

THE RECEPTION  
IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND  
OF CZECH LITERATURE  
AND OF THE  
CZECH LITERARY REVIVAL

by  
JAMES DUNCAN NAUGHTON

of  
Churchill College

Dissertation submitted for the degree of Ph.D.

at the  
University of Cambridge

CAMBRIDGE 1977

Electronic version – Oxford, 2008

Ph.D. degree awarded 1978. This is an electronically scanned version of the author's original typescript, with minor typographical adjustments, including endnotes converted to footnotes. Original page numbers are indicated in the margins. The author's few later amendments have been marked in **colour**. Spelling mistakes have been silently corrected. The text is otherwise unaltered and *not* updated, improved or revised.

Associated publications by the author:

'Morfill and the Czechs', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, new series 17, 1984. Also as: 'Morfill a Češi', *Čeština doma a ve světě*, vol. 12 (Prague, 2004), nos. 3-4, 247-261.

'Czech Literature in Britain: From Bowring to Strickland', in *Großbritannien, die USA und die böhmischen Länder 1848–1938*, ed. E. Schmidt-Hartmann and S. B. Winters, *Bad Wiesseer Tagungen des Collegium Carolinum*, 16, Munich: Oldenbourg, 1991.

'Čelakovský, Bowring a Panna jezerní', in: *Růže stolistá: F. L. Čelakovský 1799–1999*, Strakonice: Muzeum středního Pootaví, 1999, pp. 101-106.

© 2008 James D. Naughton

# Contents

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Contents</b>   | <b>3</b>   |
| <b>Preface</b>  | <b>5</b>   |
| <b>1 Introduction</b>                                       | <b>7</b>   |
| <b>2 Bowring's Predecessors, 1800–1828</b>                  | <b>9</b>   |
| <b>3 Bowring's Slavonic Studies</b>                         | <b>13</b>  |
| <b>4 Bowring and Czech Literature, 1826–28</b>              | <b>17</b>  |
| <b>5 The Foreign Quarterly Review Article</b>               | <b>29</b>  |
| <b>6 Čelakovský and the Cheskian Anthology</b>              | <b>47</b>  |
| <b>7 The Aftermath of the Cheskian Anthology</b>            | <b>59</b>  |
| <b>8 Wratislav's Early Czech Studies, 1849–58</b>           | <b>67</b>  |
| <b>9 Wratislav's Protestant Studies, 1859–73</b>            | <b>81</b>  |
| <b>10 Wratislav's Medieval and Hussite Studies, 1874–92</b> | <b>93</b>  |
| <b>11 Travellers and Others, 1836–47</b>                    | <b>107</b> |
| <b>12 Morfill and the Czechs, 1870–1909</b>                 | <b>115</b> |
| <b>13 Athenaeum Surveys, 1874–1900</b>                      | <b>135</b> |
| <b>14 Translators of the Eighties and Nineties</b>          | <b>149</b> |
| <b>15 Conclusion</b>  | <b>159</b> |
| <b>Bibliography</b>   | <b>167</b> |
| Primary Literature . . . . .                                | 167        |

|                                      |            |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Chief Secondary Literature . . . . . | 175        |
| <b>Index of Personal Names</b>       | <b>181</b> |

# Preface

Work on this study began in Prague, in 1972–3, on a ten-month British Council scholarship to Prague, and continued with a three-year studentship from the Scottish Education Department. Without their liberal financial support, including a further British Council scholarship to Czechoslovakia, the research would have been quite impossible, and I am much indebted to them for all their assistance. p.iii

I should like to thank the following Czechoslovak institutions and their staff for their indispensable help and encouragement, and for graciously making available manuscript archive material for my consultation: Literární archiv Památníku národního písemnictví (the source for most of the correspondence of Bowring, Wratislaw, Morfill and others), Náprstkovo muzeum (Náprstek papers and a useful scrapbook of newspaper cuttings entitled 'Čechové mimo vlast' in several volumes), Knihovna Národního muzea (e.g. 'Bohemica' of Jan Jeník z Bratřic, inscriptions in books), Archiv Národního muzea (Rieger papers), Ústřední archiv Akademie věd (Matices česká archives). I should also like to thank the following for their additional help and prompt answers to requests for information: Státní knihovna ČSR, Státní ústřední archiv v Praze, Státní archiv v Opavě | (also, pobočka Olomouc), Státní archiv v Třeboni, Okresní archiv v Přerově (also, pracoviště v Potštátě). I am also grateful for invaluable consultations with Dr. Vladimír Štěpánek, Prof. J. V. Polišenský and the late Prof. Otakar Vočadlo, all of whom gave me much useful advice. p.iv

In Britain I have been able to draw from archive material and obtained much essential information from the following libraries and archives: The Brotherton Collection of the University of Leeds (the Gosse papers), Churchill College Archives (Dilke Papers, by kind permission of Capt. Stephen Roskill), Taylor Institution Library (the Morfill Collection of Slavonic books, examined at the suggestion of the Slavonic librarian David Howells and Prof. J. S. G. Simmons), Christ's College Library Cambridge (the Wratislaw Collection of Slavonic books), British Library Reference Division (British Museum) London, Public Record Office, Cambridge University Library, National Library of Scotland, University College Library London, University of London Library (a most informative thesis on the political career of John Bowring by George F. Bartle).

My humblest thanks are due in particular to E. Piers Tyrrell, of the Cambridge University Library, in conjunction with Prof. Robert Auty of Oxford, for so kindly passing to me his large file of correspondence with the present members of the Wratislaw family in England, accumulated in an alas | vain attempt to trace the p.v

whereabouts of A. H. Wratislaw's papers, which, like Morfill's and Ralston's, seem to have been destroyed. Piers Tyrrell also kindly allowed me to compare his copies of Wratislaw's letters with my own, where our findings overlapped. Indirectly I owe a debt of gratitude to Mrs Ursula E. L. Wratislaw and Mrs Nancy Wratislaw, who supplied copies of W. F. Wratislaw's letters to J. M. T. Wratislaw and associated correspondence, and also discovered an isolated letter to A. H. Wratislaw from Jan V. Lego secreted in the pages of a book.

Recently **In** my researches into the somewhat enigmatic Walter Strickland, I have received great assistance from members of the Strickland-Constable family – especially Lady Lettice and Sir Robert F. Strickland-Constable and Rev. and Mrs. Denzil Wright.

My heartfelt gratitude and apologies for making them suffer for so long are extended to my indefatigable and patient supervisor Karel Brušák, who gave himself the unwelcome task of proof-reading on top of all his manifold advice and assistance at every stage, and my dear wife Shu-Ching, who as well as helping to sort out hundreds of cards for the index assisted in so many other ways.

Lastly I must add that this dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration. The work, including |  
p.vi notes, does not exceed the limit of 80,000 words, as specified by the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages. For all mistakes and infelicities of judgment I alone am finally responsible. I hope that readers will not hesitate to inform me of any errors, which I have doubtless made, and that they will not feel their time in reading quite utterly wasted.

James Duncan Naughton 27 October 1977

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Literary traffic between England and Bohemia in the nineteenth-century was mostly one-way, from England to Bohemia. What traffic there was in the opposite direction consisted very largely of historical writing and a certain amount of literature in the natural sciences, either written originally in German or translated into that language. Translations from Czech into English were extremely few and far between. Thus, although a certain knowledge of Bohemian history was accessible to the English historian equipped with German, Czech imaginative writing in the vernacular was practically unavailable to the English reader. It is true that a little of this was available in German translation, but it is doubtful whether the English reader of German literature would often have found his way to these. p.1

To speak of any literary echoes, even the faintest, of Czech imaginative writing in the English world of letters would be impossible, unless some author of note could be found on whom Czech literature exerted any significant impact; for this there seems to be no substantial evidence in the period under consideration, and little enough indeed in more recent times. A few geographic or thematic connections with Bohemia in nineteenth-century English verse or prose do nothing to diminish this assertion, for they have nothing to do with Czech vernacular literature itself. Many personal connections of writers with Bohemia through friends and visits could likewise be enumerated, but the vast majority have little or nothing to do with Czech literary endeavours. p.2

It follows that any account of Czech literature as it was presented – intermittently – to the English reader in the nineteenth century is likely to have little to say about the central currents of English poetry, fiction or criticism, as generally conceived. Presentations of Czech writing, whether in translations or in the form of critical notices, never advanced, so to speak, more than an occasional half-step beyond the ephemeral fringes of English letters, and much of the material dealt with in this account has practically never been written about, if at all. On the other hand, the themes treated are generally quite familiar, as one would expect, to the Czech reader, and especially the Czech literary historian. The Czech writer or literary historian, indeed, working in his own context, had tended to ascribe rather more importance to these few English

p.3 publications in terms of foreign recognition than the circumstances would appear to warrant. |

Relations maintained between the Czech literary world and the scattered British individuals who acted as their English literary agents – as comparative literature studies have defined the function – were vital to the furtherance of such minimal awareness as there can have been of Czech writing in England. An account of these Anglo-Czech literary communications, insofar as they may be reconstructed from archival correspondence and other sources, forms the bulk of the material presented in these pages. If there is an appropriate general conclusion to be drawn from the interpretation of these miscellaneous efforts it surely is to try and answer the question of why they went unrewarded by any perceptible recognition, – why Czech literature, fertile and busy in its own way and in its own ‘kailyard’, remained obscure and ignored in England. Indeed it still is to a great extent, among the reading public at large. What follows may perhaps help to suggest some apportionment of the blame, if blame is the word, between the potential interest of the literature itself – not easily susceptible to analysis – and the extra-literary circumstances of personal judgment and opportunity.

p.4 The first part of the present account deals with what may suitably be termed ‘The Bowring Affair’. Sir John | Bowring, English politician and diplomat, Benthamite and dabbler in obscure and recondite literatures, may have been better known and sometimes notorious elsewhere for other deeds and achievements, but for Czech literary historians his name has become irrevocably linked with the Czech literary renaissance of the early nineteenth century in something of a cause célèbre. By way of contrast the English school headmaster Rev. Albert Henry Wratishaw, who unlike Sir John actually learnt to read and write Czech and laboured in his self-appointed task of making Czech literary-scholarly endeavours known in England for over forty years, has remained more or less unknown in both countries. His well-deserving labours are described in the second part. Various other – no less important – aspects of the reception of Czech literature in England are grouped together in the third part. These include the work of William Morfill, who was the first academic English Slavist, the surveys of contemporary Czech literature by Czech writers in the London *Athenaeum*, and the early translations of Walter Strickland amongst others.

p.5 The later work described in the third section overlaps with the better-known work of Count Lützow and others in the nineties. Reasons of space partly | dictated their exclusion, but at the same time it might surely be claimed with some justification that these new writers represented more of a beginning than an end of an era. Nevertheless, what went before can hardly be called a mere prologue, in spite of the comparative sparseness of the material, as the variety of writing surveyed in the following account should suggest.



## Chapter 2

# Bowring's Predecessors, 1800–1828

References to Czech literature in nineteenth-century British publications before the work of John Bowring may not be numerous, but do exist. There are even a couple of short translations. Such early accounts are partly a continuation of a long-standing tradition of travel literature stretching back into the seventeenth century and beyond, but partly also a reflection of a new-found interest in the vernacular, and particularly the folk literatures of other nations previously almost unknown to the English reader. p.6

One of the travellers, Charles Marquis de Salvo, passing through Bohemia in 1806, complained of the inconvenience of the language as well as of the supposed manners of the populace. 'Bohemia seemed richer than any other part of the Emperor's domains; but the character of its inhabitants is rough and uncivil. Their language, a corrupted Iliric, prevents the passenger from gaining information, and besides this, their extreme avarice renders them unsocial. . .'<sup>1</sup>

William Coxe's *History of the House of Austria*, first published in 1807, cites Bohemian historians | amongst his sources, especially Pelcl, whom he quotes on the aftermath of 1620 and the Thirty Years' War.<sup>2</sup> He follows the traditional terminology: the people are Bohemians and their language the Bohemian language. This remained standard for a good part of the century, with various forms of the word Czech gradually creeping in from works of ethnographers, Slavonic scholars and others attempting to distinguish between the Czech and German speaking inhabitants of the geographical area Bohemia, all of whom might be termed Bohemians. p.7

The literary reviews, those mines of information on many a topic, provide a certain amount about the fortunes of the Czech language. The Quarterly Review in 1813 gave a short, rough-and-ready account extracted from Johann Christoph Adelung's *Mithridates, oder Allgemeine Sprachenkunde*.<sup>3</sup> 'The Bohemians emigrated, with the Moravians and Slovaks, into their present habitations, about the middle of the 6th century, after the destruction of the kingdom of Thuringia by the Franks and Saxons. There is a Bohemian

---

<sup>1</sup>*Travels in the year 1806 from Italy to England*, 1807, pp. 231. (English sources published at London, Czech at Prague, unless otherwise stated.)

<sup>2</sup>Vol. 1 part 2, 1807, pp. 815–6.

<sup>3</sup>*Quarterly Review* 10 (Oct 1813), p. 283; *Mithridates*, 4 vols, Berlin 1806–17.

hymn of the date 990, and a chronicle in rhyme of 1310. One-third of the Bohemians are of German origin, and speak a corrupt German.'

p.8 Another reference to the language occurs in the | Monthly Review in 1815, in the form of a quotation from a book *Voyage en Autriche* by Marcel de Serres.<sup>4</sup> It gives quite an acceptable outline of the position of Czech vis-à-vis German at the time. Recording the 'decided aversion' of the Bohemian for his German neighbour the passage continues:

The native or aboriginal race exists in the greatest number in the central part of Bohemia, where they speak their own language, and know very little of German. The Bohemian tongue is accounted copious, of soft pronunciation, and particularly favourable to the modulation of the voice in singing, but it has undergone, in the course of ages, a very considerable change from the progressive introduction of the German, a language which has in a great degree supplanted it along the frontier-provinces of the kingdom. Even in the interior, German is the vehicle for all public acts, and is currently spoken in every town of consequence. Numbers of its vocables thus find their way into the Bohemian, but the latter is not for that reason likely to be banished from current use, as well on account of the national feeling of those who speak it, as from the works of the authors who have chosen, during the last century, to make it the medium of their publications.

p.9 In 1814 there appeared a literary specimen of indirectly Czech origin, translated from Herder's *Volklieder*. This was 'Libussa, or the Prince's Table, a Bohemian Tale', printed in *Illustrations of Northern Antiquities*, an Edinburgh publication produced jointly by Henry Weber, Robert Jamieson and Walter Scott. The translation is printed in the section by Robert Jamieson.<sup>5</sup> The German itself was a freely versified text based on the tale in Hájek's chronicle. Jamieson cited alternative | versions given by Musaeus, Aeneas Sylvius and others.

The next published specimen of Czech literature, this time following a Czech text, though most probably translated from a Polish version of it, was taken from the notorious forged Dvůr Králové manuscript. 'Zaboy, Slawoj, and Ludeck', described as 'Translated from the Bohemo-Sclavonian Dialect', is a prose rendering, in keeping with Ossianic taste, by the Polish tutor of Count Czartoryski, Krystyn Lach-Szyrma. The count and his tutor were residing in Edinburgh, and the article in which the translation was printed 'Sclavonic Traditional Poetry' appeared in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* in 1821.<sup>6</sup> That this was also an Edinburgh publication reflects a local concern for folklore, Ossianic and traditional balladry. Lach-Szyrma's accompanying remarks take full advantage of the possible comparisons:

---

<sup>4</sup>*Monthly Review* 78 (1815) appendix, p. 469; *Voyage*, 4 vols, Paris 1814.

<sup>5</sup>pp. 460–74.

<sup>6</sup>10, pp. 145–51.

---

The tenor of the translated tale, as you will see, is Ossianish; and if your Macpherson has been true, and Ossian ever existed, we want only a Macpherson to boast of a Slavonic Ossian. . .

There should be born Sir Walter Scotts, to recal from beneath the mountain-tombs,(Kurhany), overgrown with moss and weeds, the bold spirit of the old Slavonian chivalry. There should be born Burns and Ettrick Shepherds to give us an ideal of agricultural and pastoral life; and born should be those also, for whom

‘the meanest flower that blows can give  
Thoughts that do often lie too deep for  
tears.’

He also suggests Byron and Campbell as good models for | the Slav writers. He writes p.10  
in a general Slav context, but the models and ideals recommended correspond closely to ones periodically emulated by Czech authors, anxious to develop a national popular and polite idiom based on past history or the traditional life of the countryside.

Lach-Szyrma followed up this article with a book entitled *Letters, Literary and Political, on Poland; comprising Observations on Russia and Other Slavonian Nations and Tribes*, published at Edinburgh in 1823.

*Letter I* is similar to the *Blackwood's* article, reprinting the version of ‘Zaboy, Slawoj, and Ludeck’ and repeating the comparison between Celtic and Slavonic ancient poetry.<sup>7</sup> In fact the Czech manuscripts had partly derived from Macpherson their conception of pagan antiquity, and even their diction.<sup>8</sup> Lach-Szyrma also compares in *Letter II* the extent of survival of material in the Celtic and Slav areas with the lack of it amongst other European nations. ‘In surveying the general fate of ancient popular poetry, it may with truth be asserted, that it has survived in Scotland, in Ireland, and in the Slavonian countries. . . Amongst other European nations. . . we find it now entirely silenced and forgotten.’<sup>9</sup> He should have added the Scandinavian area, one would have thought; in any case the Irish corpus is much more | extensive, and more truly ancient. To ‘Zaboy, Slawoj, and Ludeck’ Lach-Szyrma added a free poetical version of the poem ‘Zbychoň’ p.11  
from the forged manuscripts.<sup>10</sup>

Lach-Szyrma’s description of the contemporary state of Bohemian letters is depre-  
catory and slightly supercilious. He regards it as too dependent on German cultural  
models and lacking in proper Slav character. The Czech writers were worried about  
this too. It is one motive for their intensive cultivation of folksong and ethnocentric  
national history, and for their translations from non-Germanic literatures. He wrote in  
*Letter III*:<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>pp. 20–7.

<sup>8</sup>See J. Dolanský, *Záhada Ossiana v Rukopisech královédvorském a zelenohorském*, 1975.

<sup>9</sup>pp. 31–2.

<sup>10</sup>p. 56.

<sup>11</sup>pp. 69–71.

The vicinity of Germany has deprived them of their political existence; and the superiority of the German literature has diverted them from the cultivation of their own – insomuch that they may be said to have now no literature at all.

The modern Bohemians cannot look back to their ancient glory with indifference: they struggle to revive it by cherishing their national literature. It cannot, however, be said, that they cultivate it from taste, for their taste is rather German, but from what is perhaps more laudable, patriotic affection and enthusiasm. . . Still, the Bohemians are, upon the whole, too much Germanised, that their literature should ever evince any strong national feature. Their learned men, in their writings, prefer the German tongue to their own, not excepting Dobrowski, the first literary character in Bohemia. The living authors of note, who write their native language are Zdzirad Polack, and Jungman, both poets. The present Bohemian literature consists chiefly of translations from the German, and imitations of German works, and only occasionally exhibits the genuine character of the national Sclavonic.

p.12 | While a certain scepticism ought to be expressed about the use of vague condemnatory accusations of cultural dependence and attempts to define independent national cultural or literary characteristics for groups such as the Slavs or Germans, nevertheless the dependence on German language and hence German culture was undeniably great among the Czech literati both in 1823 and long after. That is more or less a commonplace of literary, and general, history.

This list of Bowring's forerunners ends with another Edinburgh publication. In 1827 Carlyle provided another English version of the Libussa legend, taken this time from Musaeus's *Volksmärchen* and published in his volumes of *German Romance*.<sup>12</sup>

None of these early sources of information give much more than a hint of a rising national literary movement in Bohemia. Such early flickers of attention were mostly accidental more or less, and part of a general enthusiasm for ballad literature and ancient lore of all kinds. Only Lach-Szyrma took a Slav viewpoint, Pan-Slav and anti-German in its cultural orientation, wont to draw contrasts between German and Slav culture, as two supposed distinctive traditions. This distinction, or opposition, with its vehement and increasingly vociferous national and nationalist reverberations, is henceforth a constant theme.

---

<sup>12</sup>Vol. 1 (Edinburgh 1827), pp. 106–73.

## Chapter 3

# Bowring's Slavonic Studies

Sir John Bowring's name is more familiar in England to the student of Jeremy Bentham p.13 or to the political and diplomatic historian, but he did have quite a reputation in his day as a literary man, translator, alleged polyglot and authority on lesser known tongues. It is not the business of the present account to detail his public career, much of which has been chronicled elsewhere<sup>1</sup>, but some description of the events leading up to Bowring's brief occupation with the Czechs may be useful for comparison's sake.

