), similar to the heading used by Šramko for his very last verses in the quatrain for his Památka; the Biblical motto “1 Korint. [ským] 7. 29.” (1 Cor.[inthians] 7:29) is indicated at the beginning of the verses on the first loose sheet. The heading of this *odpis* is the following: “Pl.[?] Rev. Joannis Csernánsky Minister Schemmiziensis & Montani Districtus Superintendens de versibus his foemineo amoris sequens nihil[?] iudicium.” (Pl. [?] Rev.[erend] Ján Čerňanský [Banská] Štiavnica Pastor and Superintendent of the Mountain [Mining] District following [is his] negative? judgment about those verses of love for a woman).

It seems most likely that for his 1971 article (“Literárny spor” 272), Eliáš transcribed the first thirty-two verses of this second *odpis* according to modern orthographic rules for transcription. The third *odpis* is one of forty-nine manuscript texts (mostly poetic with the exception of three in prose) joined together in an 1821 collection by Daniel Banko.²⁹ This third *odpis* has thirty-four of the thirty-six verses; verses 27-28 are missing, but also there is no Biblical motto reference (1 Cor. 7:29). The text is headed as follows: “Lusit serius in Carmen Schramkianum” ([He] more seriously plays on Šramko's Poem); at the end of the text is the following: “Serio lusit Joannes Csernansky Districtus mo[‘mo’ crossed out]ntani super attendens.” (Ján Čerňanský super at[in]tendent of the mining Region plays seriously). The last four verses of this third *odpis* are set off from the preceding with the heading “K zawirce” (To/For a Closing), related to Šramko's last verses in his Památka (see above). The fourth *odpis* has all thirty-six verses with the last four set off with the heading “K Zawirce” (To/For a Closing); the Biblical motto is indicated with a brief comment in Slovak “Ale toto práwym etc.” (But this I say etc.).³⁰ The heading is as follows: “Crisis in carmen

²⁹ Michal Eliáš described and studied Banko's collection in his “Rukopisný sborník poézie z roku 1821” (Manuscript Collection of Poetry from the Year 1821), *Literárny archív*, vol. 4 (1967): 93-122, especially 94-96. This manuscript collection is preserved at the Archív literatúry a umenia Slovenskej národnej knižnice (Archive of Literature and Art of the Slovak National Library) in Martin, signature 52 XX 3; I am grateful to Mgr. Magdalena Brincková, head of the Archív literatúry a umenia Slovenskej národnej knižnice, for informing me that the signature given in endnote 4 of Eliáš's article on Šramko (1971) is incorrect. The page numbers for this third *odpis* in the manuscript collection are 66-67. In 1965, this manuscript collection became part of the Archív literatúry a umenia, formerly Archív literárneho umenia (Archive of Literary Art), Matica slovenská, now the Slovenská národná knižnica (Slovak National Library) in Martin (Eliáš, “Rukopisný sborník” 94).

³⁰ This text is in vol. 12 (XII) of the *Collectanea* of Samuel Ivanka (1761-1842), on folio pages 44b-45a, and is preserved in the Biblioteca Centrală Universitară “Lucian Blaga” in Cluj-Napoca, Romania under the signature number Ms. 334/I-XIV, here XII (12). This *odpis* is printed in modern orthography in *Antológia staršej slovenskej literatúry*, 2nd ed., 701-02 and 706 for bibliographical information. In his 1970 article “Satirický útok,” Brtáň

Schramkianum quod in obitum Suae blandistinae uxoris confecerat Nagy Palugyae exhibita per D[omi]num Superatendente [space]m J. Csernansky Anno circiter 1778” (Crisis on the Šramko poem which on the death of His sweet wife [was] made in Paludza, [and was] exhibited by Sir/Mr. Superat[int]endent J. Čerňanský around 1778). Thus, the four *odpisy* have been known among scholars since the early 1970s. However, locating the fifth *odpis* was something of a fortunate accident.

In the late 1990s, as I was researching Šramko and his critics’ poetic responses, I saw listed under Čerňanský’s name in the *Slovenský biografický slovník* (Slovak Biographical Dictionary, 1: 410) the following work: “Iudicium D.[omini] J.[oannes] Csernyansky superintendentis de libro Pauli Schramko” (The Judgment of Sir/Mr. superintendent J.[án] Čerňanský about the book of Pavel Šramko) at that time preserved at the Matica slovenská, now the Slovenská národná knižnica (Slovak National Library). I requested a microfilm of that document which comprises an eight-page type-scripted essay with the signature number “52 AB 4,” comprising three “parts.” The eight type-scripted pages are in Czech with written emendations that discuss (Part 1) Šramko’s Památka; (Part 2) another “part,” i.e., the fifth *odpis* of Čerňanský’s verses—with the title “Iudicium etc.”; (Part 3) a poetic response by an anonymous defender of Šramko against his critics apparently from an *odpis* elsewhere; the entire text is entitled “Literární spor okolo ‘prvého slovenského románu’ /1780/” (The Literary Controversy around the ‘First Slovak Novel’/1780/). On type-scripted unnumbered page two of this essay, the unknown author notes that this *odpis* of Čerňanský’s verses and that of the verses defending Šramko are in a collection of manuscripts at the Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum (Hungarian National Museum) in Budapest under the signature number “5. Quart. Slav.” This archival material is now part of the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár (National Széchényi Library) under the signature number “Quart. Slav. 5/1-2.” Near the end of the second volume of this two-volume collection of varied manuscripts/*odpisy* from 1820 (volume 1) and 1800 (volume 2) are two loose sheets with the fifth *odpis* of Čerňanský’s verses and those of a poetic defense of Šramko by an anonymous author.³¹ These loose sheets are sourced on the *odpis* “sheets/pages” as follows: “Ex Collectione Documentorum Ecclesiasticorum H[isto]riae Evang.[elicae] Joan.[nis] Bilszkyana, Tomo II. Documentum 100. pag.[ina] 16-20” (From the Collection of

noted that he had found an *odpis* of Čerňanský’s verses in Cluj-Napoca in the Ivanka Collectanea (footnote 5, 346), which is this fourth *odpis*. Without any explanation, Brtáň concluded his comments in this footnote by adding that these verses were recorded “in Ondrašova.”

³¹ Slavitorum Poematum et Cantillanarum ampla Collectio Volum. I Nicolai Gankowich de W.[adas?], 1820 (An Ample Collection of Slavic Poems and Songs Volume 1 [of] Nicholas Jankowič de W.[adas?], 1820) and the same title for volume two but from 1800 and with a more complete last name for the collector: “de Wadas?.” It is noteworthy that Brtáň observed in his 1970 article “Satirický útok” that in 1956 he had seen this Čerňanský *odpis* and the anonymous poetic defense of Šramko “in Budapest at the Széchényi könyvtár [Széchényi Library]” (346, 359).

Ecclesiastical Documents of the History of the Evangelical [Lutheran Church] of Ján Bilský, Vol. 2, Document 100, pp. 16-20).³² Besides discussing and describing Šramko's Památka, the unknown Czech writer of the eight-page type-scripted essay also transcribed in modern orthography the *odpisy* of Čerňanský's verses and the anonymous poetic defense of Šramko. From the superscripted textual variants, it is clear that the Czech essayist compared the transcribed (fifth) *odpis* of Čerňanský's thirty-six verses with the *odpis* of these verses found in the Banko manuscript collection, first made known to the scholarly public by Eliáš in his 1967 article ("Rukopisný sborník"). The Czech essayist notes that the *odpis* he uses for comparison with that from the Hungarian archive is the "property of the [school] inspector K.[arol] Rapoš [1876-1947] from Brezno nad Hronom." Indeed, he gives the correct title of that *odpis* as found on pages sixty-six and sixty-seven of the Banko collection (type-scripted unnumbered page five). The transcription of the Čerňanský *odpis* and the anonymous poetic defense of Šramko with their respective original superscripted comments are on type-scripted unnumbered pages six to eight of the Czech essay preserved at the Slovenská národná knižnica.

Čerňanský's verses in this fifth *odpis* (as in all the *odpisy*) clearly convey the severe, scathing tone of the superintendent's great anger and rage at Šramko and his Památka.³³ A Latin "title" heads Čerňanský's verses with a Biblical reference: "Iudicium D.[omini] J.[oannes] Cserny[ansky] Superintendentis de libro Paulli Schramko. 1 Cor[.] 7,29" (The Judgment of Sir/Mr. Superintendent J.[án] Čerňanský about the book of Pavel Šramko. 1 Cor[inthians] 7:29). In this *odpis*, unlike in the other four, the indicated original recorder—"Jan Bilský"—or perhaps someone else—included three instances of linking certain verses by Čerňanský to

³² The background of "Jan Bilský" is described on the type-scripted unnumbered page 2 of the "Iudicium" Czech essay: Bilský was a preacher in Velký Lom and later in Agárd in Novohrad county; the anonymous author of the "Iudicium" then footnoted his writings as having been listed by Matej Holko (1757-1832) in the Lutheran publication *Solennia* (vol. 13[1821], 43-44). According to Brtáň, Bilský was the "well-known descendant of Buchholtz's Kežmarok pupil and friend Juraj Ribay [1754-1812] active in Agárd" ("Satirický útok" 359).

³³ In this study, transcriptions of the *odpis* of Čerňanský's criticism and the anonymous poetic defense of Šramko are diplomatically rendered according to the original manuscript preserved at the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár (National Széchényi Library) in Budapest under the signature number Slav. Quart. 5/1-2. The two texts are written like an ongoing prose narrative; thus a paired couplet appears as "one line" of text. I have arranged the Čerňanský text in paired couplets just as the verses are rendered in the other four *odpisy*. I have also similarly rendered the transcription of the anonymous poetic defense of Šramko. The Latin "footnotes" designated by one or two asterisks and a parenthesis related to the two recorded texts actually appear in the manuscript at the end of the two manuscript sheets on which are found these two texts, but I have indicated these footnotes within their appropriate places in the two texts.

relevant pages in Šramko's Památka as a way of clarifying the background for those verses by Čerňanský.³⁴

I. Judgment of Reverend J. Čerňanský Superintendent on the book of Pavel Šramko. 1 Cor. 7:29.

[Biblical verse: I mean, brethren, the appointed time has grown very short; from now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none]³⁵

O where has that padlock of wisdom gone,
 which was supposed to close off the pen of Pavel Šramko,
 So that he would never have written these wicked verses,
 [4] Full of offense, obscene, not salted/seasoned. (:pag.[ina/page] 53 and
 in other places passim [reference to Šramko's Památka].
 Is this the way to educate others' children
 By writing trivial and deficient matters. (:pag[ina/page] 34.40.)
 [8] That no serious Christian could read without disgust
 And every reasonable [person] will affirm
 That they are not [to] God's honor and others' education/benefit,
 But rather [about] the excessive love of a woman,
 And [Šramko] showed by this a great fall/lack of reason,
 [12] And also a greater similarity to Ovid than [St.] Paul. (:p.[agina/page]
 52.)³⁶
 Such verses, writing, as well as statements
 Are unsuited for a preacher of God's Words.
 Your writing deserves—except for the [funeral] sermon—
 [16] To be cast to the side place [where people relieve themselves],
 So that no person could ever read it,
 But rather clean up with it the secret place [use it as toilet paper³⁷].
 Thus, Pavel Šramko, you have surely deserved,
 [20] That several of your veins be severed [and bled],
 So that thereby you come to better reason [by this medical procedure]
 And such [unsuitable] matters leave your mind.
 Now then you deserve special exercises,
 [24] Because you brought the preacher's calling into disrespect

³⁴ There is no way to know whether these references to the Památka pages were first included by Jan Bilsky who is indicated in the Latin title for these sheets or by another recorder of these sheets now preserved in the manuscript collection at the Budapest archive. Indeed, there is no way to determine who exactly entitled this odpis.

³⁵ The translation of this verse is from the *New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha Revised Standard Version*, eds. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger (New York: Oxford UP, 1977) 1386.

³⁶ There is no way of knowing who actually underlined the three words "Ovid," "clean up," and "slander" in this *odpis* of Čerňanský's verses or whether there is any significance in such underlining.

³⁷ I am grateful to Dr. Hugh Agnew for suggesting reading "the secret place" as a reference to the anus.

By [your] verses written to your wife/mistress lovers;
 You are worthy to be fed with unpleasing food
 According to custom for a priest's penalty in a cell
 [28] For such stupidity, [such] great impertinence.
 This is the well-founded judgment of one man,
 Who has beneath him [under his authority] for sure many priests.
 Were he to have Pavel Šramko among them,
 [32] A lock would certainly have protected [and] imprisoned him for a
 month.
 Even without this book God's Blessing
 As always will increase over honored Christians.
 The right judgment of [this] little book is not slander*] [footnote "a"],
 [36] But [rather] the proper rebuke of the unwise.

*)[footnote "a" at the end of the sheet with the *odpis* of Čerňanský's verses] His Excellency the Superintendent refers to the verses of the author at the conclusion of his booklet, [which] sound with this beginning: Run away from the hands of those who are capable of slander, etc. [The quoted text "Run away [...]" begins the last two verses of Šramko's *Památka*; these verses are part of a quatrain addressed by Šramko to his book (page 174, see above). Indeed, the *Památka* quatrain is headed "Zawjрка" (Closing). It is noteworthy that in four of the five *odpisy* of Čerňanský's verses (see above), these last four verses are included and set aside with the title *K Z/zawirce*" (To/For a Closing).]

[Latin concluding comment for this *odpis* of Čerňanský's verses:]

Ján Čerňanský amuses himself in earnest. Exceptions are the verses of good Friends and the Condolences, which [all together] could be printed separately.³⁸

The second *odpis* in the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár manuscript collection is entitled as follows: "II. Potessenj smutnému Pawlowy Šramkowy pro mnohých měmilé Censuri Behu žiwota manželky gehu zesnulé, od něg zepsaného, predstawané od Dobrého Prjtěle**)" [see this Latin footnote comment below]" (II. Consolation for sad Pavel Šramko for the many unkind Censures for the Course [Narrative] of the life of his deceased wife, written by him, [which Consolation is] presented from a Good Friend**) [footnote "b" at end of the first sheet with part of this *odpis* of the poetic defense].³⁹ The text of this second *odpis* or anonymous poetic defense of Šramko comprises a Latin epigraph or motto and sixteen quatrains where the four verses have the same twelve-syllable, feminine rhyme

³⁸ Translated by N. Rudinsky and G. Sabo

³⁹ There is no way to determine who actually entitled this anonymous poetic defense of Šramko as found in the extant recording.

scheme with a couple of related footnotes for commentary. The diplomatically rendered verses are as follows.⁴⁰

Dat veniam Corvis, vexat censura [could be censur “e”] Columba?

[could be Columba’s]⁴¹

*Nědjweg se, Pawle Šramko že wy/jpsánj
Žiwota małželky twé něnj dle zdánj
A že y w Štawnicy złé censurowánj
[4] M/muselo okúsit y S/satirowanj.*

*Prjčina gest toho, že tj né s Katkámí⁴²
Tak často priwáta držj, než s knižkami,
Neskussugj gak Ty, Perfectye Dámi,
[8] Něbo gen w K/komů/úrkách radi sedj sami.*

*Tam pak myslj né to, co/ó gest pekná žena,
Aniž o ňjch knihy[probably “y,” somewhat blacked out] pjssj, by gich gména
Skrz takowé knihy w známost uwedená,
[12] Byla, a do počtu M/mudrých položená!*

*A poněwádž málo s njmi conversugj,
M/málo žen swých krásu, mrawy pozorugj,
Málo, gaké zuby magj, ohledugj:
[16] Proto twau K/knjzečku takto censurugj.*

*Mluwjc že hodná jest, by w mjsto postrannj;
Prissla winjmagjc Schulkowho kázánj.
Pekně twogj prácy poctili tý Pány,
[20] Tak že sy zaslaužil mó[é] politowánj.*

⁴⁰ If unable to judge whether a letter is in capital or lowercase form, both forms have been transcribed; similarly, for a letter with a diacritical that could represent more than one contemporary diacritical, both possibilities have been given: for example, “K/komů/úrkách” (verse 8).

⁴¹ This Latin epigraph or motto quotes verse 64 of Satire II of the Classical writer Juvenal (late first into early second century AD): *Saturae D. Iunii Iuvenalis* (Satires of Master Junius Juvenalis), ed. A. E. Housman (Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1938) 9. I am grateful to Professor Robert Rothstein of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst for bringing this information to my attention. Dr. Rothstein was discussant for the 2000 AAASS panel, the basis of this study.

⁴² There is no way to determine who actually underlined the seven words in this odpis of the anonymous poetic defense of Šramko (“Katkami,” “priwata,” “Dami,” “Ty,” “to,” “Schulkowho,” “magistra,” and “Prjtel”) or whether there is any significance in such underlining.

Kdyby twj Censores ženi milowali,
 Tak gak ty, weruby nědo/etonowali
 Na twú K/knižsku, než by tě nasledowali;
 [24] a wersse po smrti Ž/ženám sprawowali.
 Tu pak by wyspali wssecký gegjch kroky;
 H/hlawu, prse s Brjchem; nohy; oba Boký
 Wsse gegjch činěnj, y tý milé Roky;
 [28] Ba y negprwněgssj w T/tancy pekné skoký!

**) [footnote “b” related to the heading for the poetic defense of Šramko;]
*Ex Litteris Romanis eliciendum est nomen et cognomen hujus amici[is/y?],
 forte est B. P.* [End of the first sheet of the *odpis* with the partial text of the
 poetic defense as well as preceding verses by Čerňanský]

Ale že Ženy swé, gak Ty, němilugj;
 proto twau prácy zgewně potupugj,
 Proto y[~~crossed out~~] twau K/knizečku y tam odsuzugj,
 [32] Kde se običegně Lyde wyprazdnů/úgj.

Giste gá to željm, že twoge mjněnj
 Od M/mužůw žádneho nedosslo schwálenj,
 Ale něch to budě k twému potessenj;
 [36] Žes cestu sprawil sy k druhému ženěnj.

Neb ženy twau prácy welice schwalugj;
 Za prjklad w ljběj giným predstavugj,
 Tebe za magistra wssudy commendugj;
 [40] Wssecky Panny Wdowy dostát tě wynssugj.

Nedbeg tedy Pawle na M/mužské haněnj,
 Kdys[ž] odewssad ženské dosáhl schwálenj.
 Prwnýs Slowensky psal Román: zdáš [probably but blacked out and “y” added
 and perhaps crossed out] to něnj
 [44] K weliké pochwale znamenité ceny?

Pán Superintendent Districtus Montani
 Joannes Csernyanszký y s ginjm[“i” perhaps, not visible] Páni,
 Genž znamenitého Ženi milovánj
 [48] Trescj, něwjm pro có K/kwáčj gako Wrany.

A chcj ti pokutu K/knezskú/ů naložiti;
 Žes slowenské knihy chtel s twau rozmnožiti,
 Do K/kamrljka có M/mnjcha zatworiti;
 [52] Kolko žjl, bys rozum nadobyl, pustiti.

*Hádám Tý závidj, že Tě Žený chwálj,
 Žes gegjch pohlawj M/milownjk němalý,
 Že gjm ženy gegjch Tě za prjklad dali,
 [56] Gakoby oni gjch též milowať meli.*

*Có gest to muj Pawle, nedbeg na gjch reči,
 Wssak se y na K/kneze žený ljbít sweděj.
 Y knez gest gen člověk, též horučost wetssj
 [60] Může mjti k ženám skušenost dosweděj.*

*Takto geden Prjtel tebe potessuge,
 Bys něboheg rownú ů dostal spjš*) [footnote c] wynssuge,
 Do prjtělstwj twého dal' se commenduge,
 [64] Když y on Prjtělem werným twým vždy sluge.
 Vale.⁴³*

* [footnote c at the end of the second odpis page] i.e. [id est/"that is"]
 quantocyus - quod est[abbreviated] factum nam duxit Sextianam, seu
 Sztruharianam.

The English translation of the above verses is as follows:

([Latin motto:] He gives indulgence to the crows/ravens, but by/with censure
 harasses the doves.

Don't be surprised, Pavel Šramko, that the writing
 Of your wife's life is not for [good] appearance/judgment
 And that even in Šťiavnica negative censoring
 [4] And even satire it had to experience/endure.

The reason for this is that those [criticizers] not with Kathys
 So often have/hold private [meetings], than with books,
 They do not sample/experience like you the perfections of a woman,
 [8] For they only and gladly sit by themselves in cells.

They don't then there [in those cells] think about what is a pretty woman,
 Nor even write books about them, so that their names [i.e., of the critics]
 Through such books would be brought to fame
 [12] And placed into/included in the number/group of the wise.

⁴³In diplomatically transcribing the last two quatrains (verses 57-64), the end words of some even numbered verses "flowed off" the original manuscript sheet in the microfilm of this document that I have used, and so I consulted the transcription of this anonymous poetic defense in the eight-page type-scripted Czech essay discussed above.

And because they converse little with them [women],
They little observe the beauty, morals of women [their wives],⁴⁴
Little notice what kind of teeth they have,
[16] For this reason they thus censure your small book.

Saying that [your Památka} is worthy, [that it/she] would to the side [where
one relieves oneself],
Come/Go, excluding Šulek's [funeral/burial] sermon.
Nicely did these gentlemen honor your works,
[20] Thus have you merited my commiseration.

If your censors loved women [their wives]
Just like you [have], truly they would not be detonating/expressing
themselves strongly
To/Against your [dear] book, than [but] would be following you/imitating
your example
[24] And creating/making verses for women [wives] after [their] death.

Here then they would write out/describe all their footsteps,
Head, breast with belly/stomach, legs, both sides,
All their movement/actions, and those dear years,
[28] Why even [their] very first nice leaps in dance/dancing.

[Footnotes of first manuscript page:]

*) [footnote a, cited above related to Čerňanský's caustic verses] His
Excellency the Superintendent looks back to the verses of the author at the
conclusion of the booklet, [which] sound with this beginning: You take away
the hands of those who are capable of slander/calumny/backbiting, etc.

***) [footnote b related to the poetic defense of Šramko] From the Roman
[Latin] letters the name and surname of this friend is strongly [believed to be
a cryptogram for] B. P. [End of first manuscript page]

But that they don't love their wives, like you [do/did yours],
because/which is why they evidently/apparently disparage your book,
Why they even condemn your nice little book there [to the place],
[32] Where usually/customarily people empty/relieve themselves.

For sure do I grieve that your opinion
Did not receive/obtain any approval of men/husbands,
But may this be to your delight/consolation,
[36] That you have made yourself a path to a second marriage.

⁴⁴ I am grateful to Dr. Robert Rothstein for suggesting that at times the words for "woman/women" can also mean "wife/wives."

For women/wives very much/greatly approve/endorse your book/work,
 They offer/present it to others as an example of love/loving,
 They commend you everywhere as a master [of this art/discipline],
 [40] All young women [and] widows wish to get/obtain you [for a husband].

Don't be bothered by/pay attention to, then, Pavel, men's disparagement,
 When from everywhere you have attained women's approval.
 You are the first to have written a novel in Slovak: isn't this
 [44] To the great acclaim of outstanding worth?

Mr./Sir superintendent of the Mountain/Mine District
 Joannes/Ján Csernyansky/Čerňanský along with other gentlemen,
 Whom women/wives of well-known/famous affection
 [48] Punish, I don't know why he is cawing like crows,

And wants to impose on you a clerical/minister's penalty/punishment,
 That you wanted to increase Slovak books with [the publication of] yours,
 To shut you up/imprison you into a tiny cell like a monk,
 [52] To bleed/let how many veins, so that you would acquire/come to reason.

I guess that those [gentlemen] envy/are envious that women/wives praise you,
 That you are not a small/minor lover/admirer of their sex/gender,
 That their wives give you as an example for them,
 [56] As to how they ought also love them.

What's this, my Pavle! Don't heed/pay attention to their words/speeches,
 Why it's even proper for women to be pleasing to a priest/clergyman [for a
 clergyman to like women].
 Even a priest/clergyman is only a human being, also a greater
 heat/warmth/passion
 [60] Experience attests [that a clergyman] can have toward women.

Thus does one Friend console/comfort you,
 He wishes that you would soon [endnote c] get [a wife] equal to/like your
 deceased one,
 He commends himself further to your friendship,
 [64] When he also is always called/goes by the name of your true Friend.
 Farewell.

[Footnote at the end of the second manuscript page:]

*) [footnote c] That is, it is so much a fact, for he led Sextianam—a member of the Sextius family clan—or Sztruharianum).⁴⁵

Two matters still need to be considered related to this anonymous poetic defense of Šramko (Potessenj/ Consolation): the Památka's literary genre because of what is written in verse forty-three of the Potessenj where Šramko's Památka is named the "first Slovak román" (novel/romance), and also the author's identity of this Potessenj.

In verse forty-three and similarly, verse forty-four of the Potessenj, the unknown/unnamed author writes that "Prwnýs [Šramko] Slowensky psal Román zdáš to něnj/K veliké pochwale znamenité ceny? " (You [Šramko] are the first to have written a novel/romance in Slovak: isn't this to the great acclaim of outstanding worth? emphasis added). The question, then, is Šramko's Památka a "novel" or "romance?" In contemporary Slovak, "román" is "prozaické slovesné dielo so zložitým sujetom" (a prose verbal/literary work with a complex subject/storyline) and "nezvyčajný, zložitý a podobný životný príbeh: fúboštný román" (an unusual, complex and similar true-to-life happening: an amorous romance).⁴⁶ It is not clear from the anonymous poetic defense of Šramko how its unknown/unnamed author understood the meaning of "román."

However, the literary specialists who have written about the Památka have understood "román" as "novel." For instance, in the eight-page type-scripted Czech essay discussed above which is entitled "Literární spor okolo 'prvého slovenského románu' /1780/ [the supposed year of Památka's composition/publication]" (The Literary Disagreement about the 'First Slovak Novel'/1780/), its anonymous author notes that such a designation ("first Slovak novel") for Památka is:

nejasne, neboť tato kniha je vlastně jen podrobně a do šířky rozvedeny' životopis, jehož celkový ráz se příliš—ovšem až na rozsah—neliší od životopisů, jaké byly připojovány k pohřebním valedikcím a s nimi často i tištěny. [...] Ani v celkovém pojetí, ani v didaktické tendenci nenacházíme důvodů, jež mohly vésti k [...] označení román. Mimo to i veršová forma přímo odporuje tomuto názvu, neboť v té době jsou již romány především a po výtece prosaické.⁴⁷

(unclear, for this book is actually simply a biography expanded in detail and breadth, whose total character does not overly differ from biographies, that were attached to

⁴⁵ In his 1970 "Satirický útok" article, Brtáň noted that this footnoted comment related to Šramko's second marriage (361 and related footnote 33).

⁴⁶ See "román," *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka* (Short Dictionary of the Slovak Language), 4th supplemented and corrected ed. (Bratislava: Veda, Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, 2003), 624.

⁴⁷ "Literární spor" essay, unnumbered page 5. This citation is from the eight-page type-scripted Czech essay whose typed text was then edited by someone, perhaps the original writer/typist of this essay. Thus, one or two words-typed over with "x"s-could not be deciphered and thus were not written out but are indicated by the second ellipsis in square brackets included in the Czech citation.

funeral valedictions and often even published with them. [...] Neither in its overall conception nor in its didactic tendency do we find arguments that could lead to [...] the designation novel. Besides this, even the verse form directly counters this term for already at this time novels are primarily and in criticism in prose.)

In his study of Šramko's *Památka*, Brtáň proposes that the first Slovak novel was actually Augustýn Doležal's 1791 *Pamětná celému světu tragoedie* (The Memorable Tragedy for the Whole World).⁴⁸ Finally, in a recent study Peter Mráz also discusses *Památka*'s genre because of verses forty-three and forty-four in the anonymous poetic defense of Šramko.⁴⁹ Acknowledging that Doležal's *Pamětná [...] tragoedie* was the first Slovak novel, Mráz then observes that Šramko's *Památka* has the "narrative framework of a biographical-travel character."⁵⁰ Indeed, Mráz strikingly observes that Šramko's *Památka* "shows how to live in a Christian way and how to die in a Christian way. Its theme is not the life and death of Katarína Šramková, but the coexistence of life and death as a process of dying" based on Šramko's introductory words in his *Památka* about it helping people to reflect on death and rouse them to the love of virtue.⁵¹ In conclusion, Mráz notes that only after a detailed analysis of *Památka* could that work be considered perhaps a "biographical novel."⁵² From the various preceding comments, it is clear that though labeled the "first Slovak novel" in the anonymous poetic defense, Šramko's *Památka* is not a novel as understood then and now, but may more likely be described a "chronicle-biography" as noted at the beginning of this study.

The final matter for consideration is who could possibly be the unknown/unnamed author of this *Potessenj* (Consolation). In verses sixty-one to sixty-four of the *Potessenj* text (the concluding quatrain), the unknown/unnamed

⁴⁸ "Satirický útok" 360. In footnote 30 on page 359 of his "Satirický útok" article, Brtáň transcribes in modern orthography verses 43 and 44 from the anonymous poetic defense of Šramko. In his essay, "Predhovor k Doležalovej tragoedii v kontext literárnoteoretického myslenia medzi barokom a klasicizmom" (Preface to Doležal's Tragoedie in the Context of Literary Theoretical Thinking between the Baroque and [Neo-]Classicism), Miloslav Vojtech discusses the literary genre of Doležal's *Pamětná [...] tragoedie*: *Literatúra, literárna história a medziliterárnosť* (Literature, Literary History, and Inter-/Between-Literariness) (Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, 2004) 8-17. Vojtech concludes that the "románovosť" Doležalovho textu je naozaj iba potenciálna" (The 'novel-ness character' of Doležal's text is really only potential, 16).

⁴⁹ "Poznámky na margo knihy Pavla Šramku Života i Smrti požehnaná Památka" (Notes on the Margin of the Book of Pavel Šramko Života i Smrti požehnaná Památka), *Posledné veci človeka: Štúdie k dejinám slovenskej duchovnej kultúry 17.-18. storočia* (The Last Things of a Person: Studies for the History of Slovak Spiritual Culture 17.-18. [Centuries]), ed. and comp. Gizela Gafríková (Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, 2010) 145-50, here 147-49. (In quoting Brtáň's rendition of verses 43 and 44 in modern orthography, Mráz made a couple errors and also listed the wrong page number for Brtáň's printed transcription/citation.)

⁵⁰ "Poznámky" 146-147.

⁵¹ "Poznámky" 148-149 referring to page 6 of the *Památka*.

⁵² "Poznámky" 149.

author writes about himself in relation to Šramko and his hope for the latter: “Takto geden Prjtel tebe potessuge,/Bys něboheg rownú dostal spjš *) [footnote c] wynssuge,/Do prjtělstwj twěho dal’ se commenduge,/Když y on Prjtělem werným twým wždy sluge. Vale” (Thus does one Friend console you,/he wishes that you would soon [footnote c] get [a wife] equal to your deceased one,/he commends himself further to your friendship,/when he also always is called/goes by the name of your true Friend. Farewell.) Thus, through this text a “friend” tries to console Šramko, a friend who commends himself further to “your [Šramko’s] friendship” and who “always is called/goes by the name of your [Šramko’s] true Friend.” Yet nowhere in the text proper is this friend qualified as “dobrý/good” as written in the title for this *odpis* text by perhaps the unknown/unnamed recorder: Potessenj [...] predstavné od Dobrého Prjtěle/A Consolation [...] Presented from a Good Friend).

The phrase “dobry prjtěl” probably started the confusion about the author’s identity. Indeed, the unknown/unnamed recorder adds to the confusion with “footnote b” where he writes: “From the Roman [Latin] letters the name and surname of this friend is strongly [believed to be a cryptogram for] B. P.” Why this should be “B. P.” is not evident from anything in the text or footnotes for Potessenj. The unknown/unnamed writer of the eight-page type-scripted Czech essay writes that “the unknown author [of the Potessenj] calls himself Dobry Přítel; the initials of his name would then be D. P., but who this was, not even Bilský knew.”⁵³ Brtáň continues the confusion by speculating that “D. P.” may identify the prominent Lutheran cleric and cultural figure “Doležal Pavel” but he, however, had died on November 30, 1778, just before the death of Katařina Potoczky, which makes his authorship of the Potessenj clearly impossible.⁵⁴ Somewhat later in his study, Brtáň speculates that mentioning the “first Slovak novel” in the Potessenj brings to mind Augustýn Doležal, author of Pamětná [...] tragoedie, who “was hiding [under] the anagram of his but recently deceased uncle Pavel Doležal so that he would wipe out trace [of who the author of the Potessenj was] and befuddle [Šramko’s] opponents/critics.”⁵⁵ Thus, this would mean that Augustýn Doležal who wrote a criticism of Šramko’s Památka, though moderate in tone, was then so fulsomely defending and praising Šramko and the Památka, which seems simply farfetched at best.

Rather, I would like to propose that so passionate a defender of Šramko and his Památka was his close and longtime friend Michal Semian, given all that we know about Semian from what has been written about and by him and cited in this study’s text and certain Notes.⁵⁶ He would be the most likely candidate for Šramko’s “true Friend” who would have truly wanted to encourage Šramko, especially after the savage verses by Čerňanský. It is noteworthy that while the

⁵³ “Literární spor” essay unnumbered page 4.

⁵⁴ “Satirický útok” 359. For a detailed Slovak biography of Pavel Doležal, a list of and comments on his writings, and a bibliography about him and his works, see “Doležal, Pavol,” *Biografický Lexikón Slovenska* (Biographical Lexicon of Slovakia), vol. 2, 295-96.

⁵⁵ “Satirický útok” 360.

⁵⁶ Besides the text proper of this study, see also Notes 6, 7, and 17 for comments on Semian.

religiously conservative Čerňanský has understandably a Biblical motto for his verses, the unknown/unnamed author of the Potessenj has a Classical Latin one and ends with the Latin “Vale” (Farewell). Such Classical Latin usage reflects material Semian readily employed in his two writings incorporated into the Památka—verses for Šramko and Katařína’s wedding and for Katařína’s nameday (pages 60–68 and 70–73 respectively); this Classical material involves the mottoes for these two Semian writings and also inclusion of various Classical mythological and legendary-historical figures. For example, the motto for the verses celebrating Šramko and Katařína’s wedding is a translation of the Latin into an eight-syllable, feminine rhyme verse quatrain based on “Book 1 [of lyric poems], Ode 13, v. 17[-20 by] Horace” (65–27 BC): “O truly blessed,/[Are those] Whose Connection/Union is not torn:/Whose love through Grief,/Is not changed up to the Grave” (61).⁵⁷ Also, the motto for Katařína’s nameday in 1771 is a translation of the Latin into a twelve-syllable, feminine rhyme verse couplet based on the “Tristia, Book 1, Elegy 1, v. 58 [of] Ovid” (43BC–17 AD): “O that by my Letter I would myself stand,/And get to that place, where it [the letter] has gotten!” (71).⁵⁸ And while in the nameday verses Semian compares Katařína with the Greek female poet Sappho (c. 610–c. 570BC) and the legendary Roman matron Lucretia (early sixth century BC) (see above), Semian also wishes he himself were the mythological figure Daedalus (71). Daedalus was the creator of the labyrinth for the Cretan Minotaur, and after imprisonment on Crete lest he reveal the labyrinth’s secret, Daedalus created wings of feathers in order to escape his imprisonment.⁵⁹ For that reference, Semian writes that “And who gives me the Wings of the Morning blaze? Lady [Katařína], wanting to stand before Your Face, would [that] I from Halle [in Saxony, where Semian was studying], like Daedalus of Crete greatly be able to fly to Paluza [Paludza]” (71).

Even more striking, though, are the large number of Classical characters included by Semian in the wedding verses for Šramko and Katařína. The first Classical reference is Acteon who in myth saw Diana, the goddess of the hunt at her bath, for which viewing he is cursed by being devoured by his own hounds whom Artemis/Diana incited to fury and set on him.⁶⁰ Semian then draws on this

⁵⁷ Horace, *The Odes and Epodes*, ed. and tr. C. E. Bennett (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. P., 1968) 40–41.

⁵⁸ Ovid, *Tristia* [and] *Ex Ponto* (Sorrow and From Pontus), vol. 6 of *Ovid*, ed. and tr. Arthur Leslie Wheeler (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. P., 1975) 6–7.

⁵⁹ “Sappho (c. 610–c. 570BC),” and “Lucretia (early sixth century BC),” *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Encyclopaedia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite* (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2011). Ovid, *Metamorphoses* (Metamorphoses), Book 8, vv. 183–95; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* (Metamorphoses), ed. and tr. Frank Justus Miller (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. P., 1944). 418–21. Šramko footnoted this reference to Daedalus as verses 38–100, the story of King Minos of Crete’s daughter Scylla as she offers herself to the Minotaur for the sake of her country (71). Concerning this story on Daedalus, see “Daedalus,” *Dictionary of Classical Mythology*, Pierre Grimal, ed. Stephen Kershaw, tr. A. R. Maxwell-Hyslop (London: Penguin Books, 1991) 117–18.

⁶⁰ Šramko references Acteon’s story as found in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Book 3, vv. 138–250; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* (Metamorphoses), ed. and tr. Frank Justus Miller (Cambridge,

mythic tale as a background where now Katařína is beautiful Diana (61ff.). In relating this mythic story to Katařína, Semian involves further Classical characters: (1) Apollo, the god of music and poetry who presided over the pastimes of the Muses, and also (2) Venus (Aphrodite for the Greeks), the Roman goddess of love and “her dear son (3) Cupid” (62); (4) Juno, the wife of Jupiter, head of the gods, (5) Tethys, the sea goddess and wife of (6) Oceanus, “god of the seas and waters,” the (7) Nymphs, “goddesses” who were spirits of the fields and nature (63); (8) Sappho who “taught Semian” to write a certain pattern of verses (64-65); (9) Morpheus, the “god of dreams,” and (10) Hermes, “herald of the gods” (66).⁶¹

The description of Semian and Šramko’s very close friendship, his striking poetic writings for Šramko and Katařína, and his clear familiarity with Classical Latin material, all this makes it quite possible that Michal Semian would be readily moved and quite qualified to come to the strong and distinctive defense of Pavel Šramko, whose great gesture of love and devotion to his wife—his Památka—provoked such severe and caustic criticism by Ján Čerňanský. Yet however close his friendship with Šramko, Semian wisely did not identify himself in any way as the author of the Potessenj. For in “church politics,” Čerňanský, so prominent and powerful an official, could no doubt have also expressed his ire in writing or perhaps even worse against a Šramko-defense publicly acknowledged by the Prešov co-rector Michal Semian.

MA: Harvard U. P., 1944) 134-43. Concerning this story about Acteon, see “Acteon,” *Dictionary of Classical Mythology*, Pierre Grimal, ed. Stephen Kershaw, tr. A. R. Maxwell-Hyslop (London: Penguin Books, 1991) 12. Diana is “the Italo-Roman goddess identified with Artemis,” the elder twin sister of the god Apollo: “Diana” and “Artemis,” *Dictionary of Classical Mythology* 125 and 60.