Born of a family of cloth merchants near Exeter in 1792, a Unitarian and thus effectively debarred from the English universities, Bowring's early commercial connections supplied him a knowledge of languages such as Spanish and French. He soon set up in business on his own account. Travel in the Peninsula, supplying Wellington's armies, and visits to France and the Netherlands supplied him his first continental literary friends and ambitions. In 1819 he made his literary debut with *The State of Religion and Literature in Spain* containing versions of Spanish ballads.

| In the same year another expedition, combining business with literary pursuits, p.14 took him along the Baltic coast to Russia and homeward through Scandinavia. While in St. Petersburg he met the philologist Friedrich Adelung, nephew of Johann Christoph and tutor to the Grand Duke, and he also met Krylov and Karamzin. As a result, and with Adelung's active assistance he was enabled to publish the first anthology of Russian verse in the English language. This more than anything else established his literary and polyglot reputation.

The young George Borrow met him in 1821 at the house of the German scholar William Taylor in Norwich. They later collaborated on a Scandinavian project, but this came to nothing, and some time after they quarrelled,<sup>2</sup> a circumstance which no doubt coloured the following account of their first meeting, taken from the *Romany Rye*:<sup>3</sup>

This person, who had lately come from abroad, and had published a

---

<sup>1</sup>Biography: G. F. Bartle, 'The Political Career of Sir John Bowring (1792–1872) between 1820 and 1849', M.A. thesis, Univ. of London; *Autobiographical Recollections of Sir John Bowring*, ed. Lewin B. Bowring, 1877.

<sup>2</sup>See G. F. Bartle, 'George Borrow's "Old Radical"', *Notes and Queries* 208 (July 1963), pp. 242–7.

<sup>3</sup>Cresset Press 1948, Appendix Ch. 11 'The Old Radical', p. 404.

volume of translations, had attracted some slight notice in the literary world, and was looked upon as a kind of lion in a small provincial capital. After dinner he argued a great deal, spoke vehemently against the church, and uttered the most desperate Radicalism that was perhaps ever heard. . . . Being informed that the writer was something of a philologist, to which character the individual in question laid great pretensions, he came and sat down by him, and talked about languages and literature. . . . the Lion, after asking him whether he was acquainted at all with the Sclavonian languages, and being informed that he was not, absolutely dumb-founded him by a display of Sclavonian erudition.

p.15 | Later, after acquiring some knowledge of the subject himself, Borrow professed to have found him more reticent about his erudition.

Among Borrow's papers there is a curious and somewhat mysterious manuscript: an autograph Bohemian Grammar,<sup>4</sup> which examination reveals to be drawn from K. I. Thám's *Kurzgefasste böhmische Sprachlehre* of 1785 (Prague, Vienna). That it is this edition of the grammar is demonstrated by the alternative forms of adjectival endings given: 'krásného' or 'krásnýho' and so on. Later editions of Thám's grammar prescribed the '-é' forms in concordance with modern (classicising) literary practice. Borrow's manuscript grammar may have been made from a copy borrowed from Bowring, unless it dates to the time of Borrow's travels in Austria and Hungary in 1844.<sup>5</sup> Certain it is that Borrow was able to peruse some of Bowring's Czech books, for he wrote to him on 14 September 1830, 'I return you the Bohemian books',<sup>6</sup> and amongst these may well have been the grammar of Thám referred to. The possibility that he might have assisted Bowring in his work of translation from the Czech remains however a mere speculation.

p.16 | The success of Bowring's Russian volume prompted a second enlarged edition in 1821, and a sequel in 1823. |

The latter was dedicated to Tsar Alexander I, who presented Bowring with an amethyst and diamond ring for his services. Most if not all of the material for both Russian volumes was supplied in the form of literal versions in German or French, witness several statements in Adelung's letters to Bowring during 1822.<sup>7</sup> Bowring even managed to inadvertently print a translation of Millevoje's 'Chute des feuilles' masquerading as a Russian composition.<sup>8</sup>

Polish was Bowring's next Slavonic interest. On 15 March 1823 he wrote to Krystyn Lach-Szyrma, expressing his favourable opinion of the *Letters Literary and Political on Poland*, which had mentioned Bowring's Russian specimens. Lach-Szyrma's reply contained an offer to assist him in publishing specimens of Polish poetry. The progress

---

<sup>4</sup>British Museum (hereafter BM) Add. 34,183.

<sup>5</sup>C. K. Shorter, *George Borrow and his Circle*, 1913, pp. 260–74.

<sup>6</sup>Shorter, p. 149.

<sup>7</sup>F. Chudoba, *Listy psané Johnu Bowringovi ve věcech české a slovanské literatury*, 1912, pp. 56–61.

<sup>8</sup>V. M. Jovanović, «*La Guzla*» de Prosper Mérimée, Paris 1911, p. 478.

---

of the collaboration may be followed in the ensuing correspondence.<sup>9</sup> Publication of the *Specimens of the Polish Poets* was delayed however until 1827. Bowring referred to his troubles with the anthology in one letter to his Czech correspondent Čelakovský. 'Dans mes traductions Polonaises j'ai manqué de trouver les guides qui s'offrent de chez vous. M. Brudzinski m'a promis mais il a manqué – et d'autres amis Polonais m'ont laissé peut-être m'égarer.'<sup>10</sup> |

p.17

Čelakovský suggested that political timidity was a reason for Kazimir Brudzinski's failure to respond. 'Es ist traurig in einem Lande wo man selbst bey literarischen Correspond. Bedenklichkeiten dieser Art haben muss; überdies ist Brodzin. ein öffentlicher Beamter u hat wie mir scheint, zu viel des Hasenblutes.'<sup>11</sup> Manuscripts of English versions from the Polish in Lach-Szyrma's hand are to be found with the Bowring items among the Bentham Papers at University College, London.<sup>12</sup> In the *Specimens* Bowring acknowledges Lach-Szyrma's 'epistolary and personal communications; all marked by urbanity, friendship, good taste, information, and patriotism',<sup>13</sup> – less grudging than his statement to Čelakovský about 'other Polish friends.'

Bowring's Serbian anthology was faster reaching the presses. In 1825 the Slovene scholar Bartolomäus (Jernej) Kopitar, Imperial Librarian at Vienna and an enthusiastic Austro-Slav, sent Bowring a copy of Vuk Karadžić's *Narodne srpske pjesme*<sup>14</sup> presumably aware of the Russian anthologies. Vuk, Grimm and Goethe were revealing a new field of ancient balladry, orally transmitted, and the Serbs, via German translations, were acquiring a certain literary vogue. Thérèse von Jakob (pseudonym Talvj) produced a collection of | German versions from Vuk's anthology published at Halle in 1825–6 under the title *Volklieder der Serben*. Bowring soon obtained a copy of Talvj's book and it is generally admitted that her German translations were instrumental in the shaping of Bowring's.<sup>15</sup>

p.18

In 1826 Bowring was sent a second gift by Kopitar, a copy of Šafárik's newly published *Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur*. Bowring wrote to the author to thank him for the supposed gift, but Šafárik's reply of 17 December 1826, Bowring's first letter from a Czech writer, explained that he was not the immediate source of the book. He had sent Kopitar copies to be distributed to foreign scholars.<sup>16</sup> On receiving Bowring's letter Šafárik wrote off to Vuk enthusiastically: 'Er ist in die serbischen Lieder bis über die Ohren verliebt.'<sup>17</sup> Bowring wrote to Vuk himself in December, through his Vienna agents the sugar refiners Reyer und Schlick, and they entered into

---

<sup>9</sup>Chudoba, pp. 44–56; MS orig., Cambr. Univ. Libr. Add 7666 D.

<sup>10</sup>R. Beer, *Korrespondence Johna Bowringa do Čech*, 1904, p. 10; MSS of Bowring correspondence in Prague, Literární archiv Památníku národního písemnictví (hereafter LAPNP) unless otherwise stated.

<sup>11</sup>To Bowring VIII.1827, *Korrespondence a zápisky F. L. Čelakovského*, ed. Fr. Bílý, 2, p. 589.

<sup>12</sup>Bentham MSS 110 ff. 66–124.

<sup>13</sup>*Specimens of the Polish Poets*, 1827, p. 28.

<sup>14</sup>J. Glonar, 'Kopitarjev „Briefjournal“ 1816–1829', *Glasnik muzejskega društva za Slovenijo* 19, pp. 142–50, entry 28.IX.25.

<sup>15</sup>Jovanović, p. 478; D. Subotić, 'Serbian Popular Poetry in English Literature', *Slavonic Review* 5 (1926–7), pp. 628–46.

<sup>16</sup>Chudoba, pp. 15–9.

<sup>17</sup>10.XII.1826, *Vukova prepiska*, ed. L. Stojanović, 4, p. 632.

correspondence.<sup>18</sup> The volume of *Servian Popular Poetry* was published soon after in 1827.

p.19 Kopitar wrote Bowring quite a genial review, much later, in the Vienna *Jahrbücher der Literatur* for 1829, but appended a list of numerous errors.<sup>19</sup> A hostile opinion in one respect was however expressed | by Thérèse von Jakob in a private letter to Kopitar in 1828. She felt aggrieved at Bowring's failure to acknowledge the true extent to which he was indebted to her own work. 'Manche Stellen z. B. wo er: oj snašice, rumena ružice! was ich, um *den Reim nachzuahmen* übersetzte: 'Brudersweibchen, süßes schönes Täubchen!' ganz treuherzig wiedergibt: Brothers wife! thou sweet and lovely dovelet! machten mich wirklich zu lachen. Hier, und an tausend andern Stellen scheint er das Original gar nicht einmal angesehen zu haben.'<sup>20</sup>

p.20 In July 1827 Prosper Mérimée published his literary mystification *La Guzla*, purporting to be versions of Illyrian ballads collected from a certain guzla-player named 'Hyacinthe Maglanovich'. Many people, who ought perhaps to have known better, were fooled, and the preface to the 1842 edition listed Bowring among them. 'Deux mois après la publication de la Guzla, M. Bowring, auteur d'une anthologie slave, m'écrivit pour me demander les vers originaux que j'avais si bien traduits.'<sup>21</sup> One 'Illyrian Song' translated from *La Guzla* by Bowring appeared in the *London Weekly Review* for 23 February 1828,<sup>22</sup> and a selection under the title 'Illyrian Poems' in the *Westminster Review*.<sup>23</sup> But in a letter to Čelakovský | later, on 4 September 1828, Bowring remarked, after learning the truth: 'You know perhaps that an apocryphal collection has been published under the name of the Gusla at Paris, the whole of which M. Gerhard has published at Leipzig as if they were *genuine*.'<sup>24</sup>

In the cases of the Russian, Polish and Serbian anthologies, therefore, the evidence of dependence on German, French and English versions, whether in book form or supplied by friends and correspondents, is apt to suggest that Bowring had little grounding in the original languages, though undoubtedly the ability to look up words in the dictionary. There are no letters from Bowring to the Slavs in languages other than English, French and German, and, if further evidence were needed, attached to the Russian original of Vuk's first letter to Bowring, dated 12 January 1827, is an English translation in another hand.<sup>25</sup> Bowring's Slavonic studies were very superficial.

---

<sup>18</sup>19.XII.1826, Stojanović 5, p. 468.

<sup>19</sup>45 (Jan-März 1829), pp. 212-21.

<sup>20</sup>2.II.1828, Franz Miklosich, *Über Goethe's „Klaggesang von der Edlen Frauen des Asan Aga“*, Wien 1883, pp. 70-2.

<sup>21</sup>Cited by Jovanović, pp. 472-3.

<sup>22</sup>pp. 122-3.

<sup>23</sup>10 (1828), pp. 71 seq.

<sup>24</sup>Beer, pp. 16-7; W. Gerhard, *Wila*, 2 vols, Leipzig 1828.

<sup>25</sup>MS with attached transl., in LAPNP; see V. M. Jovanović, 'John Bowring i srpska narodna poezija', *Srpski književni glasnik* 21 (1908), p. 36; same, *La Guzla*, p. 474; Chudoba prints only Russian original, pp. 35-9.



## Chapter 4

# Bowring and Czech Literature, 1826–28

It was Kopitar who by sending Bowring Šafárik's *Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur* had brought Bowring into contact with Czech writers.<sup>1</sup> In 1825 he had also sent one of Dobrovský's works to the Bodleian Library in Oxford, quite possibly the *Institutiones linguae slavicae* of 1822.<sup>2</sup> p.21

Šafárik was then a teacher at the Serbian orthodox gymnasium of Novi Sad (Neusatz). At the end of May 1826 his friend Martin Hamuljak in Pest, who used to see his works through the press, sent twelve copies of the newly published *Geschichte* to Kopitar for distribution abroad. A note appended by Hamuljak to a letter from Vuk to Kopitar reads: 'Die 12 Ex. der Schaffarik'schen Geschichte sind zum verschenken an jene russ. u. poln. Herrn Literaturen bestimmt, welche Ew. Wohlgeboren selbst meinen werden.'<sup>3</sup>

On receiving his copy Bowring wrote a letter of thanks to the author in person, Šafárik was most gratified by the letter and looked forward to receiving some English books in exchange for assistance with Bowring's projects. His reply to Bowring, dated | 17 Dec 1826, took the opportunity, amongst matter relating mainly to Vuk and the South Slavs, to draw attention to the Czech Dvůr Králové Manuscript: 'Diese Poesien sind bis jetzt zu wenig im Auslande bekannt; sie übertreffen gleichwohl, nach meinem Dafürhalten, alles, was die Slawen im poetischen Fache aufzuweisen haben... auch die böhmischen Poesien würden gewiss reichliche duftende Blumen für eine neue Anthologie liefern...'<sup>4</sup> He concluded with a detailed request for advice about English works on the geography and topography of the South Slavs, a subject he was working on at that time. p.22

---

<sup>1</sup>See III note 14, note 16.

<sup>2</sup>Glonar, pp. 142–50, 28.IX.1825; *Catalogus Librorum Impressorum Bibl. Bodleianae*, 1, Oxford 1843.

<sup>3</sup>15/17.V.1826, Stojanović 1, p. 272.

<sup>4</sup>Chudoba, pp. 15–9; also Šaf. to Vuk 10.XII.1826, Stojanović 4, p. 632, to Kollár 13.XII.1826, *Časopis Českého musea* (hereafter ČČM) 1874, pp. 89–90, to Köppen 13.XII.1826, *Korespondence P. J. Šafařika*, ed. V. A. Francev, 1, 1927, pp. 314–5, Hamuljak 17.XII.1826, *Listy P. J. Šafařika Martinovi Hamuljakovi*, ed. A. Mařovčík, Martin 1965, no. 28.

p.23 Bowring replied on 13 January 1827 from Manchester<sup>5</sup>, already entertaining the idea of a Bohemian anthology to add to his list and promising help for Šafárik's own work.<sup>6</sup> Šafárik set about collecting together suitable books to despatch to Bowring, writing to Hamuljak with various instructions and advice. 'Rukopis Královodvorský etc. mu už poslán z Vídně. Bude to překládat na Anglicky, a uvidíte, jak na to hned Francúzi a Němci usta otvírati, a tomu se diviti budú. Bawring mi slibuje knihy a pomoc z Anglie k mému předsevzetí strany Serbie a Bulgarie. Toto všecko račte i p. Kollárovi oznámiti – nebo nestačím, abych | mu to psal. Jeho Slávy dcera bude bez pochyby na Anglicky jazyk přeložena.'<sup>7</sup> The chance of an English publication was seen as quite a turn up for the books. A letter in March to Hamuljak continued the arrangements and shows again their enthusiasm for the project as a means of gaining recognition abroad: 'nám velice na tom záleží, abychom jeho horlivost ku slovenčině, co do nás sobě vážili, a chovali... Uvidíte, jak se tomu Němci etc. budú divit – jak budú huby otvírat!'<sup>8</sup>

The parcel of books, combining items sent by Šafárik from Nový Sad and items added by Hamuljak, was despatched to Vienna on 26 March 1827. It evidently contained Šafárik's personal copy of *Písně světské lidu slovenského* (Pest 1823), which he had sent in case another could not be found. Šafárik also supplied Wesely's *Serbische Hochzeitlieder von Karadgich* (Pest 1826) and Čelakovský's *Slovanské národní písně* (Volume 1, Prague 1822), Hamuljak added Kollár's *Slávy dcera* (Buda 1824), *Čítanka* (Buda 1825) and *Dobré vlastnosti národu slovenského* (Pest 1822), and, also at Šafárik's suggestion, Herkel's *Elementa universalis linguae slavicae* (Buda 1826).<sup>9</sup>

p.24 On 18th May Šafárik told Hamuljak about some English books he was now expecting to arrive and asked | him to help in providing some German versions for Bowring's assistance. 'Posílám přeložení Kollárových sonnetův z Časopisu musejného,<sup>10</sup> a prosím Vás, přidejte k nim přeložení slovenských písní... Próbu přeložení písní nemohu přiložiti, nebo jak víte, nemám žádného exempláře... Mezitím sem podotknul v listě př. Kollárovi psaném, jak by se to překládati mělo a mohlo, jen bez odkladu<sup>11</sup> má-li z toho užitek býti.'<sup>12</sup> Later he repeated his request. 'Přítel Kollár mi slíbil, že spolu s Vámi některé z těch pochabých slovenských piesní přeloží. Obnovuji a opětuji prosbu svú, aby ste o to snažnú péči vésti ráčili. Bowring čeká – psal sem mu a slíbil – musím tedy slovo splnit! – Kopitar mu poslal tuším Lexica české a slovenské; ale on předce žádá přeložení německé, z částky aby ve svém překládání spěšněji pokračovati, z částky aby jist býti mohel, že dobře přeložil, a smysel uhádnul.'<sup>13</sup>

<sup>5</sup>Note on original LAPNP.

<sup>6</sup>See Šaf. to Vuk 13.II.1827, Stojanović 4 no. 10; to Hamuljak 22.II.1827, Maťovčík no. 32.

<sup>7</sup>22.II.1827.

<sup>8</sup>3.III.1827, Maťovčík no. 33; also, Šaf. to Hamuljak 7.III.1827, Maťovčík no. 34; to Kollár 1.III.1827, ČČM 1874, p. 281.

<sup>9</sup>Hamuljak to Reyer u. Schlick 26.III.1827, draft with certificate of posting, *Listy Martina Hamuljaka*, 1, ed. A. Maťovčík, Martin 1969, p. 84.

<sup>10</sup>'Sonette von J. Kollar... übersetzt von Jos. Wenzig', *Monatsschrift d. Ges. d. vaterl. Museums in Böhmen* 1 (1827) sv. 1, pp. 49–52, sv. 2, pp. 40–3.

<sup>11</sup>Printed 'bez dokladu'.

<sup>12</sup>18.V.1827, Maťovčík 1965 no. 36.

<sup>13</sup>Šaf. to Hamuljak 7.VI.1827, Maťovčík 1965 no. 38.

---

Šafárik was eager to receive his books from England, mentioning them to Kopitar in June. 'Bowring's Päckchen erwarte ich erste von Pest, wie mir H. Wuk schrieb. Auch ich schickte ihm einige slow. Kleinigkeiten gratis – für Duppligate wird sich doch Platz auf der Insel finden?'<sup>14</sup> A packet reached Šafárik | shortly after, as part of a consignment also containing items for Vuk and Kopitar, all Bowring's own publications.<sup>15</sup> Šafárik was disappointed by the absence of some geographical items he had been expecting, as he wrote to Kopitar, unable to restrain his suspicions and impatience: 'es wundert mich, dass er mir die Verzeichnisse von Landcharten nicht geschickt hat. Ich *erwartete diese sehnlicher, als die Bücher*. – Bowring schrieb mir: We have several new maps of European Turkey... etc. You will find Catalogues in the parcel I send you. Haben Sie die Güte, H. Wuk gelegentlich zu erinern, er möchte mir diese Cataloge, die wahrscheinlich nur aus *Versehen* bei ihm gebleiben sind, nachträglich zu schicken.'<sup>16</sup> He wrote to Vuk the same day telling him the same<sup>17</sup>, but Vuk answered in a rather displeased fashion, as well he might, that there had been nothing further in the parcel, and detailed the expenses he had incurred.<sup>18</sup> Šafárik did however eventually get the catalogues, or so it would seem. His library bibliography contains an entry 'Catalogi chart. geogr. et librorum Londinenses', and these were probably from Bowring; amongst his books was also W. Leake's *Researches in Greece* (London 1814), which Šafárik had inquired about in his first letter to Bowring.<sup>19</sup> |

p.25

p.26

Meanwhile Hamuljak and Kollár had found someone else to do the translations from *Písně světské* for them. This was František Trnka, a Moravian teacher and writer then working in Pest, and one supposes the German versions were sent soon after. Šafárik wrote to Hamuljak thanking Trnka: 'Děkuji mu za to přeložení, učinil mi to tak velice vděk, jak kdyby byl můj dluh zaplatil... Bowring mi opět psal... Strany slíbeného přeložení něm. opět upomíná. Vidíte tedy, že třeba poslati. Za to mám, že 42 pochabých písní dost a přemnoho!'<sup>20</sup> Šafárik's opinion of the value of these songs was clearly not very high. Twice in this correspondence he spoke of them as those 'foolish' songs, but Kollár had a different opinion of them in general, as will appear.

Bowring was by now also turning his attention to the Hungarians: he was never one to concentrate exclusively on a single subject for any great length of time. He had asked about Transylvanian Unitarians in letters to Šafárik and Kopitar, and Kopitar had already been passing on some Hungarian material.<sup>21</sup> Šafárik told Kopitar with a note of irritation: 'Bowring habe ich ja schon längst die Namen und Adressen *aller* unit. Gelehrten (Superint., Profess. etc.) in | Siebenbürgen geschickt. Quid vult amplius?

p.27

<sup>14</sup>4.VI.1827, *Šafaříkovy dopisy slovinci Jer. Kopitarovi v letech 1826 a 1827*, ed. V. Burian, 1931, p. 17.

<sup>15</sup>See Šaf. to Kopitar 14.VI.1827, Burian, pp. 18–21; also, *Catalogus librorum... quae olim ad Bibliothecam Pauli Josephi Šafařík pertinebant*, Vienna 1862, pp. 71, 75.

<sup>16</sup>14.VI.1827.

<sup>17</sup>14/2.VI.1827, Stojanović 4, p. 637.

<sup>18</sup>Vuk to Šaf. 10/22.VI.1827, Stojanović 4, p. 638.

<sup>19</sup>See note 15, *Catalogus*.

<sup>20</sup>19.VII.1827, Mařovčik 1965 no. 41, notes.

<sup>21</sup>See Bowring to Kopitar 18.VI.1827, ed. R. Filipović, 'Bowring i Kopitar', *Slavistična revija* 4i–ii (1951), pp. 124–6.

*Persönlich* kenne ich freilich keinen...<sup>22</sup> This was in July. Bowring's next letter asked him to find someone to help with a projected Hungarian anthology, as Šafárik informed Hamuljak and Kollár, again with a touch of annoyance:<sup>23</sup>

Dotírají Unitarii, k nimžto se on také zná, aby to učinil. Potřebuje muže učeného, který by

1/ Opatřil a jemu poslal magyarských básníkův, anebo aspoň nějakú anthologii z nich. To se rozumí, že B. za knihy zaplatí.

2/ Sebral některé národní magyarské písně (Tyto ovšem bez *ebatta a baszom* nebudú!)

3/ Na probu něco z jedněch i druhých do Němčiny nebo jiného jazyka přeložil...

Já neznám nikoho. Víte-li Vy rady?

Šafárik wrote again to Hamuljak on 4th November: 'Nepochybuji, že Vám přítel Kollár mú prosbu strany nějakého učeného (ale ne běsného) Magyara pro Bowringa zdělil.'<sup>24</sup> Through Kopitar Bowring was already receiving material from Karol Romy in Vienna,<sup>25</sup> and the name eventually suggested by Šafárik was that of Gábor Döbrentey, 'comme d'un correspondant instruit et complaisant in rebus hungaricis.'<sup>26</sup>

p.28 Like Šafárik Jan Kollár received a copy of Bowring's Polish anthology, and he wrote thanking him in a letter dated Pest 10th December 1827.<sup>27</sup> If they had any further correspondence it remains unknown. Kollár wrote that he had recently sent a packet with | the second volume of *Písně světské*, just printed, and his *Ableitung und Erklärung des National-Names Magyar*. He remonstrated against an opinion taken allegedly from a letter of Bowring to Romy and quoted in the Pest journal *Iris*, 'dasz Sie den magyarschen Volks liedern sogar Vorzug vor den slavischen zugestehn.' He thought Romy had behaved reprehensibly in publishing the statement from a private letter: 'Gesetzt auch, es stände wirklich so in Ihrem Briefe, so fanden es dennoch viele bey uns unanständig, dasz Herr Romy keck genug war, Privat-Äuszerungen und Briefes-Geheimnisze sogleich in öffentlichen Zeitungen (*Iris* 1827. Nro. 95) drucken zu lassen, und mit einem gewissen schadenfrohen Gefühl...' To remedy Bowring's opinion and supplement the material sent already, which Kollár thought had not been of the best quality, he offered some prose versions from the new volume, explaining the importance of the annotations enclosed: 'Erklärung der Volksspiele, Gewohnheiten und anderer feinen Beziehungen, ohne welche dem Liede die Seele fehlt.'

---

<sup>22</sup>22.VII.1827, Burian, pp. 25–30.

<sup>23</sup>X.1827, Mařovčık 1965 no. 45.

<sup>24</sup>Mařovčık 1965 no. 47.

<sup>25</sup>See Kopitar to Bowring 10.XI.1827, Chudoba, pp. 26–7.

<sup>26</sup>Kop. to Bowr. 24.III.1828, Chudoba, pp. 27–9; F. Valjavec, *Kopitars Briefwechsel mit Karl Georg Romy*, München 1942, gives a letter Bowring to Döbrentei 14.IV.1828.

<sup>27</sup>Chudoba, pp. 21–3.

---

Šafárik reacted angrily to the Iris report in a letter to Kollár:<sup>28</sup>

Co blázen Romy z Bowr. listů tlačiti dal – toho si ani všimati netřeba.  
Komu P. Bůh rozumu nedal – | kdo mu ho vynahradí! I Kop. psal Bowr., i  
já, aby se napotom takového correspondententa *varoval*.

p.29

Který statečný člověk by mohl s to býti, aby *privátné* úsudky v listech od  
přátelů o *osobách* a *věcech* překabátil dle své vůle a žádosti, a *tisknouti* dal!  
Ex fructibus cognoscitis eum!

Šafárik's dislike for the Hungarians comes out rather forcefully in these several quotations.

Rather abruptly at about this point, at the end of 1827 or beginning of 1828, the correspondence between Šafárik and Bowring broke off. As far as can be surmised this would seem to have something to do with Bowring's new enthusiasm for Hungarian literature and the report by Romy in *Iris*, Šafárik may also have been disappointed in his hopes of substantial help with his own literary projects. He reacted with bitter condemnation to Bowring's first article on Czech literature in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, but this only reached him after their correspondence had ceased. As the above account tries to show, Šafárik, Hamuljak, Kollár and Trnka had all expended some time and energy in trying to smooth the path for the Czech anthology. Later they may have realised that they had been used as unpaid assistants to a peddler of second-hand merchandise. |

p.30

Kopitar, who had put Bowring in touch with Šafárik, had heard by the beginning of 1827 that Bowring was intending to publish a Serbian anthology.<sup>29</sup> On 14th January Bowring wrote to him enquiring about the Bohemian popular poetry recommended by Šafárik, 'whether there are other important sources than Hanka's.'<sup>30</sup> As well as Hanka's *Rukopis Kralodvorský* he desired to obtain Dobrovský's *Geschichte der Böhmischen Literatur*, with 'such other of his works as will be instructive to a Bohemian Enquiry.'

Having learnt that a Bohemian anthology was in the offing, Kopitar wrote to Dobrovský, with whom he was in close correspondence, describing Bowring's requests and suggesting he was the man best qualified to make a selection of books: 'so wende ich mich an Sie, als den Unparteiischen zwischen Ihren beiden litt. factionen, um eine Auswahl des Besten unter den böhmischen Poesien, im Betrage von etwa f40–50 Conv. Münze, allenfalls auch etwas mehr, ein gutes Lexicon und Grammatik mit eingeschlossen – dass ich es ihm dann übermachen können, ne primi vos cultiorum Slavorum negligamini.'<sup>31</sup> The reference to two 'literary factions' and to Dobrovský as allegedly the most impartial figure shows how clearly the two literary | parties

p.31

---

<sup>28</sup>18.I.1828, ČČM 1875, p. 135; *Iris, Zeitschrift für Wissen, Kunst und Leben*, Ofen 1825–28; A. Varannai, 'John Bowring and Hungarian Literature', *Acta Litteraria* 6, p. 146 note 24, gives no letter to Romy before 1828; also A. Varannai, *John Bowring és a magyar irodalom*, Budapest 1967.

<sup>29</sup>See Kop. to Köppen 3.I.1827, *Briefwechsel zwischen Dobrowsky und Kopitar (1808–1828)*, herausg. von . . V. Jagić, Berlin 1885, p. 707; Kopitar to Dobrovský 5.I.1827, Jagić, pp. 582–3.

<sup>30</sup>14.I.1827, Filipović, p. 124.

<sup>31</sup>5.II.1827, Jagić, pp. 594–5.

were perceived at the time. They were perhaps most unambiguously definable by their respective views on orthography as ‘iotisté’ and ‘ypsilonisté’ (here Dobrovský took the reforming side), or as followers of Jungmann and Dobrovský in their opposing views on prosody (respectively advocating quantitative and accentual metres). The Jungmann men or ‘Jungmannovci’ espoused broader Slav aspirations with enthusiastic acceptance of all the forged manuscripts created to reinforce an Ossian-like picture of a democratic pagan Slav antiquity in Bohemia: Dobrovský rejected their historical speculations on such topics.

p.32 Dobrovský replied to Kopitar on 11th February accepting the task of choosing books for Bowring and mentioning some he intended to include if they could be had. His remarks on Czech national folk songs were somewhat disparaging. ‘Unter den Nationalliedern könnten wohl noch bessere stehen. Allein niemand anderer hat sie noch gesammelt. Gäbe es doch mehr von ähnlichen Gedichten, als die in der Königinhofer Handschrift sind. Sonst haben wir leider nicht so nationales, das mit den serb. Liedern und russischen alten Erzählungen verglichen werden könnte.’<sup>32</sup> Dobrovský continued to uphold the *Dvůr Králové* MS as genuine. | Kopitar reminded Dobrovský to include his own works and urged him to find a copy of the Dalimil chronicle. Perhaps Hanka could help, he added, with an allusion to the suspected author of the *Libušin soud* forgery: ‘Ist denn kein Prochaskischer Dalimil wenigstens aufzutreiben gewesen? Oder könnte der scripturae felix imitator, Hr Hanka, nicht eine Abschrift jener Ms. um f. 5–10 WW. besorgen? Sed estis faul, et incuriosi gloriae patriae.’<sup>33</sup>

p.33 The books for Bowring were delayed due to faults in some of the volumes and the work of correction was entrusted to Hanka at the National Museum – who was still on good terms with Dobrovský. A letter in April to Hanka from Kopitar spoke of additions to the parcel made by Hanka (or others): ‘Sorgen Sie dafür, dass ich die Defecte, und was Ihr mir sonst für Bowring noch schicken werdet, baldigst erhalte, um seine Ungeduld zu befriedigen.’<sup>34</sup> At this point a sealed packet was allegedly added to the consignment by Jungmann. Kopitar was sufficiently worried about its contents – knowing the internal quarrels then raging – to warn Bowring about it specially in May. He told Dobrovský: ‘Jungmann addidit obsignatum volumen an Lord Bowring, quod ridiculum est, sed ego debui relinquere | ut erat. Vielleicht verklagt er Sie sogar darin, sed monui anglum, esse illum ultra-Slavum etc., (inter nos).’<sup>35</sup>

Meanwhile Bowring had written to Dobrovský on his own account on 7th March, asking whether the collections of Rittersberg and Čelakovský were ‘the best examples of Bohemian poetry’ and the translations of Svoboda ‘in all respects satisfactory’. The letter has a slightly obsequious tone doubtless considered appropriate for addressing a ‘Grand Old Man’. ‘It may afford you pleasure to know that Slavonian Literature is now exciting some attention in this country. None of us can throw light upon the matter –

<sup>32</sup>Jagić, pp. 596–7.

<sup>33</sup>19.II.1827, Jagić, pp. 597–8.

<sup>34</sup>18.IV.1827, *Новыя Письма Добровскаго, Копитара и Другихъ Югозападныхъ Славянъ*, ed. V. Jagić, St. Petersburg 1897, pp. 60–61; also, Kop. to Dobr. 10.IV.1827, Jagić 1885, pp. 598–9, to Hanka 4.V.1827, Jagić 1897, p. 62.

<sup>35</sup>21.V.1827, Jagić 1885, pp. 600–1.

---

but we can reflect your light if you will illumine us.<sup>36</sup>

The parcel of books reached the Thames in June, as Bowring informed Kopitar. 'A few of the books in the list I possessed before, – but that matters little. My first essay shall be in one of our literary periodicals, – and I will send you a copy.'<sup>37</sup>

Bowring subsequently received a letter from Dobrovský, alerted by Kopitar, warning him against two MS forgeries, 'conjecta a quibusdam qui nimio patriae seu maternae linguae amore, haec obtrudere incautis voluere.'<sup>38</sup> These were 'Píseň pod Vyšehradem', of which he wrote, 'Novi | jam auctorem quem tibi nominare possem', and 'Libušin soud'. He insisted however that the Dvůr Králové MS was genuine: 'Ea omnia quae in MSto Auloregensi leguntur poematis sine omni dubio genuina sunt, quamquam et haec Zelotes Bohemici antiquiora esse putent saltern aliqua, quam sana crisis admittere possit.' A later statement to Kopitar confirms that it was news of Jungmann's 'obsignatum volumen' which had inspired the letter: 'Ich habe Ihrem Winke gemäss, Bowring geschrieben, und ihn gewarnet.'<sup>39</sup>

p.34

— — —

Although Kopitar and Dobrovský suspected Jungmann of hostile propaganda, the available evidence in fact points to the conclusive influence of Čelakovský, who early entered into correspondence with Bowring.

Čelakovský's first mention of Bowring was in a letter to Kamarýt in January 1827 referring to a recent conversation with Dobrovský, whom he regarded as soft in the head. 'Králo. Ruk. překládá jistý Anglik (Browen? myslím, že tak) do angličiny a též Srbské Vukem sebrané písň. Dobrovský trochu sem tam po čele...'<sup>40</sup> He had allegedly spoken slightingly of the Serbian songs. 'Ondyno jsem byl u něho a srdečně jsem se zasmál: "Ich weiss nicht, was die Leute nur | mit den serbischen Liedern haben wollen, – dass hat alles der Kopytar so ausgeschrieen, dann haben sie dem Göthe was weiss gemacht, und jetzt machen sie so viel Lärm. Und es sind doch nur Gassenhauer! Etwas anderes sind die russischen, die haben doch noch in der 3ten Person sing. das alte ть." Vidíš, tak posuzují grammatici básnické plody.'

p.35

Čelakovský wrote spontaneously to Bowring afterwards, and, as Bowring's answer in April demonstrates, he cast doubt on Dobrovský's reliability as a suitable judge of literature. Bowring replied, 'I am aware that the Abbé's merits are those of a linguist, and that there is a most obvious line of distinction between dry verbal discussions and the free flow of poetical thoughts.'<sup>41</sup> Čelakovský had offered his own services instead, which Bowring welcomed with alacrity. 'What you offer so liberally to undertake is precisely what is the object of my desire – to be able to form a correct estimate of the origin, progress, present state and general character of the popular poetry of Bohemia.'

---

<sup>36</sup>Orig. LAPNP.

<sup>37</sup>18.VI.1827, Filipović, pp. 124–6; also Glonar, entry 19.V.27.

<sup>38</sup>Chudoba, pp. 19–20, from *Cheskian Anthology*, 1832, pp. 7–8.

<sup>39</sup>28.VII.1828, Jagić 1885, pp. 616–7.

<sup>40</sup>23.I.1827, Bílý 1, p. 301.

<sup>41</sup>3.IV.1827, Beer, pp. 8–9.

p.36 It was now for Čelakovský to try to make good his offer, and he commented to Kamarýt, whom he kept well-informed on his literary activities, on the hardness of the task. 'Učiním co mohu; ale probíraje naše umělecké | dosavadní básnictví zhrozil jsem se, jak málo prací máme, kteréby za přeložení stály, a jedva možná mezi oněmi 300 básníků, jak se troubilo, 30 řádných naleznouti básní, kteréby jen poněkud cizozemským po boku státi zasluhovaly.'<sup>42</sup> Part of the difficulty, for older periods at least, was the state of literary scholarship and absence of recent editions; also a lack of appreciation for mediaeval or baroque literature, except insofar as it matched the writers' own concepts of what true popular or national Slav poetry ought to be.

Bowring's next letter in June acknowledged receipt of Čelakovský's *Slovanské národní písně* and also some German translations. Their literary tastes were easily compatible. Bowring agreed that popular poetry as a natural emanation reflected national character better than the 'poetry of civilisation' and compared the songs in Čelakovský's collection to the English ballads as distinct from Ossianic verses, 'moitié antiques moitié modernes'.<sup>43</sup> He also broached the question of translations. The form of words used implies ability to understand the originals in the main: this was pretty certainly not true.<sup>44</sup>

p.37 Les traductions Allemandes que vous m'envoyez sont d'une grande valeur pour moi – car elles servent pour éloigner tous mes doutes sur les passages et en | même temps me font connaître quels morceaux sont les plus intéressants à votre avis. Je rougis en vous en demandant encore – mais la bienveillance s'expose à ces actions – et seulement je pourrai vous dire qu'en me favorisant de la manière vous ferez connaître et votre langue et votre littérature parmi les Anglais, dont la bonne opinion vaudra quelque chose peut-être... Mr. Dobrowsky et Mr. Kopitar m'ont fait le plaisir de m'envoyer tout ce qu'il y a de mieux dans votre langue. Vous m'indiquerez peut-être les passages qui valent plus que les autres et s'il y a des morceaux difficiles vous y ajouterez quelque explication. Jusqu'à présent je n'ai fait que traduire une douzaine de vos Pjsně.

Bowring was not too loath to lean heavily on the generosity of his correspondents: their help was, after all, absolutely essential.

Čelakovský continued to keep his friend Kamarýt informed with the greatest of enthusiasm about this latest boost to the Czech literary cause. Bowring had written that Čelakovský's collection of songs would – he believed – bring pleasure to his compatriots 'et au peuple au delà de l'Atlantique.' The letter to Kamarýt commented: 'Považ si, tedy až do Ameriky přijdeme, a tam budeme známi, jsouce neznámými ve vlasti.'<sup>45</sup> The anthology, when eventually published, was a damp squib.

---

<sup>42</sup>12.VI.1827, Bílý 1, p. 311.

<sup>43</sup>28.VI.1827, Beer, pp. 9–11.

<sup>44</sup>Same.

<sup>45</sup>24.VII.1827, Bílý 1, p. 316.



---

Čelakovský wrote to Bowring on 20th June and again, his longest letter, during August.<sup>46</sup> Much of its substance was adapted for Bowring's first article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* early in 1828. The letter provided a thumbnail sketch of the entire history of Czech poetry, divided into three periods: up to 1350, 1350 to circa 1780, and the present day. On the | arrangement of the anthology he suggested a division into three sections, which Bowring followed in the published work, but not very clearly: the Dvůr Králové MS and works of the first period, folksongs, and specimens of recent poetry. He criticised Dobrovský's choice of books despisingly, both for their language and poetical merit. 'H. Dobrovský schickte Ihnen auch Gedichte von Štěpnička, Herzog u andere, die aber zu Ihrem Plane nicht passen werden; da es meistens poetische Missgeburten sind, überdies auch bei uns wegen sehr schlechter Sprache im bösen Rufe.' In a postscript he asked Bowring not to use his name in employing any of his notes, especially any remarks about government oppression: 'Ich wünsche jedoch, dass Sie im Falle Ihnen einige von diesen Bemerkungen recht wären, meinen Namen zur Bestätigung nicht gebrauchen möchten, vorzüglich, wo ich von Bedrückung sprach. Den Grund werden Sie leicht einsehen; weil es bey uns nicht rathsam ist, die Wahrheit zu geigen.' And so, when Bowring failed to acknowledge his chief source in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* article, he was in fact following the express wish of his informant, as well as his usual practice. p.38

Bowring in a reply in October brought up the matter of the forgeries (he had received Dobrovský's | letter) and pointed out the suggestive parallels in the English world of letters. 'It is a curious fact that even in Bohemia there should be a controversy respecting those literary forgeries similar to that which raged here respecting the Rowley Mss. and the Ossianic poetry (of what allow me to say en passant that only small fragments and isolated scraps have the authority of antiquity, and I mention this because the true state of the case is little understood in the Continent).'<sup>47</sup> Čelakovský was predictably annoyed and told Kamarýt he would have to set Bowring back on the right track. 'Dobrov. je sviňák; psal Bowr. a Bowr. se tomu velice diví, žeby u nás též měli býti takoví starobylostí fabrikanti jako u nich se dělo s Ossian. Bude potřebí mu to vysvětliti, anebo na jeho příchod do Prahy ponechati. . .'<sup>48</sup> p.39

Bowring had told Čelakovský that he was going with his family to Heidelberg in October, where he would 'try to diverge to your capital if that may be.'<sup>49</sup> A couple of letters from there requested autographs, of which he was an avid collector, and also short biographical notes on the authors to be included in the anthology. 'Die, welche ich in Jungmann finde, sind zu kurz und unvollständig'<sup>50</sup>, he wrote, although it is extremely doubtful how capable he was of reading | the Czech text of Jungmann's *Historie české literatury*. To Kopitar Bowring announced his intention to visit Vienna, Hungary, Transylvania and 'à ce que j'espère les provinces Slavoniques.'<sup>51</sup> But these p.40

---

<sup>46</sup>Bílý 2, pp. 589–98.