⁶¹ “Apollo” 48-51; “Aphrodite/Venus” 47-48 and 450; “Eros” [Cupid], “son of Hermes and Aphrodite” 143; “Juno,” “the Roman equivalent of Hera,” 230-31 and 181-82; “Tethys” 424; “Oceanus” 299; the “Nymphs” 297-98; “Morpheus” 280-81; and “Hermes,” “brother of Apollo” 197-99: *Dictionary of Classical Mythology*, Pierre Grimal, ed. Stephen Kershaw, tr. A. R. Maxwell-Hyslop (London: Penguin Books, 1991).

The Terezín Worlds of Lotka Burešová

Anna Hájková

One beautiful day in April 2010, the Leo Baeck Institute Archivist Mike Simonsohn suggested I take a look into the then-uncatalogued art collection for artwork from Terezín.¹ After hours spent searching through boxes of artworks from Terezín, I was beginning to lose focus. I had seen countless still-lives and depictions of the peculiar, eerie classicist architecture of Terezín. And then, as I opened one more folder, a vivacious young woman in an exuberant watercolor leapt out at me (figure 1). *Klid, rozvahy—z hluboka dýchat!* exhorts the inscription (“Calm and prudence—breathe deeply!”), quite contrary to the emotions the figure raises in the viewer. Perhaps the inscription referred to the impending liberation, but the date, December 2, 1944, was just a month after the heart-breaking liquidation transports. Rather than the caption, though, it is the female figure jumping through a frame—to what? Hope? The New Year? Spring?—that holds our attention. The beauty and vitality of the leaping figure, dressed in the Czech national costume, may come as a surprise in the particular context of Terezín. This drawing by Lotka Burešová, a Czech-Jewish painter, offers some clues leading to some of the key aspects of its enforced community.

To understand these clues, we first have to take a closer look at the social structure of the ghetto. Terezín (in German Theresienstadt), rather than a world apart, was very much a part of the surrounding world. The Jewish inmates deported to this Central European ghetto brought with them a part of the place they had considered home: The Czech, German, Austrian, Dutch, Danish, Slovak, and Hungarian Jews each brought their own culture and aesthetics, humor and cooking, courtship rituals and songs. Terezín was an eminently transnational place, and like any other society, especially an enforced one, it engendered differences as well as affinities. Many among the Czech Jews constituted the social and the political elite of the prisoner community; the Czechs had been the first to arrive there and were considered veterans. Most of the Czech Jews experienced the ghetto among their countrymen, and many viewed the elderly German and Austrian newcomers (Terezín served as a ghetto for the elderly for Jews from Germany and Austria over the age of 65, and hence the overwhelming majority of the German and Austrian deportees were old) as an irritating old presence.²

Lotka (Charlota, Charlotte) Burešová both embodied and confounded these patterns.³ Born in Prague in 1904 as the only child of the German-speaking tailor

¹ An earlier version of this paper appeared in the *LBI News*, Number 94, Spring 2014, published by the Leo Baeck Institute. We are grateful for permission to print this revised version here.

² Interview of Hanna Pravda, BL/Sound Archive, C410, 35. On a similar note, see Helga Weisssová-Hošková, *Zeichne, was Du siehst* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2001): 72f.

³ See notes from Burešová’s interview in 1972, APT, 4552.



Figure 1: Drawing for František Feigl, 1944.
Image used courtesy of the Leo Baeck Institute

Gustav Kompert and his wife Steffi, she studied at the Prague Academy of Arts and married Radim Bureš, a gentile lawyer.⁴ Their son, also named Radim, was born in 1927, and was baptized; Lotka herself converted in 1937.⁵ In 1938, Lotka filed for divorce; she had fallen in love with someone else. Lotka moved to an apartment in Vinohrady, while her ex-husband kept custody of the boy and continued living at the Ořeškovka villa.

The Bureš's divorce reminds us of the many false divorces that followed during the Protectorate years. By 1930, Bohemia had the world's highest rate of intermarriage.⁶ During the Nazi occupation, it was common for Czech-Jewish couples (quite unlike Germany) to separate legally but continue to live together (*rozvod na oko*), hoping to alleviate the burden for their children and non-Jewish spouses, believing the occupation would be over soon. This story was usually told by the surviving children; the Jewish parent usually did not come back, raising the question who divorced whom, and if the gentile partners should have not been more steadfast. Once the Nazis started deporting Czech Jews in October 1941, the divorced spouses, no longer protected, were sent to Terezín and from this transit ghetto to their deaths.

Like other divorced spouses, Burešová was deported to Terezín alone, without her family; her parents had died in the 1930s. Two of her maternal aunts died in Terezín, as did her seven-year-old niece Zuzana Neuwirthová in February 1943 of the then-rampant typhus. Burešová first worked in the *lautscharna*, a workshop that produced greeting cards for sale outside the ghetto. Soon the word spread that she was an academically trained painter, and she got a job in the "special workshops," where she worked with other painters, producing oil paintings for sale, sometimes copying old masters from the Dresden gallery from postcards. She painted portraits of the Jewish Council of Elders, but also of Karl Rahm, the third and last SS commandant. This portrait eventually saved Burešová's life: when in fall 1944 nearly everyone was deported to Auschwitz, the SS excluded her.⁷

In Terezín, Burešová also drew for her fellow prisoners, Czech, German, Danish, and Dutch. The Yad Vashem archives show a drawing of Clarence, the little boy of the young Dutch dancer Catharina Frank. We do not know whether, like many of her colleagues, Lotka bartered her paintings in exchange for food. Her divorced husband provided her with food through parcels. In 1999, Lotka's son summarized his wartime memories: "Otec vlastně nedělal nic, peníze jsme neměli, co bylo, se prodalo a jen se všelijak sháněly známky na balíčky a posílaly

⁴ On Burešová's biography, see Elena Makarova, *Terezín: Krepost a bezdnaj*, vol. 4 (Jerusalem: Gesharim, 2007); Pnina Rosenberg, "Charlotte Buresova," *Learning about the Holocaust through Art*, <<http://holocaust-education.net/explore.asp?langid=1&submenu=200&id=8>> (January 26, 2014).

⁵ Interview of R.B., July 27, 1999, collection Vzpomínky, Jewish Museum Prague.

⁶ Franz Friedmann, *Einige Zahlen über die tschechoslovakischen Juden: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie der Judenheit* (Prague: Barissia, 1933).

⁷ Interview of Lilly Fischl, July 17, 1990, BL/Sound Archive, C410, 095.

se mamince balíky.”⁸ The Bureš kept in touch by correspondence, both legally and illegally, and once both Radims tried to visit Lotka at the outskirts of the ghetto.⁹

We do know that drawing was a favorite in pastime in Terezín. Paper and pencils were scarce, but drawing offered a constructive pastime, an opportunity for reflection, and a means to document the surroundings. Bourgeois pursuits like drawing, keeping diaries, and writing and reciting poetry were some of the ways in which inmates maintained continuity with their former lives and made sense of the new, terrifying surrounding of Terezín, as Christiane Hess, a scholar of prisoners’ drawings in concentration camps, has shown.¹⁰

Varied as the subjects of Burešová’s drawings were, all of her artwork has the same striking aesthetics: sweet without being sentimental, focused on the humane, always concrete, never abstract. Burešová drew the picture at hand for the forty-sixth birthday of František Feigl of Prague; in Terezín he worked as a picture framer. The figure wears a simplified Czech national costume; the ribbons on the flowers are the Czech national colors of red, blue, and white. The woman is beautiful but also very corporeal; her skin has a “healthy” color. She smiles as she jumps, and is also nearly nude, exposing arms, cleavage, and one long, alluring, stretched leg. In fact, there is nothing remotely calm or prudent about the girl. All the viewer wants to do is to take her pretty elbow and jump with her through that frame.

Many of these features reflected the way that the older, German prisoners in Terezín perceived the young Czech Jews. The Berliner Otto Bernstein recalled the Czechs in similar terms in a 1947 letter: “A beautiful race. Splendid boys—well-built young women. A pasture for the eyes. The Slavic type was prevalent; assimilation in Czechoslovakia seems to be far advanced.”¹¹

Interestingly, to the Czech viewer (I have shown the drawing to many friends both in the Czech Republic and elsewhere), the figure is beautiful rather than naked: it is her nakedness that signifies her beauty. Our understanding of beauty is culturally rooted, and Burešová’s drawing points us toward a salient value in Czech self-perception and aesthetics: to the Czech viewer, the figure is beautiful because she is corporeal, daring, and very much present. The belonging in the picture, its Czechness, was emotionally coded; to this end, Burešová used a female figure, gendered in her beauty and nakedness. The drawing, having wandered with Feigl after the war from Czechoslovakia to the United States, lying

⁸ “My father really didn’t do anything, we had no money, and what little we had was spent, and we just got hold of stamps for parcels however we could, and were sending packages to Mama.” Interview of R.B.

⁹ Burešová was sending letters of her colleague and fellow divorcée Jana Podlipská to the latter’s gentile ex-husband. Interview Podlipská, APT, 4496; interview of R.B.

¹⁰ Hess, “Perspektivenwechsel—Zeichnungen aus dem Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück,” in Insa Eschebach, ed., *Das Frauen-Konzentrationslager Ravensbrück: Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Nachgeschichte* (Berlin: Metropol, 2014): 259-274.

¹¹ Letter of Otto Bernstein to his friends, WL, 1035.

among the other Terezín drawing made by Lotka's older, German fellow inmates,¹² is a reminder of the transnational enforced community the ghetto was.



Figure 2: Lotka Burešová and granddaughter Zuzana, ca. 1961 (Radim Bureš's papers)

And Lotka Burešová? She survived, her husband and son picked her up in Terezín a couple of days before the liberation on May 9, 1945, and several years later, they remarried. At their second wedding, Radim junior was present with his young wife, Dagmar, who was then a law student, and expecting their firstborn; the magistrate was puzzled who was actually getting married. Dagmar was one of the many people who were charmed by Lotka: "Byla bohém, byla malířka, byla zábavná, vtipná, roztomilá a nepořádná. [...] Byla prostě okouzující pro mladou holku, která měla přísnou maminku a musela být v deset doma. [...] Lotynka byla velkorysá, to je přesně to slovo, které se na ni hodilo. Říkala jsem si, že je to snad dané tím, že byla v koncentráku, a že viděla

zblízka, co je smrt, co je strach a kde jde opravdu o život. [...] Ta její velkorysost a velkodušnost, a to, čím mě tehdy tak strašně imponovala, bylo dané právě tím. A kromě toho samozřejmě také tím, jak byla zábavná, vtipná, jaké kreslila pro dědečka obrázky k narozeninám a k svátku."¹³

¹² Feigl's collection, AR 5269 in LBI archives, is a rich repository of documents on ghetto life.

¹³ D.B. in the interview of R.B. "She was a bohemian, a painter, she was entertaining, witty, she was endearing and untidy... She was simply enchanting for a young woman with a strict mother who had to be home by ten... Lotynka was broadminded, that's exactly the word that fits her. I was telling myself that it was probably because she had been in a concentration camp, that she had seen at close range what death was, what fear was, and where it was truly a matter of life and death... That broadmindedness of hers, that generosity, and everything that made such a great impression on me at the time, was a result of that. And besides, of course there was also how much fun she was, how amusing, as she drew pictures for Grandpa for his birthday and name day."

Lotka lived in Prague until 1983; she continued painting, supplying her art to Dilo; she was doing quite well, economically. Yet like so many interesting and important women survivors, she never wrote a memoir. “I am just not able to write something useful. It would be better if we could chat and I would tell you what you would like to hear, what is interesting for you,” she answered the prodding of a fellow survivor, Jiří Lauscher.¹⁴ Her son Radim became a pediatrician and her daughter in law, Dagmar, an eminent attorney. In fact, Dagmar Burešová represented the family of Jan Palach against the Communist defamation of his self-immolation in the early years of the normalization, and after 1989 served as a minister of justice. Recently, Agnieszka Holland directed the TV series *Burning Bush* about Dagmar Burešová’s courageous work.

When we think about the Czech twentieth century, the Prague Spring, its violent crushing, and the non-violent protest of the likes of Jan Palach are the first topics that come to people’s minds. But perhaps a much more principal moment of Czechness, connected to many other cultures, happened in the Terezín ghetto, and all that remains of it today is a little watercolor in the Leo Baeck Institute archives.

¹⁴ Burešová to Lauscher, March 19, 1981, BTA, 11c.

In Search of Vindication and Liberation: The Czechoslovak Republican (Agrarian) Party in Exile during the Paris Years (1948-1951)

Mary Hrabík Šámal

The history of the Czechoslovak Republican Party of the Smallholders and peasants from 1948 to 1951 must be examined in the context of its time. Already in 1946 Winston Churchill observed that an “Iron Curtain” divided Europe. Using rigged elections in Poland and Hungary, a *coup d'état* in Czechoslovakia and the Berlin blockade crisis, the Communists gained control over Eastern Europe. The West’s reaction to Soviet control of the region began the Cold War in earnest. For both the Soviet Union and the United States and their allies, the conflict quickly escalated into a mutual preoccupation that had military, ideological and espionage dimensions. At the Iron Curtain, western troops, under the aegis of the North Atlantic Treaty organization, faced the Soviet Union’s and its allies’ armies. The first of the proxy wars between the two antagonists, the one in Korea, began in 1950. A hot war in Europe did not seem out of the question.

As the Communists gained control of East European governments, non-communist politicians feared for their lives and many of them made their way to the West, often in a difficult and dramatic manner.¹ Once there, they devoted themselves to the liberation of their homeland. They believed that the Communist regimes did not reflect most of their compatriots’ wishes and that a counter coup was imminent. The international situation seemed to be heading toward a military confrontation between the USSR and the West. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, East European émigrés thought that their exile would be short and that they would soon be returning to their homeland and assuming leadership positions. This conviction accounts for the contentious nature of exile politics that in hindsight now seems like much ado about nothing.

Like the leaders of the other East European parties, those of the Czechoslovak Republican Party of the Smallholders and Peasants, often referred to as the Agrarian or Republican Party, went into exile to liberate their homeland from Communist domination. One of the first reports of the Republican Party in exile states: “After the Communist *coup d'état*, a number of officials and members of the Republican Party left Czechoslovak soil, which had lost its freedom and independence. They understood that it was only abroad that could freely speak and work so that our nation and countryside would regain the rights that belong to citizens in a democracy.”² The Agrarians, however, had an additional aim: the re-

¹ Zora Dvořáčková, *Politikové na úteku: Osudy změněné 25. únorem 1948* (n.p. Nakladatelstvíepocha, 2004).

² “Zpráva o činnosti prozatímní delegace Republikánské strany,” Martin Hrabík Family Archive, henceforth MHFA. Martin Hrabík, a long term Agrarian Party official and the Party’s chairman from 1969 to 1986 took it upon himself to keep the archive of the Republican Party in exile. The archive moved with him from Paris to New York, Washington, D.C. and Cleveland, Ohio, where there were six more moves. After Hrabík’s death, the archive was transferred to his daughter’s home in Troy, MI. By default, his

establishment of their Party and its vindication. In 1945, the representative of the Czechoslovak government-in-exile, i.e., parties of the National Front: the Communists, Social Democrats, National Socialists and Populists, had signed the Košice Program, which *inter alia* outlawed the Republican Party as a “fascist organization” that had collaborated with the Nazis. The authorities barred the Party from public activities and confiscated its property and press.

Their Party banned, Republican leaders sought other ways by which to influence public life. They tried to have the Democrat Party, which emerged in 1945 and was restricted to Slovakia, be allowed to run in the Czech lands. All important leaders of the Slovak Democrat Party, the Republicans were well aware, had been active members of the former Agrarian Party during the inter-war period and had remained faithful to agrarian principles. Perhaps because of this and because it was a transparent attempt for a disguised Agrarian Party to re-enter into the political arena, the powers-that-be did not allow the Slovak Democrats to contest the 1946 elections in Bohemia and Moravia.

Becoming active in the National Front parties was another way for Agrarians to gain political influence. At the same time, the National Socialists, Populists and Social Democrats were eager to poach former Republican Party voters and use prominent former Agrarian as the bait. The proportional representation with bound party lists used in the first Czechoslovak Republic and in 1946 lent itself to this eventuality. Under this electoral system, a political party would receive the number of seats in legislative chambers in proportion to the number of votes that had been cast for it. Whether an individual candidate was awarded a seat in the legislature depended on his placement on the party-compiled list. Thus, a political party controlled which of its candidates were elected to office. In the 1946 elections, the National Socialists had 12 former Agrarians on their candidate list. Of these, six were elected (Čeněk Torn, Ladislav Kameníček, Stanislav Novák, Leopold Slíva, Josef Sevcík, and Josef Ulrych) to the Chamber of Deputies. Ladislav Feierabend and Oldřich Suchý, prominent former Agrarians, were also in

papers contain the largest collection of correspondence and materials of Republican Party in exile. The Party's chairman from 1948 to 1969, Dr. Josef Černý, and his wife, Helena Černá, née Švehlová, also kept an extensive archive, but Mrs. Černá burned it before she moved from New York to a Chicago old age home. Jaroslav Rokoský, “Josef Černý: Okupace, Kolaborace, Exil (Part II),” *Štřední Evropa: Revue pro Středoevropskou kulturu a politiku*, 13 (1997): 72-73, 162. Presently, the Hrabík Papers can be found in several locations. In the 1980's when there seemed to be no end to Communism in Czechoslovakia, Hrabík gave part of his archive to the University of Chicago. The papers are in the Joseph Regenstein Library as part of the Archives of the Czechs and Slovaks Abroad. When materials from this collection are cited, the source will be given as ACASA, #760. The rest of the papers are designated as MHFA. The family has given a portion of these to the Czech National Archive in Prague. The author has kept whatever she felt she needed for this article. These papers, she will donate to the Czech institution at a later date. All translations are the author's.

the National Socialist ranks.³ Some former Agrarians joined the Social Democrats and Communists, but they did so as individuals and played no significant role in those parties.⁴ Populists also attracted former Agrarians. Three of those were part of that party's parliamentary delegation.⁵

The National Front parties did not recruit the pre-World War II top echelon leaders of the Republican Party. They conveniently considered them and their Party to be collaborators with the Nazis and responsible for Protectorate. The National Front also did put several foremost Agrarian leaders on trial for treason in 1947. Although some were acquitted⁶, the Court convicted the Party chairman Rudolf Beran (1887-1954) and sentenced him to twenty years at hard labor.⁷

The charges against the Party stem from its leaders' behavior after the 1938 Munich Pact and during the second Czechoslovak Republic, officially known as Czecho-Slovakia. President Edvard Beneš had left the country at that time. The Republicans, whose primary interest had been domestic policy, with few exceptions,⁸ did not go into exile. Rudolf Beran then served as prime minister of Czecho-Slovakia from December 1, 1938 to March 14, 1939.

In March 1947, Beran was tried for treason a second time (the first had been in 1942 for treason against Nazi Germany. Beran in his 1947 defense speech declared that his Party's and his government's actions during the second Republic were an attempt to save what could be salvaged as Czechoslovakia's allies first betrayed and then abandoned it. He had acted as a good farmer, who does not leave his homestead in the face of fire or hail, but rather tries to save whatever he can.⁹ Beran detailed Hitler's demands to his government and said:

³ Jan Dobeš, "Agrární politikové ve stranách Národní Fronty v letech 1945-1948" in *K úloze a významu Agrárního hnutí v Českých a Československých dějinách*, eds. Jiří Šouša, Daniel E Miller and Mary Hrabík Samal (Prague: Karolinum, 2001), 146-147.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 144.

⁵ Miloš Trapl, "Politici bývalé Agrární (Republikánské) strany v československé straně lidové letech 1945-1948," in *K úloze a významu Agrárního hnutí*, 153-156.

⁶ Lukáš Kopecký, "Tito důstojníci jsou dodnes zavázáni mu vděčností..." *Pamět a dějiny*. 8 (2014):4, 53. Among those tried and acquitted in 1947 were former Prime Minister Jan Malypeter, former minister of the Interior Josef Černý, former defense minister František Machník, Ferdinand Klindera and Josef Nebeský.

⁷ Rudolf Beran along with Jan Syrový, Jiří Havelka, Otakar Fischer, a Josef Černý, were put on trial January 30, 1947. The verdict was rendered on April 21, 1947. As soon as the Communists came to power in February 1948, they arrested and imprisoned many Agrarians, including some like František Machník, Ferdinand Klindera and Josef Nebeský, who had earlier been acquitted.

⁸ Former Prime Minister Milan Hodža and Ladislav Feierabend, were the exceptions.

⁹ Rudolf Beran, Sr., speaking in his own defense on March 28, 1947 in "Zápis soudního řízení s Rudolfem Beranem, Janem Syrovým, Jiřím Havelkou, Otakarem Fischerem, a Josefem Černým," MHFA, p.555. Miro.(sic) Vilímeč made the only stenographic record of the trial. He explains: "I made the transcript for the Slovak Democrat Party... With the exception of the protocols available before the trial, which were read into the record, I tried to transcribe everything word-for-word. I was the only one who transcribed the entire proceedings verbatim. The official court clerk noted only some short testimonies and the journalists, who were usually present only sporadically, reported in

With what did we comply? In sum, nothing. We only fulfilled crumbs from what the *diktát* demanded. Although cognizant of the command that we should not engage in provocative actions, we communicated the German demands to France. What were we advised to do?...Nothing. We were told to “comply with Germany’s wishes.” In spite of that, we did not comply with the *diktát*!¹⁰

Turning to foreign affairs, Beran stated that neither he nor his government sent President Emil Hácha (1872-1945) to Germany to intercede with Hitler on behalf of the Czech lands after the Slovak declaration of independence on March 13, 1939. Hácha undertook the trip on his own initiative or at the command of people unknown. Beran’s government resigned on March 14.¹¹ In a phone conversation to which his son, Rudolf Jr. (1917-1999), listened on the other line, Beran beseeched Hácha not to sign Czechoslovakia’s capitulation;¹² however, the Germans did obtain Hácha’s signature by thug-like, brutal intimidation. His own subsequent action, Beran describes thus:

From the very first day of the occupation, I aided both the resistance at home and abroad. I hid important papers so that I would damage the efforts of the Germans. Immediately after March 15 along with Šmoranc, I started to organize the resistance against them. General Píka, and Director General Outrata have testified that already in April 1939 I placed myself at the disposal of President Dr. Beneš

very cavalier manner.” Vilímeč to Hrabík, January 29, 1991, MHFA. One version of Beran’s defense speech was edited and smuggled abroad soon after the Communist *coup d’état*. This copy is also in MHFA. When the edited version is compared with the stenographic transcript, it is more polished, better organized and edited, but the two are identical in content. In this article, quotations in this article are from the stenographic version.

¹⁰ Ibid., 552.

¹¹ Ibid., 554.

¹² Ibid. and Rudolf Beran, Jr. to Hrabík, March 3, 1991, MHFA. The son of Prime Minister Rudolf Beran writes: “Before Dr. Hacha’s departure for Berlin, Beran’s government submitted its resignation March 14th. They did this not because they had any inkling of the Protectorate, but because after the secession of Slovakia, they no longer had a mandate to rule. The President promised to discuss this after his return from Berlin.

Dr. Hacha went to Berlin at his own initiative upon the advice of the presidential office, not on that the government. When Dr. Hacha called during the night of March 15th and asked Dad for the government to give its assent to be “protected by the Reich” (I was listening on our second phone). Dad refused. He said that government had no legal basis for this action, and again he repeated that the government had resigned. The President accepted full responsibility; he sacrificed himself. Again he did not accept the resignation, so that there would be no legal discontinuity. He promised to solve the situation upon his return home.

In the next 48 hours, the so-called National Committee, whatever General Blaskowicz called it, presented itself. After consultations, the resigning government remained in office until the President could name a new government approved by the Protectorate. Furthermore, after Hacha’s, Beran’s and Hampl’s consultations, the National Unity and Labor parties were dissolved and the *Narodní Soutěženství* was created with Nebeský at its head.”

and asked for his directives....I assisted those fleeing abroad...I send reports...and money...¹³

Beran lists the underground activities that he had organized and financed. Ironically, the Nazis had tried Beran for treason in 1941 because of these very activities. Initially, they jailed him, and from 1942 kept him under house arrest until the end of the war. During his house arrest, Beran, using own funds, supported those whom the Nazis were persecuting and the families of the imprisoned.¹⁴

At Beran's trial, the jury consisted of a presiding judge and six "judges from the people" selected by the National Front political parties. The Communist and Populist parties each had two appointees: the National Socialists and Social Democrats each had only one. The presiding judge, who also had a vote, was a Social Democrat. Beran was convicted by a vote of 4 to 7 of only three of the twenty one charges, specifically of selling war materials to Nazi Germany and of welcoming General Johannes Blaskowicz (1883-1948) and Reich Protector Konstantin von Neurath (1873-1956) to Prague. Beran did in fact authorize the sale of war materials to Nazi Germany, but did so only after several attempts to sell to France and other allies fell through and the Germans strongly insisted on the purchase. One of the National Socialist "judges from the people" noted on his ballot that Beran was required by virtue of his office as prime minister to welcome Neurath and Blaskowicz. The four guilty votes came from the representatives of the Communist and Social Democrat parties. The representatives of the Populists and National Socialists voted for acquittal in all instances.¹⁵ In his definitive study of Rudolf Beran and his epoch, Jaroslav Rokoský notes: "The Communist Party greatly influenced the preparation, proceedings and the result of the trial of Rudolf Beran."¹⁶

Nor did the activities of Republican Party leaders and adherents support the charge that the Party had collaborated with the Nazis. Out of the Party's thirty-member executive committee, four were executed or tortured to death by the Nazis, two served in the London government in exile, nine were imprisoned by the Nazis, and four were in the executive committee of the Slovak uprising. As for the others, several supported financially the families of imprisoned Party members and/or had their own relatives in Nazi jails. From various Party-sponsored organizations, forty-eight leading functionaries died in Nazi custody or were executed. Of those working directly in the organization of the Party, forty were executed. Many employed in the Party-sponsored economic organizations and cooperatives, as well as government ministries often staffed by the Party members, were either jailed or executed. From the Ministry of Agriculture alone, forty-eight lost their lives and 123 were jailed. Moreover, the first student killed in

¹³ "Zápis soudního řízení," 580.

¹⁴ Ibid. and Jaroslav Rokoský, *Rudolf Beran a jeho doba: Vzestup a pád agrární strany* (Vyšehrad: Ústav pro Studium Totalitních Režimů, 2011), 453-485.

¹⁵ Ibid., 728-741.

¹⁶ Ibid., 768.

protest against the Germans, Jan Opletal (1915-1939) was a member of the Party's youth section (Dorost) as was Jan Kubiš (1913-1942), one of the parachutists sent to assassinate Reinhard Heydrich (1904-1942).¹⁷

Beran's speech did not move those who decided his fate. He was sentenced to twenty years of hard labor, and his Party remained banned. This embittered the Agrarians and made those in exile resolve to vindicate their Party and to assure for it its rightful place in a future non-Communist Czechoslovakia. The necessary first step for the Agrarian exiles was to re-establish their Party. In this, they faced several serious obstacles.

Foremost among the practical impediments to the restoration and functioning of the Party was the geographic dispersal of its adherents, who were scattered throughout the free world. Some lived in German, French and Italian refugee camps. Others had managed to make their way to Great Britain, Belgium and Switzerland. Post-World War II Western European countries offered the refugees asylum, but not permanent residency or the right to employment. Most refugees, with the exception of young men, especially soldiers and officers, who were willing to enlist in the Foreign Legion or work in Europe's colonies,¹⁸ were in transit as they waited for visas to emigrate to the United States, Canada, Australia, or New Zealand.

A lack of funds also slowed down the Party's efforts to organize. Since it had concentrated on domestic issues during the inter-war period, the party had no funds secreted abroad and very few contacts in Western Europe and America. Moreover, the money the Agrarians had been able to bring from Czechoslovakia was nearly worthless when exchanged against Western currencies. For the Party's supporters, opportunities for legal employment were scarce. The few that did materialize were often unsuccessful as for example the offer that Jan Lobkowicz made to the Party's Executive Committee on behalf of the Union of Czechoslovak Large Estates and Farms Owners and Renters Having Holdings Outside of Czechoslovakia and their friends. Members of this organization wanted to hire Czech and Slovak refugees as managers or renters of their estates and farms.¹⁹ Unfortunately, the offer came too late, Martin Hrabík (1904-1992) writing on behalf of the Executive Committee, replied that the few families who would have qualified for such posts had already emigrated to Canada and Brazil.²⁰

During their early Paris stay, the Agrarians lived on the edge of poverty.²¹ They supported themselves with whatever money they could raise from pawning

¹⁷ "Zápis soudního řízení," 559-560.

¹⁸ Hrabík's annotation to the papers that he donated to the Archive of the Czechs and Slovaks Abroad and Štába (the first name is illegible) to Hrabík, November 9 and 21, 1949, ACASA, # 760.

¹⁹ Jan Lobkowicz to Výkonný Výbor Republikánské Strany, April 4, 1949, ACASA, # 760.

²⁰ Hrabík to Jan Lobkowicz, June 15, 1949, ACASA, # 760.

²¹ The near poverty is well illustrated by the exchange of letters between Hrabík in Paris and Múdry-Šebík in New York. "My dear Martin, I have sent you and Palko Planovský a package. It contains: 2 old man's suits, 4 used shirts, 4 pairs of socks, 4 briefs, 2 ties, 1lb. coffee, 1lb. candy and 3 packages of cigarettes. The suits are in pretty bad shape. I am not

the personal possessions that they had brought with them. Informing Vladislav Brdlík (1897-1964) of living arrangements in Paris, Josef Černý writes:

We are staying in cheap, but clean hotels; such can be had in Paris for 200 Fr....There is food enough here, but we are living modestly...We support ourselves by selling the few things we brought with us, but for these things, gold and jewelry, the French do not pay very much.²²

The additional difficulties the Party faced in trying to re-establishing itself, such as factionalism and lack of an undisputed leader, were due to its past rather than the new challenges of exile. While it had electoral successes (the Agrarian Party had been the single largest party in inter-war Czechoslovakia since 1922), the Party was able to contain the fissiparous tendencies of its heterogeneous base. It had managed to moderate the often conflicting interests of poor farmers with those of richer ones, to deal with the divergent demands of different crop cultivators, to reconcile the interest of industries and co-operatives processing agricultural crops with those of the producers. In addition to its core constituency of peasants and farmers, the Party attracted the technical intelligentsia, especially those connected with agriculture and its financial and processing interests; moreover, the Party also appealed to those employed in the state bureaucracy, particularly in the defense, agriculture and interior ministries that the Party habitually controlled.²³

As long as the Party enjoyed electoral success and had strong leadership, it was able to contain these strains, but, alas, this was not the case after 1945. The Party had lost important leaders, such as Milan Hodža (1878-1944), František Staněk (1867-1936), František Udržal (1866-1938) and Viktor Stoupal (1888-1944) through natural attrition. In 1954, Rudolf Beran died in prison. As mentioned earlier, Nazi persecution and that of the National Front (1945-1948) also took a large toll on the Party's cadres and elites. After the Communist take-over, those who had not been lucky or prescient enough to escape abroad found themselves in jail. In the resulting vacuum, the leadership of the Party in exile was up for grabs.

In 1948 the two main contenders for leadership in exile were Josef Černý (1885-1971) and Ladislav Feierabend (1891-1969). Černý was the highest ranking Republican Party officer in exile. He had served as a member of Parliament from 1918 to 1939 and Minister of Interior from 1934-1938, and had been the vice-

sure if you or Pavel will want them. If not, do pass them on to one of our needy poor. My dear Martin, I too do not have much so I am sending what I can. In the future, perhaps I'll be able to send something better. Let me know your and Pavel's shoe size and approximate suits sizes." Michael Múdry-Šebík to Hrabík, June 22, 1948, MHFA. Hrabík provided the requested sizes. Hrabík to Múdry-Šebík, n. d., MHFA.

²² Černý to Vladislav Brdlík, August 8, 1948, MHFA.

²³ Mary Hrabík Šámal, *The Czechoslovak Republican Party of Smallholders and Farmers, 1918-1938* (Ph. D. diss., The Pennsylvania State University, 1973), 38-264.

president of the National Unity Party (Strana Národní Jednoty) for a year. A long-term member of the Party's executive committee, he had the additional cachet that he was the son-in-law of Antonín Švehla, the much revered founder of the Party and after Masaryk the most important politician of the early years of the first Czechoslovak republic. Černý had been tried along with Beran in 1947.²⁴ He was unanimously acquitted. The Court noted:

...the accused Josef Černý preached unstinting patriotism, political peace and love for Czechoslovakia, but also persistently and uncompromisingly practiced them at a time when the nation was in dire straits. He was a sincere patriot, a loyal republican and a genuine democrat who during the occupation helped people without regard to their political affiliation.²⁵

Ladislav Feierabend, an economist, had held high offices in Party affiliated organizations such as the Kooperativa and the Obilní Monopol (Grain Stock Exchange). He had been the Minister of Agriculture in the post-Munich and in the Protectorate governments. In 1940, he managed to escape via Hungary, Yugoslavia and France to Great Britain where he was a member of the government in exile.²⁶ During the immediate post-war years, Ladislav Feierabend was active in the Czechoslovak National Socialist Party. After the 1948 coup, Feierabend had gone to Great Britain. There he founded an agrarian party and began publishing a periodical, *Listy přátelům*.

The Černý group, composed primarily of party activists, objected strenuously to Feierabend on personal, political and ideological grounds. Martin Hrabík summarizes them in his unpublished, as well as unfinished, memoirs:

The Parties of the National Front considered Feierabend as he arrived in London as the legitimate representative of the Republican Party and an experienced expert of the second exile. We were very bitter about the National Front government's ban of the Party, the Košice proclamation and the persecution of our operatives.... Feierabend never worked in any of the Party's organizations. Beran had delegated him to the *Obilní Monopol* and later into the government of the second republic as a technical expert. We felt that the politicians of the National Front, especially the National Socialist, were trying foisting off "their man" on us and have him lead us.

At any price, we did not want to allow Feierabend to place himself at head of our movement. Our reasons: While he had been an outstanding official in the

²⁴ Jaroslav Rokoský, "Josef Černý: Agrarník, ministr vnitra (Part I)," *Štřední Evropa: Revue pro Středoevropskou kulturu a politiku*, 13 (June 1997):71.66-78 and "Josef Černý: Okupace, Kolaborace, Exil (Part II)," *Štřední Evropa*, 13 (Sept.-Oct. 1997): 72-73, 152-164.

²⁵ As cited by Čeněk Torn, "JUDr. Josef Černý mrtev," *Novina*, 23 (June 1972): 7.

²⁶ Cf. Ladislav K. Feierabend, *Ve vládách druhé Republiky* (New York: Universum Press Co., 1961); *Ve vládách protektorátu* (New York: by the author, 1962); *Ve vládě exilu I* (Washington D.C.: by the author, 1965); *Ve vládě exilu II* (Washington, D. C.: by the author, 1966); *Beneš mezi Washingtonem a Moskvou* (Washington, D.C.: by the author, 1966); *Soumrak Československé demokracie* (Washington, D.C.: by the author, 1967) and *Pod vládou Národní Fronty* (Washington, D.C.: by the author, 1968).

agricultural cooperatives and became the president of the Grain Monopoly because of his organizational and economic expertise, he had little in common by ancestry and in conviction with our rank and file members. He served President Beneš until he found out that the agrarian party would not be permitted at home. Feierabend's colleagues returned home via Moscow. In our eyes, it was not to his advantage that he was a member of the elite that ruled financial organizations...we did want farmers to lead our agrarian organizations...not the economic elites to which Feierabend belonged. Finally, Feierabend was in the government while this self-same government persecuted the vice-president our Party, Dr. Milan Hodža.... Only later did he begin to publish his reminiscences about the government at home and in exile.²⁷

Attempts to reconcile the Černý and Feierabend camps proved futile. Černý, Josef Šámal (1906-1967)²⁸ and Martin Hrabík met with Feierabend in Paris before the 1948 Party Congress. "The meeting ended with Feierabend's promise that he would attend the congress as an observer," writes Hrabík in his memoirs.²⁹

The Agrarians who went into exile had been sufficiently active within the Republican Party to feel that the Communist take-over endangered them. Their loyalty was to the organization of the Party rather than its affiliated economic groups like the Kooperativa, which Feierabend represented. Simply put, the Černý group garnered the loyalty of the Party cadres.

The Černý group made their headquarters in Paris. "At the end of March, we decided to transfer our activities," states the report of the temporary delegation of the Republican Party, "to Democrat France not only because of technical considerations, but also as a matter of principle. If we could not resume our activities on our native soil, we did not want to do so in Germany."³⁰

Dr. Jan Král, Hrabík's volunteer secretary and translator, convinced Alexandre Alexinsky, an official of French Department of the Interior stationed in Germany, that Martin Hrabík was important personage.³¹ Alexinsky immediately

²⁷ Hrabík memoir, MHFA. The memoir is unfinished and unpublished. It consists of various episodes of the author's life and has no titles or page numbers.

²⁸ Miroslav Král, "Josef Šámal—novinář Republikánské (agrární) strany zemědělského a maloroľnického ľudu," *Podbrdsko: Vlastivědný Sborník středního Podvltaví*, 21 (2014):XX-XX, Josef Černý, "K úmrtí redaktora Šámala," *Novina*, 1967, No.2:1-2; Eduard Dellin, "Odešel věrný přítel—Archivář Čsl. agrarismu," *ibid.*, 2-3; Marie Tumlířová, "Za Josefem Šámalem" *ibid.*, 3 and Martin Hrabík, "Hrst Vzpomínek," *ibid.*, 4.

²⁹ "Hrabík memoir."

³⁰ "Zpráva o činnosti prozatímní delegace Republikánské strany zemědělského a maloroľnického ľudu," n. d., ACASA, # 760.