<sup>47</sup>8.X.1827, Beer, pp. 11–12.

<sup>48</sup>21.XI.1827, Bílý 1, p. 329.

<sup>49</sup>8.X.1827.

<sup>50</sup>To Čelak. 31.X.1827, Beer, pp. 12–13.

<sup>51</sup>1.X.1827, Filipović, pp. 128–9.

plans were all abandoned, though Kopitar urged him to come, insisting that ‘en général, vous vous convaincrez que l’Autriche vaut bien mieux que sa réputation.’<sup>52</sup> Bowring was suspicious of the Austrian police. A letter to Hanka said he hoped to come to Bohemia in the spring, ‘wenn es mir möglich ist (und ich keine Schwierigkeiten von der Oesterreichischen Polizei finden werde).’<sup>53</sup>

Meanwhile, while anticipating Bowring’s arrival next spring, which was not to be – he went instead to Holland on government business<sup>54</sup> – Čelakovský encouraged Bowring to ignore Dobrovský. However, in December, he received a not altogether satisfying answer. Bowring wrote, ‘I take an account of all you say respecting the Dobrowsky’s controversing in re Libuša. My purpose is to give what the Abbé says in his letter to me and to contrast it with your and other opinions. The world must judge – it can hardly in fairness to either be passed over in silence. No doubt he should have mentioned the Impostor’s name.’<sup>55</sup> Being unable to judge for himself he was not simply going to take Čelakovský’s word for it – not an unreasonable decision in the circumstances, even if it satisfied neither party. |

p.41

The same letter announced his *Foreign Quarterly Review* article on Czech literature, as well as a plan never carried to fruition to publish another on Kollár’s *Slávy dcera*, which, he wrote, ‘is redundant in beauties and whose fine patriotic sensibilities are full of charms both dignified and graceful.’ He called the first article ‘a Parachute to precede my Balloon.’ Čelakovský was by now impatient for the anthology itself, and early in the New Year decided that it had probably been published already. He told Bowring: ‘O wenn sie doch schon in meinen Händen wäre! Der unvergleichliche John Bowring macht, dass ich zehnmal des Tages an London denke.’<sup>56</sup> But the anthology itself was another four whole years away, and it was a month or two before he was able to see the *Foreign Quarterly Review* article.

While he was waiting a short article in the *Museum* journal came to his attention: it referred to a notice on Czech literature which had appeared at the end of 1827 in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*. The article was by the editor Palacký, and the reference was rather uncomplimentary. ‘Zprávy tyto patrně z dobrého pramenu t.j. z Čech samých vydavatelům časopisu toho dodány byly. Tím více litovati bude každý vlastenec, že to tak povrchně a běžně se stalo. Pan překladatel „Marinky“ | jistě první tomu na odpor bude, aby dramatická tato maličkost, tak říká, v čele veškerého literárního snažení Čechů považována byla, zvláště kdež o znamenitých zásluhách našich Dobrovských, Jungmannů a Presslů a j. ani zmínka se neděje... Ale však i Angličané bohdá lepší známosti o literatuře naší nabudou, až jim pan *Bowring* své již ohlášené přeložení výboru českých zpěvů podá.’<sup>57</sup> As the author of *Márinka*, a version of Goethe’s drama

p.42

<sup>52</sup>10.XI.1827, Chudoba, pp. 26–7.

<sup>53</sup>31.X.1827, Beer, p. 21.

<sup>54</sup>See III note 1.

<sup>55</sup>20.XII.1827, Beer, pp. 13–14.

<sup>56</sup>12.II.1828, Bílý 2, pp. 599–601.

<sup>57</sup>‘Literní zprávy z Prahy, na počátku měsíce dubna 1828’, ČČM 1828 sv. 2, pp. 131–8, also F. Palackého *pisy drobné*, 3, ed. Leander Čech, 1902, p. 596; ‘Bohemia’, *Foreign Quarterly Review* (hereafter *FQR*) 1 (1827), p. 649.

---

*Die Geschwister*, Čelakovský felt he was being got at, and he asked Bowring about the matter in a rather irritated tone. He had written to no other Englishman, he said: 'Ich wenigstens würde nie geschrieben haben: „The Wooer (by Macháček) is esteemed the best in the Bohem. language“ da dieses Lustspiel blos zu unsern mittelmässigen gehört. Auch würde ich nicht bemerkt haben, that Tomsa has translated Claren's tales, da Original u. Uibersetzg nicht viel werth ist; am wenigsten würde ich aber von meinen Arbeiten gesprochen haben. Wenn die engl. Foreign Reviews angaben über unser liter. Streben mittheilen wollen, so wäre es nicht schwer die besten u. neuesten Nachrichten aus der Quelle zu bekommen.'<sup>58</sup>

Bowring denied responsibility for the notice. 'I know nothing of the source whence comes the information | in the Foreign Review – Their information is frequently both lame and late. The only matter for which I am responsible is the Article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* on Bohemian Literature...'<sup>59</sup> But there was a confusion between two different journals here. Čelakovský in his letter to Bowring had written by mistake 'Foreign Review', i.e. the Foreign Review and Continental Miscellany, to which Palacký had also referred in his article. However, the second sentence of Bowring's denial is unambiguous, and the denial agrees with the claim of John Macray, an employee of the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, that the section 'Miscellaneous literary notices', 1827–34, was chiefly drawn up by himself.<sup>60</sup> Nevertheless it must be suspected that the material passed through Bowring's hands. Čelakovský wrote to Kamarýt about the incident, taking a side-swipe at Palacký: 'Snad ho to bolelo, že se tam mimo zásluh Dobrov. a j. (totož a j. znamená Palackého) též o tom jiném zmínka neděje. Jednak se mi samému ten posudek nelíbí, a jest toliko kopie z Bowring. vzata na zdařbůh, jak se pod ruku namítla.'<sup>61</sup>

Bowring enquired after Čelakovský's opinion of the Foreign Quarterly Review article in the letter just quoted, hoping that it would meet with favour. 'Errors | there may be – many – and many ones – but I hope its spirit is good – as its intention was. Its influence has been assuredly kindly – and favorable to the Bohemian people – but it was a hasty sketch and must not be judged of sternly.'<sup>62</sup> He did not know what dissension and alarm it was going to cause among the writers it dealt with, and those who had assisted him.

---

<sup>58</sup>18.IV.1828, Bílý 2, pp. 601–3.

<sup>59</sup>Bowr. to Čelak. 1.V.1828, Bílý 4 pp. 103–5.

<sup>60</sup>*Notes and Queries* 2nd ser. 8 (1859), pp. 124–7.

<sup>61</sup>Ante 3.V.1828, Bílý 1, p. 353.

<sup>62</sup>Bowr. to Čelakovský I.V.1828.



## Chapter 5

# The Foreign Quarterly Review Article

Bowring's article on 'Bohemian Literature' in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* for February 1828<sup>1</sup> was headed by the title of Jungmann's *Historie literatury české*, but it is not really a review of that work at all. It has already been stated that it was doubtful whether Bowring could have read it in the original. p.45

Bowring used the long letter from Čelakovský of August 1827<sup>2</sup> as the basis of a large part of the text, filling that out with bibliographical details from Šafárik's *Geschichte*. The translations given included specimens of the Dvůr Králové MS, folk songs from Čelakovský, and sonnets from Kollár's *Slávy dcera*. There were also extracts from Šnajdr's narrative ballad 'Zvon' ('Jan, Jan, za chrta dán'), a stanza of Puchmajer's ode to Žižka, Chmelenský's 'Nač má tu býti ekáno?' and Čelakovský's 'Vodník'. The emphasis was on popular or quasi-popular (literary) verse, ancient or modern, with the notable exception of the eight Kollár sonnets. Three of these were as yet unpublished,<sup>3</sup> and most likely provided by the author himself. There were several aspects | bound to p.46 provoke annoyance and controversy, and, at the same time, delight in differing quarters. These were his estimation of certain people, above all of Dobrovský, his stance on the MSS, his interpretation of Kollár, and his anti-Habsburg political stance.

Šafárik for a start was probably not too flattered by the following judgment on the *Geschichte*, which as far as we know was Bowring's own: 'It is much to be regretted that the author has too generally contented himself with the dry record of bibliographical facts, since wherever he has allowed scope to his mind – whether in the character of sober criticism, or in the playfulness of imagination, there is abundant evidence that he might have produced a very lively, instead of a very dull volume; and have made the matter attractive to the many, which is now referred to only by the few.'<sup>4</sup> This turns out, however, to be one of his better judgments.

---

<sup>1</sup>2, pp. 145–174.

<sup>2</sup>Bílý 2, pp. 589–98.

<sup>3</sup>Ed. 1868 III no. 105, I no. 17, II no. 42.

<sup>4</sup>FQR article, p. 146.

p.47 Kopitar, on the other hand, came in for fulsome praise, embarrassing to him as official censor in view of the political attitude represented in the article: 'Calm and philosophical in his judgment, of varied learning, ready perception, unwearied industry, and undoubted talent – his writings and exertions have served at once to encourage whatever is excellent, to | reprove whatever is vicious, to quiet the passionate enthusiasm of an overstrained patriotism, and to fix and fortify Slavonian literature on the basis of a sound and judicious criticism.'<sup>5</sup> This made him sound like some 'Grand Old Man'.

But, having apparently followed the anti-Romantic, anti-ultra-Slav line here, he then took the Jungmann, and the Čelakovský line in criticising the aesthetic (critical) and philosophical outlook of Dobrovský. I quote in full:<sup>6</sup>

In the year 1792, the Abbé Dobrowsky published his History of the Language and Literature of Bohemia. It is full of interesting and valuable information respecting the remoter periods, but records very imperfectly the progress of letters in more modern times. In 1818, he printed another edition, which is so much extended and improved as to appear rather like a new work than a revisal of the former, and which he calls a History of the *Ancient* Literature of Bohemia. Much indeed has Dobrowsky added to the stock of Slavonian knowledge, and his various philological works are the greatest and best authorities on the subject. The student who wishes to trace the early history of the Slavonic tongue, will do well to consult the Abbé's '*Institutiones Linguae Slavicae.*' Every thing Dobrowsky writes is pregnant with erudition, though his critical and philosophical merits are perhaps not on a level with his knowledge; but all Slavonians look up to him with respect, as one of the props and glories of the Slavonian race.

p.48 The last sentence delighted Čelakovský and his friends, who were annoyed by Dobrovský's rejection of 'Libušin soud' and 'Píseň pod Vyšehradem', and attacks on their conception of pagan Slavdom. The idea had come, of course, | straight from Čelakovský. And so, perhaps by trying to please all sides at once, Bowring here came a cropper with Šafárik, Kopitar and Dobrovský.

He tried to give both sides of the MSS dispute, but Dobrovský did not consider the dispute legitimate or his opponents worthy of any credence, so he failed to please him here also: 'the authenticity of this poem, and of several others which had obtained circulation, has been fiercely debated, and Dobrowsky himself, who had given an opinion in favour of their antiquity and authenticity, has of late declared that he holds them to be spurious. A contrary doctrine is however held by Hanka, Čelakovský and other authorities.'<sup>7</sup> Bowring was caught in a cleft stick, unable to totally satisfy anyone, but once again he leaned to the side of keeping favour with Čelakovský. Though assigning the Dvůr Králové MS itself to 'between the year 1290 and 1310', he stated,

---

<sup>5</sup>p. 146.

<sup>6</sup>p. 146.

<sup>7</sup>p. 149.

---

in concurrence with the Jungmann group, that the contents were 'most probably the productions of the ninth and tenth century.'<sup>8</sup>

Bowring gave Kollár pride of place among contemporary poets. For Bowring Kollár's 'Slavonia' (Sláva) was not to be seen as an area of cultural unity or mutuality alone, but as an aspired-to area of political | cooperation. This frightened everyone of the Czech writers at least a little, and horrified many, as it raised in their minds the spectre of a clamp-down by the government censorship and official suspicion against Czech literary and patriotic institutions. I quote again at length:<sup>9</sup> p.49

Kollar has chosen the form of the Sonnet, and taking Petrarch for his model, has constituted a Laura of Slavonia, his country – whose history, whose hopes, whose sorrows, he sings with the passionate fondness of a lover. At the shrine, or on the grave of Bohemia, he pours out all his affections. In her he sees nothing but beauty to be admired, and perfection to be worshipped: spite of her sufferings, even in the moments of her despair, he invokes her as the favourite of the Deity. She is blended in his mind with the tenderness of earth and the sublimity of heaven; his fancy is continually vibrating between some cheering recollection and some beautiful anticipation – revelling either in the glory that *was* – or that *is to be* shed upon her. We have been somewhat surprized that language so free and sentiments so lofty, should have been allowed to circulate in Bohemia. His are truly 'the thoughts that breathe and words that burn,' and we should have called them 'dangerous', but as a sort of allegory is preserved through most of his sonnets, it may be that their political tendency has not been perceived.

His own copy of *Slávy dcera* (Buda 1824), now in the British Museum, contains the following inscription on the fly-leaf in the owner's hand: 'This is a very remarkable book: – and how its free and fiery spirit should have burst thro' Austrian Censorship is altogether unintelligible to J. B.'<sup>10</sup>

The political sentiments of the article need not | be quoted in extenso, since Čelakovský repeated much of their substance in letters to Kamarýt and Chmelenský which will be returned to. They were in fact a slightly eroded version of the opinions in Čelakovský's letter of August 1827. In one passage Bowring sounds far more favourably disposed to the German language than Čelakovský, but this is passed over by the latter without comment. Bowring often muddles the original sense, and the same passage loses a distinction between older and recent government policy made in the original letter:<sup>11</sup> p.50

The foolish attempt of Joseph II. to eradicate the Bohemian idiom, while it added greatly to the dislike with which the Austrians were regarded in

---

<sup>8</sup>p. 150.

<sup>9</sup>p. 167.

<sup>10</sup>*Slávy dcera*, 2nd ed., Buda 1824, BM 11585b20: 'Panu Janowi Bowringowi / Pawel Josef Šaffářjk.'

<sup>11</sup>Article, pp. 146–7.

Bohemia, led to the revival and regeneration of the national literature, and leagued the patriotism and the passions of the Bohemians more closely to the language of their forefathers. A continuation of the same system on the part of the government of Vienna has continued the same effect, and instead of giving to the German tongue that influence and precedence which in the natural course of things it would have obtained in the Slavonian provinces, has arrayed the pride and the prejudices of a whole people against an interference as idle as it is despotic.

Čelakovský had in fact written, in sharper contours:<sup>12</sup>

Es war unter ihm [Joseph II] der Plan angelegt, dass in 50 Jahren die böhmische Sprache gänzlich ausgerottet werden sollte... Die jetzige Regierung befolgt zwar Josephs Grundsätze nicht mehr, den ganzen Staat auf eine Sprache zu bringen; sondern geht vielmehr von der politischen Maxime aus, dass Unterschied in der Sprache dem Throne viel zuträglicher ist...

p.51 Another example of how Bowring distorted or muddled the sense of Čelakovský's words is in the | account of the mediaeval period, where the original letter described an influx of foreign culture and consequent decline in national popular poetry (Naturpoesie) in the fourteenth century.<sup>13</sup>

Mit der Gründung der hohen Schule zu Prag unter Karl I. wurde die lateinische Sprache noch allgemeiner, die Böhmen veränderten ihre Tracht, viele Fremde zogen ins Land, und so nahm Böhmen allmählig auch die Gestalt von andern deutschen Ländern an wenigstens in der oberen Klasse seiner Bewohner. Weltliche Dichtkunst mag sich noch bey dem Volke in Liedern, und auf den Rittersitzen zur Erholung erhalten haben. Von Volksliedern wissen wir aus dieser Zeit sehr wenig, und die Gesänge der nach deutscher Art etwa herumziehenden Sängler sind nicht von der besten Art.

Bowring, after an attack on the 'tales, legends and devotional mysteries, resembling the doggerel Latin verses of the times or miserable scholastic trifling... hardly worth that deliverance from oblivion with which the industrious Wáclaw Hanka has honoured them, by introducing so many of them into his *Starobylá Skládanie*',<sup>14</sup> made it a decline in the status of the language itself:<sup>15</sup>

... An influx of foreign monks and teachers into Bohemia gave additional influence to the Latin tongue. To employ it was the characteristic of

---

<sup>12</sup>Letter VIII.1827, Bílý 2, p. 594.

<sup>13</sup>Letter, p. 591.

<sup>14</sup>Article, p. 154.

<sup>15</sup>Article, p. 154.



---

aristocracy, and of what was then deemed learning, and the Bohemian language, banished from the domains of literature – spurned and slighted by the influential clergy – took up its abode among the people, to re-appear again ‘after many days’, in those popular songs and ballads, out of which the poetic and industrious Čelakovský has made up his attractive volumes.

Specimens of folk-poetry from Čelakovský followed, thereby upsetting the chronology; and later, after | these folk songs, he quite contradicted himself over the status of the language from the fourteenth century: ‘The period during which the Bohemian language was in its highest state of cultivation, was undoubtedly between the foundation of the university of Prague (A. D. 1348), and the battle of the White Mountain (1620).’<sup>16</sup> He subsequently gave a paragraph based on the period 1526–1620 in Šafárik’s *Geschichte*, followed by another based on the period 1410–1526, in the wrong order! What Čelakovský had written was that the period 1348–1620 was the Golden Age of Czech *prose*: ‘Die Zeit von der Gründung der Universität an bis zur Schlacht am weissen Berge, ist die eigentliche Epoche der böhm. Prosa.’<sup>17</sup> p.52

Yet Čelakovský had set out his periods quite clearly at the start of his letter, as well as making the distinction between Natur- and Kunstpoesie, which is central to his aesthetic judgments:<sup>18</sup>

Es geht demnach die erste Epoche bis 1350 (runde Zahl); die zweyte von da bis 1780 (r.Z.) die 3t seqqt. Die erste ist die Epoche der Naturpoesie, durchgehends nationell, Heldenlieder. Die zweite enthält meistens versifizierte Prosa religiöse, ziemlich was Poesie betrifft gehaltlose Produkte. Die Poesie unserer Tage (3) geht meistens aus Kunstregeln hervor, ist grossentheils fremden Mustern nachgebildet u ihre Dauer beträgt nicht einmal ein halbes Jahrhundert. Neuere Naturpoesie findet man in Volksliedern, deren Alter sich zum Theil von 1600 J. bestimmen läst.

While Bowring did undoubtedly follow this scheme basic|ally in the organisation of his article he managed to confuse the structure quite a lot on the way. p.53

Čelakovský’s reaction to the article was one of delight, stressing the political anti-German, anti-Habsburg side of the thing and the account of linguistic and cultural oppression. He was also well pleased by the criticism of Dobrovský. A letter to Kamarýt (ante 3rd May 1828) shows his great gratification:<sup>19</sup>

Kdyby to četl, skákalbys radostí... Co tomu ale Němci řeknou? – Praví se tam o Josef. II. mnoho, a jmenuje ho pošetilým (the foolish Joseph), že kdy pomyslíl 5 milion. lidu chtíti jazyk odnítí, praví se tam o нашей владѣ, якъ несвѣдомитá, же тѣмто 5 мил. ани одну школу недává, правí

---

<sup>16</sup> Article, p. 158.

<sup>17</sup> Letter, p. 593.

<sup>18</sup> Letter, p. 590.

<sup>19</sup> Bílý 1, p. 353.