³¹ Martin Hrabík had been active in the Republican Party since his youth. He had served on the Republican Party's Executive Committee since 1930 and been the Secretary General of its Youth Section, Dorost, from 1936-1938. Hrabík had been one of the two designated youth leaders in the National Unity Party during the second Republic. From 1940 to 1945, Hrabík was imprisoned by the Nazis for his underground activities. He chose not to enter public life from 1945 to 1947. Although not a Republican Party member, Dr. Jan Král, a Prague an attorney, attached himself to Hrabík and volunteered his services a secretary and

took Martin Hrabík and Dr. Jan Král from Germany to France.³² So without passports or any official travel documents, Hrabík and Král, unknown and penniless, arrived in Paris on April 6, 1948. Alexinsky also arranged for them to receive residence permits for a year, but their speedy entry into France could not be repeated. Hrabík quickly realized that “it was not possible that the Ministry of Interior could take over the role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.” He added: “I deeply appreciated and silently thanked Commissar Alexinsky and the diplomatic skills of Dr. Jan Král.”³³ Hrabík’s and Král’s immediate task was to get official permission for other Agrarians activists and officers to come to France. This required numerous appeals to the French police, ministries of interior and foreign affairs. Everywhere, Hrabík and Král explained “the history of our Party, the events in Czechoslovakia and our present efforts.” With Party members who could not come to France and were scattered throughout Western Europe, Hrabík and Král tried at least to establish written contact.³⁴

The bureaucratic and organizational habits of the Party reasserted themselves. Preparations were made to hold a congress to re-inaugurate the Party. The report informs that 1,541 letters were mailed, 712 visits were undertaken (this excludes those to Party members as well as to Czech and Slovak activists) and 543 telegrams, 100 pieces of registered mail and 565 airmail letters were sent out.³⁵ Since the planners could not afford to rent sufficient office space, they often met in various Paris parks. Membership registration forms were sent out. The preparatory commission for the congress set up ten committees. They were to report on the following matters: organizational, program, economic, foreign relations, social welfare, financial, press, youth and credentials.³⁶ Activists had organized an executive committee in Paris and party local organizations in the refugee camps in Germany and Italy, as well as among the émigrés in Great Britain and Tunisia.³⁷ In Paris, Party members also established sections of the Party dealing with women and youth.³⁸

translator (he was fluent in French and English). According to Hrabík, Král also possessed remarkable diplomatic gifts.

³² “Hrabík memoir.” Alexandre Alexinsky, a high official of the France’s Department of Interior, was in the French occupation zone to recruit agricultural workers and young men to serve in the Foreign Legion. Hrabík describes him thus: “he had finished his studies in France, but he was by birth and sympathies the son of Russian emigrants.”

³³ *Ibid.* and “Zpráva o činnosti prozatímní delegace Republikánské strany.”

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ “Sjezdové komise: Paris 1948,” MHFA.

³⁷ In the Archives of the Czechs and Slovaks Abroad, there are letters reporting the activities of the local organizations in Tunisia, Italy, Ludwigsburg and other refugee camps in the American zone of Germany, as well as an explanation that a local organization could not be established in Belgium because the local authorities frowned on the emigrants’ formal political activities.

³⁸ Přemysl Kocián, “Z činnosti Republikánského dorostu v Paříži” and “A o zakládání Republikánského dorostu v Paříži,” MHFA.

Finally the congress was held on September 27 and 28, 1948. Seventy-one members signed the attendance sheet.³⁹ After the opening of the congress, the committees reported. The plenary session took place in the evening. The next day, the feast of St. Wenceslas, began with a mass to “to beseech God’s grace and blessing for our activities and the welfare of our nation.” Afterward, the presiding officer introduced and welcomed the guests. They included representatives of the Polish and Croatian Agrarian parties, as well as those of other Czech and Slovak political parties then in Paris; namely, National Socialist, the Populist, National Democrat, Smalltraders and Slovak Democrat Parties.⁴⁰

Josef Černý, who was unanimously elected Party chairman, gave the main address. After proclaiming an uncompromising struggle against the Košice program and the policies of the National Front, Josef Černý welcomed the members and guests, especially “the representatives of two parties whom the Košice Program also humiliated,” the National Democrat and Smalltraders parties.⁴¹

The Congress adopted the so-called “Svatováclavskou deklaraci,” which proclaimed the continuity of the Republican Party, stating that “after being persecuted for ten years, the Republican Party is again renewed and lays claim to all the rights that a large part of the nation granted it in all free elections of the first Republic.” In the declaration, the delegates called the Košice program an “immoral agreement” and condemned it together with all the decrees and actions of the post-World War II era, which violated the constitutional provisions of the first Czechoslovak Republic. The delegates also promised to persevere in the struggle against Communism until its ultimate defeat.⁴²

After the Party’s re-inauguration, the disunity within its ranks and lack of funds continued to impede the Party’s efforts to vindicate itself and to liberate Czechoslovakia. Money remained tight. Hrabík administered it and accounted for it to Černý.⁴³ Hrabík distributed the funds among the three or four activists who edited the newspaper and took care of Party affairs. He also used the funds to pay for the party publications, postage and office supplies, etc. There were also special expenses, such as loans for party members being evicted from their apartments for non-payment and the like.⁴⁴ In his letter of December 30, 1949, Hrabík details that he spent 3,500 Fr. for “paper and stamps” 4,000 Fr. for “children, milk, butter,

³⁹ “Preseňční listina členů a hostů ze sjezdu 28. září 1948,” MHFA.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ “Z těsnopisných poznámek Přemka Kociana ze sjezdu,” MHFA.

⁴² “Svatováclavska Deklarace,” MHFA.

⁴³ “Finance strany: 1948-1950,” MHFA. The steady income of 75,000 Fr. comes from “Opus.” The author could not figure out the identity of this donor. She suspects that the ultimate source is the CIA. Hrabík acknowledges receiving money from Černý, but does not divulge Černý’s source. He also states that Stefan Osuský has sent him funds and that Bohuslav Soumar and a few others have given and or lent money, especially for the publication of *Novina*. Occasionally mention is made of communicating via a more secure means than ordinary mail.

⁴⁴ Černý to Hrabík, April 14, 1949. MHFA.

fruit,” and 3,000 Fr. for travel on the metro and trains. He adds: “Smoking, and expenses in Paris, where I cannot meet with the National Socialists in the same place where I meet with Rys and Kuželuhová. November and December were so busy that I had to use the last of my wife’s savings to cover the deficit of 20,000 Fr.”⁴⁵ The word that appears most frequently on the treasurer’s report during the Paris years is “deficit.”⁴⁶

Divisions within Party ranks remained a contentious issue that took much of the Party loyalists’ time and effort. At the beginning of January 1949, Ladislav Feierabend, Vladislav Brdlík (1879-1964), and Josef Čapek (1906-1973) came to Paris. Josef Ševčík, who lived in Paris, joined them in their negotiation with the Černý group. “Their demands,” writes Martin Hrabík, who participated in the meetings on behalf of the indisposed Černý, “were neither ideological nor tactical. They were requests for positions.” The negotiations lasted a week. “After we had offered them three places in the Party’s executive committee and a vice-chairmanship for Slíva,” Hrabík reports, “they raised the ante and demanded parity. Under these circumstances the negotiations collapsed.”⁴⁷

Feierabend had attempted to organize a political party based on non-partisanship. In the first issue of his publication, *Listy přátelům* he explains:

We are happy that after so many years we can again pledge our allegiance to our four leaf clover, but I am equally convinced that partisanship has no place in the liberation tasks....It is too soon to want to establish a program for unknown political, economic and social circumstances. Because of this, the different views of individual political parties cannot be allowed to diminish our unity. Our nation is suffering as it did under the Nazis. More than anything else, it demands unity from us—unity without regard to party—unity without regard whether we were politically engaged in the National Front or not.⁴⁸

The Party’s Executive Committee sent Feierabend a strongly-worded letter warning him that his organizational and publication activities were in violation of Party by-laws and asking him to desist.⁴⁹ He refused to comply with the Executive’s wishes. Members loyal to Černý group, particularly Jan Srp, an erstwhile member of the Party Youth Section, gained control of the London Party group, and Feierabend’s efforts to create his own agrarian party came to naught.⁵⁰

“Feierabend reacted by forming an opposition group with Leopold Slíva and Josef Ševčík against Černý. This group was close to the National Socialists, but he

⁴⁵ Hrabík to Černý, December 30, 1949. MHFA. Zdeněk Rhys and Helena Koželuhová were leaders in the National Democrat and Populist Parties, respectively.

⁴⁶ “Finance strany: 1948-1950,” MHFA.

⁴⁷ Martin Hrabík to friends in the French zone, February 13th, 1949. It was the custom in the Party to address members as “friend” The usage was similar to the use of “comrade” in the Communist Party.

⁴⁸ *Listy přátelům.n. p.*

⁴⁹ Výkonný výbor to Ladislav Feierabend, March 16 and 18, 1949.

⁵⁰ MHFA. Jan Srp to Martin Hrabík, ACASA, # 760.

could not gain more adherents from the Republican ranks,”⁵¹ write Zdeněk Jirásek and Miloš Trapl in their book on the politics of the Czechoslovak exile from 1948 to 1956. They conclude: “L. Feierabend was completely pushed aside. From then on, Feierabend participated in [exile] organizations as an independent politician.”⁵² With the exception of Feierabend and Josef Ševčík, eventually all the other dissidents (Leopold Slíva, Čeněk Torn and Vladislav Brdlík) returned to the Party fold.⁵³

Undaunted by the intra-party organizational difficulties and a lack funds, the Agrarians placed great deal of importance on publicity in general and the Party press in particular. They well remembered how in the years 1945-1948 the confiscation of their Party press and government censorship had left them defenseless against the slander aimed at them. “For political reasons,” Martin Hrabík writes to the chairman Josef Černý in September 1949, “I consider the question of publications especially important.”⁵⁴ He continues:

1) a good press will stop various campaigns against us; 2) it will give us respect and will frighten our opponents who seem capable of everything; 3) it is impossible to take care of all party business solely by means of meetings or by letters, the membership can only be held together by means of the publications; 4) it is far better to have our journalists occupied with polemics with our enemies than to have them used by other parties.⁵⁵

In September 1949, the Party began the publication of the revue *Novina, Agrární revue pro sociální, kulturní a hospodářskou politiku*. Its editor was Josef Šámal, who had been an editor and journalist for the party newspapers *Venkov* and *Večer*. The first issue, published in 1949, encompassed numbers 1 and 2; the second, 3 and 4. In 1950, there were three issues; the first held numbers 1 and 2; the second, numbers 3 to 5 and the third, numbers 6 to 10. The very first issue was mimeographed; the rest were printed. Conceived as a magazine, *Novina* concentrated on essays and editorials dealing with current issues of interest to Czech Agrarian émigrés, such as the world situation and events in their homeland. It also devoted several articles in each publication to the Party’s past. No *Novina* appeared in 1951 because the editors (Josef Šámal and Bohumil Jílek [1892-1963]) were busy seeking paid employment: Šámal found work in Belgium, and later he, as well as Jílek, emigrated to the United States. Publication resumed, but remained sporadic. Although written in Czech, the revue occasionally sported articles in French and English. The Party also published a bi-weekly *Naším v*

⁵¹ Zdeněk Jirásek and Miloš Trapl, *Exilová politika v letech 1948-1956*, (Olomouc: Centrum pro Československá exilová studia and Nakladatelství Mometa-FM, 1996): 33.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ “Hrabík Memoir” and Vladimír V. Dostál, *Agrární strana: Její rozmach a zánik* (Brno: Atlantis, 1998): 256-257.

⁵⁴ Hrabík to Černý, September 7, 1949, MHFA.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

exilu. More a newspaper than a magazine, *Našim v exilu* provided political and party news, as well as practical information about immigration possibilities.

The Party also put much effort into getting their own adherents into the employ of Radio Free Europe. The broadcasts were the most important means by which the Party was able to communicate with its supporters at home. The radio station eventually did hire František Vohryzka (1911-1993), Miloslav Rechcigl (1904-1975) and Marie Tumlířová (1889-1975).⁵⁶

Radio Free Europe broadcasts were not the only means through which the Party could keep in touch with its adherents at home. The Party made judicious use of Western intelligence and occasionally sent its own couriers back to Czechoslovakia. The presence of Communist spies' and their activities was another reason for the Agrarian leaders' caution.⁵⁷ Dr. Černý, the Party Chairman, knew how dangerous and ultimately not very productive spying was.⁵⁸ He was, therefore, opposed on general principle to the wholesale use of his own people in the intelligence activities of Western allies.⁵⁹ In a letter to Oldřich and Jiří Škvor, Hrabík further explains:

the Party officially does not work with any intelligence service although, quite understandably, we share information that is of use and interest with appropriate officials in the countries that have granted us asylum. To grant any intelligence service full access to our organizational network or our people at home is still too dangerous for the services use people nearly exclusively as agent for risky missions.

The situation will be quite different when there will be an actual active resistance. Then we will spontaneously co-operate most closely, and work with

⁵⁶ Royall Tyler to Martin Hrabík, October 24, 1950, July 21, 1951, September 13 and 24, 1951 and Hrabík to Tyler, October 22, 1950, ACASA, #760.

⁵⁷ Hrabík Memoir. He relates several experiences he has had with spies from Communist Czechoslovakia, especially with Emil Sztwiertnia, "a particularly clever spy" who was "caught as he was leaving messages in a park for the Czechoslovak espionage service." MHFA.

⁵⁸ The fate of Josef Sobotka is a case in point. He met in West Germany in December, 1948 with the exiles Josef Čapek and Leopold Sliva, at that time still opponents of the Černý group. They asked to contact Agrarians for possible underground activities. Shortly after his return to Prague, the Secret Police kidnapped, detained and brutally tortured Sobotka. His forced and Secret-police-formulated confession implicated many Agrarian activists still Czechoslovakia. Cf. "Vysvětlení k rozsudku Státního soudu v Praze č. j. Or. 661/49 ze dne 30. června 1949," MHFA. This document is an attachment to the appeal that Sobotka filed in June 10, 1968. Sobotka describes his torture and the fabrications of the Secret Police in his confession. Occasionally, he states that he would divulge relevant facts only at the actual proceedings (which never occurred because of the 1968 Soviet invasion). It should be kept in mind that Sobotka formulated his appeal to present himself in the best light to the still Communist judiciary. MHFA. In his annotations, Hrabík comments "Čapek's action ... began a wave of arrests of our adherents for illegal activities. Our people much complained about Sobotka..." ACASA, #760.

⁵⁹ Hrabík's annotations written on a letter from Oldřich Škvor to Hrabík, March 4, 1949, ACASA, #760.

the Americans will be necessary. For that very moment, we need to save our natural conspiratorial resources and not waste them prematurely. The international political situation has been very unpropitious for this eventuality so far, and at home they have been reaching conclusions that are far too optimistic. They have not taken taking into account that our Communist enemy is very well trained in conspiracy and that the regime at home is using new and unusual methods against the underground.⁶⁰

The Party did maintain contacts with its supporters at home, but very cautiously. The Hrabík archive contains at least one documented instance in which a courier from the West, Přemysl Kocián, (1928-1993) was sent back into Czechoslovakia with important materials to distribute. Kocián relates, “in September 1948, I returned illegally to Czechoslovakia to distribute exile Republican publications through our contacts. They were declarations that our Party was alive and combating communism, as well as insisting on its rights and continuity from the first Republic.”⁶¹

Correspondents confirm that Party news and materials were received in Czechoslovakia. One writes shortly after his arrival in West Germany from the Ludwigsburg refugee camp, “the news of the re-establishment of the Agrarian Party was received at home with great satisfaction and enthusiasm. The erstwhile Dorost members and even those of the older generation are resolutely ready to give it whatever financial and moral aid is needed.”⁶² Another correspondent, this one living in Brno writes: “I have seen number 8 of your newspaper. The guys in Prague have promised to send me the first seven issues.”⁶³

The Republicans received news from home in various ways. When the borders were still porous,⁶⁴ Kocián and other couriers brought messages and letters from Paris to Prague and vice versa.⁶⁵ Refugees also brought news, and there were still a few businessmen who traveled back and forth and were willing to carry messages and money to the Agrarians abroad.⁶⁶ An illustration, perhaps an extreme one, of how the Republicans received news from behind the Iron Curtain

⁶⁰ Hrabík to Oldřich and Jiří Škvor, May 31, 1949, ACASA, # 760. The author Jiří Škvor is better known under his pseudonym, Pavel Javor.

⁶¹ Přemysl Kocián “Z Československa do Francie?” MHFA. The commander of the Všeruby border guards, Stanislav Liška, a double agent in the service of the Americans since 1945, helped Kocián cross into Czechoslovakia and then back into West Germany. Liška thought that Kocián returned to attempt to convince his Czech girl friend to accompany him to France. Václava Janděčková, *Kámen: Svědectví hlavního aktéra akce “falešné hranice” u Všerub na Domažlicku* (Domažlice: Nakladatelství Černého Lesa, 2013), 142-5.

⁶² Jiří Škvor to Hrabík, April 17 and May 3, 1949, ACASA, #760.

⁶³ Jaroslav Prokůpek to Hrabík, June 21, 1949, MHFA.

⁶⁴ According to the captain of the border guards in Všeruby, Stanislav Liška, crossing the border became very difficult when the guards were issued patrol dogs. The canines could smell what the guards could not see.

⁶⁵ Kocián, “Z Československa do Francie?”

⁶⁶ Hrabík to Helena Černá, August 17, 1949.

is the story of the false borders along the Czechoslovak-West German frontier. Stanislav Liška, the commander of the border guards in Všeruby, contacted his friend Václav Kocian, who was already in the West, asking him to arrange that the BBC Czech language broadcasts include the information that the Czechoslovak authorities had set up false borders to trap potential escapees. Václav Kocian informed Martin Hrabík and Josef Černý, who made the arrangements with BBC.⁶⁷

As the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia became more radical and paranoid, correspondence and contact with the Party became more and more risky for people at home. The three 1952 show trials with the “Green International”⁶⁸ (the first one occurred in Prague, the second in Brno and the third in Ústí nad Labem) and other arrests demonstrated how dangerous for the people in Czechoslovakia were contacts or even the suspicions of contacts with the émigrés Agrarians. The trials were an imitation of the Soviet trials in the late 1930s, with the same draconian sentences and disregard for truth.⁶⁹ The first trial dealt with persons who had been politically active in Agrarian and Populist parties, the second, with a group of Catholic and conservative intellectuals and third, with various suspected Agrarian and Populist sympathizers. All were accused of being agents of the “Green International” and the Vatican paid by “moneybags of Wall Street” in the service of the “20th century American vandals.”⁷⁰ According to a publication of the Propaganda and Agitation Section of the Executive Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, the overthrow of the Communist government of Czechoslovakia was planned thus:

The traitors Dr. Černý and Hrabík in 1948 sent to the Czechoslovak Republic a series of agents who were to join with activists of the former Agrarian Party who have remained here and now would place themselves at the head of the agrofascist center. The group abroad chose as the main leader Antonín Chloupek, a former member of Parliament and a member of the Agrarian Party’s Executive Committee. He seemed to them to have the best qualifications and be the most experienced to organize a band of the most dangerous kulaks and other terrorists.

⁶⁷ Jandečková, 205-206. A copy of the report Liška wrote after he had fled Czechoslovakia is in the Hrabík archive.

⁶⁸ “The traitor Mikolajczyk has been placed at the head of the Green International, and as a vice-president the well-known the murderer of our workers during the massacres of the first Republic, Dr. Černý, the former Minister of Interior was installed.” O. Balaš, *Zelená Internacionála—prodlouženáruka imperialistických nepřátel našeho lidu*. (Prague: oddělení propagandy a agitace KV KSC, 1952), 4.

⁶⁹ In the Prague trial the sentences ranged from the death penalty for Josef Kepka to 25 years imprisonment for Václav Renč. Also included in this group were Vlastimil Klíma, Antonín Chloupek, František Topol, Vilém Knebort and Josef Kostohryz who received life sentences. In the Brno group, which included Josef Knap, František Křelina, Jan Zahradníček, Václav Prokúpek, Zdeněk Kalista, Bedřich Fučík, Stanislav Berounsky, Oldřich Albrecht, Ladislav Jehlička, Ladislav Karhan, Miroslav Skácel, Ladislav Kuncič, Václav Hověžák, František Kadrnka and Jan Langr, the sentences ranged from 7 to 22 years.

⁷⁰ Balaš, *loc.cit.*

The agents brought instructions and orders to Chloupek and from him carried messages of an espionage character to the treasonable gang abroad.⁷¹

The plot to take over Czechoslovakia was, as the Communists saw it, the first step to make “the free Democrat People’s Republics of Europe and Asia” into a “Central European federation.” The next step would be to transform them into “enslaved agricultural colonies.” All this, of course, was for the benefit of the warmongering “20th century imperialist American vandals.” In this Communist scenario, a group of Czech conservative and Catholic intellectuals because of their hatred of communism and desire to install a “clero-fascist state” in which they would have key roles supposedly joined the political group in the conspiracy.⁷²

Like in the famous Moscow trials, the offenses of the accused were deliberate fabrications of the interrogators and prosecutors. The Agrarians in exile did have communications with some of the accused in these trials. After all, they were the émigrés’ relatives, friends, as well as former political and professional colleagues. For example, the interrogators determined that Václav Renč and several of his co-defendants had contact with Martin Hrabík, “an agent of the Green International” and Pavel Tigrid, “a clerical fascist ideologue.”⁷³ Nevertheless, no actual conspiracy to overthrow the Communist government existed.⁷⁴

The Republicans, well aware that the liberation of their homeland, as well as the vindication and re-establishment of their Party, involved joint efforts, were concentrating on other tasks. They were busily seeking allies. However, the Agrarians in exile were not willing to work with all comers, such as General Lev Prchala (1892-1963).⁷⁵ His Czech National Committee, the Agrarians believed, had no realistic chance to free Czechoslovakia, and they refused to join it.⁷⁶

The General informed Josef Černý that representatives of the National Front parties in exile would be forming an organization in which they intended to include the Republican Party; however, they also let it be known that if the Agrarian Party did not behave itself they would recognize an alternate agrarian party. In a not-too-subtle reference to Dr. Feierabend, the General writes: “Why could a member of the National Front not pretend to be an Agrarian for a change...?”⁷⁷ Later, writing to the Party’s Executive Committee, Prchala pointed

⁷¹ Ibid., 5.

⁷² Ibid., 1-16.

⁷³ Antonín Kratochvíl, “Půlstoletví of procesů s českými spisovateli,” in *Literatura určená klikvidaci: Sborník příspěvků z konference pořádané v Brně 26.-27. listopadu 2002 k padesátému výročí politických procesů se spisovateli*, ed. Luisa Nováková (Brno: Obec spisovatelu, 2004), 19.

⁷⁴ cf. Ibid., 15-22, Zora Dvořáčková, *Navzdory nenávisti a mstě* (Třebíč: Akcent, 2010) and Hana Pražáková, *Nadějí tu žijem* (n. p.: Nakladatelství Hejkal, 2001).

⁷⁵ General Lev Prchala had tried to convince President Beneš to order armed resistance rather than to surrender the Sudetenland in 1938. In exile during World War II, he opposed Beneš’s pro-Soviet policies and favored the idea of a central European federation as espoused by Milan Hodža. Prchala did not return to Czechoslovakia after World War II.

⁷⁶ Hrabík annotation to Prchala correspondence, ACASA, #760.

⁷⁷ Gen. Lev Prchala to Josef Černý, Oct. 18, 1948, ACASA, #760.

out that the Agrarians had not paid much attention to foreign affairs in the past and had allowed Beneš to dominate foreign policy. This led to the present debacle. Now, the Agrarians were considering allying themselves with the parties of the National Front, the very parties who had supported Beneš and outlawed the Agrarian Party. In the General's opinion, it would be much wiser for the Agrarians to join his Czech National Committee, which never had or would co-operate with the Soviets. The Committee also would assure Czechoslovak independence, the General added, because the country would be part of a federation of central European states.⁷⁸

Prchala's arguments did not entice the Executive Committee of the Republican Party in exile. It tactfully refused Gen. Prchala's offer stating:

The Republican Party will take an independent position on events occurring at home and abroad as it had always done in the past...We are for co-operation with anyone who wants to fight against Communism on the basis of genuinely Democrat principles and desires to join in the liberation of our country...Our vision allows the broadest union of all of the nation's forces without expelling anyone who is against dictatorship and the Košice program. We believe, esteemed General that this stand is not in conflict with that of the Czech National Committee.⁷⁹

The Party's search for help and potential allies began early. Upon reaching Paris, Hrabík, who was the first of his Party to arrive, began to make contacts. He sought out French Agrarians. Former French cabinet minister Archarde, who had worked with Czechoslovak agricultural organizations and the Beet Growers' Union that were closely linked with the Republican Party, was his first contact. Along with his translator, Dr. Jan Král, Hrabík was granted a meeting with Acharde on April 17, 1948. Acharde then arranged a meeting for them with twenty members of the Chamber of Deputies belonging to the new agrarian party, which was allied with General de Gaulle.⁸⁰ Of that meeting, Hrabík reports:

While Dr. Král was assiduously translating for both sides (the Frenchmen had not brought own translator), I noticed that they knew nothing about us and that our tradition and history only mildly interested them. We simplified our presentation until we finally piqued their interest. Suddenly they asked: "Could we find a way to co-operate with the Poles?" and most importantly: "Do we have any funds?"⁸¹

Finally, the discussion raised the possibility that the Czech Agrarians officially would recruit agricultural experts in the refugee camps for the French and while doing this, they could also take care of their own business. The Czechs abandoned this scheme when they realized that they could be accused of procuring indentured servants for French agricultural establishments. Later, Hrabík and Král

⁷⁸ Prchala to Černý, Nov. 23, 1948, ACASA, #760.

⁷⁹ Výkonný výbor Republikánské strany to Lev Prchala, Nov. 8, 1948, ACASA, #760

⁸⁰ "Hrabík memoir"

⁸¹ Ibid.

again met with representatives of General de Gaulle (Mr. Bequ ) and the French Agrarian party (Mr. Du Fou).⁸² In spite of this early scant success, the temporary delegation of the Party made contacts with the ministries of information, labor and agriculture, as well as professional agricultural organizations and cooperatives seeking possible employment for Party adherents. Hrab k and Kr l also used their French contacts as an entr e to the police, foreign affairs and interior (security) affairs ministries to get necessary visas and residence and other permits for Party adherents.⁸³

Hrab k also contacted other East European exiles. Alexinsky's mother had invited Hrab k and Kr l to dinner upon their arrival to meet Romanian, Hungarian and Serbian emigr s. On April 13, 1948, Hrab k met with Jonescu, the nephew of the Romanian politician Ion Br tianu (1864-1927). In his diary Hrab k notes that "Jonescu belongs to an older, more experienced and skeptical  migr  generation. He does not believe that the French will help us." Younger members of the Croatian Peasant Party shared this pessimism. Hrab k also visited the more idealistic Roko Mi eti , a close collaborator of Ma ek (1928-1964), the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party. Practical information came from a Mr. Lazarevsky, the editor of a Russian newspaper, who had been living in France for twenty-three years. He gave Hrab k precise and useful information on publishing newspapers in France.⁸⁴

At the same time, Hrab k and later the Republican Party, began working with the International Peasant Union (IPU), which had been formed in July 1947 to succeed the pre-World War II Agrarian Bureau and the Green International. The original organizations had been founded in 1922 by Anton n  vehla (1873-1933), Wincenty Witos (1874-1945) and Alexander Stamboliiski (1879-1923), representing the Czechoslovak, Polish and Bulgarian agrarian parties, respectively. The IPU assembled the representatives of the exiled agrarian parties of Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech lands, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Serbia and Slovakia. In its first *Bulletin* published in 1950, the IPU declared that "we, the representatives of the political organizations of the peasants of Eastern Europe, declare our intention and determination to join together to combat communism, as well as dictatorial regimes in general."⁸⁵ "Presently, the principal objective of the peasant movements," the IPU's Program stated, "is to re-establish the independence of the nations of central and Eastern Europe."⁸⁶

Initially, Hrab k was not particularly impressed with the IPU. In April 1948, he noted in his diary: "...I became convinced that up to now the headquarters are merely symbolic. From time to time, a speech is made. From Washington, we hear the names of Ma ek and Nagy...The headquarters do not work systematically or in an organized manner."⁸⁷

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ "Zp va o  innosti prozatimn  delegace Republik nsk  strany."

⁸⁴ "Jak jsme  ili—1948,"MHFA.

⁸⁵ "Notre T che," *Union Internationale Paysanne Bulletin*, 1, (1950): 1, 3.

⁸⁶ Ibid, 30.

⁸⁷ Hrab k memoir, MHFA.

Nevertheless, the IPU, which had a branch in Paris and its headquarters in Washington, did prove useful to the Party. The Republican Party enjoyed cordial relations with the other member parties in the IPU. At the Party's inaugurating congress, Professors Stanisław Kot (1885-1975) and Roko Mišetič of the Polish and Croatian Agrarian parties, respectively, spoke glowingly of their parties' cooperation with the Republicans in the pre-World War II era.⁸⁸ The Representatives of the Romanian, Serbian and Polish agrarian parties addressed at the meeting the commemoration of the one year anniversary of the re-inauguration of the Party.⁸⁹ The Agrarians had warm relations with the Polish Peasant Party. The friendship between the two parties dated back to the 1930s when the Polish agrarian leader Witos spent his exile in Czechoslovakia as a guest of the Republican Party and the International Agrarian Bureau.⁹⁰ From 1948 to 1951, the Polish Agrarians routinely invited the Republicans to their meetings and also manifestations in Paris and Tours and Lille.⁹¹ These public appearances enhanced the Party's visibility and legitimacy as a political actor.

Membership in the IPU had several other advantages for the Republican Party. Dr. Josef Černý was named one of the vice-presidents of the IPU and as such had another platform for his Party and its mission of liberating Czechoslovakia. There were also practical benefits. Over the years, the IPU employed three Agrarians, Bohuslav Soumar, Bohumil Jílek and Martin Hrabík. Soumar served as the editor of the IPU's journal, *Bulletin* and Hrabík was Republican Party's delegate to the IPU while he lived in Paris. The IPU also provided some office space and recommendations to French and American bureaucracy for needed visas and other official documents.⁹²

The Republicans found in the Slovak Democrat Party an ally in their search for a place in exile organization seeking to liberate Czechoslovakia. The Slovak Party's chairman, Josef Lettrich, acknowledges the lacuna that the Republicans' absence created in the immediate post-World War II period. He writes: "I have to confess that in political activities for the past three years I have felt strongly the gap that resulted from the absence of the equalizing force that the Republican Party had been in the past...."⁹³ In a letter signed by Fedor Hodža, Josef Lettrich, Jan Ambruš and which also states that it also encompasses the views of Michael

⁸⁸ "Ztěsňopisných poznámek Přemka Kociana ze sjezdu," MHFA.

⁸⁹ "Záznam o vspomínkovém večeru Republikánské strany zemědělského a maloroľníckého ľidu vden prvého vyročí slavného sjezdu svatováclavského v Paříži." MHFA.

⁹⁰ Wincenty Witos, *Moje Wspomnienia* (My Recollections) Vol.3, Paris: Institut Literacki, 1964, 407-484.

⁹¹ Photographs of Czech Agrarians attending conferences and manifestations in Lille and Tours. MHFA.

⁹² Tsenko Barev to L'Ambassade des Etats-Unis, Section Visa, April 27, 1951, to Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Commission pour les Affaires autrichiennes et allemandes, April 27, 1951, Certificat d'Emploi Jan. 31st, 1951. ACASA, #760. Barev was the chief of the IPU office in Paris.

⁹³ Josef Lettrich to Hrabík, June 16, 1948, MHFA. Fedor Hodža, Josef Lettrich and Jan Ambruš to Dr. Samuel Belluš and others. June 16, 1948. MHFA.

Múdry-Šebík and L'udevit Ruhmann, the leaders of the Slovak Democrats argued that the very concept of democracy rules out:

...the *a priori* ban of any political party through which voters may wish to express to express their view. The former Republican Party now has a number of adherents and leaders abroad, who are entitled to speak on its behalf; therefore it should participate in public life and be fully represented in all exile political organs. Of course, for political and moral reason, the Slovak Democrat leaders rule out any co-operation with Nazi parties such as the Hlinka's party; however, the Republican Party is not a party of this ilk. Nor can it be considered a compromised party. Although the Republican Party, like all other Czech parties, was dissolved at the eve of World War II, its representatives as much as anyone else participated in both the domestic and foreign resistance to the Nazis. Its sacrifices for the nation were proportionate to its political might....⁹⁴

The letter concludes: "...when the Republican Party formally begins its activities abroad, we will support it, work with it and seek along with it to find ways to the closest of co-operation, even co-ordination."⁹⁵

However, an important caveat was added: "While the Slovak Democrat Party in ideals and policies is closer to the Republican Party than to any other Czech party, the Slovak Democrat Party declares most emphatically its intention to retain its political independence."⁹⁶ In August 1948, Fedor Hodža met several times with Agrarian Party leaders (Josef Černý, Josef Šámal, Martin Hrabík and Robert Bohuslav Soumar [1910-1972]) in Paris. The participants discussed co-operation; nevertheless, Hodža and the Czechs put each other on notice about their priorities. The Slovaks intended to keep their Party's independence, and the Czechs wanted the renunciation of the Košice Program, which the Slovak Democrat Party was not ready to do.⁹⁷ The Democrat Party also asked the Agrarians to come out more strongly against Slovak separatists. Furthermore, the Democrat Party did not fully support the Republicans' hard line position on its and the other two banned parties' representation in the councils that sought to unite all exiles working for the liberation of Czechoslovakia.⁹⁸

The Smalltraders and the National Democrat Parties, the other two parties banned by the Košice Program were natural strategic allies for the Republicans. When their share of the vote was added to that of the Republicans', the three parties had received the support of one third the electorate in the 1935. Agrarians considered that election the last free one in Czechoslovakia. As a matter of fairness as well as a means of strengthening their own position, the Agrarians pushed for two banned parties' representation in the organization of the exiles.

⁹⁴ Fedor Hodža, Josef Lettrich and Jan Ambruš to Dr. Samuel Belluš and others. June 16, 1948, MHFA.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ "Jednání s Dr. Fedorem Hodžou," August 23, 1948, MHFA.

⁹⁸ Lettrich to Dr. Samuel Belluš, December 18, 1948, ACASA, # 760.

The presence of the three banned parties made finding common ground with the National Front parties more difficult. They were a constant reminder to the National Front parties that had given in to Soviet demands, and their acquiescence had made the Communist takeover possible, if not inevitable. For their part, the civic parties remembered, as Francis D. Raška aptly noted, that “despite their Democrat declarations, the politicians of the post-war National Front had not permitted the reestablishment of the pre-war civic parties in 1945 and had remained silent when the leaders of civic parties were persecuted in various ways.”⁹⁹ The civic parties’ feeling that they had been betrayed and unjustly treated, and the National Front parties’ lingering disdain and hostility toward them, injected a measure of bitterness and distrust into Czechoslovak exile politics.

With the support of their allies, the Republicans insisted that they had the right to be represented in any exile council that claimed to speak for the people at home. They rejected the idea that representation in these councils should be based solely on the post-World War II election of 1946. This, of course, would give the Republicans no representation whatsoever since they were banned at that time. The Agrarians also were adamant that they and they alone had the right to designate their representatives to these councils. The National Front parties, especially National Socialists, tried to have named as Republican representatives those who had joined their parties’ ranks after 1945 and had held parliamentary seats in their name.

Already in April 1948, the first salvo in this battle was fired. Upon learning that a political committee representing all exiles was being organized in Great Britain,¹⁰⁰ Martin Hrabík wrote to Blažej Vilím (1909-1976), who had been the Secretary General of the Czechoslovak Social-Democrat Party, asking that the Agrarian Party be included.¹⁰¹ Vilím, with whom Hrabík was on very good personal terms,¹⁰² explained that the one organization that did exist was a committee to aid refugees. Presently, Vilím continued, Czechoslovak political leaders in London were discussing the creation of a political organization

⁹⁹ Francis D. Raška, “History of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia,” in *The Inauguration of Political Warfare: Cold War Organizations Sponsored by the National Committee for a Free Europe/ Free Europe Committee*. ed. Katalin Kádár Lynn (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2013), 114.

¹⁰⁰ For description of meeting see Francis D. Raška, “Formation of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia,” *Kosmas*, 29, (Fall 2006): 11-26.

¹⁰¹ Hrabík to Blažej Vilím, April 8, 1948. MHFA. Hrabík and Vilím were friends in spite of their political differences. They had met and were politically active in post-Munich Czechoslovakia and worked together in the anti-Nazi underground. Both were arrested and imprisoned. After the war, Vilím, the Secretary General of the Social Democrat Party, convinced his party to offer Hrabík a place on their parliamentary list, but he could not get them to accept Hrabík’s demand that he be allowed his own independent publication. See also Martin Hrabík. “Spravedlivý a dobrý člověk...” *Nový svět*, November 19, 1976.

¹⁰² Černý cautioned Hrabík: “Be cautious with Vilím; he might be your friend but the Party’s, he is not.” Černý to Hrabík, July 15, 1949, ACASA, #760.

representing the all the post-1948 exiles. It was to consist of the political parties and important personages. Vilím continues:

Since you mention that the spokesperson of the Republican Party abroad is to be Dr. Josef Černý, I want to call your attention to the fact that all the politicians present here in London agree that his presence in this organization is not acceptable in view of the situation at home. I think that there would be no objection to you. I took this up in the last meeting.¹⁰³

Hrabík's reply summarizes the Party's case for inclusion in all exile councils. "Above all, I welcome every initiative to unite our resistance abroad," Hrabík begins, "especially since our position is more difficult than ever before." He argues:

The leaders of Finland, an even smaller state, and as unfortunately geographically located as we ours, were able to resist, but our leaders have disappointed us. Our struggle abroad cannot begin in the same place as did the downfall of our Republic. By this I mean the Košice Program and the monopoly it granted to certain political parties.

I truly am sorry that these tendencies are surfacing again. You write that the political core of our struggle should be those gentlemen elected to Parliament who are now abroad.¹⁰⁴

The mandate of these members of Parliament to speak on behalf of the nation is on shaky grounds, Hrabík contends. The 1946 elections to which they owed their positions violated the freedom of assembly that is intrinsic to democracy. Parties to whom previously one-third of the electorate had freely given their votes were not allowed to participate in these elections. With their own legitimacy so weak, the National Front parliamentarians cannot appropriate to themselves the right to speak for all Czechoslovaks at home, to decide what party and who from its ranks should take part in the exile political councils. "I see only one correct solution," he writes. "The struggle abroad, whatever shape it may take for the time being, has to be waged more politically, but by the representatives of all Democrat movements and tendencies that were present in the first Republic." The corollary to that principle is that each party has the right to select whom it wishes to send in its name. "It is the unalienable right of the Republican Party," Hrabík insists, "to choose its own representatives."¹⁰⁵

The international situation was becoming more and more favorable for their Czechoslovak exiles' effort to form a political organization. "As the United States ramped up its presence on the world stage and the Cold War became a reality," Katalin Kádár Lynne explains, "US foreign policy officials went into high gear to do everything and anything, publicly and covertly, to support the nation's policy of

¹⁰³ Vilím to Hrabík April 27, 1948, ACASA, #760.

¹⁰⁴ Hrabík to Vilím, April 30, 1948, MHFA.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid and Martin Hrabík Memoirs.