се тамъ, же мужовѣ, ктері въ целѣм свѣтѣ славнѣ имено добыли, суть у нас в ненависти яко Гусъ, Еронимъ etc. а славный удатный Жижка же ест буричем названъ, а Чеховъ наилучшій а нейшлехетнѣйшій крал Подѣбр. as a usurpator and tyran. Také uvádí slova Jungmanova Musej. Čas. I. pag. 38. a odporuje Jungm., že není tak smutný pohled na naši literaturu, že se nám není co o šlechtu a možnější ptáti, ti že nikdy žádnou literaturu neštěpili ani nezdokonalili, potřebí prý toliko v lásce k jazyku pokračov. a vlastenectví rozhojňovati etc. Zkrátka nedá se to tak vypsati, jako kdybys sám četl. . . Co tomu říkáš Dobr. nám zas upírá nalezení rkp. z 11 stol. zlomky evangelií, a dí, že podstr. bodejž ho, ale učije kosa kámen. Již dostal od Bowr. který praví, Dobrov. učenost, jak vysoká, tak nízká jeho filosof. (krásovědná) a kritika.

p.54 Another letter to Plánek is written in very similar terms, though less is said about the government of the day, and he does not find it necessary to use the | Cyrillic alphabet to conceal his words a little from the possible roving eye of the censor.<sup>20</sup>

The reference to the irrelevance of the nobility is not at all explicit in the article. The passage quoted by Bowring from Jungmann (following Čelakovský's letter, not the original article by Jungmann) has the following: 'Our mighty ones are wholly Germanized or half Frenchified, and our poorer classes, what can they do?' Bowring wrote as commentary on this: 'We look with no such gloom upon the literature of Bohemia. It is springing up anew in vigour and virtue, and its preservation depends not upon the determination or decrees of others, but on the patriotism and the exertions of the Bohemians themselves.'<sup>21</sup> The statement that nobles and the rich never determined the value of any literature is not in Bowring's text. Čelakovský was presumably just remembering what he himself had written to Bowring and reinforcing the sense of the article by recourse to his own ideas on the subject: 'Aber Schande ist es für jene adelichen Geschlechter böhmischen Blutes u Nahmens, die unbekannt mit den ruhmvollen Thaten ihrer Ahnen, sich ihrer Sprache und ihres Volkes schämen, da sie doch von dem Schweisse u Blute des böhmischen Unterhaus sich sättigen, ohne ein Wort in seiner Sprache vorbringen zu können.'<sup>22</sup> Again, where | Čelakovský writes, as if quoting from the article, 'neboť zde se nepíše pro zisk a z chlouby',<sup>23</sup> this is not anywhere in the English text, although it is not opposed to the general drift of the sense. Čelakovský in fact gave a kind of rhapsodising paraphrase of Bowring (while at the same time Bowring's words were frequently a rhapsody on Čelakovský). Through an English mouthpiece Čelakovský was enabled to express views he could scarcely render public under his own name.

p.55

Kamarýt replied to Čelakovský in suitably pleased tones. His previous doubts, now apparently mollified, had, it must be said, a good grain of truth in them: 'Myslilof se zpočátku, že snad Angličané více aneb jedině z chlouby do jazyků slovanských se

---

<sup>20</sup>12.VII.1828, Bílý 1, p. 372.

<sup>21</sup>Article, p. 173.

<sup>22</sup>Letter VIII.1827, p. 596.

<sup>23</sup>Čelak. to Plánek 12.VII.1828.

---

pouští jakož to bývá – ale ze všeho co k mému potěšení píšeš, vidím, že P. Bowr. musí býti hodná, přímá, milostná duše.<sup>24</sup>

While approving thoroughly of the political sentiments of the article Čelakovský was nervous about the possible consequences of the remarks about Kollár. He claimed to Kamarýt that he had avoided choosing the more militant ones: 'Slávy dce – znamenaje pro Bowr. z ní numera pěknější, schválně jsem vyhnul oným mečovým a bičovým, ale tento tknut její krásou hloubal dále a přišel – nač snad přijíti neměl. . . – Co my pod rouškou | tam nalezáme, našel on též, a – (trochu to ovšem nemilo!) odhalil Angličanům.'<sup>25</sup> As far as Čelakovský was concerned Bowring had interpreted Kollár just as he and his friends did, reading between the lines. Some of the sonnets printed were ones clearly not supplied by Čelakovský, which accounts for his surprise at finding them included. Bowring had used three unpublished ones most likely sent by Kollár; he also had at his disposal the Wenzig versions in German from the Museum journal provided by Šafárik, which he could have employed in two other cases.<sup>26</sup> p.56

In his first letter to Bowring after reading the Foreign Quarterly Review piece Čelakovský expressed warm approval for most aspects. His remonstrations against the Kollár passage is based, not on its accuracy or inaccuracy, but on pragmatic grounds, that Kollár might suffer in consequence. 'Was aber zu manchen Stellen – Vieña – sagen wird, weiss ich nicht, da die Wahrheit einmal unverhüllt gezeigt wurde. Die einzige Stelle über Slawy dcera, hätte ich gewünscht, gemildert zu sehen; denn das 'dangerous' sticht fatal in die Augen, u. H. Kollar können vielleicht daraus Unannehmlichkeiten geschehen.'<sup>27</sup> Bowring understood the comment on his political stance to be a little reproving (though | privately Čelakovský was quite jubilant) and rejoined with an appeal in the English manner to freedom of speech. One hopes the note of condescension passed by unobserved:<sup>28</sup> p.57

You must allow us here a little freedom of speech. We cannot so easily train our thoughts to prudence. We say many things without weighing them, because nobody calls us to account for what we say. But we must not be judged harshly, for we mean well. We desire, I hope so to see you all as happy and as free as may be, at least as free as would add to your happiness, and we have to tune our harps to English feelings, and take a stand somewhat advanced in the political contest. . .

I should be really unhappy if Kollar should experience any sort of inconvenience from what I have said; but how can he be made responsible for opinions of mine?

The fear was that it would be decided by the authorities that Bowring's was the true interpretation.

---

<sup>24</sup>3.V.1828, Bílý 1, p. 355.

<sup>25</sup>16.V.1828, Bílý 1, p. 361.

<sup>26</sup>'Sláva krásou libé řeči Polku' ed. 1824 no. 20, 'Užřev ondy měsíc plnoskvoucí' no. 39.

<sup>27</sup>26.V.1828, Bílý 2, p. 604.

<sup>28</sup>9.VII.1828, Beer, p. 15.

p.58 A storm was brewing over Kollár, just as it was over the political content of the article as a whole, and the aspersions cast on Dobrovský. A storm in a teacup, it would appear, but a storm nevertheless. Outside Čelakovský's immediate circle the reaction to the *Foreign Quarterly Review* article was either extremely nervous, even while supporting much of what it said, or negative and furious. Čelakovský told Kamarýt in September that he was even quite glad the anthology had still not appeared, in order to give time for the hue and cry to die down. 'Dobr. se na Bow. velice mrzí, že tam na | důtklivé stránky se dotekl, a jaksi kritičnost jeho v pochybnost uvedl. Pomsta to za soud libušin. Též Kopyt. cosi o tom v listech šplechtá, že ve Vídni oči se vyvalují. S pánem bohem, jižtě čas, aby se jednou otevřela usta, a tuším, bude toho více.'<sup>29</sup>

Another friend, Chmelenský, wrote to him, on the arrival of a letter from Bowring in the autumn: 'Máte zde list z Koblence od Bowringa. Snad Vám ten něco nového poví, co žluč skleněného, nec non porcelánového pána rozdráždí.'<sup>30</sup> Dobrovský, hypersensitive to any opposition to his judgments among the younger generation, was predictably annoyed by this outflanking operation of theirs in influencing Bowring against him.

p.59 Kopitar did not receive his copy of the article until July, when it arrived with other copies to be distributed, some to Prague.<sup>31</sup> His reaction was quite vitriolic, though it began in a subdued enough fashion in a letter to Hanka on 8th July: 'Von Bowring ist dieser Tage ein Paket für Sie etc. angekommen, was aber mehr Übel, als Gutes stiften wird. Mittam per occasionem.'<sup>32</sup> A following letter to Hanka gave vent to the first proper outburst of annoyance, and Kopitar | voiced suspicions about the sealed packet added to Dobrovský's consignment of books. This may be response to some disclaiming remarks from Hanka: 'Eben so schuldfrei bin ich an Bowring's Artikel. Aber Sie haben mir ein versiegeltes Paket mit den bohemicis beigepackt; und ich könnte sagen, der und jener ist es; glaube aber dass das Ganze ein seines Fantasiegemälde des Dichters Bowring ist: c'est un homme à tableau, wie Napoleon sie nennt.'<sup>33</sup> Whether this parcel did contain any material to colour Bowring's opinions is a matter for conjecture, but Čelakovský was probably the main source.

p.60 The points which offended Kopitar most were listed in a later letter to Hanka: the slight against Dobrovský, the anti-Habsburg and anti-Vienna tendency, and the effect the article might have of compromising certain people, especially Kollár, with the Vienna government. 'Bowring non solum me ridiculum fecit, et compromisit, ac si quid fecissem pro re slavica, imo plus Dobrovio fecissem – woran kein wahres Wort ist, sed et vos omnes, utpote de nemcis querentes, praesertim vero Kollarium, quem dicit non fuisse intellectum a censore Budensi. In Ungarn kann alles in integrum restituirt, und Kollar für das kleine Vergnügen des | Bowringschen Compliments blutig büssen.'<sup>34</sup> Kopitar's displeasure about the treatment meted out to Dobrovský is entirely understandable, as he was a great admirer of the man; in addition he was a patriotic

---

<sup>29</sup>6.IX.1828, Bílý 1, p. 381.

<sup>30</sup>20.IX.1828, Bílý 1, p. 383.

<sup>31</sup>See Kopitar to Hanka 8.VII.1828, Jagić 1897, pp. 72–3.

<sup>32</sup>Jagić 1897, pp. 72–3.

<sup>33</sup>19.VII.1828, Jagić 1897, pp. 75–6.

<sup>34</sup>26.VII.1828, Jagić 1897, pp. 76–7.

---

Austrian as well as a staunch Slovene. Nevertheless his reaction was exaggerated. He had been official censor of Slavonic publications at Vienna since 1810, so he was particularly nervous about the mention of himself, as well as quite opposed to the anti-Austrian sentiments.

By August he had discovered a French article in the *Revue Britannique*, which was an adaptation of the English.<sup>35</sup> He decided it must be based on an earlier, more general article, for which there is no evidence, and wrote about it to Hanka in August, apologising for still not having forwarded the copies of the article destined for Hanka, Čelakovský, Jungmann and Dobrovský. 'Videbitis, wie fatal es ist, mit fremden Tableau-Menschen zu thun zu haben! Ihr alle, selbst euer Museum ist auf die indiskreteste Art compromittirt!'<sup>36</sup>

Dobrovský had meanwhile been shown the English article by Josef Hurdálek, retired bishop of Litoměřice.<sup>37</sup> He was not unnaturally displeased by it also. He wrote to Hanka in July, referring to the MSS dispute, which disturbed him most: 'Rozvážným to, co do anglických | listů zasláno, jmenovati nemohu. Tím věc jen zhoršiti se může.'<sup>38</sup>

p.61

Shortly after, in Chudějnice, he was happy to read that Palacký had written in his defence in the Museum journal, as well as calling attention to some mistakes and inadequacies of other kinds in Bowring's account. He thanked him personally in a letter.<sup>39</sup> Palacký had tried to steer a middle course, as editor of the Museum journal, anxious not to lose the contributions of either faction and wanting to maintain some semblance of literary and scholarly cooperation. At the same time, as a protagonist of the MSS and the Romantic picture of Slav Antiquity, and in his language policy, he was a Jungmann follower, and so he did not attack those aspects of the article, just the comment on the 'patriarch' Dobrovský. 'Přičítaje tomuto patriarchovi všech zpytatelů řeči slovanské jen pouhou učenost, a výtečné kritické a filosofické zásluhy jeho poněkud v pochybnost klada, p. Bowring patrně bloudí. . . my všickni více neb méně od něho učili sme se, a učití se bohda ještě budeme, pokud bůh jemu života i zdraví popřeje, třeba bychom i ne o všech věcech s ním všudy stejně smýšleli.'<sup>40</sup>

Dobrovský concurred with Kopitar in objecting | to the onslaughts on the Austrian government, but at the top of his mind there was his sense of growing encirclement by hostile opinion, of growing conspiracy against him, and irritation at the success of the Jungmann faction in obtaining foreign recognition for the MS forgeries. While Kopitar's objections might be described as those of politics, or political expediency, first and foremost, Dobrovský concentrated on his personal sense of siege and questions of scholarly integrity. The *Foreign Quarterly Review* article was merely a last straw. He reckoned that the 'böhmischen enragé' were simply waiting for him to die to do whatever they wanted. Such were the terms in which he wrote to Kopitar on

p.62

---

<sup>35</sup>'Littérature et Poésie de la Bohême', *Revue Britannique* March 1828, pp. 253–63.

<sup>36</sup>9.VIII.1828, Jagić 1897, pp. 77–8.

<sup>37</sup>See Dobr. to Palacký 18.VII.1828, in V. Brandl, *Život Josefa Dobrovského*, Brno 1883, p. 256.

<sup>38</sup>12.VII.1828, Brandl, p. 255.

<sup>39</sup>See note 37.

<sup>40</sup>'Literní zprávy z Prahy v měsíci červenci 1828', *ČČM* 1828 sv. 3, pp. 132–6, also *Palackého spisy drobné* 3, p. 603.

p.63 28th July, showing more anger against Jungmann, Hanka, Čelakovský et alia, than bitterness over Bowring's own personal contribution. 'Dieser zum Theil erlogene Inhalt gab nun manchen Anlass, Ausfälle auf die österreichische Regierung zu machen. Wie ich behandelt werde, werden Sie mit einigem Befremden bemerken. . . Die böhmischen enragé bilden einen förmlichen Club und verbreiten ihre schiefen Urtheile in die entfernten Länder (vermuthlich auch bald nach Indien und Amerika), da sie in der Nahe nicht so unbedingt aufgenommen zu werden hoffen dürfen. . . | Schade, dass Sie nicht nach Prag kamen, und das saubere Geschmiere ansahen. . . Die Leutchen scheinen nur noch meiner Tod abzuwarten, um ungescheut in die Welt zu bringen, was ihnen belieben wird.'<sup>41</sup>

p.64 In his next letter Dobrovský somewhat reproached Kopitar for having introduced Bowring to him in the first place, and continued to speculate about the conspiracy against him. 'Die Bekanntschaft mit Bowring habe ich nicht gesucht; nur auf Ihre Aufforderung gab ich ihm Antwort. Diess bereitete mir nur unverdiente Kränkung.'<sup>42</sup> Kopitar urged Dobrovský to make light of Bowring's 'Dandy-Artikel'. Even Šafárik, Kollár and Hanka, with whom he had been in correspondence, seemed shocked by the affair, he said. He was encouraging Dobrovský to come to Vienna for a visit, and there is a suggestion that he might have a talk with people close to the government. 'Oder könnten Sie mit Graf Eugene ad visendum patrem auch noch bis Wien sich bemühen zum Lustlager.'<sup>43</sup> Perhaps Count Sedlnitzky, chief of the Police and Censorship Dept. in Vienna, is meant.<sup>44</sup> Dobrovský replied that it was the open conspiracy that troubled him, not Bowring and his article. 'Über des Dichterlings B. Urtheil soll ich freylich nur lachen, aber die offenbare Conspiration der böhmischen | Literaturpatrioten gegen mich verdriest mich höchlich.'<sup>45</sup> In contrast, Kopitar continued to treat the affair from the point of view of political indiscretion and radical hotheadedness. He wrote to Dobrovský about the French article: 'Da sind Sie nicht genannt. Si bene memini; saltem nicht so ungerecht, wie im 2ten, aber compromittirt sind darin die Provinzen mehr, deren Museen etc. das Vorspiel ihrer Selbständigkeit und Befreyung und Trennung von Austria seyen sollen!'<sup>46</sup> He had written to Bowring ('Ich habe dem Dandy sein Kapitel richtig gesagt'), but so far with no answer ('Er hat es nicht der Mühe werth gefunden, sich zu vertheidigen und mir gar nicht geantwortet'). That autumn Dobrovský visited Vienna for a while, and he and Kopitar presumably discussed the Bowring affair together. Dobrovský left there in December, but he died shortly after at Brno on 6th January 1829.

The bitterest letter Dobrovský wrote on the subject was to Hanka. It shows again that the attacks of the younger Czech writers loomed much larger in his mind than Bowring's article itself. He included a scarcely veiled threat to denounce Hanka in

---

<sup>41</sup>Jagić 1885, pp. 616–7.

<sup>42</sup>'Am Vorabend meines Geburtstages, 1828', Jagić 1885, pp. 617–9.

<sup>43</sup>30.VIII.1828, Jagić 1885, pp. 619–20; Count Eugen Karel Černín, 1796–1868, friend of Dobrovský and Goethe.

<sup>44</sup>K. Paul, *P. J. Šafárik – život a dílo*, 1961, p. 67.

<sup>45</sup>Mariägeburt 1828, Jagić 1885, pp. 620–21.

<sup>46</sup>27.IX.1828, Jagić 1885, pp. 621–4.

---

public for the forgeries:<sup>47</sup>

Že mne Palacký zastal proti zavedenému Bawringovi, to mu časem odplatím. Svoboda mne skoro za blázna | vyhlásil, angličan za nefilosofo, ale predce za *wědnika*. Majíli pak Čechové mnoho takových bláznů vědníků? Nepřestanu však proto vším dobrým se odměňovati. . .

p.65

Wer ist wohl der Verräther, Lügner und Judas, der mich dem Bawring so *schändlich* schilderte und Kritik nebst Philosophie absprach. Ich werde mich gar bald an ihn rächen. Und wie? Ich werde ihn zum Mitgliede der böhm. gelehrten Gesellschaft vorschlagen. Vielleicht bekehre ich ihn auf diese Art. . .

Kýž by se staří rukopisové naléztí mohli. Však ne snad od nějakého falešníka kování a podvrhli, jako libušin soud. Co pan prof. Jungmann Bawringovi psal, nevím sice, když mu literaturu česku odeslal, že mě ale angličan nedobře zprav[en] křivdu velikou činí, vy sami uznáte po malé[m] času; a kdo jest toho příčina? Jak by se to mohlo poněkud napravit, pan Kopitar, jehož zde očekávám, vám psáti bude. . .

Will man mich etwa noch kreuzigen, weil ich eine Schurkerei so nannte, wie sie es verdiente. Ich erwarte und verlange keine Antwort.

Kopitar wrote a very angry letter indeed to Bowring about the article, which probably came as a nasty surprise after Čelakovský's favourable reception. Kopitar defended Dobrovský with great indignation, called Čelakovský and Hanka a couple of young upstarts, insisted that 'Libušin soud' was an imposture like the fragment of St. John's Gospel, and protested about the compromising statements on Kollár and, in the case of the French article, the National Museum. He found the picture given of a police state a disgusting distortion of the truth.<sup>48</sup>

Mr abbé Dobrowsky est un vieillard de 75 ans, le plus grand savant et *critique* non seulement en fait de littérature et histoire slavonnes, mais en général, en toute l'Autriche: et vous voilà qui lui opposez deux *blancs-becs*, comme Č. et H., ses disciples, et *tout à fait sans suffrage* encore parmi les savans en | général. – C'est lui qui vous a *choisi* l'envoi des Bohemica, et voilà votre réponse à tant de complaisance! Et pour *combler l'affront*, vous lui envoyez une copie de vos insultes, imprimée et adressée de votre propre main! Avouez qu'il faut être bien étourdi au moins pour faire de pareilles extravagances. – *J'en appelle à Me Bowring, en cas de besoin.* –

p.66

Je ne dis rien des autres que vous n'avez pas insultés, mais bien *compromis* à plus d'un égard, p.e. Mr Kollár, dont les ennemis citeront votre article pour prouver des dessins, *criminels d'après eux et d'après vous-même*. Moi-même, je pourrais me plaindre d'être représenté par vous comme un Vieux de la

---

<sup>47</sup>30.VIII.1828, 'Vzájemné dopisy Václ. Hanky a Jos. Dobrovského', ed. A. J. Vrtátko, ČČM 44 (1870) sv. 4, pp. 335–8.

<sup>48</sup>Chudoba, pp. 30–33.

montagne et président du comité directeur slavon, si ma conscience ne m'en faisait sourire. Nil conscire sibi, nullâ pallescere culpa.