‘containment’ of the Soviet Union.”¹⁰⁶ Only an aggressive program that included psychological warfare, they believed, could halt the Communist movement. American officials began to take steps to create an organization tasked with pursuing this organized political warfare.¹⁰⁷

In this atmosphere, the exploratory talks for the creation of common Czechoslovak resistance organization began on July 17 and 18, 1948 in New York. The State Department and the British government were kept informed of these developments. This proposed organization could not be considered a government in exile while the Western powers maintained diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia; nevertheless, political circles in the West had shown interest in this idea.¹⁰⁸

On September 9, 1948 representatives of the Czech and Slovak parties met in Paris, and the National Socialist leader Hubert Ripka (1895-1958) announced that an organization would begin its existence on October 28. The announcement, however, was premature as conflicts arose, and further meetings ensued. Their only result was the creation of a preparatory committee, which Petr Zenkl (1884-1975), a National Socialist, chaired.¹⁰⁹

Černý, along with Zdeněk Rys and Josef Kučera, leaders of the National Democrat and Smalltraders Parties, respectively, and Bohdan Chudoba, a Populist at odds with his own party, submitted a memorandum to the American Embassy in which they protested the concept and the composition of the proposed organization. The State Department replied that the Czechoslovak exiles should settle this matter among themselves and not involve the United States in their dispute.¹¹⁰

Talks about the organization continued in both Paris and London. The most important meeting occurred in Paris on January 8, 1949, and it went well for the Republicans. They out-maneuvered the Feierabend group and were seated as the sole representatives of agrarian interests. On the issue of the representation of the Smalltraders and National Democrats, the Republicans were satisfied with the compromise that acknowledged the need for these parties’ cooperation. The Republicans, like the other participants, accepted in principle the formation of an organization to be called “Council of Free Czechoslovakia” or in Czech “Rada Svobodného Československa.” The parties at this conference were to send their delegates to Washington to draft a charter for the Rada.¹¹¹

This Republican victory did not settle the matter for long. Late in January 1949, in London, Feierabend visited Štefan Kočvara, Martin Kvetko and Pavel

¹⁰⁶ Katalin Kádár Lynn, “At War While at Peace: United States Cold War Policy and the National Committee for a Free Europe, Inc.,” in *The Inauguration of Organized Political Warfare*: 16.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 17-26.

¹⁰⁸ Raška, *Fighting Communism from Afar: The council of Free Czechoslovakia* (Boulder: East European Monograph, 2008), 12-13.

¹⁰⁹ Jirásek and Trapl, 47.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ Jirásek and Trapl, 48-49 and Hrabík to friends in the French zone, Feb. 13, 1949.

Viboch, leaders of the Slovak Democrats and informed them that he had formed an agrarian party. He asked the Slovak Democrats to support its delegates for positions in the Rada. The Slovaks, who knew the Republican Party and the relationship among its various factions all too well, visited the Republican local organization in Great Britain and asked that this information about Feierabend's activities be relayed to the Party's leadership in Paris. According to the London-based Republican activist, Jan Srp, who sent this information to Paris, the Slovak Democrats "are convinced that the two socialist parties are behind this." Dr. Feierabend repeated the same request to the Bohumír Bunža, a Populist Party leader.¹¹²

In Paris, Hubert Ripka, a foremost National Socialist, and Václav Majer, a Social Democrat, requested that Dr. Černý delegate Ladislav Feierabend and his supporter, Leopold Slíva, to the deliberations in Washington. Dr. Černý refused declaring that this demand was undue interference of other parties' into his party's internal affairs.¹¹³ On February 9, 1949, the preparatory committee for the Council of Free Czechoslovakia informed the Party's Executive Committee that the State Department had decided to award two visitor visas per party and that for the Republicans they had been given to Mořis Klimeš and Leopold Slíva¹¹⁴ (The former was Černý loyalist and the latter Feierabend adherent). When discussing this with the Republicans in Paris, Ripka insisted that the Americans had made the selection. Černý replied: "The Americans certainly have other worries. You did this!"¹¹⁵

At the deliberations establishing the Rada, the Agrarians had three representatives: Černý, Slíva and Klimeš. State Department had granted Černý a visa to participate in the meetings of the International Peasant Union. One of the most contentious issues for the newly formed Rada was the seating of the rival agrarian delegations. Finally, only Černý's wing was admitted. It received the support of the Slovak Democrats, most of the Populists and even some Social Democrats. Černý, however, was unable to gain membership in the executive committee for his allies, the Smalltraders and National Democrat parties, but they were to be represented in the plenum of the Rada.¹¹⁶

In the meanwhile in the United States, the National Committee for a Free Europe (NCFE) was formally established as a response to the challenge that the Communist movement posed to the survival of democracies. It was incorporated on May 11, 1949.¹¹⁷ Officially the Committee was a private organization. Its leadership was drawn from the top echelon of the worlds of diplomacy, military,

¹¹² Jan Srp to Republican Party Executive Committee, Jan.17, 1949, acasa, #760.

¹¹³ Hrabík to friends in the French zone in Germany, Feb.13, 1949, MHFA.

¹¹⁴ "Přípravný výbor Rady svobodného Československa výkonnému výboru Republikánské strany zemědělského a malorolnického lidu," MHFA.

¹¹⁵ Hrabík to Friends in the French zone, Feb. 13, 1949.

¹¹⁶ Jirásek and Trapl, 50.

¹¹⁷ Originally the organization was incorporated as Committee for Free Europe Inc. Shortly afterwards its name was changed to "National Committee for Free Europe, Inc.," Lynn, 23.

commerce, mass media and entertainment; however, the CIA covertly funded it and the Department of Defense and the National Security Council supported it.¹¹⁸

The creation of the NCFE was a boom to all the East European exiles, especially to their intellectual and political organizations. It provided the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, as well as all the other nationality councils, with funding, office space, salaries and a support system for their activities. Its establishment and continuing financing of Radio Free Europe employed refugee intellectuals and journalists. National Committee funds were used to finance the resettlement of refugees, employ scholars and educate those of university age. Furthermore, the NCFE also granted stipends to a few deserving prominent exiles from the region.¹¹⁹

The formal creation of an American-based National Committee for a Free Europe did not end the struggle for the control of the Rada. In the spring of 1950, a coalition of conservative parties in Paris, known as the Civic Bloc, removed the National Socialist Dr. Hubert Ripka from the chairmanship of the Paris regional Rada organization. Agrarians were very active in the Civic Bloc, which also included Populists, National Democrats, Smalltraders and even some Social Democrats. The Paris Civic Bloc did not have long to enjoy its victory, for the Rada in Washington reinstated Ripka.¹²⁰

The disagreements in Paris percolated into the leadership of the Rada in Washington. The conservatives clashed with the liberals. A dispute also arose over the Slovaks' new concept of Czech-Slovak relations. A lack of confidence in Dr. Zenkl's leadership also surfaced. On January 25, 1951, the conservatives, the so-called seventeen, won and elected Dr. Černý to lead the Rada. Agrarians, most of the Social Democrats, Slovak Democrats and Populists comprised this "seventeen" group. Their opponents, the thirteen, all National Socialists or their allies, left the Rada. They briefly formed a rival organization, Národní výbor svobodného Československa (National Committee of Free Czechoslovakia).¹²¹ In 1952 at the behest of the Committee for a Free Europe, the sponsor of the Rada, the two exile organizations reunited, but their union remained uneasy.¹²²

The Rada went on for many years to many more leadership struggles, conflicts, crisis and personality clashes. The organization continued to issue proclamations on the Cold War issues of the day and events in the home country. It also dealt with questions of the Rada leadership, the basis for membership and representation in this body (on the basis of political party affiliation or important posts held in the home country), the relationship of the Czechs, Slovak and Ruthenes,¹²³ as well as issue of the Sudeten Germans. On this matter, Dr. Josef Černý, the chairman of the Party in exile, was the only Rada member who was not

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 26.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Jirásek and Trapl, 57.

¹²¹ Ibid, 50.

¹²² Raška, *Fighting Communism from Afar*, 51-62.

¹²³ Bořivoj Čelovský, *Politici bez moci: První léta exilové Rady svobodného Československa* (Šenov u Ostravy: Tilia, 2000), 74-171.

only against the manner in which the expulsion had been carried out, but also against the very expulsion itself.¹²⁴

For the Republicans, 1951 was a watershed year: the center of activities shifted from Paris to the New World. By then, the Party faithful understood that the international situation was not propitious for their return to Czechoslovakia in the near future. In the meantime, they and their families needed food and shelter. The West European countries, still suffering from the destruction of World War II, had offered asylum but not permanent residency and the right to seek employment. So circumstances dispersed the Republican activists and adherents to the four winds: the United States, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, Brazil, Ethiopia, French Indochina and Madagascar. They had achieved the goal they had set for themselves as they went into exile: they had re-inaugurated their Party and assured its place in the exile council seeking the liberation of Czechoslovakia. In their adopted countries, the Agrarians continued in their efforts to liberate their homeland from communism and to vindicate their Party. Within their means, they persisted in meeting and issuing publications. Many also became active in the Czechoslovak organizations of the countries to which they had emigrated.¹²⁵ For most of them, time was merciless: when Communism finally fell in Czechoslovakia, they had already gone to their eternal reward.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ Ibid., 103, ft.3.

¹²⁵ Mary Hrabík Samal, "Republikánská strana v exilu," in *K úloze a významu agrárního hnutí 187-194*.

¹²⁶ A version of this article was presented at the annual conference of the American Association for Slavic East European and Eurasian Studies held in New Orleans in November 15-18, 2007. I am indebted to Dr. Zdenka Brodská (University of Michigan) and Prof. Daniel E. Miller (University of West Florida) for comments on earlier drafts and to June Pachuta Farris of the University of the Chicago Library for assistance in locating sources.

At Home among Strangers: British-Born Wives in Czechoslovakia (1945-1960)

Kathleen Geaney

Introduction

In both the Czech and Slovak Republics and abroad, much has been written about the communist regime and the trials and tribulations that followed its seizure of power in Czechoslovakia in February 1948. Political persecution, in particular, is a popular motif in both academic and non-professional literature. However, what is often neglected is the fact that this singling out of particular individuals and groups had ramifications far beyond the immediate plight of the persons who were sent to prison or a labor camp, or who were dismissed from employment; indeed every specific case had profound implications for the wider family. Although scholars have paid attention to the Czechoslovak men who served in the British forces during the war, including their major contribution to the war effort both in the air and on the ground and their fate after 1948, their everyday life and experiences both during the war and after 1948 have been largely overlooked. Despite the fact that hundreds of these men married British (or Irish) women while serving with the British forces, virtually nothing has been written on this subject, and what little information does exist tends to be partial and fragmentary.¹ All too often the wife is mentioned in passing as a shadowy appendage, as it were, to the life of her husband.²

¹ “British-born wives” is probably the most accurate term to use even though it is not always precise. Czechoslovak soldiers and pilots with the British forces did not marry only British women. It should be borne in mind that many women from neutral Ireland left their homeland to find work in the neighboring island. In some cases, therefore, the man married an English-speaking woman of Irish origin. In addition, in terms of nationality, the situation is made even more complicated by the fact that some of the women in question considered themselves English or Scottish rather than British.

² Very little has been written about the everyday life of Czechoslovak soldiers and pilots who served in the British forces during the Second World War. One chapter on the subject can be found in: Ladislav Kudrna, *Když nelétali: Život našich letců v Polsku, Francii a Británii za 2. světové války* [When They Did Not Fly: The Life of Our Pilots in Poland, France and Great Britain during the Second World War] (Praha: Libri, 2003). When it comes to British-born wives (not exclusively those who married Czechoslovak soldiers and pilots in the British forces during the war), one could mention the following: Trudie Bryksová, *Naděje a beznaděje* [Hope and Despair] (Praha: Votobia, 2003), Rosemary Kavan, *Freedom at a Price: An Englishwoman's life in Czechoslovakia* (London: Thetford Press Ltd., 1985); Phyllis Myrtle Clarke Šisperová, *Not far from Wenceslas Square* (Sussex: The Book Guild Ltd., 1990); Marian Šlingová, *The Truth Will Prevail* (London: Merlin Press, 1968). Some of the Czechoslovak soldiers and pilots who married British women also wrote memoirs. The following, for instance, addresses the issue of a mixed Czechoslovak-British marriage: Karel Macháček, *Escape to England-Útěk do Anglie* (Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Ústav dějin Univerzity Karlovy—Archiv Univerzity Karlovy, 2003).

The main focus of this article is the British-born women who married Czechoslovak citizens during the Second World War and their ensuing life in Czechoslovakia. It is not meant to be a thorough analysis of the theme, but rather I try to tease out the human aspect of the story and let the various participants talk about their particular experiences while I examine the issues raised. Moreover, since this could be labeled a pioneer article on the topic, the main goal is to sketch the problems British-born wives had to face at different periods between 1945 and the late 1950s/1960s. The aim of the first part is to present the background of the tale, with the remainder devoted to the lives these women led in Czechoslovakia.

English-Speaking Wives of Czechoslovak Citizens and the Second World War (1939-1945)

It was during the Second World War that the majority of Czechoslovak-British marriages came into being. After the Munich Pact was signed in September 1938, and particularly after the German Führer Adolf Hitler occupied what remained of Czechoslovakia and created the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, many Czechoslovak men decided to escape from their homeland and take an active part in the fight against Nazi Germany for the liberation of their native land. Their complicated and sometimes quite dangerous journey often led them through Poland or Yugoslavia to the Near East, and, ultimately, in the majority of cases at this time, to France. However, according to some of the memoirs written by these men, they experienced an “unpleasant surprise” upon their arrival on French soil, especially once the German Reich attacked Poland on 1 September 1939. Karel Macháček, for instance, later a medical doctor with the British Army, described the French welcome as aloof: “They considered us an undesirable element because of whom the war started.”³ Nevertheless, already at this time, i.e. in the early stages of the war, Czechoslovak men dated local women and the first mixed marriages, Czechoslovak-French in this case, took place.⁴ However, the length of time Czechoslovak soldiers and pilots spent in France was rather short, and consequently, marriages of this kind did not develop in any great numbers.

After the fall of France in May 1940, Czechoslovak soldiers and pilots were among those who were evacuated to Great Britain. Others made their own way across the Channel. Macháček, to refer to his account again, mentions that the reception accorded the Czechoslovaks on their arrival in Britain was in marked contrast to their French experience: “[W]hen we marched through the city, they [the British] gathered, waved to us, cheered and clapped their hands as if we were some kind of heroes.”⁵ Yet, even if such a welcome was general, and that is by no means certain, it did not signify that “it was roses, roses, all the way” as far as adjustment to their new life was concerned. From the very first moment they set

³ Macháček, *Útěk do Anglie*, p. 113.

⁴ Ladislav Kudrna, *Když nelétali: Život našich letců v Polsku, Francii a Británii za 2. světové války*, p. 167

⁵ Macháček, *Útěk do Anglie*, p. 119.

foot on British soil they were faced with a variety of problems and difficulties that were not confined to placement, accommodation, meals, uniforms, and the like. The main challenge they had to cope with was the language barrier, since English was not a language commonly taught in Czechoslovakia. In addition, even if they had learned the language in their homeland, they might well have experienced a shock similar to that which the Czech writer Karel Čapek had on visiting the British Isles in 1924: “When I reached the country and learnt with great surprise that I do not know and do not understand a single word in English...”⁶

Logically enough, part of the training of the Czechoslovak men serving with the British forces during the war was English-language learning. The expertise of some renowned English-language teachers was enlisted to help not only the Czechoslovaks, of course, but all those of foreign origin who had joined the armed forces.⁷ Naturally, there were many women among the teachers. It is also unsurprising that, when the men sought to practice their fledgling language skills by engaging people from the neighborhood in conversation, their efforts often led to local girls being invited out on a date. As a result, the first Czechoslovak-British relationships came into being. Even though the following lines are highly subjective, they illustrate the human aspect of the matter. General Antonín Sedláček, in an article for the Czech daily *Lidové noviny*, stated that Czechoslovak men were very popular among British women: “There was a kind of a hierarchy of allied armies' popularity [among the local women]. As far as I know, the Norwegians were ranked the highest, we were right behind them, and somewhere on the bottom were Poles.”⁸

Contacts between Czechoslovak men and British women were not, of course, connected only to English-language learning or meeting and socializing with the population in the immediate environs of where the men were stationed. Another tried and trusty way to form a relationship was to invite out a member of the Women's Auxiliary Air Force (WAAF). One might mention in passing that seeing a woman in army uniform came as something of a shock to the Czechoslovaks who had no such experience at home. One of these WAAF-women, for example, was Trudie Rose Deller, the future wife of Josef Bryks, the famous Czechoslovak soldier and pilot who attempted to escape from Nazi POW camps several times.⁹ Additionally, Czechoslovak soldiers and pilots came into contact with English-speaking women on various social occasions, such as hospital visits, when people would come to pay their respects to the wounded “heroes,” or while the men were

⁶ Karel Čapek, *Anglické listy* (Praha: Československý spisovatel 1958), p. 60.

⁷ Kudrna, *Když nelétali*, pp. 79-80.

⁸ *Lidové noviny*, Jan Čáp, “Útrapy válečných nevěst: Příběhy Angličanek, které se provdaly za československé vojáky, zůstávají zatím ve stínu osudů jejich manželů,” [The Suffering Of War Brides: The Stories Of English Women Who Married Czechoslovak Soldiers And Remain In The Shadow Of Their Husbands], August 30, 2008.

⁹ Trudie Bryksová died on 28 April 2011 in the US. Her husband, Brigadier General in memoriam Josef Bryks, needs no further introduction. His story was turned into the film “The Captive Heart,” starring Michael Redgrave, in 1946. Trudie Bryksová, *Naděje a beznaděje*, p. 11.

on vacation in the English countryside. This was where Karel Macháček found his future wife, Betty Mond.¹⁰ On the other hand, Jiří Litner, a Czechoslovak doctor with the British Royal Army Medical Corps (RAMC) met his wife, a nurse, while they were both serving in the Middle East.¹¹ One could likewise mention the case of Yvonne Šebestáková who had her first encounter with her future husband Karel while waiting at a train station in London. In an interview, she said that a stranger simply approached her and said: “Your name and address, please.”¹²

Many of these Czechoslovak-British relationships resulted in marriage: some lasted the lifespan of the couple, others terminated shortly after the wedding. Sometimes one of the spouses, in the vast majority of cases the husband, died. Such was the case of May Janeba, née Maylor, the wife of Josef Janeba, a pilot with the 312th Fighter Squadron. The two married on April 4, 1942 and not even a month had gone by when Josef died, his plane having collided with that of another pilot.¹³ May was already expecting a baby when the accident happened and their son was born posthumously on January 31, 1943. At least the widow's pension she got from the Czechoslovak authorities in London provided some form of relief, even if not very much.¹⁴ Other couples broke up on realizing that they were simply not compatible. There were also marriages that might have stood the test of time had the husband and wife not been separated by the communist authorities.

Marrying a British woman was by no means a straightforward matter. In the first instance, the Czechoslovak soldier or pilot needed the approval of his commanding officer. To obtain the necessary permit, the couple had to submit a long list of documents including a written confirmation of the man's military service, a medical certificate on his state of health, an affidavit about his family status, testimonials from two corps officers concerning the bride-to-be, written consent for the wedding signed by her parents, her birth certificate and a medical certificate, an affidavit about her family status and, in the event that the prospective bride was a divorcée, the court decision pertaining to the divorce.¹⁵ An examination of the documents in the Central Military Archive in Prague dealing with such matters, clearly shows that obtaining the requisite marriage authorization sometimes took quite a long time. As a result, it happened on many occasions that the bride was heavily pregnant when the wedding ceremony

¹⁰ Macháček, *Útěk do Anglie*, p. 152.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

¹² Interview with Yvonne Šebestáková conducted by the author, May 2010.

¹³ Vojenský ústřední archiv [The Central Military Archive, hereafter VÚA], f. Náhradní těleso-Velká Británie [Replacement-Great Britain, hereafter NT-VB], Kmenové rozkazy [Orders] 1942, Kmenový rozkaz [Order, hereafter KR] No. 7, 1 May 1942. Josef Ptáček and Jan Rail, *Letci Královéhradecka v druhém čs. zahraničním odboji (1939-1945)* [Pilots of the Hradec Králové Region in the Second Czechoslovak Exile Resistance (1939-1945)]. (Hradec Králové, Muzeum východních Čech v Hradci Králové, 2000), p. 79.

¹⁴ VÚA, NT-VB, Kmenové rozkazy 1943, KR č. 6, 1. 5. 1943. More information can be found in the British Archives [hereafter TNA], f. FO 371/71274.

¹⁵ Kudrna, *Když nelétali*, p. 168.

actually took place, or indeed had already given birth to a child.¹⁶ It might be pointed out that the women in such circumstances had the right to an allowance for the birth and maintenance of the child. As the war neared an end, however, more and more cases of marriages without the necessary approval of the Czechoslovak soldier's or pilot's superiors took place. For this, the man faced disciplinary charges; but, according to the law, the marriage was valid.¹⁷ Findings from the Central Military Archive in Prague show that men stationed in Britain before 1940 were the most likely to marry girls from the host country and that the greatest number of marriages took place in 1943.

Marrying a Czechoslovak citizen had one particularly serious consequence for a British woman—she automatically lost her British citizenship and became a citizen of a state which at this particular time no longer existed, and which she had never actually visited.¹⁸ A corollary of this was that the women became foreigners in their own country and this meant, among other things, that they had to register with the British police and call upon them regularly. Kathleen Jandlová and Beryl Tuhančíková, for example, complained: “They treated us as foreigners in our own country; we were under omnipresent police control which was indeed very unpleasant.”¹⁹ On top of that, these British-born wives were to remain Czechoslovak citizens even in the event of their husband's death or on divorce. Another complication arose in the case of offspring. Under British law, the children had a right to dual citizenship, both British and Czechoslovak. The Czechoslovak authorities, on the other hand, acknowledged only the citizenship of their own state, even if the child had been born in Britain.

Many famous Czechoslovak servicemen married English-speaking women while on duty with the British Army, Navy, or Air Force. Worthy of specific mention are Robert Matula, a parachutist of the so-called WOLFRAM group, Karel Kuttelwascher, one of the greatest Czechoslovak pilots of all time, and Rudolf Drbohlav, the secret agent who would later achieve fame for his exploits in carrying information in and out of Czechoslovakia in the late 1940s.²⁰

The Lives of British-Born Wives in Czechoslovakia, 1945-1948

After the Second World War had ended, the men, quite naturally, wanted to return home to Czechoslovakia and take their families with them. The women,

¹⁶ VÚA, NT-VB, Kmenové rozkazy 1940-1945.

¹⁷ TNA, f. FO 371/42310, Questionnaire for the Undersecretary of State of the Air Ministry, 26 September 1944.

¹⁸ TNA, FO 371/42310, Questionnaire for the Undersecretary of State of the Air Ministry, 26 September 1944

¹⁹ TNA, FO 372/4688, Letter to the British Ambassador in Prague signed by Kathleen J. Jandlová and Beryl Tunhačíková, 22 March 1946.

²⁰ See, for example Jan Břečka and Václav Kolesa, *Robert Matula: Parašutista skupiny Wolfram* [Robert Matula: Parachutist of the WOLFRAM Group], (Zlín: Václav Kolesa, 2007), and Ivo Pejčoch and Prokop Tomek, *Agenti chodci na popravěšti* [Agents-Walkers on the Scaffold], (Cheb: Svět křídlel, 2010).

however, were not always so enthusiastic about the move and in some cases tried to postpone relocation to the country in the heart of Europe for as long as possible. Some of the wives did eventually take the step, but after a short sojourn in Czechoslovakia decided to go back to Great Britain, sometimes with their husbands, sometimes without. For example, as early as the autumn months of 1945, Jan Svoboda and his wife Ellen, a former WAAF driver with the 310th Fighting Squadron, returned to Britain, because she could not stand the new environment and being so far away from her relatives and friends.²¹ Colonel Jaroslav Liška, a radio operator with the 311th Bomber Squadron, and his wife Rosemary faced a similar situation and left Czechoslovakia only a year after their arrival.

On the other hand, these negative responses were by no means universal. In at least one instance, a British-born woman decided to move to Czechoslovakia even though her husband had died in the war. This was his wish and she wanted to fulfill it. The woman in question was Joy Kadečková who lived in her adopted country until her death in 2006. “I decided to move here [to Czechoslovakia] and I do not regret it at all,” she said.²² According to Karel Macháček, his wife Betty was likewise looking forward to her new life in Czechoslovakia “even though it would be difficult for her to penetrate the nation’s mentality to such an extent that she would feel part of it.”²³ However, distressing situations existed as well. A few of the women met with an unpleasant surprise when they reached Czechoslovak soil and discovered that their husbands were already married and had children—that they were bigamists.²⁴

The story of Jean Šimková, née Foster, is another case worthy of note. She married Alois Šimek and a year later gave birth to a baby boy. Two years after the wedding her husband died in an air raid. Jean had promised that if something were to happen to him, she would visit his family in South Bohemia to let them know how much he cherished them. Jean travelled to her husband’s homeland in 1945 with the intention of staying for two months. However, her in-law family treated her and her child so nicely that she decided to stay longer. In fact, her trip to Czechoslovakia ended with another wedding—she married her deceased husband’s younger brother, Ivo.²⁵

All of the English-speaking women who journeyed to Czechoslovakia after the end of the war faced a difficult situation from the very moment of their arrival. Similar to their husbands, who had reached Britain with little or no knowledge of English, they arrived in Czechoslovakia with practically no, or at best a very limited, acquaintance with Czech or Slovak. As a consequence, they had problems communicating with their family-in-law and their husbands’ other relatives and

²¹ Interviews conducted with contemporary witnesses and independent non-academic researchers (Zuzana Pivcová, Marie Klůzová, Jan Votava) between 2010 and 2012.

²² *The Guardian*, Kate Connolly, “Secret Army,” June 6, 2010.

²³ Macháček, *Útěk do Anglie*, p. 180.

²⁴ Bryksová, *Naděje a beznaděje*, p. 56.

²⁵ TNA, FO 369/5147, Press extract, *Daily Mail*, June 22, 1955. TNA, FO 369/5148, Brief of a conversation with the Czechoslovak Ambassador, July 7, 1955.

friends. They also found the customary duties expected of a wife at the time, such as shopping and cooking, very onerous. For instance, Rosemary Kavan, the wife of a communist functionary, remembers how the realization that she was pregnant was very difficult for her when she had only been a short time in Czechoslovakia. "Giving birth to a child in broken Czech scared me," she says. "I would have rather waited a bit [before getting pregnant]. Life is already so difficult here. I cannot imagine that on top of everything I have to take care of a baby."²⁶

In addition, the rationing system in Czechoslovakia was much stricter than that operating in Britain, even during the war. To make matters worse, many of the basic foodstuffs they were used to preparing and eating back home were simply not available in Czechoslovakia—such as ocean fish. Czechoslovak tea and cocoa were likewise not highly valued and the women would ask their relatives in Britain to send them such commodities with their letters and parcels.²⁷ Furthermore, according to some of the letters or memoirs later written by the British-born wives, they also found some Czech customs somewhat bizarre. "I shall never forget ... seeing people after they entered the [railway] carriage settle down, take from their bags thick bread sandwiches and jam-filled yeast buns to relish on their way.... This was the custom wherever and whenever the train picked up passengers, no matter what time of day."²⁸

A number of the women also recall that they had not always received a warm welcome in their new homeland. For one reason or another, some Czechoslovak citizens thought that the newcomers were German, not British. Yvonne Šebestáková and Ivy Kovanda, for example, both agreed that one of the first sentences they had to learn in Czech was "Já nejsem Německa [I am not German]."²⁹ Similarly, Trudie Bryksová, who lived with her husband and daughter in Olomouc, described how one day two Soviet soldiers rang the bell of their apartment demanding something from her in Russian, which she did not understand. She tried to explain to them that she was not German but English, but their response seemed to be: "No! No! You are not an English woman, you are a German. And you will come with us!"³⁰ Likewise, Iris Urwin Lewitová, later a brilliant translator of Czech books into English, remembered how one of her English-speaking female friends got slapped in the face when she was speaking English in a tram.³¹

It was only natural that the British-born war brides who moved to Czechoslovakia tried to stay in contact with one another. Some were already acquainted from their life in Britain or from serving with the British forces, while others met for the first time after their arrival in their adopted country. One might mention, too, the rather exceptional case of three sisters marrying men of

²⁶ Kavan, *Love and Freedom*, p. 36.

²⁷ Ibid. See also Ivy Norman-Kovanda, *Tapestry: From Suffolk to Prague*, (Praha: Published at the expense of the family, 2007), pp. 129 and 137.

²⁸ Norman-Kovanda, *Tapestry*, p. 128.

²⁹ Interviews with Yvonne Šebestáková and Ivy Kovanda conducted by the author in 2010.

³⁰ Bryksová, *Naděje a beznaděje*, pp. 77-78.

³¹ Unpublished memoirs of Iris Urwin Lewitová in the possession of the author, p. 38.

Czechoslovak origin and moving to their new homeland together.³² Keeping in touch and meeting regularly was of course easier for those who lived in the larger Czechoslovak cities, particularly Prague, but also Brno, Olomouc or Bratislava. Prague was especially attractive in this regard as it offered a lot of social events which other English-speaking foreigners resident in the country, whether embassy employees, staff from the British Council and other such institutions, foreign journalists, or simply tourists, would attend.³³

Some of the more outgoing women voluntarily offered their services to British cultural and other institutions such as the British Council in Prague after 1945.³⁴ Others looked for ways to help one another adjust to the new life. One such person was Edith Popperová, who founded a special organization for the English-speaking war brides in 1946. The “Společný výbor pro péči o britské ženy československých občanů” [Committee to Help British Women of Czechoslovak Citizens], had as its main aim to help British wives of Czechoslovak citizens to overcome the initial problems that appeared after their arrival in Czechoslovakia, and to help them become accustomed to the Czech and Slovak environment so that they could fully participate in life in their new homeland.³⁵ Still others took up English language teaching positions, such as Trudie Bryksová at the University of Olomouc. Together with her husband Josef, she was likewise active within the “English Club” founded in Olomouc, whose members invited interesting personages from Great Britain to give lectures in Czechoslovakia.³⁶ Similar clubs existed throughout the country.

Some of the British war brides who had married Czechoslovak citizens during or shortly after the war, and had thereby automatically taken on Czechoslovak nationality, never reconciled themselves to losing their British citizenship. A number of them were quite vociferous in their complaints to the British authorities on the issue. They included Kathleen Jandlová, mentioned earlier, and Beryl Tuhančíková, who argued in 1946 that whereas British wives of nationals of former enemy states (Germany, Austria and Italy) had the right to have their British citizenship restored, those whose spouses came from states that had been occupied by the Axis powers, in particular Czechoslovakia and Poland, were denied this right. Moreover, they expressed the fear that if they decided to return to Great Britain, their husbands might not be allowed entry—even on a short-term visit. They continued, “The conditions in this country [Czechoslovakia] are quite primitive, which makes the life unbearable for British girls used to comfort and

³² TNA, FO 369/5279, List of British-Born Wives Known to Live in Czechoslovakia, the British Embassy in Prague, 1956.

³³ Yvonne Šebestáková, Trudie Bryksová, Iris Urwin Lewitová, Ivy Kovanda and Karel Macháček all confirm this statement.

³⁴ TNA, BW 27/17, Commentary on Czechoslovak Note of 12 May 1950, 25 May 1950.

³⁵ Archiv Hlavního města Prahy [Archive of the Capital City of Prague], f. Spolkový katastr [Association Register], XXII/3411, 1947-1950

³⁶ Bryksová, *Naděje a beznaděje*, pp. 66 and 84.

amenities of modern times.”³⁷ On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that not all of the women experienced a decline in living standards by moving to Czechoslovakia. For some, especially those from Scotland or Ireland, the new life actually represented an improvement in living conditions compared to what they had been used to in their home country.

To sum up this section, one can conclude that even though the personal situation of every single war bride was not easy in many respects, the overall political conditions in the country were tolerable between 1945 and 1948. Among other things, the war brides were able to be with their husbands and children, take care of the family, participate in various clubs and committees in their free time, write and receive letters to and from relatives and friends abroad, and invite their British family members over to Czechoslovakia to visit them. The situation would change, however, after the communist takeover in February 1948.

British-Born Wives and the Initial Phase of the Communist Regime in Czechoslovakia

Interestingly enough, a few of the British-born wives learned about the communist coup of February 25, 1948 while they were at a reception organized by the British Embassy in Prague—the last one that most of the English-speaking wives were not afraid to attend for a long time, as Ivy Kovanda would write later.³⁸ This does not mean, however, that some of the wives, at least in the beginning did not welcome the new state of affairs in the hope that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia would usher in a bright future. Trudie Bryksová, for example, noted in her memoirs her reaction to what she heard on the radio shortly after the communist takeover: “With horror I listened to one Scottish woman who, in English, praised the virtues of the new communist government and was dewy-eyed to draw a scenario of a bright future that awaited loyal workers in Czechoslovakia. After that, to my great surprise, she passed a special remark directed at the British wives of Czechoslovak citizens and urged them not to return to imperialist Britain. They were to stay in the country and support the progressive policy and the great prospects of communism.”³⁹ There was even a case where a British-born wife joined the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and sent complaints to the party authorities about her marriage, being very unhappy with her husband’s behavior.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, I would argue that only a very small number of the British-born wives in Czechoslovakia openly supported the Communist Party.

³⁷ TNA, f. FO 372/4688, Letter to the British Ambassador in Prague signed by Kathleen J. Jandlová, Beryl Tunhačíková, A. P. Procházková, 22 March 1946.

³⁸ Norman-Kovanda, *Tapestry*, p. 158.

³⁹ Bryksová, *Naděje a beznaděje*, p. 95

⁴⁰ For example Národní Archiv České Republiky [the National Archive of the Czech Republic, hereafter NA], f. ÚV KSČ [the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia], 100/3, sv. 204, ar. j. 715.

If an English-speaking war bride decided to depart from Czechoslovakia after the communist takeover, then the best chance of success was right after the coup, as things became more difficult in the weeks and months that followed. It was precisely at this moment that Trudie Bryksová and the then pregnant Betty Macháčková left the country.⁴¹ For the spouses of women like these to follow in their wake, however, was no easy matter, since they would have to cross the border illegally. Some managed to do so successfully; others failed in the attempt. Trudie Bryksová's husband, for example, was arrested on May 2, 1948 when preparing to leave Czechoslovakia to join his wife and daughter. One of Josef Bryks's fellow Nazi POW camp inmates, Otakar Černý, was detained on May 12, 1948. His wife Rhoda was still in the country and he believed that it would be best for her to leave as soon as possible. She did so just before Christmas 1948, but until then she had visited her imprisoned husband on every occasion possible.⁴² Miroslav Kafno was likewise taken into custody while trying to flee the country. Like many others he was sentenced to hard labor at the uranium mines despite his severe injury from the Second World War.⁴³ Rhoda Černý and her husband were re-united years later. Unfortunately, Trudie Bryksová never saw her husband Josef again. He died in a communist prison in 1957.

Once the wives reached Britain, many did their utmost to assist their husbands, some of whom had managed to cross the frontier illegally but were now stranded in refugee camps in West Germany and lacked the necessary papers to enter Britain. Betty Macháčková and Edith Lintnerová, for instance, contacted MPs for their former electoral districts pleading with them to intervene. Perhaps as a result of such intercession with the authorities of the Frankfurt Refugee Camp, Jiří Lintner managed to get to Great Britain sooner than Karel Macháček, who had crossed into West Germany earlier, but on whose behalf the local MP declined to become involved.⁴⁴ The British wives, both those still in Czechoslovakia and those who had returned to Britain, also tried to help their husbands by sending letters of complaint and pleas for clemency wherever possible, even to the Czechoslovak communist president, Klement Gottwald.⁴⁵ However, nothing much could be done for the men since they were Czechoslovak citizens within their own jurisdiction. Moreover, in the initial phase of the

⁴¹ Bryksová, *Naděje a beznaděje*, p. 124. Macháček, *Escape to England*, p. 211.

⁴² Ladislav Kudrna, "Útěkář" Otakar Černý, *plukovník letectva v záloze: Jeden český osud na pozadí dvou totalitních režimů* ["Fugitive" Otakar Černý, Reserve Air Force Colonel: One Fate against the Background of Two Totalitarian Regimes], (Praha, Naše vojsko 2008), pp. 207 and 219

⁴³ TNA, f. FO 369/5147, Letter from Mandie Kafno to E. Pitt, MP, June 1956.

⁴⁴ Macháček, *Escape to England*, p. 222.

⁴⁵ For example TNA, f. FO 371/77261, Letter from Rhoda Černý, 7 January 1949; TNA, f. FO 369/5147, Letter from Mandie Kafno to E. Pitt, MP, June 1956; and hundreds more. Kudrna, "Útěkář" Otakar Černý, p. 222.

Czechoslovak communist regime, it seems leading British authorities were afraid that their intervention might actually do more harm than good.⁴⁶

In at least one instance the British-born wife was arrested together with her Czech husband. Jaroslav and Phyllis Šispera were married in England in 1941 when Jaroslav served with the 311th Bomber Squadron as a radio operator. Three children were born before they moved to Czechoslovakia. In 1950, the Šisperas asked the Czechoslovak authorities for an exit permit. Their application was denied so they decided to leave Czechoslovakia illegally. They chose a spot near Břeclav. To their utter bewilderment and dismay, the guide who was supposed to help them cross the border turned out to be an agent-provocateur who led the family right into the hands of the Czechoslovak State Security. Jaroslav was sentenced to ten years in prison and his wife to eighteen months, although this was later reduced to ten months.⁴⁷ During the court hearing, neither the investigators, nor the judge or prosecutor, were interested in the fact that Šisperová spoke only broken Czech and did not understand what was being said. No interpreter was present. Procurator Barbaš is said to have commented: "It does not matter [that she does not understand], she will understand, she will comprehend."⁴⁸

Among the many unsuccessful attempts to leave the country, one other that stands out was that of Bořivoj and Charlotte Šmid in 1950, since in this case there was a reversal of the usual roles. The couple agreed to divorce so that Charlotte could apply for a British passport, to which she was now entitled because of the new British Nationality Act which went into effect in 1949. In the meantime, her husband crossed the border illegally. In fact, he was one of the crew members of Czechoslovak Airlines (ČSA) who hijacked a company plane in order to get to West Germany. After the event, the Czechoslovak State Security raided Charlotte's apartment and confiscated her British passport.⁴⁹ Thus, she was confined within Czechoslovakia while her husband was safely outside. Charlotte complained about the conditions she had to endure in the aftermath of his escape.

⁴⁶ For example TNA, f. FO 371/77261, Letter from the Foreign Office to Rhoda Černý, 21 January 1949.

⁴⁷ TNA, f. FO 369/5146, Correspondence between the British Embassy in Prague with the Foreign Office, 1 March 1955. More information can also be found in Archiv bezpečnostních složek [Archive of the Security Services, hereafter ABS], f. Materiály I. oddělení ABS-vyšetřovací spisy, V-2817 MV [Investigation Files, Ministry of Interior], kauza Gejza Holoda a spol.