Mais, pour en finir enfin, le but de cette lettre est de vous prier instamment, si vous comptez encore publier une *anthologie bohème*, de réparer le tort, *du moins en ne le répétant pas*. Mr l'abbé Dobrowsky passe en *Allemagne et ici* plutôt pour *hypercritique* que pour manquant d'*icelle*. Et surtout il ne faudrait pas lui opposer des blancs-becs, fanatiques *sans honneur*, qui se permettent des *piae fraudes*, in honorem patriae; car il est *certain*, intus et extra certani, que le Saud Libussin est une imposture. Et *le même* imposteur a répété déjà une fois son manège, et étoit sur le point de la faire pour la *seconde fois*, si Dobrowsky et moi ne l'en avions détourné par nos menaces de le démasquer sans pitié.

L'article *analogue* qui se trouve dans la N. 34 de la Revue Britannique, qui diffère de l'original que vous nous avez envoyé, sera traduit sur son avant-coureur. Il *compromet* les fondateurs du musée. Il faut que *vous autres* vous nous preniez pour des *Turcs*, qui ne prennent guère connaissance de ce que vous autres pensez d'eux! Et de *l'autre côté* vous peignez notre police comme l'inquisition d'Espagne! Bien fou celui qui se fie à vous.

Pardonnez, Monsieur, ma franchise et agréez les assurances de la haute considération avec lesquelles j'ai l'honneur d'être, Monsieur, Votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur / Kopitar.

p.67 For a long time there came no answer. Bowring was in Holland on government business and on his own evidence did not receive this letter of 23rd August | till 10th October. While expressing regret if he had fallen into any error, he denied showing ingratitude to Dobrovský or insulting him, and reserved the right to state his own opinion. He had not represented 'Libušin soud' as beyond doubt authentic – which was true – , and he would be sorry if he had compromised Kollár. He was 'no party to the Article in the "Revue Britannique".' The letter was very long, too long, and more protesting than apologetic in tone:<sup>49</sup>

Allow me, my dear Sir, to address you in my own language that I may speak more freely.

It never entered into my mind to speak of Dobrowsky with anything but respect and esteem – still less of *you* from whom I have received many courtesies, – who have done me *many* services, – and for whom I fell (*seriously and truly*) the greatest regard.

I have never said that you have done 'peu de bien' – I never have uttered against you a 'reproche' – I have never set Č and H against Dobrowsky. I have never, as I hope, shown him ingratitude – *Insult him!* That was impossible – I may be *étourdi* but I do not forget – I am the first to acknowledge his services and *your* services to the literature of Slavonia.

---

<sup>49</sup>10.X.1828, Filipović, pp. 126–8.



---

If I have compromised M Kollar it will be to me a bitter thought. I am an Englishman – yet if a man of Wales, of Scotland, or of Ireland talked to me of his worship independence I should listen to him with patience – aye with affection – I have never thought of criminality. That would be to me an unintelligible dream as respects Kollar – and as to representing you as a ‘Vieux de la montagne’ I can refer to twenty occasions where it has been my privilege and my pride to speak of you to the English public in a manner which your incensed language to me will *not change*.

Again – if I have done wrong – if I have said anything I ought not to say – I live to learn – I will not repeat it – Opinions, literary and political, we cannot receive from others – but they may teach us wisdom – and nothing that can fall from you can be | unkindly received by me.

p.68

I would have given much – not to have received from you an uncourteous letter because I honor talents and have always considered you as one of the lights of the age. I do not think I have deserved your severe reproaches – I will not change my tone – because I am not sure that your letter was seriously meant – but I have no interests but those of truth, – *no interests but those of truth*. I will change any thing which is not founded on truth. I have no knowledge of any facts which show that any individual I have mentioned is ‘sans honneur’ – If it be so, I am sorry for it. I have not introduced that Saud Libussin as authentic – but it would have been no more right to pass it over than to forget the poems of Rowley in the history of English poetry, I look upon all the questions you are engaged in to unmask imposture as a service done to literature and to the world. I hope you do not think that I would encourage dishonesty.

I am no party to the Article in the ‘Revue Britannique’ – For myself I can say that I have sought to be just – and if I have erred I mourn it. I value your good opinion – I should be sorry to lose it. I would have buried in oblivion many thoughts could I have thought they would have awakened such feelings as your letter portrays. It is not in anger but sorrow that I write. – I would have made some sacrifice to have prevented you from saying ‘Bien fou qui se fie à vous.’ It is true, I am not an infallible guide – but, my dear sir, I have no motive to deceive and if I wander, it is the wandering of the blind and not of the wilful. It hurts me sorely to think that you have found an occasion of reproach – I shall sit at your feet in patience if you will condescend to instruct me – what motive have I to be false? What can I gain by insincerity? We may differ in opinion in many matters – but why should you think worse of me – even tho’ my ‘vivacité poetique’ led me somewhat astray? I am no hardened sinner. Speak – and I shall listen.

Seriously – your letter has wounded me deeply – you know me not – nor know I you in person – but I looked on you always as one to be honored and your good opinion is of great value to me. I never flattered man – and I do not flatter you – not do I write in any spirit but that of frankness and

p.69

amity – I may be misunderstood – that is true, but I know my thoughts and they cannot be translated according to your interpretation | if they [were] misunderstood. I pray you accept my assurances of esteem – I am not your ‘t[rès] H[umble] et t[rès] O[béissant] S[erviteur]’ yet you insist it shall be so. – Of your police (?) I know nothing – I may soon put it to the test – not in an unfriendly spirit I am sure – but as a foreigner seeking instruction.

I pray you, believe me my dear Sir,

Your friend

John Bowring

I shall be at the Hague if you will kindly reply. I only received your letter today having been travelling in Holland.

Undoubtedly Bowring’s pride was hurt, and he was upset, and certainly it was asking too much of him to expect him to be familiar with the internal feuds of Czech men of letters, and avoid the corresponding pitfalls. He might, however, at least have admitted that his sweeping statement that Dobrovský’s ‘critical and philosophical merits’ were ‘perhaps not on a level with his knowledge’<sup>50</sup> was less than complimentary and not entirely indicative of ‘respect and esteem.’

p.70

A second letter from Kopitar in the wake of the first must have crossed with Bowring’s reply. It was not so angry and emotional, but by now Bowring could not have stirred up more trouble if he had tried. All he had really done was to take what Čelakovský had set on a plate before him, which suited his own political inclinations, add a couple of other sources, an idea or two of his own, and garnish the lot with his translated specimens. Without the passages about language oppression and so forth the article would have been much duller. | This time Kopitar pleaded political expediency as reasons for urging restraint: ‘vous autres étrangers de Londres et de Paris, (nous prenant pour des Turcs, sur la foi de quelques pamphlétaire qui vivent de médisance) vous ne savez pas combien vous compromettez indignement la bonne cause, en accablant d’injures le gouvernement de Vienna, tandis que vous-même, si hic esses, en agiriez encore plus lentement peut-être.’<sup>51</sup> He concluded with some vaguely peace-making remarks, but this more or less seems to conclude Bowring’s own correspondence with Kopitar, which is not surprising. Kopitar continued nevertheless to act on occasion as intermissary for Vuk.<sup>52</sup>

Surprisingly, in contrast to the acrimony of the last letters, Kopitar’s later review of the Serbian anthology, in the Vienna *Jahrbücher der Literatur*,<sup>53</sup> was altogether mild and kind-hearted, though it listed a large number of factual errors. This was fair enough, as Bowring was entirely dependent for his anthologies on what his informants gave him, but at the same time the slipshod way he put this material together is scarcely praiseworthy.

---

<sup>50</sup>FQR 2, p. 146.

<sup>51</sup>28.IX.1828, Chudoba, pp. 33–5.

<sup>52</sup>See Kopitar, ‘Brief-Journal 1829’ 14.V.30 etc., Jagić 1897, pp. 823 seq.

<sup>53</sup>45, pp. 212–21.

---

Bowring's correspondence with Dobrovský and Kopitar highlighted the childish infighting of Prague literary | society and in particular Dobrovský's hostile relations with the 'Jungmannovci'. It also brought out the growing rift between loyal Habsburg subjects, antagonistic to criticism of the government, and those who wished to express at least some sign of opposition to Vienna. Both parties were linguistically and regionally patriotic, and thus in their varying ways nationalistic, but the Pan-Slavist conception, modelled after Herder and German or Pan-German nationalism, tended ultimately (though after the period being dealt with in the main) to move from the area of culture to politics and find itself advocating the dismemberment of the Habsburg Empire, built as it was on dynastic rather than ethnic-national foundations. (The Pan-German conception was apt to do the same, but took longer, since the German element was politically dominant.) In such a way Kollár's espousal of cultural and spiritual Slav unity and his strong anti-German attitude could be interpreted as ideologically seditious even without the necessity for political formulation. p.71

The first news Kollár had of the contents of the Foreign Quarterly Review article may have come from Šafárik, who got an angry letter from Kopitar about it.<sup>54</sup> | Kollár's position as pastor to the Slovak congregation of the Evangelical Church in Pest had encountered opposition from Germans, Magyars and church authorities alike, and the dispute was only finally settled in 1833, by an imperial judgment in his favour. This was one reason for him to be nervous about the article, Šafárik also decided that it would alarm Jungmann. As yet, however, he only knew of it at second-hand from Kopitar, whom he quoted to Kollár word for word, in August 1828:<sup>55</sup> p.72

K--r mi onehdy psal z Vídně v tato slova: 'Bowrings Anzeige von Jungmann etc. haben Sie wohl schon von ihm? Desto schlimmer für seine Correspondenten. Der étourdi hat sowol den H. Jungmann, als noch mehr den guten Kollár compromitirt, den die Censur nicht verstanden haben muss, weil sie ihn admittirte. Rien n'est si dangereux qu'un maladroit ami! etc. etc.' Potom si stěžuje velice na Bowr., že prý i jeho tam připomenul! Ovšem k obávání jest, aby ta věc zlé následky neměla. Ve Vídni to nepochybně pozornosti vzbudí – a to právě v najhorší čas – když Vaše pře před J. M. císaře přijde. Já s Bowringem *od roka* žádného listovného spolku nemám, aniž znám, co psal, co nepsal, nebo jsem té recensie neviděl. Dost na tom, že *tlachal* o věcech, o nichž mlčeti měl.

Jungmann se nepochybně velice uplaší, an i jináče bázliv jest. Já jsem mu nepsal od dávna a sotvy postačím, abych mu psal, nebo mi opět examina nastávají. Snad by dobré bylo, kdybychom mu o tom jaké také návštějí dali.

On seeing the article itself some weeks later Šafárik redoubled his opposition, detected a radical revolutionary note that he did not in the least approve of, | and reckoned it must have been 'those young Czechs' who had fed him his material:<sup>56</sup> p.73

---

<sup>54</sup>17.VIII.1828, ČČM 1875, p. 143.

<sup>55</sup>Same.

<sup>56</sup>To Kollár 30.VIII.1828, ČČM 1875, p. 144.

Na Bowringa jsem se rozlítit náramně, čítaje to jeho tlachání. Ten člověk si mi nejen nerozumným, nýbrž i zlým býti zdá! Jakoby počínání Slovanův *naschvál v podezření u vlády* uvesti chtěl. Rozpráví tam o tendencích – jako nějaký francouzský jezuita a kongregationista etc. etc. Vyznám se Vám upřímně, že jsem já už před rokem v listech jeho cosi takového – *nečistého* zavoněl, a proto jsem i dopisování přerhnul a na poslední jeho list neodpověděl. Bóh zná, co mu ti mladíkové z Čech psali! On naposledy i *všecky jich listy* vytisknout dá. Nebo *kupec* jest, a co dělá, *pro zisk dělá*.

Whether he saw the English or the French article, or both, is unclear. He wrote later to Kollár: 'Časopis český Vám po prvé příležitosti navrátím, jako i jiné Vaše věci (Bowringov zlomek etc.).'<sup>57</sup>

A later reference to the affair occurs in the correspondence of Jungmann's son. He had first mentioned Bowring to Marek in 1828. 'O Kolláru zvláštní pojednání napiše, nebo velké v ňom má zalíbení pro duch vlastenský co tam zavívající.'<sup>58</sup> But the mentions of the affair over the article come in two letters as late as 1831, by which time one might have imagined the whole matter long forgotten. He wrote to Marek on the recent publication of Kollár's *Nedělní, sváteční a příležitostné kázně a řeči* (I, Pest 1831) that the censorship was on the alert. 'Kollár přeci jich asi 400 výtisků prodal, ač v Čechách jen 'permittatur' v censure mají, a | oznamovati se nesmějí. Teď na Kollára budou pozorni velmi; četli prý v Vídni jakési přeložení francouzské oné recensí Bowringovy, v níž Slávy dceru za ideál Všeslovanskosti vydává atd., nad čímž se ti policajti a censuráci velmi durdili.'<sup>59</sup> He wrote to Kollár about it as well, as though the French article of 1828 had just been printed, suggesting that Kollár should declare that there was no advocacy of a 'universal Slav fatherland' in *Slávy dcera*. 'Co rače mysliti, bylo-li by záhodno, aby se jim oči otevřely a povědělo, že tu není potahu na žádnou Slávii všeobecnou, anebo máme toho nechat? Což abyste sám dost málo řádků třeba do Čechoslava o tom zaslal?'<sup>60</sup> This is the most direct piece of evidence of attention to Bowring's article by the censorship, but in the absence of corroboration it is hard to judge whether to take this story at face value or simply as gossip.

Kollár also found Bowring's interpretation objectionable, unlike Čelakovský. He went so far as to attack in print Bowring's article and its picture of Mina as a personification of a Slav fatherland. (Bowring had written: 'Kollar...has constituted a Laura of Slavonia, his country...')<sup>61</sup> The attack came in a prominent place, in 1832, in the form of a rude | and rather feeble sonnet in an enlarged edition of *Slávy dcera* (Book IV, no. 103):

Milí páni! tu, dim, ještě jeden  
Sedí, proti němuž námitka

---

<sup>57</sup>27.XI.1828, ČČM 1875, p. 149.

<sup>58</sup>15.I.1828, *Koresp. J. J. Jungmanna*, ed. Olga Votočková-Lauermannová, 1956, p. 131.

<sup>59</sup>8.VII.1831, *ibid*, p. 182.

<sup>60</sup>3.VII.1831, *ibid*, p. 180.

<sup>61</sup>FQR 2, p. 167.

---

Ta jest, že co lhář a klevítka  
Nezasloužil tento slavský Eden;  
Dlouho o tom, kdoby to byl, veden  
Rozpor a to prudký nežřídka,  
Zda já? či já? zněla povídka –  
Ano ty, jímž onen pudding sněden!  
Bowringu tys leccos na mne nalhal  
Ve svých spisech, zač i tobě by  
Neslušel hod Slávy, než jen Walhall;  
Odpouštím však tobě tuto zradu,  
Ale na znak liché pochleby  
Budeš sedět na posledním řadu.

He appended an explanatory note to this, putting most of the blame at the door of a certain German commentator, who was not necessarily even aware of Bowring's remarks.<sup>62</sup> 'Ten zde s pravdou a lží smíchaný soud, zvláště poslední lichý punkt, přešel z tohoto anglického časopisu i do jiných francouzských a německých novin, v Maltenově pak bibliotece (Th. VII. Aarau 1831 S. 7.) jest on kýmsi nestydatým nejmenovaným ošemetníkem ještě novými lžemi rozmnožen. Odkud tato bázeň některých Němců před Slávy jim nikdy neublíživšími!'<sup>63</sup>

Kollár was, it would clearly seem, alarmed and surprised by the interpretation. The 'poslední lichý punkt' objected to is presumably the sentence ending, 'it may be that their political tendency has not been perceived.'<sup>64</sup> Kollár was not really thinking in terms of politics and governments, but of culture and history. More than anything else it was probably alarm at the | words 'dangerous' and 'political' that stirred the Protestant clergyman into making his vehement denial. He never expounded his ideas of Pan-Slav mutuality in political terms, and the possible developments or consequences of ideas are not necessarily perceived by their originators, even if in Kollár's case, if true, this was somewhat near-sighted. p.76

Palacký, dealing with the article in the Museum journal, steered clear of the shoals of politics, Vienna, and the Kollár controversy, but rose, as noted before, to Dobrovský's defence. He opposed another idea presented in the article, its advocacy of the Cyrillic alphabet for all the Slavonic languages. This was only supported, as far as Palacký could recall, by Jan Herkeľ, in *Elementa universalis linguae slavicae* (sent to Bowring by Hamuljak), and Palacký was against the idea. 'A byťbychom i něco získati měli, získ ten nepatrný bylby ve srovnání k té ztrátě, kterou literatura naše novým pobuzením vášní podniknout by musela, ažby spisovatelstvo i čtenářstvo české vesměs tu novotu sobě oblíbilo.'<sup>65</sup> Palacký also enumerated various errors and misreading of Šafárik's *Geschichte* which had occurred, such as calling Comenius bishop of the 'Unitarians

---

<sup>62</sup> *Výklad čili Přímětky a vysvětlivky ku Slávy dceře*, Pest 1832, p. 369, zn. 483.

<sup>63</sup> 'Politischer und militärischer Zustand der österreichischen Monarchie', *Bibliothek der Neuesten Weltkunde...* herausg. von Malten, Th. 7 (1831), p. 7.

<sup>64</sup> *FQR* 2, p. 167.

<sup>65</sup> *ČČM* 1828 sv. 3, pp. 132–6.

p.77 of Poland' ('Bischof der Unität in Polen!'), and saying that his 'travels into | divers countries of Europe have been translated into several languages.' Čelakovský was at fault in the latter case: he had written to Bowring in August 1827 of 'Komenský's satyrische Reisen durch die Welt; (Labirynt swěta)...'<sup>66</sup>

The possibility of the censorship's curiosity in the relations of Bowring with the Austrian Slavs, or of the police, is raised by Karel Paul in his book on Šafárik,<sup>67</sup> but in the report he refers to from Novi Sad in 1837 Bowring is not even mentioned by name and the general tone is approving. The reference is in connection with the *Geschichte*, 'ein Werk...welches ihm die Celebrität im Auslande und nahmentlich in England bewirkte; in folge dessen er auch von hier aus mit einigen Engländern zu London und dem Professor zu Prag, wenn ich nicht irre, Dumbrofsky, correspondirt.'<sup>68</sup>

There is no evidence firm enough so far to show that Kopitar's alarm was justified by events. If the matter was noted in high places, as it may well have been, it was more likely to have been as a result of the French version, which had written of Kollár in stronger terms than Bowring: 'Grâce à l'expression métaphysique d'un sentiment que les maîtres de la Bohême regarderaient comme révolutionnaire, l'auteur n'a pas été inquiété | par la police autrichienne.'<sup>69</sup> As more Austrians knew French than English this was the more likely version to be read.

p.78

---

<sup>66</sup>FQR 2, pp. 158–9; Bílý 2, p. 593.

<sup>67</sup>K. Paul 1961, p. 67.

<sup>68</sup>J. Volf, 'K jmenování Pavla Josefa Šafaříka censurem r. 1837', *Bratislava* 3 (1929), pp. 1062–5.

<sup>69</sup>*Revue Britannique* 1828, p. 263.

## Chapter 6

# Čelakovský and the Cheskian Anthology

A side theme in Čelakovský's correspondence with Bowring in 1827–8 was Sir Walter Scott, much idolised in Bohemia as generally in the Europe of the day. Čelakovský told Bowring in November 1827 that he would soon send him his forthcoming translation of the *Lady of the Lake*.<sup>1</sup> Bowring ventured to hope that two copies would come, 'as I should like to give one to Sir Walter Scott whom I expect to see in a few days at Abbotsford.'<sup>2</sup> In February 1828 a copy of the book *Panna jezerni* was duly sent for Scott, 'dem grossen Land- und Seelenmahler',<sup>3</sup> by Čelakovský, and Bowring acknowledged it in April.<sup>4</sup> p.79

I sent your translation of the Lady of the Lake to Sir Walter Scott – since then he is come to England, and yesterday I had a conversation with him of which you were the subject. I told him I thought it would afford you great delight if he would write to you a few lines in acknowledgment of your book, which he promised to do and which I doubt not will be satisfactory to you. He is as far removed from affectation and pride as a man can be, and – as I told him – to give *you* pleasure is to be engaged in his vocation which is to give pleasure to every body.

The sycophantic tone of the last remark is not untypical of Bowring when addressing the 'great of this world'. Once he wrote to Goethe enclosing one of his works and requesting his autograph: 'I was once on my way to Goethe's dwelling – What imports it to recollect that I could never reach it – And the hope is extinguished for ever.'<sup>5</sup> p.80

---

<sup>1</sup>See Bowr. to Čelak. 20.XII.1827, Beer, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup>Same.