⁴⁸ Quoted in Jiří Mikulka, "Akce „Letci“: Nezdařený pokus o odchod do exilu bývalých čs. příslušníků RAF Gejzy Holody, Vladimíra Nedělky, Karla Šedy, Karla Schoře a Jaroslava Šispery v prosinci 1950 [Campaign "Pilots": An Unsuccessful Attempt to Go into Exile by Former RAF Members Gejza Holoda, Vladimír Nedělka, Karel Šeda, Karel Schoř and Jaroslav Šispera]," *Sborník Archivu bezpečnostních složek Ministerstva vnitra* [Proceedings of the Archive of Security Services of the Ministry of Interior], No. 5/2007, pp. 117-136, here p. 131

⁴⁹ TNA, f. FO 369/4462, Correspondence between the Prague Embassy and the Northern Department of the Foreign Office, 27 June 1950.

Not surprisingly, she suffered malnutrition and developed migraines as a result of the ongoing psychological pressure.⁵⁰

Marriage to a British-born wife was also used as incriminating evidence in some political trials. As might be expected, the fact that a defendant had a British spouse was presented as an aggravating circumstance. Nor was this particular used only against former pilots and soldiers who had fought with the British forces during the war, but also, for example, against Otto Šling, one of the accused in the Slánský case. It is worth noting, too, that in the spuriously manufactured legal action against General Janoušek, all those indicted except Janoušek himself had British-born wives.⁵¹ Having an English-born wife was tantamount to unreliability and perhaps even spelled “danger” to the state from the machinations of “imperialist” Great Britain, the “lackey” of the United States. In this context, what members of the Military Advisory Committee wrote about the above-mentioned Otakar Černý is apt: “His wife is English, does not master Czech and never got used to the Czech nation. Anti-democratic thinking. He himself is unreliable and under the influence of his wife.”⁵²

British-Born Wives in Czechoslovakia in the 1950s: Some Remarks about Their Situation

For many of the English-speaking wives of Czechoslovak citizens, life was particularly difficult in the 1950s, although, as already pointed out, some among them had initially hoped or maybe even believed that communism would bring about a better and more just society. Many of the husbands lost their jobs—in the army, air force, civil air transport, and various state institutions or private companies. Several families found themselves in severe financial difficulties; some were forced to vacate their house/apartment and move to other parts of Czechoslovakia. Indeed living conditions were sometimes dreadful.⁵³ On the other hand, not all the families had such grim experiences, which makes it difficult to generalize. Nevertheless, the evidence supports the conclusion that the lives of British-born women in Czechoslovakia in the early years of the communist dictatorship were in most cases very difficult.

As was mentioned regarding Charlotte Šmíd, according to the new British Nationality Act, effective from January 1, 1949, people born on British territory were considered to be British citizens.⁵⁴ However, this did not mean the situation

⁵⁰ TNA, f. FO 369/4462, Correspondence between Waldron Smithers MP and William Strang, 6 June 1950.

⁵¹ For more information, see: Zdeněk Vališ, *Generál Karel Janoušek*, (Praha: V Ráji 1997).

⁵² Quoted in Kudrna, „Útěkář“ Otakar Černý, p. 199.

⁵³ Kavan, *Love and Freedom*, p. 21. Interview with Yvonne Šebestáková, May 2010.

⁵⁴ A detailed analysis of the consequences for the British-born wives in Czechoslovakia may be found in documentation dealing with Eleanor Kudibalová. Státní okresní archiv Chomutov se sídlem v Kadani [The State Regional Archive of Chomutov situated in Kadaň, f. ONV Chomutov, 193/116, Kudibalová Eleanor, Potvrzení od Britského velvyslanectví, Konsulární sekce, vystavené pro Eleanor Kudibalovou, která žádá o

of the women was eased dramatically; indeed, despite the passing of the act, its provisions would only help to improve the lot of the women a few years later, especially in the latter half of the 1950s and the 1960s. According to international law, Great Britain did not have the right to offer protection to people with dual citizenship if they were in the country of their second citizenship.⁵⁵ In addition, getting consent from the Czechoslovak communist authorities for release from Czechoslovak citizenship was no easy task, particularly in the initial phase of the communist dictatorship. The British Embassy in Prague tried to help the women in some ways, notably in the second half of the 1950s and in the 1960s. For example, if a British-born wife found herself in serious trouble financially, the Embassy gave her a small allowance. If the woman's family in Britain had not heard from her for a very long time and they contacted the British Foreign Office about the matter, sometimes employees of the British Embassy in Prague would go to the woman's address to find out what the problem was. In a few exceptional cases, the British Embassy in Prague undertook to deliver a letter that would not have cleared through Czechoslovak censorship.⁵⁶

Many of the British-born wives and their families, however, were afraid to go near the British Embassy in Prague in the early phases of the communist regime, let alone visit regularly or even register with them. For this reason, officials at the Embassy were unaware of some of the women present in the country. A document from 1956, for example, estimated that there were about 150 British-born wives in Czechoslovakia, but the number was, in fact, much higher. Yvonne Šebestáková had this to say about going to the British Embassy in communist times: "In the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, the [British] Embassy was not a place one would visit very often. Eyes were spying on you through a small window. [...] Your visit ended with being called to Bartolomějská [the State Security]."⁵⁷ It stands to reason, of course, that those who did call on the British Embassy in Prague, whether regularly or not, had a better chance of getting assistance.⁵⁸

In response to some of the pleas and requests the British-born wife made to the Embassy, however, nothing could be done. Occasionally, Embassy officials would be asked to use their influence so that the wives could see their husbands

propuštění z československého státního občanství [Confirmation from the British Embassy in Prague, the Consulate Division, for Eleanor Kudíbalová asking for release from Czechoslovak Citizenship], 15 August 1950

⁵⁵ TNA, f. FO 369/5148, Brief for conversation with the Czechoslovak Ambassador, 7 July 1955

⁵⁶ For example: TNA, f. FO 369/5148, Brief for conversation with the Czechoslovak Ambassador, 7 July 1955; TNA, f. FO 369/5146, Correspondence between the Prague Embassy and T. G. Ranken from the Consular Department in London, 30 March 1955; TNA, f. FO 371/77261, Correspondence between the Prague Embassy and the Foreign Office, 6 October 1949; TNA, f. FO 369/5146, Correspondence between the Prague Embassy and the Consular Department in London, 4 April 1955

⁵⁷ Sian MacLeod, Ambassador to the Czech Republic, Commentary Yvonne Šebestáková, 6 November 2009.

⁵⁸ TNA, f. FO 371/77261, Correspondence between the Prague Embassy and the Foreign Office, 6 October 1949

who had been imprisoned on political grounds more frequently or for longer than the normally-allotted few minutes. In some cases at least in the latter half of the 1950s the British Embassy made overtures to the authorities. One such intervention was for Jean Šimková and her husband Ivo, whose case was mentioned earlier. Ivo owned a small factory in České Budějovice and was sentenced for “espionage” and “sabotage” against the Czechoslovak state. In his case, the British diplomats contacted Czechoslovak representatives several times, but to no avail.⁵⁹

The women themselves were regularly spied on by State Security, their correspondence was read and many were subjected to all sorts of psychological pressure. On top of that, often they had no Czech friends to fall back on because people during the Stalinist period were generally afraid to have any dealings with foreigners. Some of the women felt quite desperate, as is shown for instance in the case of Emily Veselková, who was denied letters and parcels from her family in England. Her husband was in prison and she was in a very difficult financial situation with nobody, it seems, willing to employ her. She wrote the following lines to her relatives: “You have never replied to my letters, you are probably not interested in about how things are going or not going. [...] I am so lonely night after night and have nobody to talk to. If it was not for her [her adopted daughter Alice], I am sure I would not be here. [...] I just cannot go on.”⁶⁰ However, from the available archival documents it is clear that not only did the family care about her but that they were doing everything in their power to get news of their daughter.⁶¹

Both the British-born wives and their relatives back home tried to stay in touch and find some way of meeting. Until the 1960s it was virtually impossible for the women to obtain the necessary permission to visit their family in Britain. However, in the 1950s, some of the parents did manage to get to Czechoslovakia and see their daughters, even though this was by no means easy, since the Czechoslovak authorities were afraid of potential espionage.⁶² Among those who succeeded, the mother of Ailsa Domanová stands out. She had written thousands of letters to both the Czechoslovak and British authorities until she attained her goal and had the necessary approval to travel to Czechoslovakia and see her daughter.⁶³ Another method used by some parents to be allowed to enter Czechoslovakia was to apply for acceptance on one of the so-called Progressive

⁵⁹ More information about the case can be found in for example TNA, f. FO 371/116178.

⁶⁰ TNA, f. FO 369/5146, Letter written by Emily Veselková to her family in England, 8 March 1955

⁶¹ TNA, f. FO 369/5146, Documents concerning the case of Emily Veselková, 1955

⁶² TNA, f. FO 371/122199, Translation of a *Rudé právo* article concerning foreign espionage in connection with tourist traffic in 1956, Prague Embassy to the Northern Department of the Foreign Office, 9 October 1956.

⁶³ TNA, f. FO 369/5146, Correspondence between the Prague Embassy and R. Horáčková, a British-born wife from Brno, 22 March 1955.

Tours, organized for British Communists and fellow-travelers.⁶⁴ This is how Yvonne Šebestáková, for example, met her parents. At the same time, the British-born wives kept in contact and helped one another to bear the feelings of isolation and loneliness even though this became much more difficult after the communist takeover in 1948. There is even a case on record concerning one of the wives who took care of the children of her British friend while the latter was in a psychiatric hospital after suffering a total mental breakdown.⁶⁵

Conclusion

The topic of British-born wives in Czechoslovakia is still largely unexplored and it is therefore not possible to offer wide-ranging conclusions. Many difficulties awaited these women once they set foot in their new homeland. In the majority of cases, matters became much worse after the communist takeover. Those who remained in the country faced many additional challenges and their situation improved only in the 1960s.

Historiography dealing with life in communist Czechoslovakia focuses mainly on what is called macro-history. Indeed, a lot has been written on political developments, on the persecutions, and such topics as the country's economy, industrialization and collectivization. Yet, to fully understand what was taking place in Czechoslovakia and other countries of the Soviet Bloc in the initial stages of the communist dictatorship, it is likewise important to take the micro-historical perspective into consideration.

Looking at the previously neglected question of British-born wives of Czechoslovak citizens and their experiences in their adopted homeland shows that history is not just about politics, grand decisions, prominent men and, though to a lesser extent, women, but that it is, first and foremost, also about ordinary people. Of course, it is sometimes impossible to verify all of the stories on offer from the common man and woman but by a judicial sifting of the information in the light of one's own knowledge of the context in which the events were played out, and by comparing and contrasting the individual accounts themselves and the subsequent lives of the narrators, our understanding of the period can be deepened.

It is axiomatic that in times of political turmoil, survival often depends on not attracting attention, not sticking out. For those British-born wives who moved to Czechoslovakia with their Czech and Slovak husbands after the end of the Second World War, life was no doubt difficult, as indeed it was for their Czechoslovak counterparts, but at least the relatively free political atmosphere gave them space to focus on adjusting to marital life and very often, the responsibilities of raising a family in the new environment, on managing routine day-to-day needs in an unfamiliar language, and on learning to cope with the loneliness attendant on being far from family and friends.

⁶⁴ TNA, f. FO 369/5146, Extract from *The Statesman*, 5 March 1955. For more information about Progressive Tours, see: NA, f. ÚV KSČ, 100/3, sv. 204, ar. j. 715

⁶⁵ TNA, f. FO 369/5146, The case of Jean Buchlerová, 1955.

For most, this would change dramatically when the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia took over the reins of government in February 1948. Against the backdrop of their own insecurity and deteriorating East-West relations, the Party propagated a picture of the enemy lying in wait across the border and of a fifth column active inside the state itself. The concept of “them” and “us” was promoted and vigilance became a catch phrase. Czechoslovak men who had served with the British forces and their British-born wives were in full view, in easy reach, a tangible image of the enemy within.

But why were such people in particular singled out for persecution? Why they were not simply allowed to leave as many of them so earnestly wanted? Vindictiveness would certainly have played a role. Most of the couples had not nailed their colors to the mast and, like Jessie Kocmanová, for instance, thrown in their lot with the Communist Party. Her father, Tom Murray, had been Secretary of the Scottish-USSR Society, and she had married her husband Vincenc in 1941 while he was with the Air Force in Britain and travelled with him to Brno after the war, where she settled down to a distinguished academic career at Purkyně University. Suspicion, too, would have had a part. After all, the men were tainted, having served in the ranks of the current enemy and married enemy nationals, who, in their turn, once back in Britain could well paint a not-so-rosy picture of life in the “far away country,” the obverse indeed of what the Party themselves were doing; and of course on top of that there was the inherent Communist inability to accept divided loyalties.

With the easing of international tension that followed Stalin's death in 1953, the situation of the British-born wives improved. Despite the “Thaw,” however, insecurity and uncertainty remained, and, unlike other states within the Communist Bloc, there was little let-up in the harshness of the Czechoslovak regime. The year 1956 would mark another important watershed, although real advances would not be made until the 1960s. It is interesting to speculate on just how many of the British-born wives would have married their Czechoslovak husbands if they had had any inkling of what lay in store.

REFERENCE MATERIALS

Notable Czech-American Women in Arts and Letters

Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr.

This is a follow-up on my previous studies¹ dealing with the pioneer women of Czech extraction in the US history. This particular paper focuses on notable Czech-American women in arts and letters, including writers, visual artists, music performers, actresses, singers, sports figures and women in the media.

Although most professional fields were closed to women through much of the nineteenth century, the area of arts and letters was open to them. This was, in part, due to the fact that this area did not require formal attendance at schools. Before the colleges and universities opened their door to them, all women in this category were necessarily self-educated or taught at home or by private tutors. Professional journalists fall into a different category because they normally required schooling. Because of that, women did not enter this profession until after the 1920s. Sports competition, interestingly, was not open to women until after the Federal Title IX legislation was passed in 1972. This state of affairs applied to American women as a whole, including those of Bohemian or Czech ancestry.

A. Letters

For women in the western hemisphere, writing might be thought to be the oldest profession. Much before professions like law and medicine gradually opened to them, women found that they could support themselves through their writing. In fact, in the 1850s, reputed writers like Hawthorne and Melville complained that women writers were selling far better than they were.² And they had good reason to feel cheated! Even in those early days, one of the major bestsellers was *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, written by a woman—Harriet Beecher Stowe.³

Many of these women writers had no formal education. They often acquired their skills with the pen in their fathers' libraries. Popular fiction was their preferred genre and within it emerged what came to be seen as “domestic fiction” with the family and its fortunes being the heart of the story.

The earliest known woman writer of Bohemian ancestry was Susan Anne Livingston Ridley Sedgwick (1788-1867), a native of Stockbridge, Massachusetts. Sedgwick traced her descent to Frederick Philipse, an early settler who came to

¹ Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., “Czech (Bohemian) Women in US History: Independent Spirit and their Nonconforming Role,” *Kosmas* 15/1 (Fall 2011): 102-139.

² Harsh A. Desai, “America's Women Writers, Word By Word,” *News Blaze*, August 26, 2009; Elaine Showalter, *A Jury of Her Peers: American Women Writers from Anne Bradstreet to Annie Proulx*, (New York: Knopf, 2009).

³ First published in 1860, it went on to become the first international bestseller with more than 305,000 copies sold in the first year within the United States itself. It was translated into 18 languages.

New Amsterdam in the mid-seventeenth century. She was a nineteenth century American writer specializing in children's novels. After her father's death in 1813, she took over the management of a school for young ladies, which she conducted for fifty years. In 1832, she published *A New England Tale*. Its success led to a second venture, *Redwood* (1824) which attained even greater popularity. The followed a long series of tales, letters, and biographical sketches. *Hope Leslie* (1827), *Clarence* (1830) and *Linwoods* (1835) are considered her best. She also painted a watercolor-on-ivory portrait of an ex-slave who came to work for her family.⁴

Some thirty years later three women writers of Czech extraction, descended from Augustine Hefman, Frederick Philipse's contemporary, who immigrated to America from Bohemia in 1640, enjoyed active careers. These writers, the daughters of Rear Admiral Ralph Randolph Wormeley of the British Navy and Caroline (Preble) Wormeley, were Mary Elizabeth, Ariana Randolph and Katherine Prescott.

Mary Elizabeth Wormeley Latimer (1822-1904), was a writer and translator who lived in Boston and Newport. In 1852 she published her first book, a novel *Amabel*; her second, *Our Cousin Veronica* appeared in 1856. After getting married she suspended her writing career for some twenty years to take care of her family. She resumed her literary work in 1876, writing stories for various magazines. In addition she began writing histories of various countries which were widely popular, including *France in the Nineteenth Century* (1891), *The Making of Austria-Hungary and Germany* (1896). *Judea from Cyrus to Titus* (1899), and others. She also produced several translations, Ernest Renan's *History of the People of Israel*, Louis Ulbach's *The Steel Hammer*, George Sand's *Nanon*, J. C. L. de Sismondi's *The Italian Republics*, *The Love Letters of Victor Hugo* and others.⁵

Her sister, Ariana Randolph Wormeley Curtis (1833-1922), was the author of *The Spirit of Seventy-six, Or The Coming Woman*, a parlor play, which was quite popular in its day, and was performed throughout Europe. Amateur plays rarely reach the professional stage. *The Spirit of Seventy Six* was a notable exception. Its success as a parlor farce was outstanding and lasted more than three decades. In 1889, the published play had already reached its twenty-third edition. The author's intention was clearly anti-feminist and there is little sympathy for radical women's rights leaders. Mrs. Badger was, in fact, played by a male actor at Selwyne's Theatre to emphasize the grotesqueness of the character. *The Spirit of Seventy Six*,

⁴ Lucinda L. Damon-Bach and Victoria Clements, Eds., *Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives*, (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2003); Supplement to *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 9th ed. (New York-Philadelphia-London: J. M. Stoddart, 1889), IV, p. 463.

⁵ "Wormeley, Mary Elizabeth," in: *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, (New York: D. Appleton & Sons, 1889), VI, p. 615; *American Women Historians: 1702-1990s: a Biographical Dictionary*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), p. 142; "Noted Woman Writer Dead: Mrs. Mary E.W. Latimer, Authoress, Dies at Baltimore," *New York Times*, January 5, 1904.

together with two other plays, was published anonymously, although bibliographical sources usually list Ariana and her husband Daniel S. Curtis as joint authors of the collection. The earlier editions, however, credit Ariana with sole authorship of the title play, which is more likely. Together with her sisters, Ariana wrote the recollections of their father, Rear Admiral Ralph Randolph Wormeley, published in 1879.⁶

Her second sister, Katherine Prescott Wormeley (1830-1908), was a writer, translator and philanthropist. She served as a nurse with the Union Army during the American Civil War and was head nurse at the Army Hospital at Portsmouth Grove near Newport, Rhode Island. She also played a role in the creation of the United States Sanitary Commission, a government agency set up to coordinate the volunteer efforts of women who wanted to contribute to the war effort. She was one of the best known translators of her time, having translated from the French language many works by Honoré de Balzac, the *Narrative of Marie-Thérèse Charlotte de France*, the *Memoirs of Madame de Motteville on Anne of Austria*, as well as works by Alphonse Daudet and Alexandre Dumas, among others.⁷

Mary K. Buck (nee Marjánka Knížek) (1849-1901), was born in Bohemia and brought to America by her parents before the Civil War, when she was five years old. They first lived in New York City until 1861, when they removed to Traverse City, Michigan. Her father was the village's first boot and shoemaker. She attended college and became a school teacher. Early in life she developed a talent for composition, and she was especially creative. She became a contributor to several nationally-circulated magazines. She married Charles Buck, an entrepreneur and general store owner, member of the school board, and of the public works board. According to a critic, because of her daily duties, "she has not much time to woo the muses. Had she more leisure and less of the active life, the world would have known more of her. As it is, her literary work makes up in quality what it lacks in quantity. Her graceful verse is very often found among the fugitive poems that have been so often copied as to have lost name and identity and are bound up in many compilations of choice poetry." Originally she had written for *St. Nicholas* and other leading periodicals, but mainly for prominent newspapers, the *Congregationist*, *Advance*, *Inter-Ocean*, *Portland Transcript*, *Detroit Free Press* and *Good Housekeeping*. As a prose writer, she produced many bright short stories for leading periodicals. In 1891, she collaborated with M. E. C. Bates on a volume of northern Michigan stories, *Along Traverse Shores*. A collection of her poetry was published posthumously, by her husband, in 1902, under the title *Songs of the Northland*.⁸

⁶ Bettina Friedl, *On to Victory: Propaganda Plays of the Woman's Suffrage Movement*. (Northeastern, 1990), pp. 15-18.

⁷ "Wormeley, Katharine Prescott," in: *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*. (New York: James T. White, 1900), VIII, pp. 366-367; "Miss Katherine Prescott Wormeley, Obituary," *New York Times*, August 6, 1908.

⁸ *The Magazine of Poetry and Literary Review* 5 (1893), No. 1, p. 5; Thomas Capek, "A Forgotten Poetess," *Central European Observer*, April 17, 1936; Clarence A. Andrews, *Michigan in Literature*, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), p. 254; *A Woman*

Martha Wolfenstein (1869-1903), of Moravian ancestry, was an essayist, short story teller and publicist. She published widely in the secular literary press and also in the local Anglo-Jewish press and *Jewish Orphan Asylum Magazine*. Most of her short stories were based on her father's reminiscences from a small community in Moravia in the middle of the nineteenth century. Her *Idylls of the Gass* (1901) is a series of stories about the same character; *A Renegade and Other Tales* contains stories from the same locale.⁹

Josephine Weatherly (née Havernek) (1870-?), was born in Prague, and educated at Connersville Indiana High School, and the State Normal School, with special training in music and English. She was a grand chief of degree of honor of the State of Kansas for four years, president of Woman's Relief Corps of Emporia and grand junior of Pythian Sisters of Kansas. She favored women's suffrage and was local speaker in county affairs. She was the author of *Parliamentary Law; After Strange Gods*, and about sixty short stories published in current magazines and Sunday-school papers.¹⁰

Bertha M. Shambaugh (nee Horack) (1871-1953), was born in Cedar Rapids, Iowa of Czech parents, graduated from Iowa City High School in 1889, and attended the State University of Iowa from 1889-96. Bertha taught the natural sciences at Iowa City High School from 1892 to 1897, until her marriage to Benjamin Shambaugh. She was the author of *Amana: The Colony of True Inspiration*, and *Amana That Was and Amana That Is*, in 1908 and 1933 respectively, and *Amana in Transition*.¹¹

Clara Vostrovsky Winlow (1871-1971), was born of Czech parents in West Point, Nebraska. She was a psychologist and writer trained at Stanford and the University of California. Her articles about child psychology came to the attention of Boston Publishing firm which commissioned her to prepare a book about a Czech child for their series "Little Cousins." The resulting publication, *Barbara: Our Little Bohemian Cousin* (1911) was so successful that the publisher gave her a task to prepare comparable texts about other nationalities, i.e. *Our Little Bulgarian Cousin* (1913), *Our Little Serbian Cousin* (1913), *Our Little Carthaginian Cousin of Long Ago* (1915), *Our Little Cossack* (1916), *Our Little Roumanian Cousin* (1917), etc. She also wrote short stories and serials and

Of The Century: Fourteen Hundred-Seventy Biographical Sketches ..., Edited by Frances Elizabeth Willard, Mary Ashton Rice Livermore, (Buffalo, Chicago, and New York: Charles Wells Mouton, 1893), III, p. 134.

⁹ Ellen Handler Spitz, "Martha Wolfenstein: Toward the Severance of Memory from Hope." *Psychoanalytic Review*, 85 (1998): 105-115; Nellie Thompson, "American Women Psychoanalysts, 1911-1941," *Annual of Psychoanalysis*, 29 (2001): 161-177; Martha Wolfenstein. *Children's Humor: A Psychological Analysis*, (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1954); *Jewish Women in America. An historical encyclopedia*. Edited by Paula E. Hyman and Deborah Dash Moore, (New York and London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 1486-1487.

¹⁰ *Who's Who in America 1914-1915*, (New York: American Commonwealth Co., 1914), p. 861.

¹¹ *Who Was Who in America 1969-1973*, (Chicago: Marquis Who's Who, 1973), V.

articles pertaining to child study and magazine features and was active as a translator.¹²

Hortense Flexner (1885-1973) born in Louisville, Kentucky, was a writer, playwright and poet of Bohemian ancestry. She worked first as a reporter and then an editor of the women's section at the *Louisville Herald* from 1912 to 1919. While there, Hortense Flexner met and married cartoonist Wyncie King. Hortense Flexner worked as a writer for Curtis Publishing from 1923 to 1929, while she established herself as an active and published poet. She also taught courses in freshman English and contemporary verse at Bryn Mawr, and later, modern fiction and creative writing at Sarah Lawrence College. Her plays include *The Broken God* (1915) and *The New Queen* (1920). *The Wishing Window* (1942), about two French children at the time of the Nazi invasion of France during World War II, is but one of her several popular books for children. Her poetry collections include *Clouds and Cobblestones* (1920), *The Stubborn Root* (1930) and *North Window* (1943). Her poems were frequently published in *The New Yorker*. Some of her best poetry was gathered in 1963 in *Selected Poems* with a foreword by Laurie Lee. In 1971 the University of Louisville honored Hortense Flexner with an Honorary Doctor of Letters for her contributions to American poetry.¹³

Catherine Drinker Bowen (1897-1973) was born in Haverford, Pennsylvania of Moravian ancestry. She became one of the world's greatest biographers and authors. She was also an accomplished violinist, playing with string quartets in Philadelphia and New York, but it was as a writer that she gained her fame. Her first biography was *Beloved Friend: The Story of Tchaikovsky and Nadejda Von Meck*, followed by *Free Artist: The Story of Anton and Nicholas Rubenstein*. The discovery of some less than desirable characteristics in the private lives of various musicians caused her decision to write about "good" men. The following books were the result of this decision: *Yankee from Olympus: Justice Holmes and His Family* (1944); *John Adams and the American Revolutions* (1950); *The Lions and the Thorns: The Life and Times of Sir Edward Coke* (1957). She also wrote *Miracle at Philadelphia: The Story of the Constitutional Convention* (1966), and *Family Portrait*, a history of her own family in 1970. During her lifetime she was awarded numerous literary and civic honors, as well as honorary degrees. She was also the holder of two of the city's top prizes: the Philadelphia Award and the Gimbel Award. At the time of her death she was working on a study of Benjamin Franklin. The book was published posthumously in 1974 as: *The Most Dangerous Man in America: Scenes from the Life of Benjamin Franklin*.¹⁴

¹² *Who's Who in California*, (Los Angeles: Who's Who Publications Co., 1941), p. 996.

¹³ John E. Kleber, *The Encyclopedia Of Louisville*, (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), p. 484; Wade H. Hall, *The Kentucky Anthology: Two Hundred Years of Writing in the Bluegrass State*, (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky), p. 794, 826; Hortense Flexner (King) Papers, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, William F. Ekstrom Library, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY.

¹⁴ "Bowen, Catherine (Shoeber) Drinker." *Twentieth Century Authors: A Biographical Directory of Modern Literature, First Supplement*, ed. Stanley Kunitz, (New York: H.W. Wilson Company), 1955; Sharon Cosner and Jennifer Scanlon, "Bowen, Catherine Shober

Lenore Guinzburg Marshall (1897-1971), born of Bohemian ancestry in New York City, was a novelist, poet, and activist. From 1929 to 1932, Marshall worked as an editor at the publishing firm of Cape and Smith, where she convinced her company to take a chance on William Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*, which had been rejected by twelve other publishers. She served as the poetry editor of *American Mercury* in 1938, and during World War II was active in the founding of children's writing clubs in the New York City public schools. Throughout her career, she contributed articles and reviews to New York literary magazines. A poet in her own right, Marshall published *No Boundary* (1943), *Other Knowledge* (1957), and *Latest Will* (1969). She wrote the novels *Only the Fear* (1955), *Hall of Mirrors* (1937), and *The Hill Is Level* (1959). *Unknown Artists* was published in 1947; *The Confrontation and Other Stories* appeared in 1972, shortly after Marshall's death; and *Invented a Person: The Personal Record of a Life* was published in 1979.¹⁵

Marshall's social concern and political activism were perhaps as important to her career as her literary accomplishments. A member of the Post-War World Council from 1940 to 1962, Marshall expressed profound concerns for the fate of humanity in the wake of world war. She was a founder, in 1956, and member to her death of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. In 1971, she helped to found the Committee for Nuclear Responsibility, an organization committed to enhancing public awareness of the dangers of nuclear power, and was its co-director, with nuclear physicist Charles E. Goodell. This group targeted the use of nuclear power for generating electricity and the reliance on nuclear weapons as a major component in foreign policy and national security as especially dangerous.

Hertha Ernestine Pauli (1906-1973), born in Vienna of Bohemian ancestry, was the daughter of the medical scientist Wolfgang Pauli. She became a journalist, author and actress. Her brother was the Nobel Prize winner Wolfgang Pauli. From 1927 to 1933 she played different small roles at the Max Reinhardt Theatre in Berlin and was allied with Ödön von Horváth. From 1933 to 1938 she lived in Vienna, edited the *Österreichische Korrespondenz* and published biographical novels, for example about the feminist Bertha von Suttner. After the Anschluss she emigrated to France. In Paris she belonged to the circle of Joseph Roth, knew the American journalist Eric Sevareid, and wrote for Resistance. In 1940, after the Nazis occupied France, she fled with the writer Walter Mehring through Marseilles, the Pyrenees, and Lisbon. With the aid of Varian Fry and the Emergency Rescue Committee, she made her way to the United States. After her arrival in America she described her flight in the journal *Aufbau*. In the following years she wrote books about Alfred Nobel and the Statue of Liberty. Her books for children, in particular, had some success. These books included *Silent Night*:

Drinker," in: *American Women Historians, 1700s-1990s: A Biographical Dictionary*. (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc., 1996); "Catherine Drinker Bowen, Holmes Biographer, Dies," *New York Times*, November 2, 1973, p. 44.

¹⁵ Obituary, *New York Times*, September 24, 1971, 34:1; *Who's Who in New York* (1960); Lenore Marshall Papers 1887-1980., Columbia University Libraries, Archival collections; Barbara L. Tischler, "Lenore Guinzburg Marshall," *Jewish Women in America*, 894-895.

The Story of a Song (1943), in which she explained the origin of the carol. She married Ernst Basch (pen name E.B. Ashton), with whom she had collaborated on *I Lift My Lamp*. Her last book was autobiographical and described the time after the Nazis occupation of most of France.¹⁶

Eleanor Flexner (1908-1995), was born in Georgetown, Kentucky, of Bohemian ancestry, and became a writer and historian. She was the daughter of the famed education reformer Abraham Flexner, one of the founders of the Lincoln School at Teachers College of Columbia University in New York, and the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. Eleanor Flexner attended Lincoln School, which was one of the outstanding progressive schools of the time. After graduating from Swarthmore College with high honors in English and history in 1930, she attended Somerville College at Oxford University for one year. Back in the United States, she held a series of promotional and editorial positions in the theater and with the Institute of Propaganda Analysis, the Foreign Policy Association, and Hadassah. In 1938 she published a book of dramatic criticism entitled *American Playwrights, 1918-1938*, and in 1957 moved from New York to Northampton, Massachusetts. Her classic account of the “first wave” of American feminism, *Century of Struggle: The Woman’s Rights Movement in the United States*, was published in 1959. When she showed the completed book to the distinguished historian Arthur Schlesinger, he recognized its value and urged her to offer it to Harvard University Press, which readily accepted it for publication. The book was notable in demonstrating that the topic of women’s rights was worthy of serious scholarly and analytical study. Flexner was particularly prescient in her use of race, gender, and class in interpreting the struggle for women’s equality. Her analysis was a source of inspiration for “second wave” feminists and laid the groundwork for subsequent generations of women’s history scholars. Her other publications included *Woman’s Rights: Unfinished Business* (1971) and *Mary Wollstonecraft: A Biography* (1972). Eleanor Flexner was awarded an honorary doctorate of humane letters from Swarthmore College in 1974.¹⁷

Maxine Kumin (née Winokur) (1925-2014), born in Philadelphia, Massachusetts of Bohemian ancestry on her mother’s side, was a notable poet, novelist, essayist, and children’s author. A graduate of Radcliffe College (AB, 1946; MA, 1948), she was praised for her novels in literary circles, but she was best known for her poetry, written primarily in traditional forms, on the subjects

¹⁶ Helmut F. Pfanner, *Exile in New York: German and Austrian Writers after 1933*, (Wayne State University Press, 1983); *Between Sorrow and Strength: Women Refugees of the Nazi Period*, edited by Sibylle Quack, David Lazar and Christof Mauch, (Cambridge University Press, 2002).

¹⁷ Susan Ware and Stacy Lorraine Braukman, eds., *Notable American Women: a Biographical Dictionary completing the twentieth ...* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2004), pp. 213-214; Ellen Carol DuBois, “Eleanor Flexner and the History of American Feminism,” in: *Woman Suffrage and Women’s Rights*, (New York: New York University Press, 1998); Thomas Neville Bonner, *Iconoclast: Abraham Flexner and a Life in Learning*, (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

of loss, fragility, family, and the cycles of life and nature. Critics compared Kumin to Robert Frost and Henry David Thoreau for her precise, unsentimental evocations of rural New England and the rhythms of daily life. She was the recipient of prestigious awards such as the Pulitzer Prize, the Ruth Lilly Poetry Prize, and an American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters Award. She was the poetry consultant for the Library of Congress in 1981-1982, and taught at many of the country's most prestigious universities, including Princeton, Columbia, Brandeis, MIT, Washington at St. Louis and the University of Miami. She served on the staff of the Atlantic Center for the Arts, Bread Loaf and Sewanee writer's conferences, and gave readings or conducted writers' workshops in every state in the Union save Hawaii and North Dakota. In 2005, Kumin was the recipient of the Harvard's Arts Medal. When Kumin was 73 she suffered an accident while preparing a horse for competition and broke her neck, receiving serious internal injuries. She was able to make a successful recovery, however, and her book *Inside the Halo and Beyond: The Anatomy of a Recovery* (1999) describes her convalescence.¹⁸

Erika Ostrovsky (nee Spielberg) (1926-), born in Vienna of Bohemian ancestry, grew up in Vienna's Seventh District. Her earliest childhood memories reach back to Austria's civil war in 1934. After the Anschluss her father was forced to scrub the street. In early 1939 the family escaped to Mýto, Czechoslovakia, then to Paris and finally, in August 1939, to the United States. Erika Ostrovsky eventually settled in San Francisco. She was a professor of French at New York University. She was the author of *Celine and His Vision*, *Eye of Dawn: The Rise and Fall of Mata Hari*, and *Under the Sign of Ambiguity: Saint John Perse-Alexis Leger*.¹⁹

Anne Bernays (1930-), who was born in New York of Moravian ancestry, is the grandniece of Sigmund Freud. She studied at Wellesley College and Barnard College before becoming a successful novelist. Her first novel, *Short Pleasures*, was published in 1962. She published four more novels in quick succession. Her fifth book, *Growing up Rich*, tells the story of an orphaned adolescent girl growing up between the German Jewish elegance of New York society and the Russian Jewish intellectual world of Brookline, Massachusetts. In 1976, *Growing up Rich* received the Edward Lewis Wallant Book Award for its contribution to American Jewish life. Since *Growing up Rich*, Bernays has published four more novels. *Professor Romeo* (1989) which examines the issue of sexual harassment from the perspective of a harasser and was featured on the front page of the *New York Times Book Review* and chosen as a *New York Times* notable book of the year. Her most recent novel is *Trophy House* (2005). In addition, Bernays has also

¹⁸ "Kumin, Maxine," in *American Poets*, ed. Rosemary M. Canfield Reisman, 4th ed, II (Pasadena, CA: Salem Press, 2011), pp. 1073-1083; Philip Schultz: "Postscript: Maxine Kumin (1925-2014)," *The New Yorker*, February 14, 2014; Maxine Kumin, *Inside the Halo and Beyond. The Anatomy of a Recovery*, (New York: W. W. Norton, 2000); Meg Schoerke, "On Maxine Kumin's Life and Career." *Modern American Poetry*, (2002), 24 February 2005.

¹⁹ AHC Interview with Erika Ostrovsky.

published three non-fiction works. *What If? Writing Exercises for Fiction Writers* (1990), written with Pamela Painter appeared in 1990. She has also coauthored with her husband, Justin Kaplan, *The Language of Names* (1997) and *Back Then: Two Literary Lives in 1950s New York* (2002), a double memoir.²⁰

Janet Malcolm (1934-), born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, is a prose writer, essayist and art critic. Janet Malcolm has been writing for *The New Yorker* since 1963, when the magazine published her poem "Thoughts on Living in a Shaker House." For nearly ten years, Malcolm wrote "About the House," a column on interiors and design. From 1975 until 1981, she wrote a photography column. Throughout her career, Malcolm has contributed a variety of pieces to *The New Yorker*, including profiles, reporter at large articles, and book reviews. She is also a prolific book author. Along with *In the Freud Archives* (1984), her books include *Diana and Nikon: Essays on Photography* (1980), *Psychoanalysis: The Impossible Profession* (1981), *The Journalist and the Murderer* (1990), *The Purloined Clinic: Selected Writings* (1992), *The Silent Woman: Sylvia Plath and Ted Hughes* (1994), *The Crime of Sheila McGough* (1999), *Reading Chekhov: A Critical Journey* (2001), and *Two Lives: Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas in War and Peace* (2007).²¹

B. Vocal Music

Bohemian-born Anna Růžena Sprotte (1872-?) was an opera singer and teacher. She had a strong contralto voice and wide vocal range. She made her debut in Mainz, Germany and sang on operatic stages in the leading musical centers of Germany. She was made Royal Court singer of Saxony and sang with the Berlin Philharmonic. She also sang with the Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul and Los Angeles symphony orchestras. In Seattle she organized an opera company and presented fourteen operas. As a pianist she played the Liszt concertos with the Prague Symphony Orchestra when she was only thirteen years old. She had a repertoire of seventy operas and wide stage experience. She resided in Los Angeles in the United States.²²

Emmy Destinn (nee Kitlová, 1878-1930), born in Prague, Bohemia, was a famous Czech dramatic soprano of notable power and intensity. She made her American debut in 1908 in "Aida" with the Metropolitan Opera in New York, Toscanini conducting, and remained with the company until 1916. She returned again in 1919 and stayed until 1921. Here she sang 247 performances of twenty-two roles, most often as Aida, Santuzza and Gioconda, but also as Butterfly,

²⁰ "Anne Bernays," in: Jewish Women's Archive. *Jewish Women: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia*.

²¹ Craig Saligman, "Janet Malcolm," Salon.com, Tuesday, February 29, 2000.

²² Willey Francis Gates, *Who's Who in Music in California*, (Los Angeles: The Pacific Coast Musician), 1920.

Nedda, Eva, Mařenka, Alice Ford, Elisabeth, Lisa, Tosca, Parmina and Valentina.²³

Maria Jeritza (originally Jedličková, 1887-1982), born in Brno, Moravia, was a famous soprano. She made her debut at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York in 1921, and quickly secured her place as the *prima donna assoluta* there. Her exuberant style led to her nickname “The Moravian Thunderbolt.” Her official debut came in 1910 as Elsa in Wagner’s “Lohengrin.” After the Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph heard her, she was immediately signed by the Imperial Opera in Vienna, where she would be a mainstay until 1935. Over her career, she performed around seventy principal roles at the leading opera houses of Europe and North America, in German, Italian, French, English and Czech. Able to sing works ranging from light operetta to the heaviest Wagner, she was called upon for several world premieres: Ariadne in Strauss’ “Ariadne auf Naxos” (1912), the Empress in “Die Frau ohne Schatten” (1919), Marie/Marietta in Korngold’s “Die tote Stadt” (1920), Janáček’s “Jenůfa” (1924), Korngold’s “Violanta” (1927), and Strauss’ “The Egyptian Helen,” and “Salome.” Madame Jeritza was particularly known for Massenet’s “Thais,” Puccini’s “Turandot,” and Bizet’s “Carmen,” but her signature piece was the title heroine in Puccini’s “Tosca.” After leaving the Metropolitan in 1932, she appeared in a number of movies. Following the Second World War, she helped raise money to repair the war-damaged Vienna State Opera House.²⁴

Julia Nussy-Backer (1889-1981), born in Prague, Bohemia, was a soprano concert and opera singer. She originally studied violin and harp at the Conservatory in Prague, but later shifted her focus to singing.

Růžena Herlinger (née Schwartz, 1890-1978), born in Tábor, Bohemia, was a soprano. In 1922 she was a member of the newly formed International Society for Contemporary Music in Salzburg. She gained a hearing for Webern’s *Lieder*, particularly in London. When she commissioned a work from Alban Berg in 1929, he interrupted his work composing *Lulu* to write “Der Wein,” a concert air which he dedicated to her. She gave the premiere on June 4, 1930 in Königsberg under Hermann Scherchen and the Vienna premiere on June 21, 1932 under Webern. After living in England during the Second World War, she returned to Czechoslovakia in 1946 to conduct the Prague Radio Choir. She arrived in Montreal in August 1949, and taught there, at first privately, and then (1957-62) at the Conservatoire de musique du Québec à Montréal and from 1963 to 1970 at McGill University. Among her pupils were Josephe Colle, Claude Corbeil, Claire Gagnier, Joseph Roulrau, Huguette Tourangeau, and Andre Turp.²⁵

²³ A. Rektorys and J. Dennis, “Emmy Destinn,” *Record Collector* 20 (1971-1972): 45-47, 93-94 [with discography] ; Marie Bajerová, *O Emě Destinnové* (Praha: Vyšehrad), 1979.

²⁴ Wilhelm Wymetal, *Maria Jeritza* (Wien-Leipzig, 1922); Maria Jeritza, *Sunlight and Song: A Singer’s Life*, (New York: Appleton, 1924), “Maria Jeritza, Star of Opera’s ‘Golden Age’ Dies at 94,” *New York Times*, July 14, 1992.

²⁵ Claude. Gingras, “Ruzena Herlinger, Montréalaise d’adoption, vient de mourir à l’âge de 88 ans,” *Variations*, May 1978

Hulda Lashanska Rosenbaum (1894-1974), born in New York City of Czech ancestry, was a lyric soprano, known professionally as Hulda Lashanska. Initially studied for a career as concert pianist, she later studied voice. She made her singing debut in 1910. Throughout her career she appeared with some of the world's leading musicians, including Micha Elman, Lawrence Tibbett, Emanuel Feuerman, Rudolf Serkin, as well as with singers of pop music, such as Morton Downey, Frank Cruinit, Jack Smith and Gene Austin. She also appeared in concert in 1928 with George Gershwin.²⁶

Jarmila Novotná (1903-2004), born in Prague, Bohemia, was a famous soprano. She made her debut in San Francisco as Madame Butterfly (1939) and first sang at the Metropolitan Opera in New York City as Mimi in "La Bohème" (1940). She also appeared in twelve other roles at the Met: Euridice, Violetta, Cherubino, Manon, Marenka, Donna Elvira, Pamina, Octavian, Antonia, Freia, Mélisande, and Count Orlofsky, the role of her farewell performance on January 15, 1956. Of her 208 appearances at the Met, 103 were in the breeches roles of Count Orlofsky, Cherubino, and Octavian.²⁷

Thelma Votipka (1906-1972), born in Cleveland, Ohio of Czech ancestry, was a mezzo-soprano who made her début as the Countess in "Le nozze di Figaro" with the American Opera Company in 1927, and later appeared in Chicago (1929-30) and San Francisco (1938-49 and 1952). Her first role at the Metropolitan was as Flora in "La traviata" in December 1935. During her twenty-nine year career at this house she sang in over one thousand performances, primarily in the *comprimario* repertoire: for example, the Witch in "Hansel and Gretel," Frasquita in "Carmen" and Marianne in "Der Rosenkavalier."²⁸

Eva Liková (1920-2004), born in Dvůr Králové nad Labem, Czechoslovakia, was an international opera star who performed with opera companies and orchestras in New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and around Europe, and appeared in numerous televised opera productions on NBC and CBC in the early 1950's. She also taught voice at the University of Michigan.²⁹

Leonie Rysanek (1926-), born in Vienna of Czech ancestry, was a famed soprano in the Met who now appears in the world's foremost opera houses. Her Metropolitan Opera debut was in Lady Macbeth in 1959 and culminated with her final performance as the Countess in "The Queen of Spades" on January 2, 1996. She returned nearly every season, appearing in 239 performances covering twenty roles, including Senta Chrysothemis, Elisabeth, Merschallin, Tosca, Fidelio,

²⁶ Hulda Lashanska Papers, 1908-1971, New York Public Library.

²⁷ Lanfranco Rasponi, *The Last Prima Donnas*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf), 1982; *Current Biography Yearbook*, (New York: H. W. Wilson), 1994, p. 655; Elliott Robert Barkan, *Making It In America: A Sourcebook On Eminent Ethnic Americans*, (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2001), p. 261.

²⁸ "Grand Opera Ends With Presentation of Figaro Marriage," *The Washington Post*, p. 11, December 15, 1927.

²⁹ "International Opera Star and Beloved Teacher Eva Likova Dies at 84," *PR Newswire*, March 22, 2004; *Opera News*, June 2004, vol. 68, No. 12.

Salome, Sieglinde, Amelia, Aida, Elisabeth de Valois, Elsa and Ortrud, Kundera, Desjmona and Leonora.³⁰

Dolora Zajick (1952-), born of Czech ancestry in Salem, Oregon, is an American mezzo-soprano who specializes in the Verdian repertoire. After winning the Bronze Medal at the seventh International Tchaikovsky Competition in Moscow and being accepted in the San Francisco Opera's Merola Program, she made her debut with the San Francisco Opera as Azucena in "Il Trovatore," launching her to international stardom. In addition to the role of Azucena, Zajick is well-known for her interpretations of Amneris and Eboli (in Verdi's "Aida" and "Don Carlo" respectively). Zajick has also performed in other Verdi roles, including Ulrica in "Un ballo in maschera" and Lady Macbeth in "Macbeth" (opera). She has also appeared as the Princess in Cilea's "Adriana Lecouvreur," Marfa in Moussorgsky's "Khovanshchina," Ježibaba in Dvořák's "Rusalka," Santuzza in Mascagni's "Cavalleria Rusticana," and Adalgisa in Bellini's "Norma." Since her debut in San Francisco, she has sung with such companies as the Metropolitan Opera in New York, Lyric Opera of Chicago, Houston Grand Opera, La Scala, and Covent Garden. She has appeared with some of the foremost conductors of her era including James Conlon, Daniele Gatti, Valery Gergiev, James Levine, Lorin Maazel, Zubin Mehta, Riccardo Muti, and Michael Tilson Thomas.³¹

René Fleming (1959-), born in Indiana, Pennsylvania of Czech ancestry, is a soprano opera and jazz singer. She has won international acclaim for her operatic concerts and recitals. Fleming has appeared in the world premiere of three major operas and was a Grammy recipient in 1998 at the forty-first Annual Grammy Awards for her performance of "The Beautiful Voice." She is one of the most sought after sopranos of today, appearing at such renowned opera houses as the La Scala, Metropolitan Opera House, Vienna State Opera, Royal Opera House at Covent Gardens, and Carnegie Hall. Her repertoire extends to all musical forms. She recently appeared in the role of Blanche Du Bois in Andre Previn's "A Streetcar Named Desire" at the San Francisco Opera. She also appeared at the Dvořák Hall of the Rudolfinum in Prague.³²

Phyllis Pancella (1963-) was born in St. Louis, Missouri of Czech ancestry. She is a mezzo-soprano who was a prizewinner in the 1988 McAllister opera competition and the 1990 Metropolitan Opera National Council Auditions, and she won the 1993 Award of Excellence from the Lotos Foundation. Her career has taken her to opera houses in the United States and abroad. At Glimmerglass Opera in 1996 she sang the title role in Jack Beeson's "Lizzie Borden," a role she repeated at New York City Opera in 1999 in a performance telecast live on PBS.

³⁰ Jane Boutwell, "The Talk of the Town, 'Leonie Rysanek,'" *New Yorker*, April 4, 1988, p. 24ff; Elizabeth Forbes, "Obituary: Leonie Rysanek," *The Independent*, Monday, March 9, 1998; "Leonie Rysanek, Operatic Soprano, Dies at 71" *The New York Times*, March 9, 1998.

³¹ "Dolora Zajick," *San Francisco Sentinel*, Sunday, September 19, 2010.

³² Renée Fleming, *The Inner Voice: the Making of a Singer*. (New York: Penguin Group, 2004).

Her European debut was at the Theatre du Capitole in Toulouse, and in the concert hall she has appeared with the National Symphony, the Minnesota, Baltimore, Cleveland, Cincinnati, and New World symphony orchestras, as well as the Orchestra della Toscana and the Opéra de Lyon.³³

Stephanie Novacek (1970-), born in Iowa City, Iowa, of Czech ancestry, is a mezzo-soprano and soloist with the Houston Grand Opera. She was a member of the Houston Grand Opera Studio from 1996-1999. Her roles at Houston included: Hänsel in Humperdink's "Hänsel und Gretel," Messaggiera in Gluck's "Orfeo," and the title role in Bizet's "Carmen." Stephanie also created two important roles in new operas: Jo in Mark Adamo's "Little Women" and Maria Callas in Michael Daugherty's "Jackie O." She was a finalist in Plácido Domingo's Operalia Competition in 1998.³⁴

Sondra Radvanovsky (1969-), born in Berwyn, Illinois of Czech ancestry, is an American soprano. Specializing in nineteenth-century Italian opera, she is considered not only one of the great Verdi singers of the new generation, but also a rising star in the dramatic *bel canto* repertoire. Her signature roles include Elvira in "Ernani," Leonora in "Il Trovatore," Elena in "I vespri Siciliani," and Élisabeth in "Don Carlos." "Along with a vocal flexibility that allows her to play with softness and edginess at will," notes one critic, "she can float notes of shimmering radiance, yet pour out a powerful, luscious sound that thrills both at the top and bottom."³⁵

C. Drama

Czech American women have done extremely well as dramatic artists, both on the stage and on the screen.

Stage

Fanny Janauschek (1830-1904), born in Prague, Bohemia, established an international reputation as a performer of the great tragic roles. Among her best were Lady Macbeth, Media and Mary Queen of Scots. She made her American debut in 1867 in "Medea." Thereafter she spent most of her career in the US, playing opposite Edwin Booth and other leading actors.³⁶

Bohumila Ludvíková (1856-?), was a theater actress born in Dobruška, Bohemia, who came to America together with her husband, František Ludvík, in 1893. She was a member of the Ludvík Theater in Chicago and later became its director.³⁷ Another member

³³ "Phyllis Pancella," *Barrett Vantage Artists*, 10/2012.

³⁴ "USA: Stephanie Novacek," *BBC Cardiff Singer of the World*, 2001 Competitors.

³⁵ Paula Citron, "Sondra Radvanovsky," *Opera Canada*, September 22, 2003.

³⁶ William C. Young, *Famous Actors and Actresses on the American Stage*. (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1976), p. 56.

³⁷ *Album representantů všech oborů veřejného života československého*. (Praha: Umělecké nakladatelství Josef Zeibrdlich, 1923), p. 1202a.

Another member of the Ludvík Theater in Chicago was Otilie Splavcová-Stropnická (1866- ?), born in Prague, Bohemia. She studied drama in Prague and in Paris. She had her first performance in the National Theater in Prague at the age of eighteen. She thereafter she was engaged for seven years in the theater in Plzeň. Two years later, she left with her husband for America and joined the Ludvík Theater. They toured with the company all over the US. In 1891, they came with the Ludvík Theater to Bohemia for a three-month tour and performed in Prague—in the Pištěk and the Švanda Theatres—as well as in Plzeň and Roudnice. She remained in America for thirty-five years before returning to Bohemia, where she continued in her acting career.³⁸

Maxine Elliott (1871-1940) was born as Jessie McDermott in Rockland, Maine, of Moravian ancestry, is said to have been one of the most photographed and beautiful actresses at the beginning of the twentieth century. She was a star of the stage and motion pictures. In 1908 she built the Maxine Elliott Theatre on 39th Street, in the Times Square area off Broadway in New York—the first woman to finance and build a theatre there. Her first professional stage appearance was on November 10, 1890, in the role of Felicia Umfraville in “The Middleman” at Palmer’s Theatre in New York. The performance was produced by the company of the great English actor/producer Edward S. Willard, in his first US production. Elliott remained with Willard for the next three years, touring the US and Canada in various productions, most notably “The Professor’s Love Story,” one of Willard’s greatest successes. She began to use the stage name Maxine Elliott on the suggestion of the great actor and dramatist Dion Boucicault. Her sister Gertrude would adopt the same surname for her own stage career. As a young actress, her many boyfriends included baseball’s Hall of Famer John Montgomery Ward and heavyweight champion and actor “Gentleman” Jim Corbett. She quit her acting career during World War I to finance and staff a floating hospital to nurse wounded soldiers in France. She met her second husband Nat C. Goodwin, the leading comic actor of his era, en route to Australia in 1896. Goodwin was a dedicated baseball fan and gambler, and the stage idol of George M. Cohan. They married in 1898, and divorced in 1908.³⁹

Gertrude Elliott (1874-1950), also an actress, was Maxine Elliot’s younger sister. After making her New York debut in 1894, she acted with Marie Wainwright in 1895 and with Nat Goodwin from 1897 to 1899, playing Emily in “In Mizzoura,” Lucy in “The Rivals,” and Angelica Knowlton in “Nathan Hale.” She made her London debut in 1899 as Midge in “The Cowboy and the Lady” and remained in England to play Ophelia to Forbes-Robertson’s Hamlet. After the two were married in 1900, she returned to America several times, playing Maissie in “The Light That Failed” (1903), a character in the mold of Hedda Gabbler, and creating the role of Cleopatra in G. B. Shaw’s “Caesar and Cleopatra” (1906).

³⁸ *Album representantů všech oborů veřejného života československého*, p. 1204a.

³⁹ Edward T. James, et al. eds., *Notable American Women, 1607-1950: a biographical dictionary*, (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 1971), vol. 2, pp. 576-578.; Don B. Wilmet and Tice L. Miller, *Cambridge Guide to American Theatre*, p. 140.; Diana Forbes-Robertson, *My Aunt Maxine: The Story of Maxine Elliott*, (New York: Viking Press, 1964).

Critics praised her girlish spirit, playful humor, eloquent speech and dusky beauty. After her husband retired, she managed London's St. James Theatre (1918).⁴⁰

Leopoldine Konstantin (1886-1965), born in Brno in Moravia, was an actress who first came to public attention in 1910, when she played Maria in the play "Gawan" in Berlin. Beginning in 1912 she acted on the Berliner Reinhardt stage but after a lawsuit with Reinhardt she moved to Vienna in 1916. Starting in 1912 she also played in silent movies, initially in title roles, but when, after the First World War, she was offered increasingly minor parts, she returned her focus to the stage. In 1933 she returned to film work, and in 1935 she went back to Austria. During the Second World War, she was forced into exile, first to London, where she lost her son during a bombardment, and later to the US, where she found a home in Hollywood. She is fondly remembered as Claude Rains's domineering mother in Hitchcock's film "Notorious" (1946). Her works also include "Sumurun" (1910), "Die Insel der Seligen" (1913), "Lola Montez" (1918), "Saison in Kairo" (1933), "Prinzessin Turandot" (1934), "Andere Welt" (1937) and "The Swan" for television in 1950.⁴¹

Blanche Yurka (1887-1974), was born in St. Paul, Minnesota, of Czech ancestry. She became a Broadway leading lady and film character actress. From a comic role in "Is Matrimony a Failure?" she later shifted to more tragic roles, including playing the role of Hamlet's mother Gertrude to John Barrymore's Hamlet, as well as roles in "Gloriana," "Oedipus Rex," "The Merchant of Venice," "Romeo and Juliet," "Electra," and others. She also had roles in films, including "Tale of Two Cities," "Lady of the Night," "The Bridge of San Luis Rey," and "At Sword's Point."⁴²

Libuše Prokop (nee Zdeněk) (1894-1986), who was born in Chicago of Bohemian ancestry, graduated from Chicago Musical College, where she majored in voice, piano and dramatics. Already in 1915 she was engaged by the Ludvik Company and played not only in Chicago but in many cities with Czech communities. The Ludviks traveled extensively, in many states, as the leading Czech company in the US. Libuše teamed up with George Prokop, whom she married, and together they enjoyed considerable popularity.⁴³

Nita Krebs (1905-1991), was born in Bohemia as Anna N. Krebs, and became an actress and folk figure. As a small person, she played the part of a Lullaby League Munchkin in the beloved 1939 classic film "The Wizard of Oz." One year before her appearance in that movie, she played a part in the all midget film "Terror of Tiny Town." She was a member of the famous vaudeville troupe, Leo Singer's Midgets. Nita's favorite love was ballet and she relished her dancing

⁴⁰ James et al., eds., *Notable American Women, 1607-1950*, pp. 570-572; Wilmett and Miller, *Cambridge Guide to American Theatre*, p. 140.

⁴¹ *International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Émigrés 1933-1945*. New York: R. G Sauer, 1983.

⁴² *Who Was Who in America*, vol. 6.

⁴³ "Prokop, Libuše," in: *Panorama. A Historical Review of Czechs and Slovaks in the United States of America*, (Cicero, Illinois: Czechoslovak National Council of America, 1970), pp. 266-267.

moment before Dorothy in Oz. She was featured in many of the Munchkin reunions. Nita Krebs retired to Sarasota Florida, where she died of a heart attack at the age of eighty-five.⁴⁴

Screen

Betsy Palmer (b. 1926) was born Patricia Betsy Hronek in East Chicago, Illinois, of Czech ancestry. She graduated from DePaul University in Chicago. Palmer has appeared in numerous movies, TV programs and game shows, and is probably best known for playing the part of Jason Voorhees's mother Pamela in the horror film "Friday the 13th" (1980). Before that she was a long-time panelist on the panel show "I've Got a Secret" from 1957 to 1967. She played Lieutenant Ann Girard (the most prominent female character) in the movie "Mister Roberts" (1955) and the character of Carol Lee Phillips in the film "Queen Bee" (1956), where she appeared with the legendary actress Joan Crawford. She starred alongside Henry Fonda and Anthony Perkins in the low budget Western "The Tin Star" (1957), which was nominated for an Academy award for Best Writing, Story or Screenplay. Apart from numerous film appearances, she also played "Aunt Ginny" on the TV series "Knots Landing" from 1989 to 1990. She got her first acting job in 1951 when she joined the cast of the fifteen-minute long daily soap opera "Miss Susan," which was produced in Philadelphia. She was discovered for this role while enjoying a party in the apartment of Frank Sutton, the actor famous as Sergeant Vince Carter on the long-running CBS television series "Gomer Pyle, USMC." At the time, Palmer had been in New York City less than one week. She also provided the disembodied voice for the title character (the ghost of a dead witch) in the film "Bell Witch," which premiered in theaters on September 24, 2005.⁴⁵

Marj Dusay (originally Marjorie Ellen Pivonka Mahoney) was born in Russell, Kansas, and had Bohemian ancestry on her mother's side (née Pivonka). Marj's upbringing included playing every sport imaginable. A gifted equestrian, she trained her own horses to ride in saddle club shows and riding contests, even garnering the title of country rodeo queen. Marj excelled in every area of high school, and was an honor student, debater, and prom queen. While at the University of Kansas, she appeared in several stage productions and was crowned Kansas University Homecoming Queen. While living in Kansas City, Marj began her modeling career, and when the family moved to New York for her husband's medical internship, Marj began modeling and studying acting. For his residency, they relocated to San Francisco, where Marj quickly became a top fashion model and nationally-recognized commercial personality. It was there Marj began studying improvisational comedy and radio speech. Ultimately, Marj moved to Los Angeles and began working in theatre and film. Her first break came when

⁴⁴ Michael Neil and Bonnie Bell, "Now a Half Century Down the Yellow Brick Road, Six Munchkins Remember Oz," *People* 31, No. 25, June 26, 1989.

⁴⁵ J. P. Shanley, "Realistic Actress. Betsy Palmer Discusses Her Work on TV," *New York Times*, July 8, 1956, p. 77.

Rob Reiner formed an improvisational comedy troupe called *The Session*, whose members included Marj, Reiner, Richard Dreyfuss, Larry Bishop, David Arkin, Phil Mishkin, Richard Mishkin and Bobbi Shaw.⁴⁶

Marj's career to date has encompassed a huge range of roles in feature films and television. Some examples of her work include appearing opposite James Garner on "Bret Maverick," four years on the CBS soap "Capitol," and NBC's "Santa Barbara." She also had a recurring role for seven seasons on NBC's "Facts of Life," earning her two Emmy nominations for her performance as Blair's mother, Monica Warner. Marj has guest-starred hundreds of times on TV series such as "Murder She Wrote," "In the Heat of the Night," "Perfect Strangers," "Friday the 13th," "Quincy," "Wild, Wild West," "Star Trek" and "The Fresh Prince of Bel Air." She has received critical acclaim for her dramatic roles, specifically for her performance in the film "MacArthur" as Gregory Peck's wife, and in "Mancuso," playing opposite Robert Loggia.

Lenka Pichlíková-Burke (b. 1954), an American actress born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, represents the seventh generation of her family to appear on stage since the eighteenth century. Her great-uncle was the noted national actor, Ladislav Pešek. While in Czechoslovakia, she performed on stage in many theatres, played in twelve films, and created over forty television roles, rising to the rank of Advanced Master Artist. In addition to performing as an actress in cinema, she was also involved professionally in classic pantomime. Since the 1980s she has resided in the United States. In the United States, she has performed onstage in speaking roles as well as in pantomime productions for more than twenty-five years. Since 1988, she has been a member of the Actors' Equity Association, the union which represents professional actors. In 2006 she was named the "Best Mime" of Fairfield County, Connecticut. She teaches performing arts, dramatic literature, and cultural history, and translates plays.⁴⁷

Donna Murphy (b. 1958), of Czech ancestry, comes from Corona, New York and is an American stage, film, and television actress. She is perhaps best known to film viewers for her role as Anij, Captain Jean-Luc Picard's love interest, in "Star Trek: Insurrection" (1998). Murphy is one of seven children of Jean (née Fink) and Robert Murphy (an aerospace engineer). She moved to Hauppauge, Long Island, New York and then to Topsfield, Massachusetts. Murphy asked for voice lessons at age three, and already put on shows in Hauppauge. She graduated from Masconomet Regional High School in 1977, and studied drama at New York University's Tisch School of the Arts, where she earned a B.F.A. in 1980. She also studied at the Lee Strasberg Theatre Institute. Her success on Broadway has been considerable. In 1994, she won the Tony Award for Best Actress in a Musical for her performance as Fosca in Stephen Sondheim's and James Lapine's "Passion." In 1996, she played Anna Leonowens in the Broadway revival of "The King and I" alongside Lou Diamond Phillips. The role earned her another Tony for Best Actress in a Musical. She also appeared in a revival of "Wonderful Town"

⁴⁶ Marj Dusay Official Website.

⁴⁷ "Time for Mime-Lenka Pichlikova," *The New York Times*, February 11, 2001.

from 2003 to 2005, and in “Lovemusik” (2007) as Lotte Lenya, opposite fellow Tony winner Michael Cerveris as Kurt Weill. Murphy’s recent film roles include “The Nanny Diaries” as Scarlett Johansson’s mother and as Rosalie Octavius, wife of Dr. Otto Octavius, the movie’s villain, in “Spider-Man 2.” She has appeared in a number of television series including “Trust Me” (2009), “Hack” (2002-2003), “Liberty! The American Revolution” (as Abigail Adams) (1997), and “Murder One” (1995-1996).⁴⁸

Lisa Pelikan, born in 1954 in Paris, France, is an actress of Czech ancestry. Her immigrant great grandfather from Bohemia was a tailor who settled in Nebraska with his family. She graduated from the Juilliard School with a full scholarship to its drama division. Pelikan is primarily a stage actor and director, but is also known to film audiences for her film debut as the younger version of Vanessa Redgrave’s title character in “Julia” (1977) (for which Redgrave won an Oscar), and her role as the widowed mother, Sarah Hargrave in the film sequel “Return to the Blue Lagoon” (1991). Lisa’s first regular TV work was as maid Kate Mahaffey on the CBS soap opera “Beacon Hill.” Other high points in her career include her performances as the lusty Lucy Scanlon in the TV miniseries “Studs Lonigan” (1979), and the title character of the horror film “Jennifer” (1978). She also won a Drama-Logue Award for her one-woman play about Zelda Fitzgerald entitled “Only a Broken String of Pearls.” She married fellow actor Bruce Davison in 1986, and they have one son. She and Davison are currently separated.⁴⁹

Lucy DeCoutere born in Canada in 1970 of Czech mother and a British father, is a Canadian actress best known for her role as the character Lucy in the hit television series “Trailer Park Boys.” She grew up as the youngest of four siblings in Montréal, Québec. She attended graduate school in Montréal and has held various jobs, including teaching kindergarten in Korea. She has also appeared in “The Vagina Monologues.” Introduced to the stage through dance, she was in a number of productions during her high school years and minored in theatre at university. Immediately after graduation, Lucy traveled across Canada with a theatre company for five months and started dabbling in the film industry shortly thereafter.⁵⁰

Jane Novak (1896-1980), born in St. Louis Missouri, of Bohemian ancestry, was a silent screen leading lady in the early 1900s. She was the celebrated blond beauty and leading lady to such stars as W. S. Hart, Tom Mix, Harold Lloyd, Hobart Bosworth, W. D. Taylor, Charles Ray, and others. She made her first film appearance in 1913 and was prominent until the coming of “talkies.” The last of her few sound pictures was released in 1957, ending a career encompassing 110 films.⁵¹

⁴⁸ The Official Dona Murphy Website.

⁴⁹ The Official Website of Lisa Pelikan.

⁵⁰ Lucy DeCoutere’s “My Space.”

⁵¹ “Silent Films Star Jane Novak Talks At Length about Her Past,” *Nevada State Journal*, Friday, November 22, 1974, p. 37.

Eva Novak (1898-1988), was Jane Novak's sister. She, too, was a silent screen leading lady, who starred as Tom Mix's love interest in ten of his westerns, including "Sky High" and "Trailin." She was also the leading lady in three films for William S. Hart and appeared in John Ford's classics such as "She Wore a Yellow Ribbon," "Stage Coach" and "Fort Apache."⁵²

Alice Calhoun (1901-1966), born in Cleveland, Ohio, of Czech ancestry, was another silent screen star in westerns. She became an actress with Vitagraph in New York and moved with that company to Hollywood. By 1932 she had appeared in fifty-two Vitagraph and Warner Brothers pictures. Among her credits were "The Man Next Door," "The Man from Brodney," "Angel of Crooked Street," "Our Stolen Night" and "The Little Minister."⁵³

Geraldine Dvorak (1904-1985), born in Texas, an actress, was Greta Garbo's double. When Garbo first saw Dvorak (also known as Jeraldine Dvorak) in 1926 while filming "Love," she exclaimed: "Gott! She looks like me!" Dvorak also doubled for Marlene Dietrich. "A Woman of Affairs" was the first Garbo film to have Geraldine Dvorak, her costume double, on the set every day. Garbo did not want to waste her time doing long shots or over-the-shoulder shots. It is easy to see why Dvorak could stand in for Garbo at costume fittings and impersonate her in public. As Rilla Page Palmborg wrote: "Geraldine had everything that Garbo had—except the mysterious ingredient that made Greta, Garbo." Dvorak also played one of Dracula's wives, in the Universal Studios classic "Dracula," starring Bela Lugosi.⁵⁴

Věra Hrubá Ralston (1923-2003), born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, was the ice skating champion of Czechoslovakia at age 13. She competed in the 1936 Olympics and was runner up to Sonia Henie in the figure skating events. She studied ballet and dramatics in Prague and London. In 1938, she came to the United States. There, she met Jimmy Johnston, who became her manager and who introduced her in the ice revue at Hotel New Yorker, and subsequently presented her in the spectacular "Ice Vanities" on tour. After a brief return to Prague she decided to stay in the United States permanently. When the Ice Capades organized in 1940 she became one of the revue's featured stars. She appeared in such pictures as "Ice Capades", "Ice Capades Revue", "Storm over Lisbon", "Lake Placid Serenade", "Dakota", "The Murder in the Music Hall", and "Angel of the Amazon."⁵⁵

Miroslava Stern (1926-1955), born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, moved with her parents to Mexico in the late 1930s, seeking to escape war in their native country. After winning a national beauty contest, Miroslava began to study acting. She participated in various Mexican films. For a time, she worked in Hollywood,

⁵² Biography for Eva Novak, IMDb Website.

⁵³ "Alice Calhoun," in: *Stars of the Photoplay*. Chicago: Photoplay, 1924; "Alice Calhoun," in: *Blue Book of the Screen*, 1923; Ruth Wing, *The Blue Book of the Screen*, (Hollywood: Blue book of the Screen, 1924).

⁵⁴ "Geraldine Dvorak," IMDb Website.

⁵⁵ "Vera Hrubá Ralston, 79, Dies. Skated in Olympics and Films," *New York Times*, February 18, 2003.

appearing in “Adventures of Casanova” (1945), “The Brave Bulls” (1951) and “Strangers on Horseback.” She is fondly remembered for her last film, “Ensayo de Un Crimen” (1955), directed by Luis Buñuel. She also appeared in “Bodas Trágicas” (1946), “Juan Charrasqueado” (1947), “La Muerte Enamorada” (1950), “Dos Caras Tiene el Destino” (1951), “La Visita que no Tocó el Timbre”(1954) and “Escuela de Vagabundos” (1954).⁵⁶

Elamrie Louise Wendel (b. 1932), born in Iowa of Czech ancestry, is an American actress, perhaps best known for her role as Mrs. Dubcek in the NBC sitcom “Third Rock from the Sun.” Born on a farm in Iowa, Wendel spent her childhood traveling with her musically-gifted parents and dancing with her sisters in and around the Midwest in club and concert hall venues, including the Grand Ole Opry. She eventually made her way to New York, where she enjoyed success in both Off Broadway and Broadway productions. A national touring company of the musical “Annie” took her to Los Angeles, where she made a successful transition into film and television. Her television credits include guest roles on many hit shows, such as “Murphy Brown,” “Seinfeld,” “Love & War,” “Murder, She Wrote,” and “Empty Nest.” She appeared in the acclaimed original cable films “And the Band Played On” for HBO and in “Far from Home” for Showtime. Most recently, she played a recurring role as Gina, one of the assembly line workers at the aviation factory on “George Lopez.”

Kim Novak (b. 1933), is an American actress of Czech ancestry, born in Chicago, Illinois. After winning a beauty contest she was placed under contract with the intention of creating a new star to succeed Rita Hayworth. She appeared in such films as “The Man with a Golden Arm”, “Vertigo”, “Of Human Bondage”, “Moll Flanders,” “The Great Bank Robbery”, “Legend of Lylah Clare,” and others. She was named one of the ten most popular movie stars by *Box Office* magazine (1956), *All American Favorite* (1961), and in the Brussel’s World Fair poll as the world’s favorite all time actress (1958).⁵⁷

Maruška Staňková (1934-2000), a Czech actress, born in Prague, was a former head of the Directing, Acting and Writing for Camera (DAWC) workshop. She emigrated from Czechoslovakia to Canada in 1967. She performed both on the stage and in films, garnering a Genie nomination for her performance in “Dreams beyond Memory.” Her DAWC workshop, created in 1982, was attended by nearly 800 students, including Atom Egoyan and Paul Gross. One hundred and twenty-four short films were produced through the program.⁵⁸

Susan Kohner (b. 1936), was born in Los Angeles, California, of Czech ancestry. She was a leading lady in Hollywood films of the late 50s and early 60s, as well as the stage and TV. She is most notable for portraying Sarah Jane, the biracial teenage daughter who passes for white in the 1959 color remake of “Imitation of Life.” The role garnered her a nomination for an Academy Award as

⁵⁶ Alejandra Espasande Bouza, “Remembering Miroslava Stern Becka (1926-1955),” *LatinoLA*, February 22, 2006.

⁵⁷ Charles Fritch, *Goddess of Love*, (Derby, Connecticut: Monarch Books, 1962); Peter H. Brown, *Kim Novak. Reluctant Goddess*, (New York: St. Martin Press, 1986).

⁵⁸ Mark Dillon, “Industry to Honor Stankova,” November 13, 2000.

best supporting actress, and in 1960, a Golden Globe Award for Best Supporting Actress, Motion Picture. Other films in which she appeared included "The Big Fisherman," "The Gene Krupa Story," "All the Young Cannibals," "By Love Possessed," and "Freud." She retired from acting after her 1964 marriage to fashion designer John Weitz.⁵⁹

Barbara Bouchet was born Barbara Gutscher in Liberec, Czechoslovakia, in 1943, but lived in the United States from her early childhood. An uncommonly beautiful woman, Bouchet rose to fame as a magazine-cover and TV-commercial model. Few actresses displayed their bare abdomens with such frequency as Bouchet in the 1960s: she was fetchingly garbed in harem attire in "John Goldfarb, Please Come Home" (1964), was killed while gamboling in the nude on the beaches of Pearl Harbor in "In Harm's Way" (1964), and spent virtually the entire running time of "Agent for H.A.R.M." (1966) in the briefest of bikinis. In the 1967 James Bond pastiche "Casino Royale," Bouchet portrayed Miss Money Penny, bringing a whole new smoldering aspect to this otherwise demure character. In the early 70s, she switched her base of operations to Europe, starring in a steady stream of forgettable Italian pictures. Barbara Bouchet made a welcome return to American television screens in the 1983 TV-movie "The Scarlet and the Black."⁶⁰

Olga Schoberová (later known as Olinka Bérová) (b. 1943), an actress born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, is often compared to Brigitte Bardot and Ursula Andress. She acted in twenty-two Czech, German, Italian and American movies. She was married to Brad Harris from 1967 to 1969, and they have one daughter, Babrinka. She is now married to John Calley, and lives in the US. She became a Czech sex-symbol years before Paulina Porizkova and other current fashion models, because she was the first beauty from Czechoslovakia or the Czech Republic to appear in Playboy, and made it on the front cover, too.⁶¹

Erika Alena Slezak was born in 1946, in Hollywood, California, the daughter of Walter Slezak and granddaughter of Leo Slezak, a world famous operatic tenor born in Moravia. She is best known for her role in the long-running ABC TV show "One Life to Live," (1971-2012). She has won six Daytime Emmys in the category of "Outstanding Lead Actress in a Drama Series" (in 1984, 1986, 1992, 1995, 1996, and 2005), tying with Justin Deas for the record for most wins by an actor, as well as holding the record for most wins for playing one character. Additionally, she won (with Mark Derwin) a Soap Opera Digest Award for "Favorite Couple" in 2000.⁶²

Mary Elizabeth 'Sissy' Spacek, born in 1949 in Quitman, Texas, of Moravian ancestry. She is an Academy-Award-winning American actress and singer. Spacek was given the nickname "Sissy" by her older brothers. Spacek started out as a country singer, recording one single ("John, You Went Too Far This Time," (about John Lennon) under the name Rainbo. With the help of her

⁵⁹ "About Two Boys," JewishJournal.com, March 13, 2003.

⁶⁰ Biography for Barbara Bouchet, IMDb Website.

⁶¹ "Olga Schoberová," IMDb Website.

⁶² "Biography for Erika Slezak," IMDb Website.

cousin, actor Rip Torn, she was able to enroll in Lee Strasberg's Actors Studio and then the Lee Strasberg Institute in New York City. Her first credited role was in the 1972 movie "Prime Cut," in which she played a young woman sold into white slavery. The first movie that brought her wider notice was the 1973 film "Badlands," during the making of which she met art director Jack Fisk, whom she would later marry. Her breakout role was in "Carrie" in 1976, in which she played the title character, an emotionally troubled teenager with telekinetic powers. She was nominated for the Academy Award for Best Actress for her work in the film. She eventually won the Oscar in 1980 for "Coal Miner's Daughter," in which she played country music star Loretta Lynn. She was also nominated for a Grammy Award for her singing on that film's soundtrack album. She made a comeback of sorts in 2001 when she starred as Ruth Fowler in "In the Bedroom," winning extraordinary praise and garnering the New York and Los Angeles Film Critics Awards for Best actress. She was also nominated for an Oscar that year, but lost to Halle Berry.⁶³

Tanya Wexler (b. 1970), hails from Chicago and is of Bohemian ancestry on her mother's side. She has been a professional actress since she was five years old. She has numerous commercial and local theater credits as an-all-too precocious child actor. Five years ago she moved from in front of to behind the camera, and enrolled in Columbia University's Film School, where she earned an MFA. She has written and directed several video and short film projects including behind the scenes of *Fallen Angel at Circle in the Square*. "The Dance," her first short film, was shown at The Telluride International Film Festival, The Seattle International Film Festival and the First Look Series at the Tribeca Film Center. Her thesis film, "Cool Shoes," was awarded the bronze medal at The Houston Worldfest. "Finding North" is her first feature. She is best known for her 2011 comedy "Hysteria."⁶⁴

Mary Lynn Rajskub (b. 1971), is an American comedic actress of Czech background, born in Trenton, Michigan. She was one of the original cast members of "Mr. Show," and also had roles on "The Larry Sanders Show" and "Veronica's Closet." Recently she has ventured into more dramatic roles, most notably her role as a CTU tech analyst, Chloe O'Brien, on "24," a show which she joined in 2003 at the start of the its third season. Her character was a hit with viewers and critics and was one of the few cast members to return in the show's fourth season. After being a regular guest star for one season, Rajskub became a main cast member in the show's fourth and fifth seasons. She also appeared in Kelsey Grammer's "The Sketch Show" on Fox Television and numerous films including "Serial Slayer" (aka "Claustrophobia"), "Mysterious Skin," "Legally Blonde 2," "Sweet Home Alabama," "Dude, Where's My Car?," "Man on the Moon," "Punch-Drunk Love," "The Anniversary Party," "Firewall," and Weezer's music video for their song "The Good Life," as well portraying a blind girl in "Road Trip." She is also a skilled guitar player, and was part of a comic duo (with Karen Kilgariff) called "Girls Guitar Club." She also played guitar and sang for a few minutes of a

⁶³ "Spacek, Sissy," *Current Biography* 1978 (1979), p. 397-400.