<sup>3</sup>Čelak. to Bowr. 12.II.1828, Bílý 2, p. 599.

<sup>4</sup>19.IV.1828, Beer, p. 14.

<sup>5</sup>5.VI.1822, J. M. Milović, *Goethe – seine Zeitgenossen und die serbokroatische Volkspoesie*, Leipzig 1941, p. 221.

Bowring had hoped to visit Scott while in Scotland early in 1828, but this did not come off.<sup>6</sup> Scott was informed however by his publisher Robert Cadell in March: 'I have for two days had the pleasure of conversing a good deal with Mr. Bowring who has been in Edinburgh for a short & hurried visit.'<sup>7</sup> Four letters from Bowring to Scott survive in the National Library of Scotland.<sup>8</sup> The first, dated New Lanark 22nd March 1828, cancels the visit intended to Abbotsford. The second, dated London 28th March, wrote, 'On returning to Town I found the little volume which accompanies this.' Enclosing *Panna jezerní* he begged for a letter of thanks to Čelakovský. 'Its young author is undoubtedly one of the most interesting men of Bohemia and has done more than any other to regenerate his mother tongue. Could you afford the condescension – and your intellectual *largesse* can afford any thing – what a delight it would be to him to have evidence under your own sign manual that you had received the book.'

p.81 Scott came to London shortly after, on 9th April, | leaving again on 26th May. His Journal makes no mention of Bowring here, or indeed elsewhere, but the following remark, recorded on 15 Feb 1827, has a general relevance: 'I make it a rule seldom to read and never to answer foreign letters from literary folks. It leads to nothing but the battledore and shuttlecock intercour[se] of compliments as light as cork and feathers.'<sup>9</sup> This was written on receiving a letter from Goethe, which he decided to make an exception to the rule. Bowring was also successful in obtaining a letter for Čelakovský, which he enclosed on 19th April.<sup>10</sup> It reads:<sup>11</sup>

Sir

I am honoured with a copy of your version of a Bohemian version of the Lady of the Lake in which you have done the procreator much more honor than the Author ever expected on its behalf. Being as you will easily suppose totally ignorant of your ancient language I can be no judge of the translation which is to me a Book closed and a fountain sealed. My thoughts sense of gratitude is however the same and I am Sir

your most obedient Servant Walter Scott

London 19 April 1828

p.82 Čelakovský was of course delighted. He expressed his joy to Kamarýt, telling him: 'Slečny Sternberg, si ho vyžádaly k pohlednutí a s největší vroucností jmeno líbaly.'<sup>12</sup> He wrote similarly to Bowring: 'Zu einem vorzüglichen Vergnügen wurden mir Sir Walter Scotts Zeilen, und ich kann Ihnen sagen, dass mich ein Schreiben | vom heiligen Vater aus Rom nicht so sehr überrascht, geschweige denn mehr erfreut hätte. Alles, was hier literarisch ist und seyn will wünschte die Handschrift Ihres grossen Meisters zu sehen,

---

<sup>6</sup>See Bowr. to Čelak. 20.XII.1827.

<sup>7</sup>21.III.1828, *The Private Letter-Books of Sir Walter Scott*, ed. W. Partington, 1930, p. 362.

<sup>8</sup>3906 fo. 162, 166; 3911 fo. 37; 3915 fo. 156.

<sup>9</sup>*The Journal of Sir W. Scott*, ed. W. E. K. Anderson, Oxford 1972, p. 278.

<sup>10</sup>Beer, p. 14.

<sup>11</sup>Bílý 1, pp. 351–2, orig. LAPNP.

<sup>12</sup>16.V.1828, Bílý 1, p. 361; 7.V.1828, Bílý 1, p. 357.



---

und edle Fräulein erbathen sich, nach einem frommen slawischen Brauch, den werthen Namen zu küssen.<sup>13</sup> Kamarýt went quite overboard with the premature thought that Scott might now show some special attention to the Slavs, and even learn the Czech language. 'Kdyby tak Skottovi chtěla choutka přijít aby se učil našemu jazyku, aneb aby se jakýmkoli způsobem ukázal příznivcem Slávy. Jestli Bowring jeho přítelem nebo on Bowringov, nebude snad na tom chybovati.'<sup>14</sup>

On 9th July Bowring informed Čelakovský: 'I have told Sir Walter Scott what you say, what he will be gratified to hear and talk of – for he is a warmhearted, eager affectioned creature and fully sensible of those marks of esteem which have been showered on him from all parts of the world.'<sup>15</sup> Scott was less fulsome in Bowring's praises when he described him later as having 'a flux of conversation.'<sup>16</sup> There is no reason to believe Scott showed Czech literature the slightest further attention. |

p.83

Čelakovský had sent some autographs along with *Panna jezerní*, and an article he had written comparing Slavonic word roots with English.<sup>17</sup> Bowring wrote back deflatingly and doubtless also accurately, 'I shall in some way or other employ your article on the affinities between English and Slavonian, though I think most of the words referred to are *indirectly* derived.'<sup>18</sup> This reply crossed with a letter from Čelakovský in April 1828 informing him that he was working on an article about Czech proverbs, 'denn so wie Volkslieder das Gefühl u. die Phantasie einer Nation Überhaupts beurkunden; so sind es im Gegentheile wieder die Sprüchwörter, die die praktische Volks-philosophie ausmachen.'<sup>19</sup> Though it was not published at the time, what seems to be part at least of the text of this article was printed in 1853 as 'Böhmisch nationale Sprüchwörter und ein Wort über dieselben.'<sup>20</sup> Bowring referred favourably to both articles on 1st May, promising to publish them, and in answer to a request included a list of fifteen books on English proverbs.<sup>21</sup> Čelakovský asked for Ray's *Collection of English Proverbs* (1672 and 1817), which Bowring had particularly recommended for his purposes, and at the same time enclosed a sample of about two hundred Czech | proverbs. 'So können Sie auch mein Wort über das Sprüchwort abändern u. verändern, nach Ihrem Gutdünken.'<sup>22</sup>

p.84

The same letter mentioned an idea he had had. Impressed by the plan and aims of the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, he suggested writing an annual survey of Czech literature for the English public. 'Wäre es der Redaction nicht genehm, immer zu Ende des Jahrs einen Bericht über die literarischen Leistungen in Böhmen zu erhalten? – So lange ich in Böhmen bin, wollte ich mich selbst der Arbeit unterziehen, u. auch fürs Künftige

---

<sup>13</sup>26.V.1828, Bílý 2, p. 604.

<sup>14</sup>To Čelak. 8.V.1828, Bílý 1, p. 359.

<sup>15</sup>Beer, p. 15.

<sup>16</sup>'Living Litterateurs', *Pictorial Times* 15.VI.1844.

<sup>17</sup>To Bowring 12.II.1828, Bílý 2, pp. 599–601.

<sup>18</sup>19.IV.1828, Beer, p. 14.

<sup>19</sup>18.IV.1828, Bílý 2, pp. 601–3.

<sup>20</sup>*Literatura příslovnictví slovanského a německého*, ed. I. J. Hanuš, 1853, repr. Leipzig 1970, pp. 38–43; acc. to Bílý 3i, pp. 40 note 2, in *Almanach de Carlsbad* 1841.

<sup>21</sup>Bílý 4i, pp. 103–5.

<sup>22</sup>26.V.1828, Bílý 2, pp. 604–7.

jemanden dazu finden. Zunächst wäre die Uibersicht vom 28 Jahre.’ This scheme was only realised by the London *Athenaeum* and the Dilkes in the second half of the century.

In July Bowring wrote he was sending Ray’s *Collection*, and professed to like the article on proverbs. ‘I shall write an article on the general subject, for which it will be very useful to me.’<sup>23</sup> He also wrote that ‘as to the For. Quar. Rev. I think I can say that your communications will be welcome, and I can obtain payment for them, I have no doubt.’ In fact, this was the last to be heard of the articles.

p.85 At the same time Bowring informed him that ‘I have engaged to write one on the *Slavonian popular poetry*.’ Čelakovský reacted with another much grander | scheme, which he communicated to Kamarýt. ‘Já mu ponavrhl, aby raději na to pomysll, mohloliby se v Londýně vydati (v angl. a původně spolu) jádro všeho slovansk<sup>o</sup> básnictví národního. Co mi as na to odepíše?’<sup>24</sup> But Bowring replied cautiously from the Hague, where he had gone on government business: ‘As yet, I apprehend, sufficient interest has not been excited in England to authorise the publication there of your valuable labors without considerable risk, for the cost of publishing is so enormous... Now I will try the effect of two or three articles on Slavonian popular poetry.’<sup>25</sup>

p.86 In the same letter Bowring resurrected his travel plans. ‘I expect to be here a month, and am not quite sure that I shall not make an attempt to visit Bohemia.’ It was while in Holland that Bowring received the first angry letter from Kopitar about his article. However, Čelakovský’s most recent letter must have warned him and had perhaps had even gone so far as to hint that Kopitar should be treated as an informer. A similar charge against Nejedlý is known to have been made by Čelakovský.<sup>26</sup> Bowring responded; ‘I take friendly note of your hints respecting K- and shall turn them to prudential account should I visit Austria.’ However, he neither made the visit, nor did he realise the | new literary projects. One likely reason was that politics and government business travels abroad were interfering more and more with his literary pursuits.

— — —

Čelakovský had been eagerly awaiting the anthology in the winter of 1828, but delays intervened to postpone this event for a number of years. In April Bowring told him: ‘My volume would have been completed and printed but for the irregularity of the Bookseller whose affairs are some way or other involved, and who has caused very unexpected delays.’<sup>27</sup> And in May he repeated: ‘The man who had undertaken to publish it has I fear got into pecuniary difficulties and the book remains slumbering – between heaven and earth – I hope it won’t fall into perdition.’<sup>28</sup> Instead Bowring sent his *Matins and Vespers*, a volume of his own devotional verses. Čelakovský was enthusiastic, writing to Kamarýt: ‘V německém jsou též podobné Mor. u. Abendopfer

---

<sup>23</sup>9.VII.1828, Beer, pp. 15–6.

<sup>24</sup>14.VIII.1828, Bílý 1, p. 376.

<sup>25</sup>4.IX.1828, Beer, pp. 16–7.

<sup>26</sup>See J. Jakubec, in *Literatura česká 19. století*, 2, 1903, ch. 8, p. 491.

<sup>27</sup>19.IV.1828, Beer, pp. 14–5.

<sup>28</sup>1.V.1828, Bílý 4i, pp. 103–5.

---

mnohého vydání; kýž bychom v českém též něco podobného měli!<sup>29</sup>

For the whole of 1829 a gap ensued in their correspondence. Čelakovský told Kamarýt in February 1830 about an attempt to send him some books via Hamburg.<sup>30</sup> They came back with the note 'Der Empfänger ist gestorben', and Čelakovský concluded that Bowring | might have died, rather than the merchant through whom the parcel was sent. The second was in fact the case. Kamarýt urged Čelakovský to have faith that one day another Englishman would be found to take up the torch. 'Kdybychom Bowringa byli ztratili, jakož se domníváš, tedy mnohé naše těšení s nim do hrobu složití musíme; a čekati, až jiný někdo z hrobu je vzkřísí, a co zde ztraceno dvojnásobně nám vynahradí. Nevím proč a čím je to, že nyní žádný pád, žádná překážka mne tak sklíčiti nemůže, abych třeba i z toho pádu ještě prospěchu nedoufal. Zrajme ještě, dospějme, bez křiku, však se nám potom dostane anthologií.'<sup>31</sup> Such was the weight of significance they attached to the foreign recognition they hoped the anthology would win.

p.87

Čelakovský tried again with another letter sent by a certain 'H. Polak, der in Geschäften von hier nach England abreiset'.<sup>32</sup> This time he got an answer, dated 18 March 1830, in which Bowring claimed to have written several times without success. 'It is quite unintelligible to me how so many difficulties present themselves in our correspondence.'<sup>33</sup> Their letters had presumably gone astray either due to the merchant in Hamburg or to Bowring's travels. It is perhaps too fanciful to suspect the Austrian police censorship. | The anthology was still delayed. 'Many things have led to delay with the Boh. Anthology: – first the bankruptcy of the bookseller, 2d my circumstances are far less prosperous than they were, so that I cannot publish until I get a sufficient list of subscribers.' Meanwhile he had written another article, on the Dvůr Králové MS, published in the *Westminster Review*, of which he was an editor.<sup>34</sup> 'I shall send 8 or 10 copies by Mr. Polak and a few other things.'

p.88

This article, 'Ancient Bohemian Ballads', gave some more specimens from the MS, accompanied by a text very largely based on sections of Šafárik's *Geschichte* and treating of the Slavs in general. Bowring's statistics for population contain some odd 'roundings-up', if that is what they are. His 45 million Slavs in Russia corresponds to the *Geschichte*'s 39,260,000, his 15 million in Austria to 11,890,000, and his 2½ million in Prussia to 2,050,000.<sup>35</sup> The figures for Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Protestant affiliation are similarly treated. Bowring repeated his advocacy of the Cyrillic alphabet, an idea also to be found in the *Geschichte* (as Palacký failed to notice in reviewing the *Foreign Quarterly Review* article). Šafárik had written: 'Ist aber dem wärmeren Slawisten gestattet, fromme Wünsche unmassgeblich auszusprechen, so gestehe ich, dass nach | meiner innigen Ueberzeugung das Kyrillische Alphabet sich mehr zu einer Pasigraphie für Slawen eigne, als das lateinische, und dass demnach jenem in dieser Hinsicht der

p.89

---

<sup>29</sup>3.II.1829, Bílý 1, p. 410; J. Bowr., *Matins and Vespers*, 1823.

<sup>30</sup>3.II.1830, Bílý 2, p. 53.

<sup>31</sup>16.II.1830, Bílý 2, p. 60.

<sup>32</sup>Čelak. to Bowr. 18.II.1830, Bílý 2, pp. 607–8.

<sup>33</sup>Beer, pp. 17–8.

<sup>34</sup>'Ancient Bohemian Ballads', *Westminster Review* 12 (April 1830), pp. 304–21.

<sup>35</sup>Article, p. 305, *Geschichte*, p. 27 (ed. 1826).

Vorzug gebühre.<sup>36</sup> The impressive citations from Hacquet, Dugonics, Neumann and the Abbé de Pradt, on the character of the Slavs, are all lifted straight from the *Geschichte*.<sup>37</sup> Bowring follows the division into South-Eastern and North-Western groups employed by the *Geschichte*.<sup>38</sup>

Bowring's next letter asked for subscribers to the anthology, 'I would immediately print if I had 100 names from Bohemia.'<sup>39</sup> This was what he had done with the Hungarian anthology, which Čelakovský received later in the year. 'Ondyno mi poslal Bowring anthol. maďarskou, stkvostné vydání, píše český rukp. že již vydobyl, a více jej knihkupci prodati nemíní; nýbrž sám svým penízem vydati, tak jako s maďarskou učinil. Ptá se mne, mnoho-li by se subskrib. u nás našlo? Maďarů se mu více jak sto podepsalo, a nejvíce šlechtictvo. Věru nevím, co mu na to mám odpověděti; myslím však žeby se předce 50 výt. rozstrkalo.'<sup>40</sup> Kamarýt asked to be put down for a copy: 'toľby muselo zle býti aby se u nás také 100 výtisků neodbylo, či tak málo zde Angličanů?'<sup>41</sup>

p.90 Thereafter contacts became intermittent, and a | letter from Bowring dated Paris 4th April 1831 answers a letter from Čelakovský of 21st September 1830, which reached him 'some months after it was written.'<sup>42</sup> Part of the trouble at least was the increasing level of Bowring's public commitments. 'The great tide of politics seems for the present to have turned men's thoughts away from the literary field, and it has been my lot of late to be called into the public service in a manner which has occupied all my attention. I shall be very glad to be again abstracted into the imaginative world.' He pressed again for subscribers. 'I was once rich, I am now poor, and with seven children I must run no risks.' Čelakovský had objected to some artificial 'popular poems' in the Hungarian anthology: 'You are right in saying that many of the Magyar poems were hardly entitled to the epithet *popular*, and I felt it, but my Hungarian friends arranged them under this name, and it was not for me to profess to know more about the matter than they knew.' It must have been most infuriating for Čelakovský to find that the Magyar anthology had reached the presses sooner, thanks to Hungarian financial support.

p.91 In April 1831 Čelakovský told Kamarýt he had collected about 30 subscribers. 'Nevím, jestliby ty též o některém věděl. Pro všecko na tvé jméno zaznamenal | jsem 2 Výt.'<sup>43</sup> And in August he wrote prematurely that he thought the anthology was now in the presses.<sup>44</sup>

In fact it was the late summer of 1832 before a few copies apparently reached Prague, although the book was published by March of that year.<sup>45</sup> Kamarýt had heard by 5th September: 'Anthologie prý v Praze – a již dávno.'<sup>46</sup> Čelakovský replied on

<sup>36</sup> Article, p. 306, *Gesch.*, pp. 69–70.

<sup>37</sup> Article, pp. 306–7, *Gesch.* note, pp. 44–7.

<sup>38</sup> *Gesch.*, pp. 22–6, article, p. 305.

<sup>39</sup> 22.III.1830, Beer, p. 18.

<sup>40</sup> Čelak. to Kamarýt 18.VIII.1830, Bílý 2, p. 101; *Poetry of the Magyars...* by John Bowring, 1830.

<sup>41</sup> 14.IX.1830, Bílý 2, p. 104.

<sup>42</sup> Beer, p. 18–9.

<sup>43</sup> 15.IV.1831, Bílý 2, p. 165.

<sup>44</sup> Čelak. to Kamarýt 6.VIII.1831, Bílý 2 č. 129.

<sup>45</sup> Notice, *The Times* 8.III.1832.

<sup>46</sup> Bílý 2 č. 196.

---

12th September, in disappointed tones. 'Bowrg. anthol. přišlo do Prahy 6 exempl. jeden koupil Jungm. a ostatní kníže Kinský – snad tyto dni opět nový transport přijde. Docela však nejsem z mnohých příčin spokojen, a kdybych to byl věděl, že některé věci tak trochu víchovatě a neúplně vypracuje, byl bych buďto se docela do toho nepletl, anebo celou tu práci mu rozpořádal, co jsem z polovic učinil. Jestli ti libo, můžeš ji od Kronb. obdržeti.'<sup>47</sup> Kamarýt rapidly assented to this reappraisal of Bowring, before the book was even in his hands. 'Anthol. Bow. ještě nemám, však jsem ji též u Kronb. zamluvil. P. Bowr. bude rovněž jako jiní Angl. i Něm. spisovatelové a la mode – prvnější jich plody se příliš roztrubují a přecení, nad čímž one zhrdnou, a opilému publikum na konec podávají brindu, zvl. v zábavných spisech dokázáno.'<sup>48</sup>

The last letter from Bowring to Čelakovský is dated October 1833 from Paris and it apologised for the breaks | in their correspondence of late. 'Mein lieber Freund. I have been so long a wanderer and so uncertain a wanderer that the chain of my literary communications has been broken.'<sup>49</sup> Quite possibly Čelakovský never replied, disappointed by the result of all his efforts for the anthology, but one cannot know for sure. One hundred copies were to be sent, as Bowring wrote, although Čelakovský had sent a list of only 40 subscribers. Sales were clearly not good. 'I have desired Grenttel and Wurz to send to their correspondents at Prague 100 copies of the Bohemian Anthology. You sent a list of 40 subscribers, for the other 60 copies perhaps a means of sale may be found. You may be able to get it noticed in your different journals, and if any articles appear, you will much oblige me by sending them to me... Use them liberally and dispose gratuitously of as many as you please.'

Bowring only seems to flit briefly across the pages of Čelakovský's letters after this. In 1843 for instance he sent some autographs to Příbil, which included Bowring's, 'Angličana, vydavatele české anthologie a nyní ouda městské sněmovny Unterhaus.'<sup>50</sup> An autobiographical sketch in MS dated to 1842 also mentions 'der berühmte John Bowring' as translator of some of the collected folk songs.<sup>51</sup>

Čelakovský's dissatisfaction with the *Cheskian Anthology* of 1832 was entirely understandable. As well as being poorer in general appearance and layout than the Hungarian volume, which had had Hungarian subscribers' useful support, it was also untidily and carelessly written. Its introduction, though more ambitious than the *Foreign Quarterly Review* article, is much duller to read.