⁶⁴ Vancouver International Film Festival - Film and TV Forum.

“Gilmore Girls” episode which originally aired on May 9, 2005. Rajs kub has volunteered as an actor with the Young Storytellers Program.⁶⁵

Lavinia Gutmann Vlasak (b. 1976), is a Brazilian actress born in Rio de Janeiro, of Czech ancestry. She is a former top model who has worked in USA, Portugal, Spain and Germany. She is frequently compared to Audrey Hepburn and, then, has imitated her in many of her pictures.⁶⁶

Heidi Lucas (b. 1977), Czechoslovak and Chinese ancestry, was an actress active during the 1990s. She is best known for her role as Dina Alexander on the Nickelodeon show “Salute your Shorts,” which ran from 1991-1992. She is also known as Noriko “Max” Matsuda in the 1996 sci-fi series “Hypernavts.” She has been in many movies and TV shows which include “Saved by the Bell: The New Class,” “Boy Meets World,” “The Wayans Bros.” and the 1992 action/adventure film “Ghost Ship.” She has also been in TV Commercials for Coca Cola (1998) Clearasil (1997) Sunny Delight (1996) Noxema (1995, 1996) Secret Ultra Dry Deodorant, Johnson & Johnson Persa Gel, and Skittles. She won a Young Artist Award for best young actress in 1993 for “Salute Your Shorts.”⁶⁷

Kate Kelton (b. 1978), was born in Bamberg, Germany, in a refugee camp where her parents were living after escaping from Czechoslovakia. When she was seven years old, Kate and her mother settled in Toronto, Canada. An artist, model and actress, Kate is most notable for appearing as the “Tic Tac girl” in recent television advertisements for Tic Tac candies. In Toronto, she attended the Etobicoke School of the Arts and received a Bachelor of Applied Arts in Film degree at Ryerson Polytechnic University in 1998. She began her career as an artist before moving into modeling and, finally, acting. Some of her movie credits include “Harold and Kumar Go to White Castle” and “American Psycho II: All American Girl.” She has also appeared in Shaggy’s music video, “It Wasn’t Me.”⁶⁸

Jodi Lyn O’Keefe (b. 1978), is an American award-winning actress and model born in Cliffwood Beach, New Jersey, of Czech ancestry. She rose to fame at age seventeen as Don Johnson’s daughter, Cassidy Bridges, on “Nash Bridges.” She is also known for her role in “Prison Break” as Gretchen Morgan, otherwise known as “Susan B. Anthony.” When she was a child, the youngest of three sisters, she had a bowl haircut and was a self-described “dork.” Her older sister was a model and Jodi decided that she wanted to do the same. Modelling, according to Jodi, brought her more confidence and more friends. Midway through her junior year of high school she left school to star on the soap opera “Another World,” playing Marguerite “Maggie” Cory. She then was offered the role of Cassidy on “Nash Bridges.” She and her mother moved to Hollywood, so Jodi completed her schooling by mail. She made her big screen debut in 1998 in “Halloween H20: 20 Years Later,” and later starred in such films as “The Crow:

⁶⁵ Biography for Mary Lynn Rajs kub, IMDb Website.

⁶⁶ “Lavinia Vlasak,” IMDb Website.

⁶⁷ “Heidi Lucas,” tv.com Biography.

⁶⁸ Kate Kelton Website; Debra Smouse, “Meet Actress Kate Kelton,” ATG Interview, *all things girl*, August 11, 2012.

Salvation,” “Whatever It Takes,” and “Devil in the Flesh 2.” She hit the spotlight when she portrayed a conceited and popular high school girl, Taylor Vaughan, in the teen flick, “She’s All That” (1999) alongside Freddie Prinze, Jr. and Rachael Leigh Cook. O’Keefe kept on working both in movies and on “Nash Bridges” until the series ended in 2001. Later films have included “Out for Blood,” in which she played a vampire named Layla Simmons, and “Venice Underground.” In 2005, she appeared for three episodes in the first season of “Boston Legal.” O’Keefe was also in 3 Doors Down’s music video “Let Me Go,” 2005, alongside Jesse Metcalfe of “Desperate Housewives.” She joined the cast of “Prison Break” in 2007. She also appeared in episodes of the television series “Charmed” as the Spider Demon, “The Evidence,” and “Two and a Half Men.” She also portrayed Tru Davies’ high school friend in the episode “Reunion” in the short-lived, 2003 television series “Tru Calling.”⁶⁹

Winter Ave Zoli (b. 1980), left her birthplace in New Hope, Pennsylvania at the age of eleven, to move to Prague, Czech Republic with her family. There she fully developed the Czech roots she inherited from her father’s side of the family. She transitioned from ballet to musical theater, developing a love for the stage, and for the craft of acting. She began working professionally at the age of thirteen, and developed her resumé through acting opportunities on European and American productions that came through Prague. At the age of seventeen, she attended the Carnegie-Mellon summer school theater program, and at nineteen enrolled in the Atlantic Theater Company acting school in New York City, founded by playwright David Mamet and actor William H. Macy. After graduating from the professional program, Winter moved to Los Angeles, where she currently resides. She appeared in the 2007 film “Sex and Death 101” as Alexis, the fast food beauty. She held the main role of legendary Libuše in the 2009 Czech film “The Pagan Queen.” Winter gained further international recognition with her main role as Lyla Winston on the hit American TV series “Sons of Anarchy.”⁷⁰

⁶⁹ “Jodi Lyn O’Keefe,” IMDb Website.

⁷⁰ “Biography for Winter Ave Zoli,” IMDb Website.

D. Visual Arts

Visual arts are another area in which Czech American women excelled, starting with Catherine Drinker Janvier in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

Catherine Drinker Janvier (1841-1922), was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, of Moravian ancestry, and became a prominent artist and art teacher in Philadelphia. She won the prestigious Mary Smith Prize in 1880 at the Fifty-First Annual Exhibition of the Pennsylvania Academy. The prize-winning painting was titled "Old Fashioned Music," and "represented the culmination of twenty years of artistic production." In the 1870s and 1880s, she had demonstrated strong accomplishments, both as a painter and teacher. She gave private lessons to future artists including Cecilia Beaux, her most gifted student and one who remains one of America's most prominent women artists. Janvier also taught at Miss Sanford's School and secured a teaching position there for Miss Beaux. Janvier and Beaux had a life-long friendship to which they added a family connection when Beaux's brother married Janvier's sister. In 1878, Janvier became the first woman hired by the Pennsylvania Academy to give a series of lectures on perspective. She had finished about twenty-two major paintings of various styles including historical genre, portraits, and religious subjects. She exhibited widely at galleries and academies including the National Academy of Design, the Brooklyn Art Association, the Pennsylvania Academy, and the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition.⁷¹

Ella Klauber Wormser (1863-1932), was born in Carson City, Nevada, of Bohemian ancestry. She had many talents, including painting portraits and still lifes, photography, writing, and music. She was best known in the art world for her painting and photography skills.⁷²

Alice Ellen Klauber (1871-1951), was a painter born in San Diego, California, of Bohemian ancestry. A sister of Ella Klauber Wormers, she lived with her grandparents in San Francisco, where Alice Klauber attended public schools, and later studied art locally at the School of Design and the Art Students League. She further studied with William M. Chase, with Robert Henri in Spain (1907), and with Hans Hofmann at UC Berkeley (1930). As a close friend of Henri, she had correspondence with him that led to his visit to San Diego in 1914. For the 1915 Panama California Exposition, Klauber, chair of the art department, Henri, and Dr. Edgar Hewett, director of exhibitions, organized an exhibition of work by some of America's foremost contemporary artists. Klauber was affiliated with a number of art organizations and had memberships in the San Diego Art Association, San Diego Art Guild, La Jolla Art Association, and Los Angeles Watercolor Club. With her brother-in-law Julius Wangenheim, she was one of the main forces behind the founding of the Fine Arts Society of San Diego in 1926. She also helped support the Fine Arts Society financially and with donations of art including works on paper by Edward Burne-Jones, Henri Matisse, Kathe Kollwitz

⁷¹ *Dictionary of American Biography*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928-1936), vol. 5; *Who Was Who in America*, vol. 1.

⁷² "Ella Klauber Wormser (1863-1932)," AskART Website.

and Pablo Picasso. Her greatest interest, however, was in oriental art, and she was one of the founders of the Asiatic Arts Committee. She was named honorary curator of oriental art at the Fine Arts Gallery in 1940, and donated to it important Japanese block prints by Utamaro, Hokusai and Hiroshige, among others. In spite of her many and varied activities, Klauber still made time to paint. She exhibited frequently in Southern California, particularly during the 1920s and 1930s, occasionally winning awards. Her work was exhibited at the Panama California International Exposition in 1916, and also at the California Pacific International Exposition in 1935. In 1928, a book of her poems was published by the Denrich Press in Chula Vista. Alice Klauber probably did more for the cultural advancement of San Diego than any other individual. She gave assistance and encouragement to many artists and art organizations, and always strove for aesthetic excellence. Her own paintings show unmistakable talent that perhaps was never allowed to fully develop due to her many other interests and commitments.⁷³

Leda Josephine Klauber (1881-1981), born in San Diego, California of Bohemian ancestry, was a painter and the sister of artists Alice Klauber and Ella Klauber Wormser. After 1951 she was on the Asian Arts Committee at the San Diego Fine Arts Gallery. Her work includes landscapes and still lifes in watercolor and gouache. Her work was exhibited in the San Diego Fine Arts Gallery, 1927, and in the California -Pacific International Exposition in San Diego, 1935.

Helen A. Salz (née Arnstein) (1883-1957), born in San Francisco of Bohemian ancestry, began her art studies locally with Gottardo Piazzoni, and continued with Rockwell Kent and Robert Henri at the Art Students League in New York City. Early in her career she worked in oil and watercolor, but later switched to pastels. Inspired by the Fauvists, her subjects include landscapes, floral still lifes, portraits, and genre subjects. Salz was also a poet, civil libertarian, and founder of the Presidio Hill School in San Francisco. She died in San Francisco.⁷⁴

Wanda Hazel Gag (1893-1946), born in New Ulm, Minnesota of Czech ancestry, was an artist, illustrator and writer. Her works held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Whitney Museum of American Art, Newark Museum, New York Public Library, and the Art Institute of Chicago.⁷⁵

Anita Lily Pollitzer (1894-1975), was an American photographer born in Charleston, South Carolina, of Czech ancestry. Her mother, Clara Guinzburg Pollitzer (born Clara Guinzburg), was the daughter of an immigrant rabbi from Prague. Pollitzer may be best known for her friendship with Georgia O'Keeffe, whom she met at Columbia University. Pollitzer introduced O'Keeffe to Alfred

⁷³ "Alice Ellen Klauber (1871-1951)," AskART Website.

⁷⁴ "Helen Salz (1883-1978).," AskART Website.

⁷⁵ Wanda Gág, *Growing Pains*, (Saint Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1984); Karen Nelson Hoyle, *Wanda Gag: A Life of Art and Stories*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).

Stieglitz, helping to forge one of the most significant artistic relationships in the twentieth century.⁷⁶

Melanie Kent Steinhardt (1899-1952), born in Bohemia, was an aspiring Czech Jewish artist who left Europe in 1939 and finally settled in California in 1941. In her diverse and compelling collection of compositions, portraits and landscapes she blended European Expressionism with an émigré's troubled impressions of two World Wars, a woman's place in a male dominated world, and her new life in America. The artist's residency in Inglewood, amid the burgeoning military industrial complex of 1940s Southern California, informed some of her most compelling work, and provided her an opportunity to reconnect with her estranged family. Melanie Kent Steinhardt died suspiciously at the age of fifty-two in her Los Angeles studio—whether by accident or suicide remains a mystery.⁷⁷

Hana Geber (nee Kraus) (1910-1990) was a sculptor born in Prague, Bohemia, who studied in Prague and at the Art Students League and Sculpture Center, New York. She was known for her modern sculpture of Biblical subjects in bronze, silver and terra cotta, and as a designer of ceremonial objects for use in home and synagogues. She received the gold medal of the National Association for Women Artists and the first prize in a competition sponsored by the American Society of Contemporary Artists.⁷⁸

Amy Josephine Klauber Wormser (1903-1988), born in San Diego, California, of Bohemian ancestry, was a painter who studied at Mills College, Oakland under Roi Partridge, and in Vienna at the Kunstgewerbeschule from 1929 to 1931. She later returned to the California School of Fine Arts in San Francisco for further study with emphasis on applied design. Her major paintings were completed during the three decades from the 1920s to the 1940s. Thereafter, she specialized in fabric and wallpaper design.⁷⁹

Sonja Bullaty (1924-2000), born in Prague, Bohemia, was a photographer married to Angelo Lomeo. Sonja Bullaty was an assistant to the renowned Czech photographer Josef Sudek in Prague. She worked on assignment photography for magazines, books, and advertising in Czechoslovakia and abroad. Personal projects involved themes such as Kafka's Prague, The Seasons, Ways of Seeing the World's Landscapes and Cityscapes, Nature, Light and Color. Bullaty and Lomeo have exhibited their work together and separately, in the United States and abroad. Their work has been shown at The Metropolitan Museum of Art, and International Center of Photography in New York City; George Eastman House, Rochester, New York; the Museum of Modern Art, San Paolo, Brazil; Uměleckoprůmyslové Museum (Museum of Decorative Arts), Prague, Czechoslovakia; Witkin, Neikrug, Cityana, Space, and Nikon House Galleries, in

⁷⁶ *American National Biography*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); *Who Was Who in America*, vol. 6.

⁷⁷ Richard T., Hill, *Mela: The Life and Art of Melanie Kent Steinhardt*, (Rabbit Hill Press, 2002).

⁷⁸ *International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Émigrés 1933-1945/*

⁷⁹ "Amy Josephine Klauber Wormser (1903 - 1988)," AskART Website.

New York City; the DeCordova Museum, Lincoln, Massachusetts; and others. Books by Sonja Bullaty and Angelo Lomeo include: *Provence, Tuscany, and Venice and the Veneto* (Abbeville Press), *Circle of Seasons: Central Park Celebrated* (Amaryllis), and *Vermont in all Weathers* (Viking). Their photographs have appeared in *Life, Time, Orion Audubon, Geo, Horizon, Horticulture*, and numerous other prestigious publications. Bullaty and Lomeo were the first recipients of The Orion Society's Olivia Ladd Gilliam Award.⁸⁰

Eva Fuka (b. 1927), is a photographer and native of Prague. She attended the State School of Graphic Arts in Prague under Professor Rudolf Skopec, and later studied at the Academy of Visual Arts from 1945 to 1950. A member of a group of dissident intellectuals, she was known for her melancholic and surreal effects. In 1967 she defected with her family to the United States. She is now retired, and divides her time between New York City, Prague, Paris and the French Alps, where she spends her summers. Eva Fuka has had numerous one-woman shows here and abroad. Her last exhibition took place in 2001 in the Prague House of Photography. Important recent group exhibitions in which she has participated include "A History of Women Photographers (1850-1975)," a traveling exhibition that originated in the Akron Art Museum in 1996, and "One Hundred years of Photography," in the Discovery Museum in Connecticut in 2000. Her work is included in the collections of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts; the Akron Museum; in the International Center of Photography and the Museum of Modern Art, in New York, among others. Her photographs appear in numerous books and encyclopedias.⁸¹

Juliet Hartford (b. 1968), a native New Yorker of Bohemian ancestry, is the daughter of A&P heir Huntington Hartford. Her father was the original owner and developer of Paradise Island in the Bahamas. Juliet is an artist (painter) spending time in London, Paris and New York. She has worked with Elite Model and has done shoots for both the German and American *Vogue*. Juliet appeared in the film "Plain Clothes" (1988), and she also played herself in "Born Rich," a documentary on HBO.⁸²

Jana Štěrbák (b. 1955), a native of Prague, Czechoslovakia, Štěrbák left Czechoslovakia with her parents in 1968 after the Prague Spring, settling first in Vancouver before moving to Montréal to complete her studies at Concordia University. She has had a peripatetic career as a sculptor, having lived in both Toronto and New York before returning to Montréal. At present she divides her time between Montréal and Paris. Since her inclusion in the Aperto exhibition of the Venice Biennale in 1990 and a solo exhibition at the National Gallery of Canada in 1991, she has exhibited extensively in solo and group shows in Europe.

⁸⁰ "Sonja Bullaty, 76, a Photographer of Lyricism," Obituary, *New York Times*, October 13, 2000.

⁸¹ Willoughby, Ian (Interviewer), "Eva Fuka—Part 1," Radio Prague, May 21, 2007; "Part 2," May 22, 2007.

⁸² "Biography for Juliet Hartford," IMDb Website.

The National Gallery, the Musée d'Art Contemporain de Montréal and the Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris hold key examples of her work.⁸³

E. Sports

Prior to 1870, activities for American women were recreational rather than sport-specific in nature. They were noncompetitive, informal, rule-less, emphasizing physical activity rather than competition. Women's opportunities for organized, competitive physical activity were limited in America before Federal Legislation, commonly referred to as Title IX, became law. This legislation required American society (specifically, institutions receiving money from the federal government, which includes almost all institutions of higher education) to recognize a woman's right to participate in sports on a plane equal to that of men. As noted below, Czech American women became competitive, as soon as the occasions presented themselves, many of them becoming outstanding in just about every sports category.

Athletics

Olga Fikotová Connolly (b. 1932), from Prague, Czechoslovakia, took the Czech discus title in 1955 and 1956 and then went on to win the Olympic gold medal with a new record of 176'1". At the games, she met Hal Connolly, the US hammer thrower champion, whom she subsequently married. As an American citizen, she represented the US at the next four Olympiads. She won five Amateur Athletic Union titles between 1957 and 1968 and in Olympic competition she finished seventh in 1960, twelfth in 1964, and then sixth in 1968. In May, 1972 she beat Earlene Brown's twelve-year-old record in the discus with a throw of 179' 2", and later that month she improved the record to 185' 3". At the 1972 Olympics she was selected to carry the US flag at the opening ceremonies.⁸⁴

Gymnastics

Mildred Prchal (née Milada Prochuska, 1895-1983), was an early pioneer in the field of women's gymnastics. She was born in Chicago's Pilsen neighborhood, and entered the local Czech gymnastics and cultural group Sokol at the age of five. By the age of ten she was pursuing training also in ballet, tap dancing, and acrobatics. It was while pursuing advanced Sokol training at Chicago's Havlicek-Tyrs unit that she met her future husband, Charles Prchal. They were married in 1916. In 1918, Mildred became the first woman instructor at Havlicek-Tyrs, breaking established gender barriers of the time. She introduced

⁸³ *The Canadian Encyclopedia*.

⁸⁴ Brian Pinelli, "The Golden Girl. Olga Fikotová—Olympic gold medalist returns to Prague after half a century," *The Prague Post*, December 20, 2006.

the concept of rhythmic gymnastics into women's training. After studying this new technique in Prague and Paris in the 1920s, she went on to become the chairperson of the United States Gymnastic Federation's Rhythmic Committee as well as a recognized authority on Women's Gymnastics in Europe and America. She also served as the American Sokol National Director for Women from 1953 to 1965, and on the US Olympic Committee. She was inducted into the National Hall of Fame for Gymnastics in 1975.⁸⁵

Laddie Bakanic (nee Hniz) (b. 1924), born in New York City of Czech ancestry, began her gymnastic training in the New York Sokol at the age of five and soon mastered intricate routines, winning most of the Sokol gymnastic meets. At the age of thirteen she won first place in the Sokol Junior Girls' Championship and in 1946 she won the Sokol Senior Women's championship. She also successfully competed in amateur AAU gymnastic meets, winning first place in the junior championship in 1941 and second in the Senior Championship in 1944. She was a member of the US gymnastic team that won the bronze medal in the 1948 Olympics.⁸⁶

Kim Zmeskal (b. 1976) of Houston, Texas, was the first US gymnast to win the all-around title in the world championship. She emerged as one of the country's top women gymnasts in 1989, when she won the all-around balance beam and floor exercise in the American classic. She also scored her first perfect 10.00 in the floor exercise, while winning the all-around title in the Arthur Gardner Memorial meet in Switzerland. In 1990, Zmeskal won the first of three consecutive US all-around championships, and had two perfect scores in the vault and floor exercise, in winning the all-around championship and the US Challenge meet. She was the 1991 world all-around champion in gymnastics, and during the 1992 world championship she was the only athlete to win two gold medals.⁸⁷

Norma Zabka (b. 1928) is a native of New York City of Czech ancestry. She was inducted into the US Gymnastics Hall of Fame in 1966 for her pioneer works in the development and progress of Rhythmic Gymnastics in the US and for her services as a national and international judge. She has been a Sokol member since age four, and currently has served as President of Sokol New York. Sokol New York is the legacy left to Yorkville by the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Czech and Slovak immigrants, their children, and grandchildren, and survives to this day thanks to their continued volunteer work maintaining the organization.. Sokol started in Prague in 1862, reaching the United States in 1865, when the first Sokol in America was established in St. Louis, with New York following in 1867.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ *Gymnastics Who's Who*, 2005; "Charles and Mildred Prchal, Co-Equals in Building Berwyn History," *Berwyn Post-Times* 24/2 (Winter 2003-04), pp. 1, 5.

⁸⁶ "Bakanic, Laddie," in: *Encyclopedia of Ethnicity and Sports in the United State*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000), pp.41-42.

⁸⁷ Michael Janofsky, "Zmeskal Driven to Overall Success," *New York Times*, September 15, 1991.

⁸⁸ *Gymnastics Who's Who*, 2005.

Acrobatics

Lillian Leitzel (1892-1931), was born in Breslau, Germany (today Wrocław, Poland), a Bohemian on her mother's side. She was a circus performer for the Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Circus. She was known as the "Queen of the Circus." Renowned for her beauty, her grace, and her amazing one-arm swings, which made her resemble a human pinwheel in the air, she was the first person named to the Circus Hall of Fame. Leitzel performed on the Roman Rings and on a swivel rope in the tent top. Although most men cannot chin themselves even once with one hand, Lillian could chin herself nineteen times with her left hand twenty-seven times with her right hand. The tiny performer, only 4 feet 9 inches tall, created her own spell-binding two-part solo act that climaxed in a breathtaking feat of skill and endurance. For six minutes the elfin Leitzel performed, to stirring music, on two eight-inch Roman Rings, with a grace unparalleled in aerialist history. Near the tent top on a single rope, Lillian hung by one wrist, her hand slipped into a noose of a metal swivel. Swinging her body over her shoulders, she would complete the full circle while the awed audience tensely counted out loud. She did this one-hundred fifty times each show—two a day—and once she reached 239 such turns, her face alight with laughter, her heavy blond hair breaking away from its pins to ripple about her like bright pennant. On Friday, February, 13, 1931, in Copenhagen, Denmark, Lillian fell to the arena floor when her rope swivel crystallized and snapped. Her death was one of history's greatest losses to the entire circus world. Lillian Leitzel was the only inductee elected into the first class of the Circus Hall of Fame in 1958.⁸⁹

Olinka Bertini (b. 1954), born in Czechoslovakia, is an accomplished circus performer and aerialist. Descended from an honorable and well-respected Czechoslovak circus family, the Valla-Bertinis, she has excelled in a variety of circus arts including trapeze, unicycling, and balancing on her head on a trapeze as it spins and descends to the earth. She holds a record in the Guinness Book of Records for a unique walk she did upside down suspended only by her toes.⁹⁰

Eleanore Pelikán (ca 1872-1954), was a circus trapeze performer born in Bohemia. She invented the so-called gigantic half flange, using a leather handgrip and shoulder pivot for body spinning. She was the mother of the Ringling aerialist, Lillian Leitzel. She retired at the age of fifty-four and then resided in Czechoslovakia until returning to the US after World War II. She spent forty years touring with circuses in the US, and such foreign countries as Poland, Ireland, England and Germany.

Alida Wallenda-Cortes, of Czech ancestry, is the great granddaughter of the famous Karl Wallenda, and the daughter of Olinka Bertini. She thus represents the seventh generation of one of the most well-known circus families of all time, The Flying Wallendas. She also claims descent from the Czech Republic's

⁸⁹ Lillian Leitzel's biography, Ringling Bros. website; "Alfredo Codona and Lillian Leitzel," *Hollywood Remains To Be Seen: Inglewood Park Cemetery*, CemeteryGuide.com

⁹⁰ Sandra Sparks, "Balancing Act: the Wallendas," *Antique Trader*, February 25, 2008.

unicycling champions, the Bertinis, and one of Italy's best known bareback riders, Alberto Zoppé. Alida began performing in the circus ring at the age of three, clowning around with her father, Tino Wallenda-Zoppé. When she was eight, she was allowed to try out the high wire, and by ten was made a regular member of the act with her father and mother. When she was thirteen, she added Spanish web to her repertoire, and at the age of 18, decided to put together her own act on the cloudswing. She has also performed on the double trapeze, on horseback, and in the family's unicycle act. In 1999, Alida also started performing on the cradle and flying trapeze, when she married Robinson Cortes. She has performed many memorable acts in the US, Canada, Mexico, Germany, and France, including helping to re-create The Flying Wallendas seven-person pyramid in 1998. She was also part of the family team that set a *Guinness Book of World Records* mark with an eight-person pyramid in 2001.⁹¹

Tennis

Martina Navrátilová (b. 1956), a native of Prague, Czechoslovakia, was at the age of 16 the highest ranking female tennis player in her homeland, a distinction she retained until 1975, when she defected to the West. After several years of adjustment, she won her first major American tournament, the Virginia Slims championship in Oakland, in 1978, and then went on to win the British Open title at Wimbledon with back-to-back victories in 1978 and 1979. She then partnered with Chris Evert and Billy Jean King, winning the Wimbledon doubles title in 1978 and 1979, and added the 1979 Avon and Colgate Series championships to her victories. In 1979 she was considered the foremost female tennis player in the world. She continued her winning streak in the British Open at Wimbledon, taking nine titles between 1978 and 1990. In 1982 and 1984 she added the French Open and won the US Open on four different occasions between 1981 and 1987. She also won the Australian open in 1981 and 1983 and the Canadian National championship in 1983 and 1984. She was named Female Athlete of the Year in 1983 by the Associated Press. That year, she played in seventeen tournaments, winning sixteen of them. She tallied eight-six victories, losing only once against Kathleen Horvath. Many tennis experts consider her the finest women's tennis player of the twentieth century.⁹²

Figure Skating

Maria Jelínek (b. 1942), born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, is a Canadian pair skater. She competed with her brother Otto Jelínek. They were the 1962 World

⁹¹ "Alida Wallenda-Cortes," The Flying Cortes Website.

⁹² Adrienne Blue, *The Lives and Times with Martina Navratilova*, (New York: Carol Publishing Corp., 1995); Richard FitzPatrick, "Navratilova, Martina," in: *Encyclopedia of Ethnicity and Sports in the United States*, (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2000), pp. 335-336; Johnette Howard, *The Rivals: Christ Evert vs. Martina Navratilova. Their Epic Duels and Extraordinary Friendship*, (New York: Crown Archtype, 2005).

Champions, the 1961 North American national champions, and 1961-1962 Canadian national champions. They represented Canada at the 1960 Winter Olympics, where they placed fourth. The pair was the first to perform lifts with several rotations, and also performed side-by-side double jumps. The Jelínek family fled to Canada from Czechoslovakia in 1948, at the beginning of the Cold War. While competing, the pair was warned not to return to Czechoslovakia for events, but chose to do so despite political and personal concerns. They won their World title in their original home city of Prague. The Jelíneks retired from competition in 1962, and later toured professionally with “Ice Capades.” The Jelíneks were inducted into Canada’s Sports Hall of Fame in 1962 and into the Skate Canada Hall of Fame in 1994.⁹³

Nicole Bobek (b. 1977), of Chicago, is the daughter of Czech refugee Jana Bobková. She relocated with her mother, first to the West Coast, then to Colorado Springs, then to Cape Cod, and eventually to Detroit. She won her first figure-skating titles in 1991—a gold medal at the Olympic Festival and another at the 1991 Vienna Cup in Austria. Under the guidance of Coach Callaghan in 1995, she won the US Women’s Figure Skating championship, by beating the favored Michelle Kwan. She then went on to win a bronze medal at the world championship. During her appearance with “The Nutcracker on Ice,” she aggravated an ankle injury which curtailed her practice time and severely affected her future performances, including her disappointing showing at the 1998 Winter Olympics.⁹⁴

Swimming

Linda Louise Jezek (b. 1960), of probable Czech ancestry, is an American swimmer born in Palo Alto, California. After winning the AAU 100 meter backstroke in 1975 and 1976, she won the same event in the 1976 Final Trials. Jezek was a member of the second-place U.S. team in the 4 x 100-meter medley relay at the 1976 Summer Olympics in Montréal, Quebec. She set the 200-meter backstroke world record (long course) in 1978. Jezek was inducted into the “George F. Haines International Swim Center Hall of Fame” in 2002.⁹⁵

Marksmanship

Kateřina Emmons (née Kůřková) (b. 1983), born in Pilsen, Czechoslovakia, is a female Czech sport shooter who competed in the 2004 Summer Olympics, where she won a bronze medal, and the 2008 Summer Olympics, where she won her first gold medal in the women’s ten meter air rifle competition, and the very first gold medal of that particular games. On her way to winning the gold medal, Emmons

⁹³ “Maria Jelínek,” Canada’s Sports Hall of Fame.

⁹⁴ Mike Pritchard, “Nicole Bobek Takes Back the Ice At ‘Caesars II Tribute,’” *Atlantic City Weekly*, December 7, 2011; Philip Hersh, “Bobek not skating on thin ice anymore,” *Chicago Tribune*, January 21, 2012.

⁹⁵ “Linda Jezek,” SR/Olympic Sports: Athletes.

tied the qualifying round world record and set a new Olympic record by achieving a maximum score of 400. She then proceeded to set a new Olympic record in the final by totaling 503.5. Emmons is married to the American Olympic rifle shooter Matthew Emmons. They both live and train at the Colorado Springs Olympic Training Center.⁹⁶

F. Media

As journalism became a profession, American women were restricted by custom and law from access to journalistic occupations, and faced significant discrimination within the profession. This began to change with the onset of World War I. The career of Martha Gellhorn is an outstanding example of this development.

Martha Gellhorn (1908-1998), of Bohemian ancestry, was an American novelist, travel writer and journalist born in St. Louis, Missouri. She is considered to be one of the greatest war correspondents of the twentieth century. Martha Gellhorn first started working as a foreign correspondent for the United Press Bureau in Paris, and later, in 1937, she reported on the Spanish Civil war. It was there that she began a relationship with her future husband, Ernest Hemingway. Before the Second World War, Gellhorn covered the growing popularity of Adolf Hitler, and later provided reports on the war from Finland, Hong Kong, Burma, and Britain. She went as far as to go undercover as a stretcher-bearer to witness the D-Day landings. After the war Gellhorn provided dispatches from other conflicts, including the Vietnam War, the Arab-Israeli Six-Day War and the wars in Central America. She published numerous books including *The Face of War* (1959), a collection of her war reports, and *Travels with Myself and Another* (1978), recounting her relationship with Hemingway.⁹⁷

Anna C. Hridel (1913-1996), of Czech ancestry, was a radio music journalist and manager born in Cleveland, Ohio. She had a long career broadcasting ethnic music on Cleveland Radio. She began her Cleveland radio career in 1933, and over the years she sang on WGAR-FM, performed with the Louis Rich radio orchestra and recorded songs in both English and the Czech language for RCA Victor records. She had a daily radio program on WDOK-FM, and was later production manager for WHK-AM. Hridel also helped to establish ethnic programming for WEWS Channel 5.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ The Official Website of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games, August 8-24 2008.

⁹⁷ Angelia Hardy Dorman, *Martha Gellhorn: Myth, Motif and Remembrance*, (Seattle: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2012); Kate McLoughlin, *Martha Gellhorn: The War Writer in the Field and in the Text*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007); Peter Moreirar, *Hemingway on the China Front: His WWII Spy Mission With Martha Gellhorn*, (Dulles, Virginia: Potomac Books, 2007); Carl Rollyson, *Nothing Ever Happens to the Brave: The Story of Martha Gellhorn*, (New York: St Martin's, 1990); Carl E. Rollyson, *Beautiful Exile: The Life of Martha Gellhorn*, (London: Aurum Press, 2007).

⁹⁸ "Hridel, Anna C.," *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*.

Hana Gartner (b. 1948) is a Canadian television journalist born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, who has hosted a variety of programs for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. She began her career as a radio host at Montreal's CJAD in 1970, and joined the CBC in 1974. In 1976, she was host of CBC Radio's "This Country in the Morning," replacing Judy LaMarsh. The following year, she moved to television, as a co-host of both the CBC's local newscast in Toronto and the network's afternoon public affairs program "Take 30." In 1982 Gartner became co-host of the CBC's prime time newsmagazine, *The Fifth Estate*. In 1994, she was given an interview series, "Contact with Hana Gartner," to showcase a different side of her journalistic skills than the investigative reporting of *The Fifth Estate*. In 1995, she was named co-host of "Prime Time News" after Pamella Wallin's departure from that newscast. In 2000, Gartner returned to *The Fifth Estate*. Gartner won the Gordon Sinclair Award for excellence in broadcast journalism in 1985. She has also won three Gemini Awards.⁹⁹

Mika Emilie Leonia Brzezinski (b. 1967), of Czech ancestry on her mother's side, is a TV journalist at MSNBC, born in New York City. Brzezinski is co-host of MSNBC's weekday morning program, "Morning Joe." In addition to providing regular commentary, she also reads the news headlines for the program. Brzezinski also anchors the 9:00 a.m. hour of "MSNBC Live." Additionally she reports for "NBC Nightly News," and serves as alternating news anchor on "Weekend Today." Previously, she was a CBS News anchor and correspondent. Her memoir *All Things At Once* became a *New York Times* best seller in January 2010, and her second book, *Knowing Your Value*, which examines the role of women in the workplace, reached #1 on the *New York Times* best sellers list for business books in spring 2011. She also writes "Getting What You Want" for *Cosmopolitan*, a monthly column about career confidence and empowerment.¹⁰⁰

Monica Novotny (b. 1972), of Czech ancestry, is a former news anchor for MSNBC. She joined MSNBC after four years working at the Channel One network as a reporter and anchor, where her work was seen daily by some eight million teenagers and their teachers. Novotny joined MSNBC as an Internet reporter for "HomePage." She has covered major stories both in the US and internationally, including the 1999 earthquake in Turkey, the conflict in Kosovo, the funeral of King Hussein of Jordan, and the explosion of a deadly volcano on the island of Montserrat. In the US, she reported on President Clinton's impeachment, the risks of a chemical weapons incinerator in Utah, Election Night 1996 in Little Rock, and the Clinton-Dole debate. Novotny won a Gracie Award in 2000 for a series of reports chronicling the Women's Suffrage movement through six generations of Elizabeth Cady Stanton's family. She won a Golden Apple in 1998 for "The Long Road to Freedom" and a Telly Award in 1996 for a report on "Life on Mars." In 2003 she became a correspondent for MSNBC's "Countdown with Keith

⁹⁹ "CBC's Hana Gartner retires after 35 years with 'The Fifth Estate' and CBC News," *Winnipeg Free Press*, May 11, 2011.

¹⁰⁰ "Morning Mika," Mika Brzezinski's Personal Website.

Olbermann.” More recently, she also served as a substitute host for “The Most with Alison Stewart,” “First Look,” and “Early Today.”¹⁰¹

Eva Jinek (b. 1978), born in Tulsa, Oklahoma of Czech parents, is a journalist and television presenter living in Holland. She grew up in Washington, DC, but when she was eleven she moved with her parents to the Netherlands. After studying American history at the University of Leiden in 2004, she became foreign editor of the Dutch public network news “NOS Journaal,” where she covered the United States. Since the end of 2007 she has anchored the news show “NOS Journaal 3.” Since the autumn of 2008, Jinek has presented the morning and afternoon news bulletins of the NOS. She is well-known as a co-host of the show “Amerika Kiest” (America Votes) of the NOS on the US presidential elections, seen from the Netherlands on November 4 and November 5, 2008. Together with Philip Freriks she reported directly from the Occidental Restaurant near the White House. On January 20, 2009, she was the host of the live broadcast on Nederland 1 of the inauguration of Barack Obama as forty-fourth President of the United States. She debuted as a radio show host on June 4, 2010, for the program “Met het Oog op Morgen” (A Glance at Tomorrow). She now hosts the show every Monday night.¹⁰²

Conclusion

Comparatively speaking in the various fields we have surveyed here, Czech American women did best generally speaking in the arts, as writers and as dramatic artists such as opera singers. In these fields both in quality and quantity their work equaled, where it did not exceed, that of the men. They have also excelled in just about every type of sport. Most recently they have also begun to be recognized as outstanding TV reporters and anchors.

¹⁰¹ Weddings/ Celebrations: Monica Novotny, Michael Foley, *New York Times*, May 16, 2004; “Monica Novotny returns to MSNBC...,” *Inside Cable News*, April 23, 2007.

¹⁰² Stephen Vanfleteren, “Interview with Eva Jinek,” *de Volkskrant*, December 24, 2010.

ESSAYS

The Sense of Mystery and the Learning Process in the plays of the Jára Cimrman Theatre

Tracy A. Burns

In the Jára Cimrman Theatre (Divadlo Jára Cimrmana) the fictional protagonist of Jára Cimrman is an empty character that is only partially filled by fragments from his life and work, as revealed by the actors during the seminars in the plays. The fragmentation of knowledge about Cimrman, the incompleteness and the sense of mystery that envelopes the character are vital for the plays to succeed, for the actors and audience to engage in the “game” that revolves around a nonexistent character.

Cimrman is a sort of optical illusion; it is as if the container adjusts to the liquid that is poured into it instead of the liquid taking the shape of the container. There are also many cases in which Cimrman’s identity is defined by what he is not rather than what he is, in a kind of argument by denial. Throughout the plays, the actors’ journey of discovering who Cimrman was proves just as important as the discoveries themselves.

The fifteen plays, written by Zdeněk Svěrák and Ladislav Smoljak, are divided into two parts. The first hour focuses on a seminar in which the actors, as themselves, discuss various aspects of Cimrman’s life and works. During the second hour spectators see the play itself. In each play we find out something new about Cimrman’s identity.

A Czech nationalist who lived under the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Cimrman was fervently anti-Habsburg and anti-German. We learn that that he was an inventor who came too late to the patent office and did not get credit for his creations, such as the telephone. In *Vinárna U Pavouka* (*The ‘Spider’ Wine Tavern*), a book of 1960s radio plays in which the Cimrman character first appears, we learn that Cimrman created synchronized swimming.¹ In the play *Akt* (*Nude*), written by Svěrák, we find out that Cimrman invented an electric washboard that used a vibrator.² To be sure, Cimrman also was a prolific writer. He penned plays, operas, fairy tales, novels and poetry, for example. An avid traveler, he visited six continents, even trekking to the North Pole, where he discovered a snowperson who was both man and woman and could reproduce by him- or herself.

Cimrman also influenced the founding of Australia on January 1, 1900, worked in construction for Zakoupil and Zbořil and served as a salesman for silverware, trying to convince the Japanese to use knives and forks. He was also a dramaturg for a Polish circus, a travelling dentist, a philosopher, a teacher, a filmmaker, a psychologist, a gynecologist, a physicist and a chemist. Cimrman

¹ Zdeněk Svěrák and Jiří Šebánek, *Vinárna U Pavouka* (Prague: Radioservis, 1998), 28.

² Ladislav Smoljak, and Zdeněk Svěrák, *Divadlo Jára Cimrmana Hry a Semináře* (Prague: Paseka, 2010), 32.

was imprisoned for two months because he told an anecdote about the emperor and then became an educational supervisor at the jail, where he set up a choir and orchestra with inmates. He also painted frescoes at the prison in Brno's Špilberk Castle, though he was not incarcerated there.

The lack of knowledge concerning Cimrman's appearance is one of the mysteries necessary to make the plays work. No photos of him remain, except for some in which he is shown from a long distance, and most of those are in groups, so it is impossible to make out his features. The one good photo was destroyed. The bust that Dr. Evžen Hedvábný found in his attic in the village of Liptákov is severely damaged as well. "All one could make out were two eye sockets, two ear holes and two chins," Svěrák explained in the seminar section of *Akt*.³

Even Cimrman's birthdate is a mystery. All we know is that he was born on a freezing February night in 1856, 1864, 1868 or 1882. We do not know when he died, either, though we find out that he spent most of World War I in Prague's Louvre Café, where he wrote most of his play *České Nebe (Czech Heaven)*. It is possible that he never died, as in the film *Jára Cimrman, Sleeping, Lying down*, the protagonist appears as an elderly woman giving tours about himself in Liptákov, situated in the Jizera valley.

Cimrman's statement about his religious beliefs also leaves readers and spectators in a quandary. "I am such a die-hard atheist that I'm afraid God will punish me."⁴ Thus, the religious aspect of Cimrman's life is defined by ambiguity and remains a mystery. Cimrman's philosophy is a case of argument by denial. He claims that he does not exist (which he really doesn't, since he is fictional). "The ambient world exists; it's just me that doesn't."⁵ In the seminar part of *Akt*, the late actor and director Ladislav Smoljak continued to explain how Cimrman is "missing," according to his own philosophical belief. He said: "Jára Cimrman compared the ambient world to a kind of surface in the middle of which is the spot where Jára Cimrman is missing."⁶

Thus, Cimrman does not define himself as influencing the world but as being absent. He sees himself as an outsider. To be sure, in his lifetime all his efforts and accomplishments went unrecognized. In this sense, he was "missing" or absent from world events. In his plays his characters do influence history, though. The historical relates to the fictional, especially in *Czech Heaven*, in which Jan Amos Komenský, Jan Hus, Saint Wenceslas, Karel Havlíček Borovský and Božena Němcová's fictional character the Grandmother decide which Czechs can come to Heaven and what will happen to the country after World War I ends.

Cimrman's identity as a child was also defined by what he was not. His parents dressed him as a girl until he was fifteen because they wanted him to wear his older sister's clothes. While Cimrman became a fervent Czech nationalist, in his youth he had two national identities forced upon him. His Austrian mother sent

³ Ibid, 23.

⁴ Ibid, 301.

⁵ Ibid, 32.

⁶ Ibid.

him to a German school while his Czech father sent him to a Czech school. He attended both simultaneously.

Cimrman's character is partially filled as the actors go through a learning process, discovering more and more about the protagonist with each new play. For example, in *Hospoda Na mýtince (The Glade Tavern)*, we discover that Cimrman entered a contest for best operetta with his seven-hour work, the 96-scene *Proso*, but because he did not send it registered mail, composers stole his ideas. The acting ensemble only found six two- to five-second snatches of the opera, yet they recreated it in its entirety. Also, all of Cimrman's films except for one were destroyed in a fire. His posthumous papers, kept in a trunk in Dr. Hedvábný's cottage, were blown to shreds when the trunk exploded, yet the group was able to put together bits and pieces of Cimrman's texts. Josef Padevět, Cimrman's neighbor, borrowed the manuscript of the play *Němý Bobeš aneb Český Tarzan (Bobeš the Mute, the Tarzan of Bohemia)* to dry his mushrooms, but, luckily, five percent of the play was readable. From these fragments, the actors were able to construct the comedy.

Furthermore, it is the journey of discovery of Cimrman's life and works that is just as significant as the findings themselves. We see this most clearly in *Posel z Liptákov (The Messenger from Liptákov)*, where two groups of actors set off to Liptákov to look for Cimrman's posthumous papers. They find his novel *Školník (The Janitor)*, the third act of *Proso* and his poetry collection, *Divoké větry (Wild Wind)*.

The details not directly relating to Cimrman about the trip to Liptákov contribute greatly to the absurdity of the play. Actor Bořivoj Penc describes his group's journey to Liptákov:

Our first stop was in Brandýs nad Labem, where, under the guidance of Docent Weigel, who had passed this way as a boy before the war, we set off on a tour of the town.... As we were driving through Stará Boleslav, my passenger Brukner, at the very spot where, on the threshold of a small Romanesque church, Prince Wenceslas was murdered by his brother Boleslav—in 929 or 935—the year is uncertain, developed a thirst.⁷

Thus, not only does not the description concern details from real life, such as the towns of Brandýs nad Labem and Stará Boleslav, but the text combines the historical fact of Prince Wenceslas' murder with the common feeling of being thirsty. The banality of being thirsty takes on an entirely new resonance when stated in this instance.

While U Sirotků (The Sirotek Restaurant) was open, the actors peel away 35 layers of paintwork from the walls in order to reveal the various rhymes Cimrman had painted there. This is one instance where we see how the journey for discovery is just as significant as the result of the discovery. This journey takes on a kind of grotesque black humor that is also recognizable in Bohumil Hrabal's and Jaroslav Hašek's tales. In the seminar of the first act, Docent Jaroslav Weigel

⁷ Ibid, 252.

recalls:

At the corner table the tractor driver Karel Teplý was breakfasting on goulash soup, and directly above him Doctor Svěrák was peeling away the highly toxic aniline paintwork off the wall. The tractor driver turned his eyes to the ceiling and Doctor Svěrák, initially flattered by his interest, didn't immediately spot that his eyes were glazed, his body rigid.⁸

In this excerpt we have person with a common name —Karel Teplý—who does a common job—driving a tractor—and who is at that moment doing a common action—eating goulash soup. Drawing on these real-life details, the authors Svěrák and Smoljak are able to create something grotesque and absurd.

While Cimrman's identity is often defined by what it is not, his plays are at times defined in the same way. Fictitious Austrian Dr. Fiedler staged the world premiere of *Němý Bobeš aneb Český Tarzan* in a German production, but he did not understand the play at all. Fiedler interpreted the sentence, "Mikovec vrací se z pole" totally wrong. Instead of having Mikovec return from battle, which "pole" means in this context, Fiedler's interpretation showed Mikovec going home after ploughing a field, as "pole" can mean field as well.⁹ As Penc explains, when Bobeš got a new bike manufactured by the Premiér Company, Fiedler thought he had become Prime Minister and had the plot revolve around politics.¹⁰

It is no wonder that Jára Cimrman was chosen to be the Greatest Czech during a survey in 2005. (However, he was disqualified because he is a fictional character.) One of the elements that make the plays successful involves the character starting out as empty and then being partially filled but never filled completely. A sense of mystery is also vital to the plays. The journey of discovery, characterized by absurdity and the grotesque, becomes a learning process for the actors, and it is a learning process that the audience shares.

⁸ Ibid, 259.

⁹ Ibid, 166.

¹⁰ Ibid, 175.

BOOK REVIEWS

Thomas Ort, *Art and Life in Modernist Prague: Karel Čapek and His Generation, 1911-1938*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2013. ISBN 9780230113626,

Karel Čapek was one of Czechoslovakia's best-known and best-loved writers, and his work remains important in today's Czech Republic; anyone with an interest in the Czechs needs to know about Čapek and his elder brother, the writer and painter Josef Čapek. During his lifetime, Karel Čapek was popular not only at home but abroad, writing novels that were rapidly translated into the world's major languages, and writing plays that were quickly produced in London, Berlin, and on Broadway. He was twice nominated for the Nobel Prize in Literature, but one of the reasons he did not receive the prize was that the Nobel Committee was afraid of offending Germany by choosing an overtly anti-fascist writer. Yet while Čapek was world-famous in the 1920s and 1930s, he is no longer very well known in the Anglophone world. The interested reader can find translations of his work—for example, Catbird Press offers no fewer than seven volumes—but he is no longer a household name. This is a pity, for Čapek is an interesting and readable author.

Historian Thomas Ort's book, *Life and Art in Modernist Czechoslovakia: Karel Čapek and His Generation, 1911-1938*, should help spark new interest in Čapek's work and ideas. Less a biography than a work of intellectual history—or perhaps best described as a combination of the two genres—this is a fine and much-needed study of Karel Čapek's philosophy in relation to what became known in the 1920s as the Čapek generation. The author divides his text in three main parts (although they are organized into five chapters plus an introduction and conclusion): first, the prewar years and Čapek's engagement with Cubism and Bergsonian philosophy; second, the changes in Čapek's attitudes as a result of war (he was too unhealthy for military service, yet the war affected his thinking deeply); and third, Čapek as the interwar voice of pragmatism, centrism, liberal democracy, and indeed of his generation.

In his introduction, Ort notes that the usual impression given of early twentieth-century Central Europe is one of relative gloom. We picture sexually repressed and deeply neurotic members of the Viennese bourgeoisie recounting their painful memories and fantasies to Sigmund Freud; we imagine hapless citizens trapped in Kafkaesque bureaucracies and prisons; we envision intellectuals and cultural figures withdrawing from public life into the self; in short, we think of a decadent-influenced view of a crumbling, inefficient empire that would soon be replaced by numerous unsuccessful or protofascist states. But as Ort points out, this is hardly the whole story. The story he tells is a different one.

This generation was often called the Čapek generation, and Ort centers his book on the figure of Karel Čapek not merely because Čapek is the best-known member or because Czechs named the generation after him, but because Čapek so

perfectly embodied its main features and its ideals. Ort quotes Čapek himself who admitted this:

I can't help it that people got into the habit of talking about a Čapek generation. I didn't come up with the idea, and I absolve myself of all responsibility for it. But if I understand the opinions of those who are clearly much more familiar with this generational problem than I, then the arrest warrant for the Čapek generation would probably read something like this: *Height*: average. *Nose*: between the eyes, though sometimes they deny it. *Distinguishing marks*: relativism, pragmatism, humanism, liberalism. It indulges in the vice of supporting the state and of compromise. It's the official generation and so is necessarily behind the times. It encourages a pedestrian kind of realism and lives by pandering to the government. And so on. In a word, a terribly unpleasant generation (vi).

This notion of generations was much discussed in Czechoslovakia in the 1920s, when enthusiasm about the newly constituted state was high and cultural figures were eager to define themselves and others both nationally and internationally. Čapek, as Ort shows, belonged to a very specific chronological, geographic and cultural group that had many ties both to the two Czech generations that bracketed it, and to modernists born in the same period elsewhere in Europe, who were termed by historian H. Stuart Hughes a "generation of 1905." High stakes were involved in these generational political and artistic stances, and much of this generational identity related to each group's relationship to the Czech nation. Katherine David-Fox in her 2000 *Slavic Review* article has suggested that by the 1890s, Czech avant-gardists already saw Prague as a node in a larger European network rather than emphasizing its position as the Czech center, an attitude that was in part a reaction to the more parochial aspects of the nineteenth-century National Awakening.

While all three of the modernist generations wished to be seen as European rather than only as Czech, in other ways their differences were notable, with the "1890s" generation being a symbolist and decadent group and the "Devětsil" generation (named for the avant-garde Devětsil group) reaching out in all manner of new artistic directions both through international connections and through home-grown experiment. Notably, as Ort stresses, these generations that bracketed Čapek's sought collective truths, whereas Čapek and his friends were skeptical of absolutes and universals and instead emphasized "the limitations of rational knowledge and the necessity to respect the multiplicity and relativity of all life values" (3). Ort notes that Čapek and his generation came of age rebelling against nineteenth-century positivism. He argues that they critiqued reason by insisting that all knowledge was subjective, as well as provisional, and that it was impossible to disentangle it from individual beliefs, desires and values; they rejected irrationalism and dogma in favor of allying reason with intuition. Consequently, rather than embracing fascism or communism, as did many in other Central European states, Čapek and his cohort actively reinforced the liberal

state—Czechoslovakia's First Republic under Masaryk and Beneš—as is clearly visible in Čapek's *Talks with T. G. Masaryk*.

One thing that Ort could perhaps have explored more fully in this respect is what this meant for First Republic Czechoslovakia more generally, in terms of the alliance between a philosopher-president and a writer of philosophical essays, fiction, and plays. At the same time, neither politics per se, nor popular reception of philosophical approaches, are really the author's focus in this book.

Karel Čapek's friends and antagonists within the Czech avant-garde are for the most part even less known to English-speakers than is Čapek himself, although that is gradually changing as more scholars write about Czech modernism generally. In this regard, the book does an excellent job of placing Čapek within at least parts of his artistic context, particularly in relation to the Czech Cubists and to some of the members of the Devětsil group. After its beginnings in Paris in the studios of Picasso and Braque, Cubism's most significant subsequent home was Prague. Twenty or thirty years ago, few people outside Prague were aware of this fact; it is now more commonly known, although it is still unusual for art history courses to mention Czech Cubism when covering French Cubism.

Ort asks some pertinent questions here, in particular why this movement took root in Prague among the Czechs rather than in Vienna or Budapest. Here, he stresses social, national, and intellectual differences between the three cities and points out that while generational consciousness often arises in relation to disruptive political events, prior to 1914 the Čapek generation had already developed a strong sense of its own identity despite the absence of traumatic, generation-defining, upheavals. While in part this development of generational consciousness related to advances in science and technology, Ort particularly links the Čapek generation to Cubism's revolution in form and perception; Picasso and Braque and their followers abandoned Renaissance perspective and illusionism and forged a new combination of conceptual and perceptual ways of working with visual representation. This Cubist revolution, then, is what Ort proposes catalyzed the Czechs' generational sensibility. Ort then introduces the Cubists of the Skupina výtvarných umělců (Group of Visual Artists), who included painter and writer Josef Čapek, Karel's brother, and provides a clear overview of many of their concerns and disagreements. True, the group's relationship to Expressionism is not fully explored—possibly because of Karel Čapek's own disdain for Expressionism, which was not felt by all Czech Cubists (Bohumil Kubišta had ties to the German Expressionist group Die Brücke and in general Czech Cubist painting has a strong visual relationship to Expressionism)—but apart from that lacuna the reader gains a solid overview of the art-historical aspect.

Ort further makes the important point that while nineteenth-century Czechs had sought to build nation through art, and while the 1890s generation still sought a national art but rejected self-conscious striving for Czechness in favor of being Czech by being true to oneself, Čapek and his generation benefitted from a new mobility and confidence that stemmed in part from Austria's industrial expansion in Bohemia and Moravia. Čapek and friends retained the preference for French

cultural connections over German ones that had marked many of their predecessors, but they were not anti-German, Čapek indeed pointed out that the prized Czech folk culture was not actually very old and that the patriotic art of the nineteenth century had earlier been denounced as too German, too English, or too Italian. Čapek asserted that Czech art had always assimilated foreign influences and that the real national art would be modern art. Ort's argument that national differences explain why Prague's Czechs became Cubist is subtler and more nuanced than I convey here, but as an art historian, I would like to see someone further develop his analysis of why Cubism became important in Prague (despite much mockery in the press) and why it was less significant in Budapest (where artists also experimented with it).

In the postwar part of the book, Ort deftly delineates Čapek's (and his cohort's) turbulent relationship with the younger Devětsil group, which is something of a feat given the complexity of Devětsil's development. Finally, several of Čapek's writings are analyzed for their philosophical underpinnings, in particular their exploration of epistemological questions Čapek considered significant to contemporary European life. Due to the interdisciplinary nature and philosophical focus of this book, it may not be as widely read as it deserves, but it is clearly written and intelligent, and should be sought out by everyone interested in Czech and early twentieth-century European culture.

Karla Huebner, Dayton, Ohio

Svěrák, Zdeněk. *Po strništi bos (Barefoot Across a Stubble Field)*. Prague: Fragment, 2013. ISBN: 978-80-253-1820-1, 92 pp.

In Zdeněk Svěrák's novella *Po strništi bos*, pre-adolescent Eda Souček struggles to comprehend the complexities of life in a war-torn country and tries to make sense of the adult world where nothing is black-and-white. Eda and his parents are forced to move from Prague to a village in east Bohemia, where the family and their relatives live in a house that borders a cemetery. All the events, both mundane and those of historic importance, take place as World War II comes to a close.

The author is also an actor, screenwriter, playwright and writer of children's books, stories and musical texts. Along with the late actor Ladislav Smoljak, Svěrák created the fictional character Jára Cimrman, a Czech underdog who had been an inventor, poet, philosopher and composer, among other trades, at the turn of the twentieth century. Svěrák has authored scripts that his son Jan has directed, including *Kolya*, which won an Oscar during 1996, *Obecná škola (Elementary School)* and *Tmavomodrý Svět (Dark Blue World)*. He also wrote and acted in the comedy *Vrchni, Prchni! (Run, Waiter, Run!)*. Other films in which Svěrák has cast his magical acting spell include *Vrátné lahve (Empties)*, *Vesničko má středisková (My Sweet Little Village)*, *Skřivánci na niti (Larks on a String)*, *Srdečný pozdrav ze zeměkoule (Hearty Greetings from Earth)* and *Na samotě u lesa (Seclusion near a Forest)*. *Po strništi bos* is his fourth book for adults.

Svěrák's extensive experience as a screenwriter and film and theater actor is clearly illustrated in the structure of this fictionalized autobiography. Each chapter is not more than a page long, sometimes consisting of only several paragraphs, filled with dramatic action and vivid imagery that seem to jump out of scenes from a film. The dialogue also could belong in a film; it is crisp and sparse—no words wasted. In a sense, the book is like a collage of memories that all culminate in an enthralling finale.

Viewers of Svěrák's films will recall the protagonist Eda from the movie *Elementary School* (*Obecná škola*). The film covers a later time period, from September in 1945 to the first anniversary of the liberation. Both take place in a village and both poignantly explore family relationships. Some of the family details are the same: Eda had a brother by the same name who died before Eda was born, at the age of five, from blood poisoning caused by stepping on a rusty nail. In both works Eda's mother is very worried something will happen to him because of her first son's death. Eda's father listened to foreign broadcasts during the war and works at a power plant in the movie and at the beginning of the 2013 book. The curious youngster shows an interest in girls in the two artistic creations.

Stubble fields appear in both the novella and the film. In the book Eda goes across a stubble field barefoot, very aware of how his brother died. In another scene Eda and his mother huddle together, helpless, in a stubble field during a fierce storm. In the movie, for example, Eda rides his bike across a stubble field, dragging his baby sister in a cart behind him. The cart overturns, and the baby falls out but luckily survives.

The stubble field is symbolic in that stubble is made of dead, dry plants that are sharp. In a sense, it resembles a Hindu holy man's bed of nails, in this case representing a crucified country. A stubble field is also like a country at war, where everything has been cut off. Even the stubble has to go before it is possible to prepare the soil for a new harvest. It is similar to childhood, which has to end before an adult can be born out of it.

The imagery is vivid and graphic. Take the scene in which Vlk (Wolf), the black sheep of the family, chases Eda through the cemetery. Eda states that he is not afraid of walking through the cemetery at night but describes its eeriness:

The headstones are bigger at night than during the day, that's something you have to reckon with. Those made of rough stone are dark, the ones made of glossy marble shine in the moonlight and dead farmers with mustaches and deceased old women in headscarves wink at you from sepia photographs (57).

The characters in *Po strništi bos* are impressively described and seem to come alive in the text. One of the most memorable is Vlk, Eda's uncle whom his grandfather has disowned because Vlk tried to strangle Eda's grandmother. (She refused to give Vlk money to buy a house after he married.) The family is under strict orders not to speak to Vlk. Svěrák humanizes the character instead of making him a total monster. In one scene Vlk is giving water to German refugees from Silesia who are fleeing from the Russians. Then even Eda's mother and Aunt Ludmila concede that Vlk is not evil.

Death surrounds Eda, and not only because his house borders on a cemetery. His grandmother dies during a fierce storm. He and his friends have a secret clubhouse in a mortuary where old funeral wreaths are stored. He goes through the pockets of a corpse, looking for some form of identification, only to realize that it is Vlk, killed in the uprising of May, 1945. In another scene Eda describes watching a rabbit die:

And the rabbit's eyes can see me. The small crystal of sand with which they're coated make it difficult for them to see, but they can see me: I'm bright red all over, slowly I darken into purple until I'm gray and then I am no longer, because the eyes have died (66).

It is noteworthy that Svěrák chooses to use the first person when Eda is describing the rabbit's eyes. A part of Eda's innocence dies with the rabbit.

Eda learns that the world is not so simple, that under certain circumstance even lying and stealing can be justified. With his father he steals sugar from a refinery, and he lies to his parents when they want to know why he did not pay for the cucumbers he supposedly got from Mr. Košťál. He cannot tell his parents that Vlk gave them to him for free:

Lying disgusts me, but what else can I do? If I tell them the truth, either they'll chuck the cucumbers on the compost or I'll have to return them to Vlk. That would cause such a fuss that they'd make me the black sheep of the family. Sometimes it is probably necessary to lie (64).

Eda struggles with the definition of what makes a hero. While his grandfather bans the family from going to Vlk's funeral, Eda leaves the house and watches the ceremony. The village gives Vlk a farewell befitting a hero as he died for his country during the uprising. Eda realizes he was a human being, albeit one who made a big mistake. Eda has learned the value of forgiveness.

The protagonist by no means considers himself a hero and feels burdened by the necessity to grow up so fast. When stealing sugar from a refinery with his father, he muses, "My heart starts pounding. I hear my small soul wingeing: What do you want from me, people? After all, I'm no hero. Why do you keep piling all these tasks on me?" (41).

Svěrák shows how the events of World War II and its immediate aftermath affect the village by interspersing historical events with everyday events. When Russians wearing German uniforms so they could fight against the Russians come by Eda's home, his Uncle Venouš gives them civilian clothes, and the family even forfeits their Czechoslovak flag, which was banned for six years. Refugees from Silesia also walk down the road in front of Eda's house in a poignant, descriptive scene that illustrates the helplessness of their situation.

The author is best known for his humor, and this book is no exception. Eda hits the bully Škaloud, who falls into a fountain next to the muzzle of a horse drinking from it. In another chapter Eda discovers that one of their two pigeons,

Petrík, has not flown away but rather has merely been stuck in the stove. The pigeon has turned black, and at first his “wife” Petruška doesn’t recognize him.

In a nice touch the book comes with a bookmark replicating the 10-crown banknote that was circulated during the Nazi Occupation. Eda writes that he is attracted to the girl pictured on the bill. The sentences are fairly simple as it is narrated by a child but still exhibit Svěrák’s dexterity in his use of the Czech language.

Even everyday occurrences are influenced by the war that changes Eda’s life as he comes face-to-face with betrayal, hatred and death. But there is also a sense of hope and love that remain alive throughout the book, which is full of vivid images. *Po strništi bos* makes readers laugh and cry as Eda confronts the complexities of adult life in a chaotic and senseless world.

Tracy A. Burns, Prague, Czech Republic

Václava Jandečková. *Kámen: Svědectví hlavního aktéra akce “Falešné Hranice” u Všerub na Domažlicku (Kámen: The testimony of the main participant in the events of the “false border” at Všeruby in the Domažlice region). Domažlice: Český Les Publishers, 2013. ISBN 978-80-87316-35-1, 327 pp.*

Today is an exciting time for historians of Eastern Europe. The opening of government archives, especially those of the secret police, presents them with narratives that an Eric Amber, John Le Carré or Ian Fleming might envy. One such story line is found in Václava Jandečková’s *Kámen: Svědectví hlavního aktéra akce “Falešné Hranice” u Všerub na Domažlicku*.

This book describes a dangle operation that the Czechoslovak secret police (StB) began shortly after the *coup d’état* in February 1948. The secret police established several entrapment places along the Czechoslovak-West German border. After infiltrating a genuine underground group or convincing an endangered person that a way to the West was possible and available, StB agents led the potential escapees across a false border. Then posing as US Army Counter-Intelligence Corps (CIC) officers, the secret police officers debriefed them and finally arrested them. This operation was code-named “Kámen.”

One such trap was established in the village Všeruby near the town of Kdyně in the southern Bohemian region of Domažlice. Všeruby lies across the border from the West German town of Furth im Wald. Shortly after the Communist *coup d’état*, Evžen Abrahamovič, a highly placed officer of the Ministry of Interior’s secret police branch, visited and ordered Stanislav Liška, the commander of Všeruby border station, to arrange for the entrapment of the would-be escapees.

Abrahamovič gave Liška two specific tasks. First, he was to set up the last leg of the sting. Specifically, Liška was to rent and suitably outfit an abandoned house near the border to serve as the office of the fake CIC official. He was also to have two of his most reliable men dressed as German border guards guide the hapless victims to the fake CIC house. Secondly, Liška was to co-operate with “Johny,” a

StB operative embedded in a genuine underground group. The StB was using one of its common tactics: to have an *agent provocateur* infiltrate a group and eventually to arrest its participants when the StB knew their identities and activities. Liška's assignment was to guide victims on what they believed was the last stretch of the way to the border.

Liška's superiors chose him because they were pleased with his professional performance, and his station was at the Czechoslovak-West German border. At their request, he had provided excellent reports about the activities on the German side of the border. His superiors, however, were not aware that Liška was a double agent who had been working for the Americans since 1945. Moreover, they also had no inkling that he and several guards of his station were part of a genuine underground operation smuggling people to the West, in which the author's grandfather, Ota Tulačka, and members of the American embassy in Prague were also involved. This conspiracy was so well organized on a need to know basis that, when Abrahamovič recruited him, Liška did not know how and whom to contact with a warning.

Nor could Liška warn the victims of the entrapment while he was supposedly guiding them across the border. They would certainly have betrayed him during their thorough debriefing by the StB operative disguised as a CIC officer. Liška considered escaping to the West with the victims, but he gave up this idea because he did not want to destroy his own family. (After a difficult pregnancy, his wife had recently given birth to their third child). Hoping that the victims would notice and clam up, Liška made gross spelling errors on the labels of the rooms of the false CIC offices: "Wachzimer" and "Komandant." (In correct German, both words would have had two "m's.") It was to no avail. Neither Jan Prošvic with members of his family, nor Oldřich Maláč and his wife, noticed the warning. In the end, using his German contact, Willi Seidel, Liška wrote to his friend Václav Kocian, who was already in the West, asking him to arrange that the Czech language BBC broadcast announce the existence of the false border

The American Embassy in Prague sent a sharply worded protest against the use of American uniforms, vehicles and other artifacts. This cast suspicion on Liška. First, the American Embassy's note was sent too soon after the inauguration of the Kámen operation and had details that only a participant would have known. Second, two border guards, firm Communist supporters, found a purse on a path leading to the border. It contained money and identification belonging to Marie Tumlířová, prominent non-Communist. The authorities arrested Liška, but thanks the advice of his clever wife and a smart attorney, he was released due to the lack of evidence against him. Shortly afterward, Liška, with his wife and three small children escaped to West Germany. There in a refugee camp, Liška met Jan Prošvic, the first victim of the operation in Všeruby. Prošvic, who subsequently had managed to flee Czechoslovakia, reported Liška to the American authorities. Liška also had to deal with Communist spies, who wanted to liquidate an inconvenient witness to the Kámen sting. Ultimately, Liška and his family emigrated to Canada. There Liška wrote his account of the operation on which Janděčková based her book.

Besides being a “good read,” *Kámen: Svědectví hlavního aktéra akce “Falešné Hranice” u Všerub na Domažlicku* has a number of unusual features. Books dealing with the secret police and its activities are usually based on the accounts of victims and/or the correspondence and reports found in StB and other official archives. This volume is based on the recollection of a key direct participant, Stanislav Liška.

Jandečková supplements Liška’s account with copious archival material from the StB files. The book contains many facsimile of official reports, orders, memos and photographs from official archives. The reader can see for himself how the infamous cogs of the secret police’s bureaucratic machinery operated and thought.

Besides the Liška family, others also have opened their archives to the author. They gave her personal letters and photographs, which add an appealing human dimension to the narrative.

The story, furthermore, points to the little noticed continuity of the early Communist era with World War II. The habits of conspiracy were still fresh in the late 1940s and early 1950s. The anti-Communist resistance was able to use some of the networks and practices established by the anti-Nazi underground. Moreover, the American liberation of southern Bohemia in 1945 had left in its wake contacts who served as CIC informants and operatives.

More importantly perhaps, the book also calls attention to the organized domestic resistance to Communism in the late 40s and early 50s. It is a corrective to the view that the Communist take-over of Eastern Europe was so well executed, meticulously planned and multifaceted that it met with little local push back. Not much has been written about the resistance to Communism, with the result that scholars, especially in the West, are tempted to conclude that it did not exist.

In his introduction to *Kámen: Svědectví hlavního aktéra akce “Falešné Hranice,”* Miroslav Kopt, the editor in chief of *Věrní zůstaneme*, the organ of the association of former political prisoners, reminds the reader of the extent of the resistance. The Communist regime executed 248 people and sent 267,000 to labor camps for political “crimes.” At least 300 persons perished trying to escape to the West. Countless numbers were beaten to death during interrogations. There were at least three attempts to organize military coups against the Communist regime: namely by groups around Miloslav Jebavý, Borkovec and Čančík.

The action of the Všeruby border guards who helped people to escape to the West fits into the resistance mosaic. Liška estimates that he had helped about 100 people safely cross the border. His and his fellow guards’ activities made up only a final segment in an operation in which American diplomats and Czech anti-Communists were involved.

Czech scholars are increasingly addressing themselves to what they call *třetí odboj* (third resistance). Theirs is an attempt to reclaim their nation’s fuller and more nuanced recent history. Václava Jandečková’s *Kámen: Svědectví hlavního aktéra akce “Falešné Hranice” u Všerub na Domažlicku* is a successful step in that direction.

Mary Hrabík Šámal, Troy, Michigan

Letters from Readers in the Polish American Press 1902-1969: A Corner for Everybody, Anna J. Jaroszynska-Kirchmann, ed. Theodor L. Zawistowski and Anna J. Jaroszynska-Kirchmann, trans. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2014. 583 pp. ISBN-13: 978-0739188729.

Dispersed throughout Europe and the Americas, many Poles have lived outside of their ancestral territory. This diaspora, referred to as Polonia, has remained involved in the political and cultural space of Polish *res publica*, i.e. public affairs. In fact, Polonia has played a decisive role in the survival of the Polish nation and its culture during the turbulent and difficult times. It helped the nation persevere through many uprisings, repeated political and economic emigrations, as well as three partitions by Russia, Prussia and Austria-Hungary. One of Polonia's most potent instruments in this endeavor has been the Polish language press because it provided the connection between the émigrés and the homeland.

The rich history of American Polonia has found its excellent historian in Anna J. Jaroszynska-Kirchmann. In her latest work, *Letters from Readers in the Polish American Press 1902-1969: A Corner for Everybody*, Jaroszynska-Kirchmann looks at history of Poles in America through the readers' letters in the "Readers' Corner," a rubric of *Ameryka-Echo*, one of the hundreds of Polish language periodicals published in the United States. Theodor L. Zawistowski and Anna Jaroszynska-Kirchmann's excellent translation of the letters traces the history of readers' ideas and the formation of an intellectual community. The correspondence Jaroszynska-Kirchmann presents dates from 1902 to 1969. i.e., from the time *Ameryka* merged with the *Echo* to three years before the newspaper ceased publication.

Antoni A. Paryski, the "Polish American Hearst" started publishing *Ameryka*, in 1889. He was then a 24-year-old mostly self-educated print shop worker in Toledo, Ohio. By 1920 *Ameryka-Echo* had a circulation of 120,000. Eventually the newspaper lost subscribers because there were fewer emigrants arriving from Poland, and the successfully assimilated younger generation of Polish-Americans no longer read or needed the Polish language press. When *Ameryka-Echo* ceased publication in 1971, Polonia lost one of the most important *porte-parole* of its cultural and political aspirations. Its seven decades of existence, however, constitute a witness to the Polish American immigration and assimilation.

The author groups the letters into five thematic chapters. In the first chapter, the correspondents deal with religion, the Catholic Church and spiritual life. They discuss Polishness not only from the cultural point of view, but also the spiritual one. Some letters raise existential questions that describe the tragic role Poland played in European history's dynastic and political designs. They ask why God is punishing Poland so severely. In the view of some of the correspondents, the Catholic Church in the United States introduced old European allegiances into the American milieu. Poles felt slighted and resentful that the American Catholic Church hierarchy did not sufficiently take their interests into account. For example, the bishops often appointed Irish priests to serve Polish parishes.

Nevertheless, Catholicism did not constitute an exclusive category in these letters, because some of the correspondents were Jews, Protestants and Orthodox believers whose mother tongue was Polish.

The chapter concerned with Polonia communities in the United States and the Polish Diaspora contains letters about Polish ethnic organizations both on the local and national level, as well as their role within Polonia as a whole. "The Readers' Corner" allowed Polish communities to connect with each other not only throughout the United States, but also worldwide. The correspondents provided information about political, social and cultural events and introduced leaders of fraternal, social and cultural associations. Dates of meetings, theater and choir performances, as well as agendas of reading clubs were announced. Polish businesses were also promoted.

Entitled the "Polish American Identity," the book's third chapter presents letters expressing the need of American Poles to integrate into the United States' democratic society and polity. Since democratic institutions were lacking in Poland, correspondents discussed the political processes on the North American continent and their possible transplantation to their homeland.

Although from different perspectives, the last two chapters, "The American Nation" and "Polish Homeland," address themselves to the same issue, assimilation into American society. Clashes between the old and the new political post-World War II generation of immigrants led to a need to reexamine the concept of Polonia. During the Cold War, the letter writers hotly debated ideological issues, especially socialism and communism. Many expressed their disappointment with communist ideology in the Soviet Union.

In conclusion, the book traces the development of the American Polonia and the growth of Polish culture in the United States as described by the very people who created and experienced it. *Letters from Readers in the Polish American Press 1902-1969: A Corner for Everybody* also adds understanding to the history of the United States, especially in regards to issues of ethnicity, immigration and assimilation. Moreover, the book shows the input of American Polonia into the survival of Polish culture and *res publica* during the devastating twentieth century.

Mila Šašková-Pierce, Lincoln, Nebraska

Contributors

Tracy A. Burns is a writer, proofreader and editor in Prague. She often writes about travel throughout the Czech Republic and abroad. She has published articles about travel for *The Washington Post*, *Private Prague Guide Prague Blog* and *Tracy's Travels* at taburns25.wordpress.com, to name a few. She writes in Czech and English. Her articles in Czech have appeared in *Listy*, *Lidove noviny* and *Reflex*, for example. Her works in English have been printed in *The Prague Post*, *Czech Business Weekly*, *Prague Leaders Magazine* and many others. She has also edited an art catalogue for Prague's National Gallery. She has been writing for *Kosmas* since 2002.

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*.

Kathleen Geaney has studied and teaches at the Institute for World History, Faculty of Arts, Charles University. Her works concerns relations between Britain and Czechoslovakia and other parts of Central and Eastern Europe in various contexts. During the academic year 2012-13 she was visiting scholar at the Skalny Center for Polish and Central European Studies at the University of Rochester.

Anna Hájková is currently a Humboldt Fellow in Erfurt on leave from the University of Warwick. Her dissertation focused on the everyday history of the Holocaust, using the Terezín transit ghetto as a springboard to examine larger issues of human behavior under extreme stress. Her next project, *Dreamers of a New Day: Building Socialism in Central Europe, 1930-1970*, is a long-durée study of a cohort of leftist intellectuals who built socialism in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and (East) Germany. It follows their lives from their university studies to the point of their politicization, to the war, and to their postwar quest to build a better, more just society. Whether she focuses on the transnational kaleidoscope of Terezín or the Central European Communist mid-functionaries, she connects critical analysis of long-term developments with close attention to details. By looking at everyday life against the grain, she finds many examples that both complicate and enhance our understanding.

Karla Huebner Karla Huebner is an Associate Professor in Art History, specializing in 1750-present with research interests that include Czech modernism, surrealism, and gender and sexuality. Dr. Huebner has received research grants and fellowships that include Fulbright-Hays, DDRA, and an

Andrew Mellon Predoctoral fellowship. She has presented conference papers in England, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Portugal, and the United States, at such venues as the College Art Association, the Association of Art Historians (UK), the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies, the Berkshire Women's History Conference, and the European Association for Urban History. In 2013 she was elected to the board of Historians of German and Central European Art (HGCEA); she is also active in SHERA and the Czechoslovak Studies Association.

Matej Jančošek is a postgraduate student of public administration at Leiden University and graduated as a valedictorian at the Geneva School of Diplomacy. He mostly enjoys writing about social and political history, drawing his inspiration from folklore and the depths of Carpathian forests. He was born in Bardejov, eastern Slovakia and currently lives in Bratislava.

Judith Mabary is an associate professor of musicology at the University of Missouri at Columbia. Dr. Mabary's research interests include Czech music of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, focusing particularly on the life and works of Antonín Dvořák, Zdeňek Fibich, and Bohuslav Martinů, melodrama as a genre, and Native American music and culture as it impacts the Western musical tradition. Dr. Mabary has served on several professional societies, including as president and secretary of the Czech and Slovak Music Society, as a member of the Board of Directors of the International Bohuslav Martinů Society, and on the Advisory Committee to the Kaprálová Society. She is currently working on a book on the topic of *Musical Melodrama in the Czech Lands: Its Origins and History*.

Miloslav Recheigl, Jr. is one of the founders and past President for 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).

Gerald J. Sabo, S.J. is Associate Professor of Slavic Languages and Literature at John Carrol 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, an interest reflected in his contribution to this volume of *Kosmas*.

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.

Mila Šašková-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.

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.