The volume began with a historical survey of Czech literature, based on Dobrovský's *Geschichte der Böhmischen Sprache und Literatur* of 1792 and with some reference to the reworked *Geschichte der Böhmischen Sprache und altern Literatur* of 1818.<sup>52</sup> The dependence in the main on the 1792 edition can be demonstrated by the order in which the material

---

<sup>47</sup>Bílý 2, pp. 267.

<sup>48</sup>25.X.1832, Bílý 2, p. 273.

<sup>49</sup>23.X.1833, Beer, pp. 19–20.

<sup>50</sup>25.III.1843, Bílý 3i, p. 93.

<sup>51</sup>Bílý 4i, p. 202.

<sup>52</sup>E.g. anthology pp. iii–iv, *Dobr. Geschichte* 1818, p. 185 (edition: *Dějiny české řeči a literatury*, ed. B. Jedlička, containing 1792 and 1818 versions).

is presented as well as by the inclusion of information lacking in the later book. Often Bowring's dependence can be shown sentence by sentence, and his uninformed selection and omission of authors, in spite of guidance from Čelakovský, and poor understanding and summarising of Dobrovský's text evidence his real unfitness for the task.

His knowledge of German does not come out of the test too well. He calls 'Laurentius, Hofbedienten des K. Wenzels' a 'sort of lord of the bed-chamber to Wenceslav',<sup>53</sup> translates 'die Prager Magistri' as the | 'magistracy of Prague',<sup>54</sup> and 'Stadtschreiber der Neustadt Prag' as the 'historiographer of Prague'.<sup>55</sup> His knowledge of Czech emerges as still more scanty than one might have liked to believe, since he is capable of referring to a town by its derived adjective. He remarks of the Dvůr Králové MS that 'Čelakowsky supposes that the remainder of these MSS. were destroyed by the Hussites during the siege of Kralodworsky'.<sup>56</sup> An example of inaccurate rendering of the original sense of a whole passage is his treatment of a section on the cultural consequences of the Hussite Wars. He writes: 'The evil which was thus inflicted became the source of good, and the bohemians, thrown upon their own resources, made rapid advances in the arts, in literature, and in general improvement.'<sup>57</sup> This seems based entirely on the following: 'So fingē nun die Böhmen ohne von fremder Kraft bestimmt oder durch ausländischen Beispiel gereizt zu werden, ihre eigenen Kräfte zu üben an, da schon die ersten Versuche vorausgiengen.'<sup>58</sup> At another point he confuses two separate works. A note attached to the sentence 'The following hymn written by Wenceslaw has been very frequently reprinted' reads 'See Script. Rer. Bohem. II. Pragae, 1784.' From this it is clear that the statement refers | to 'Das bekannte Lied von heil. Wenzel, Swatý Wáclawe, Weywodo české země' described by Dobrovský, who gives the same printed source. This statement also does not mean that it was written by St. Wenceslas, but then Bowring proceeds to print something quite different: 'King Wáclaw's song of love' or 'Pieseň Krále Václava', which as well as being a nineteenth-century forgery, is supposed to be by King Wenceslas II.<sup>59</sup> Under the circumstances Čelakovský might have reacted more strongly.

Bowring's statements on the Czech language, some based on Dobrovský's *Lehrgebäude der böhmischen Sprache* of 1819, are often either confusing, slack, or downright wrong. On the sound of the letter 'g' ('j' in modern orthography) he informs us, misprinting 'g' as 'q', that 'q is rather a vowel than a consonant, and nearly corresponds to our y: the hard q is unknown to the bohemians.'<sup>60</sup> A worse statement has to do with the representation of hard (unpalatalised) and soft (palatalised) consonants in the orthography. Where he writes 'follow' it is necessary to substitute 'precede' to make

<sup>53</sup> *Gesch.* 1792, p. 121, anth., p. 48 note.

<sup>54</sup> Anth., p. 52, *Gesch.* 1792, p. 128.

<sup>55</sup> Anth., p. 59, *Gesch.* 1792, p. 137.

<sup>56</sup> Anth., p. 42.

<sup>57</sup> Anth., p. 57.

<sup>58</sup> *Gesch.* 1792, p. 128.

<sup>59</sup> Anth., pp. 43–5, *Gesch.* 1792, p. 103.

<sup>60</sup> Anth., p. 79.

---

sense. Probably he was confused by German word order (object – verb – subject): ‘the soft generally follow an e or y, in which case these letters are converted into ě and i, or when the accent [he means length mark] | is on the y, into j, as běda, djtě, pěti, měnjm. – If the soft consonant be either at the end of the word, or follow the a, o, or u, it is marked by an apostrophe, as bud’, han’, let’, rozp’aty, d’as, t’opan, pocit’ugi.’<sup>61</sup> p.96

All this suggests a hasty pasting-together of material and little proper understanding of the subject.

By using conflicting sources he manages to contradict himself too. On Czech prosodies he writes first of all, following the Dobrovský school of thought: ‘Attempts were made, as early as the year 1515, to introduce the rules of latin prosody into bohemian verse; but as the accent invariably falls on the first syllable, it is clearly impossible that the bohemian language should be adapted to a versification whose character so much depends on the changing of the accents.’<sup>62</sup> But later, there is the following diametrically opposed statement, in harmony with Šafárik’s way of thinking: ‘The late writers on bohemian prosody contend, that of all living languages (the moravian and slowakian excepted, which are dialects of the bohemian), theirs is the only one whose verses may be measured by feet instead of syllables; the discovery is one of our own times, and escaped the observation of Dobrowsky, the most indefatigable of Slavonian critics. It would not be easy, | however, to produce more perfect hexameters than are to be found in the bohemian language.’<sup>63</sup> p.97

Reacting, perhaps, to Kopitar’s outburst of offended loyalty, Bowring is milder on the subject of Dobrovský, but still not altogether complimentary. Considering that nearly all of his literary-historical introduction is utterly dependent on information in Dobrovský’s books he might have sounded more grateful and respectful, or kept silent. He retains his previous picture of the dry-as-dust grammarian and antiquarian. ‘He had the verbo-mania upon him, and prized any three Slavonian letters which he could discover combined in the first five or six centuries of bohemian history, more than the coin-collector values his brass Otho, or the Roxburghian his Wynkyn de Worde.’<sup>64</sup> Perhaps he was not quite wrong, but it ill became him to adopt such a superior tone in view of his own ignorance of the subject and role as purveyor of second-hand goods: ‘words to him were interesting because they breathe of antiquity, and not because they are the instruments for touching the strings of pain and pleasure.’

The political message of opposition to Vienna displayed in the Foreign Quarterly Review in 1828 is here not so evident, and the optimism is missing. | There is much less punch, although he talks of works which ‘prepare, nay more, create, another and a better epoch’.<sup>65</sup> Announcing Hanka’s discovery so-called of the Mater Verborum forged glosses, he inserts a word against the censorship, adding a pessimistic tail. He hopes to see them published: ‘It is to be hoped, that no impediment will be thrown in his way,

---

<sup>61</sup>Same.

<sup>62</sup>Anth., p. 75, cf. *Gesch.* 1792, pp. 165–6.

<sup>63</sup>Anth., pp. 82–3.

<sup>64</sup>Anth., pp. 78–9.

<sup>65</sup>Anth., p. 78.

which one cannot but fear, from the arbitrary suppression of the fifth volume of his collection [Starobylá skládání]. It is not much to allow that those who have no hopes for the future, may be permitted to indulge in the memories of the past.<sup>66</sup> In fact, the fifth volume was not suppressed, though sections were censored and withdrawn before unsold copies were put on sale again, for reasons of obscenity. Bowring himself referred to it as a printed source elsewhere!

p.99 At the same time he rants on against the Roman-Catholic church and the priesthood just as strongly as before, using the obvious ammunition provided by the subject of the Counter-Reformation. 'Not catholicism alone, but ultra-catholicism (as Dobrowsky remarks) was required from the unhappy bohemia, and the free inquiries and high aspirations of Hus, and Jerome, and Žižka were to be superseded by the debasements of the monkish spirit, and the fierce and barbarous ignorance of a persecuting priesthood. Legends and lives of the | saints – trumpery discussions about trumpery dogmas – and all those streams of pitiful and useless learning, in which civil and religious despotisms seek to engage and to exhaust inquiry, were poured over Bohemia.'<sup>67</sup>

In describing the literature of the post-1620 period he manages to omit mentioning Comenius at all this time, just as before, for earlier periods, Štítný and Chelčický were ignored. As for poetry, according to him, 'The only poetical work of this epoch entitled to attention is the *Zdoroslaviček* (the proud nightingale) [Trutznachtigall] of Spee, translated by Felix Kadlinský, who died in 1675.'<sup>68</sup> He also names Zyvalda – likewise from Dobrowský – and clearly Bowring had simply picked out the secular-sounding titles, and ignored the religious-sounding ones.

He retained his advocacy of the Cyrillic alphabet, writing that he preferred Czech to Polish orthography 'though it is to be regretted that the Slavonian letters should not have been retained, at least for the Slavonian sounds, which find no representatives in the roman characters.'<sup>69</sup>

p.100 On the question of 'Libušin soud' Bowring remains sitting on the fence, but seeming on the whole to favour its protagonists by detailed attention to their arguments. | 'In justice to the opinions of those who differ from Dobrowsky, I am bound to add that the MS. of *Libuša* exists in the museum at Prague; that Dobrowsky is accused of not having fairly judged it, because it interfered with one of his historical speculations, which denies the existence of a renowned leader named *Čech*, from whom the čechian (bohemia) nation received its designation. They state that the antiquity of the MS. has been admitted by almost every antiquary who has examined it – that no *modernism* of any sort has been detected in the language or the style – in a word, that the internal evidence of its genuineness is indisputable. Between such authorities I dare not attempt to decide...'<sup>70</sup>

<sup>66</sup> Anth., pp. 49–50; *Starobylá skládání*, 4 vols, 1817–20, and 'Opožděný díl', 1823, containing *Mastičkář* inter alia; see Bílý 4ii, p. 368 note; Dobrowský to Kopitar 11.II.1827, Jagić 1885, pp. 596–7; FQR 1828, p. 154 note; Bowring cites vol. 5 as a source in anth., p. 45!!

<sup>67</sup> Anth., p. 77.

<sup>68</sup> Anth., p. 77, 'Trutznachtigal'.

<sup>69</sup> Anth., pp. 79–80.

<sup>70</sup> Anth., pp. 8–9.



---

It was natural enough that Bowring should tend to incline towards the views of Čelakovský and the Jungmann school, when his most satisfactory relations were with Čelakovský and his literary sympathies closest to Čelakovský's Herderesque pseudo-folk aesthetic. The volume was dedicated to him. As it happened, however, Dobrovský's history of Czech literature was not very suitable for compiling a survey of the poetical literature to match Čelakovský's suggested outline and desires. The *Foreign Quarterly Review* article for all its failings | was closer in overall effect to that conception. p.101

The translated specimens in the anthology fall into three sections, although the plan does not show very clearly, partly because there is no contents page. In the first section there are specimens of the early poetry, incorporated in the introductory survey. As well as translations from the MSS he also gives versions of 'Hospodine pomiluj ny' and 'Ktož jste Boží bojovníci'; then there are five verses from the Schwartzberg MS including 'Přečekaje vše zlé strážě'; also 'Píseň veselé chudiny' and a quotation of the first three hexameters of the fourteenth-century 'Bohemarius'. Two folk songs are included in this part, assigned to the 'sixteenth or seventeenth century': 'V rychtářovic dvoru' and 'Časné ráno po neděli'.

The second section consists of folk songs from Čelakovský's *Slovanské národní písně*, and the third contains specimens of contemporary poets, among whom Kollár has pride of place with over forty translated sonnets. Šnajdr is represented notably by his 'Jan za chrta dán', Puchmajer by the ode to Žižka, and Šafárik by 'Oldřich a Božena'. Others represented by shorter poems are Jungmann, Hanka, Turinský and 'Žofie Jandová', alias Čelakovský.<sup>71</sup> Each poet is supplied a short | biographical sketch, most of the material for which had been solicited from Čelakovský. Hanka provided information about himself directly.<sup>72</sup> Fictitious particulars must have been fed to Bowring about 'Žofie Jandová' by Čelakovský with his usual sense of mischief. 'Of this lady I have been able to obtain no other particulars than that she is the daughter of a bohemian schoolmaster and is married in Moravia. She has published only two or three pieces of poetry, which I have found in the periodicals.'<sup>73</sup> p.102

Many of the poems used by Bowring must have been supplied by Čelakovský in German translations, with annotations, either by himself or by friends of his. Sometimes there were published German translations available, some of which Bowring referred to in his notes. Manuscripts of others (by Wenzig perhaps) may already have existed. There were German versions for the Dvůr Králové MS by Svoboda,<sup>74</sup> and Dobrovský printed a version of 'Píseň pod Vyšehradem'.<sup>75</sup> Wenzig had translated some sonnets of Kollár, published in the Museum journal, and later published a version of Šnajdr's 'Jan za chrta dán'.<sup>76</sup> There was a German version of Šafárik's 'Oldřich a Božena' by

---

<sup>71</sup>See Bílý 4ii, p. 318 note; the poem – 'Dívka bdící'.

<sup>72</sup>Anth., p. 242.

<sup>73</sup>Anth., pp. 251–4.

<sup>74</sup>V. Svoboda, *Die Königihofers Handschrift*, 1818 ('1819').

<sup>75</sup>*Gesch.* 1818, pp. 247–8.

<sup>76</sup>'Sonette von J. Kollar', *Monatschrift d. Ges. d. vaterländischen Museums in Böhmen* 1 (Jan 1827), pp. 49–52, (Feb 1827), pp. 40–3; 'Jan za chrta dán', *ibid* 2 (March 1828), pp. 187–94; 'Sonette von Johann Kollar', *ibid* 3 (Sept 1829), pp. 191–5; also, 'Slawische Volkslieder', *ibid* 1 (July 1827), pp. 9–14, (Dec 1827), pp. 13–6;

p.103 Svoboda,<sup>77</sup> and Bowring refers to poems by Hanka translated by Zimmermann and | Hanslík.<sup>78</sup> The rest, not available printed elsewhere, must be supposed to have issued from Čelakovský, except for what was supplied by Šafárik and Kollár in the way of folk songs and sonnets from *Slávy dcera*.<sup>79</sup> Part of 'Píseň veselé chudiny' is given in both Czech and German in Čelakovský's letter of August 1827, and an unused extract from 'Mastičkář' in German appears in his letter of 26th May 1828.<sup>80</sup>

For reasons best known to himself Bowring did not reprint all the specimens he had previously published in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*. Chmelenský drops out and Čelakovský's 'Vodník' is omitted. Perhaps the omission of several Kollár sonnets may be in order to present a less belligerent and 'dangerous' profile. He omits no. 80 'Načby srdce k vlasti proto chladlo', and no. 20 'Sláva krasou libé řeči Polku', and includes different unpublished sonnets altogether.

p.104 Bowring's *Cheskian Anthology* was the most comprehensive survey of Czech literature available in a Western European language outside German in its day, and as such the Czech writers were bound to consider it some sort of achievement. That Čelakovský for one was unable to be delighted testifies first of all to the sloppiness and inaccuracy of the introductory text, some examples of which have been mentioned, and also perhaps suggests that he had hoped for more attention to the strivings of contemporary literature in the introduction. That his | earlier doubts about the feasibility of assembling enough good poems and songs, suitable for presentation in a richer literary context, were more or less proved right, is shown by the anthology's poor, and sometimes ironical reception in England. In contrast to this, the increasingly reverential attitude to the anthology in Bohemia, as the years went by, is merely a matter of empty piety.

---

*Blüthen neuböhmischer Poësie*, Prague 1830; *Slawische Volkslieder*, Halle 1830.

<sup>77</sup> *České historické zpěvy... Böhmsche hist. Gesänge*, ed. V. Hanka, 2 pts, Prague 1826–7.

<sup>78</sup> Anth., pp. 245, 246, 249; probably Josef Václav Zimmermann, 1804–1877; Jos. Ad. Hanslík, 1785–1859.

<sup>79</sup> See IV note 10.

<sup>80</sup> Bílý 2, p. 606.

## Chapter 7

# The Aftermath of the Cheskian Anthology

Bowring's Hungarian anthology had received quite a good number of reviews in the English press, between February and March 1830. The *Monthly Review* and *Fraser's Magazine* were however unfavourable.<sup>1</sup> Bowring's son Lewin commented that 'the public were rather tired of translations from little known tongues.'<sup>2</sup> After a straightfaced review in March 1830,<sup>3</sup> a whole series of satirical articles were carried by *Fraser's Magazine*. The texts of these have been attributed to the editorial hand of William Maginn, the verses to John Churchill, and the titles indicate their general tendency: 'The Magyars versus Dr. Bowring', 'Kisfaludy's "Meeting of the Similes"', 'The unpublished poems and other misfortunes of a man of genius', 'The Poetry of the Sandwich Islands', 'Tydus-pooh-pooh, Translator of the Sandwich Isles', and 'The poems of Quaffypunchovicz.'<sup>4</sup> p.105

The *Metropolitan Magazine* devoted a few gentle words of recommendation to the *Cheskian Anthology*: 'This volume is a valuable addition to those which have preceded it, introducing us to a new literature and people, for which we feel under great obligation | to our author.'<sup>5</sup> However, this does not convey any real enthusiasm, and a year or so later the same magazine joined the ironical bandwagon with an article called 'Discovery of a New Language by Dr. Bowring.'<sup>6</sup> It described how the eminent Doctor conversed with a dog, whose speech he identified as 'a modification of the dialect spoken by the *Dog ribbed Indians* of North America. . . he asserts that he has discovered their dialect to have a strong similarity to that of those singular Orientals, the *Howling Dervishes*.' p.106

---

<sup>1</sup>See A. Varannai, *Acta Litteraria* 6, p. 139.

<sup>2</sup>*Autob. Recoll.*, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup>*Fraser's* 1 (March 1830), pp. 155–7, prob. J. A. Heraud and William Maginn (attr. *Wellesley Index* 2.)

<sup>4</sup>1 (May 1830), pp. 433–42; (June) pp. 601–4, (Oct.) pp. 267–81, 2 (April 1831), pp. 334–45, (Oct.) p. 333, 13 (May 1838), pp. 593–9.

<sup>5</sup>3 (April 1832), pp. 114–5.

<sup>6</sup>6 (Jan–Apr 1833), pp. 148–53.

*The Times* took the ridiculing line in its notice of 8th March 1832:<sup>7</sup>

It is well known that Mr., now, we believe, Dr., Bowring translated, in a wonderful manner, some time ago, certain Magyar poets. To these translations he has now added a little book of Cheskian poetry. With the countries, Magyar and Cheski, our readers are, of course, entirely familiar! What we admire in the latter work are certain additions by the translator himself, rendering each original poem much more complete. We subjoin a specimen. A girl wants a bird to carry a note to her lover, but she has not got a pen to write it with. What a want of invention in the Cheski poet, not to be able to make a pen out of a girl and a bird! How happily, however, English genius supplies the want shall now be seen.

After quoting Bowring's translation of 'Skřivánek' from the Dvůr Králové MS the *Times* appended an invented quatrain entitled 'Lark's Answer, Supplied By The Translator', which went:

p.107  
No; from my wing here pluck a quill,  
With thy scissors slit and nib it; |  
Write thy note, which, in my bill,  
Me to bear nought shall prohibit!

The so-called translator was not amused. Bowring wrote indignantly from Paris to Edwin Chadwick on reading this little joke: 'I see in the *Times* of the 8 there is a foolish attack on my late little book – and they introduce a verse as mine, which has, you may well believe, no claim to be so – I do not see the wit of such stupid lies, – and wish you would in the *Examiner* say that when the *Times* declares there "are certain additions by the Author himself rendering each original poem much more complete" – and when the *Times* says this, merely to introduce a nonsense verse, – it condescends to a wit of mendacity not very honorable to its character if it has any character. I send you the book.'<sup>8</sup>

Another short whimsical notice was bestowed upon the Czech anthology in the *Athenaeum*.<sup>9</sup> In fact, on the whole, the British reception of it seems to have been ironic or unenthusiastic, although there was favourable comment in a general review of his Slavonic anthologies in *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*.<sup>10</sup>

p.108  
In Bohemia Čelakovský's disappointment has already been noted, In contrast, Jan Jeník z Bratřic, the old patriotic antiquarian and collector of scabrous songs, wrote about it with pleasure. He began his remarks, in | a letter to Tomáš A. Burian, with a complaint against the censorship of books: 'již pouhé jméno ctihodného magistra Husa nebo nepřemoženého reka Žižky z Trocnova, vyskytne-li se v podané knize kdesi,

---

<sup>7</sup>'Poetry'.

<sup>8</sup>12.III.1832, Bentham MSS 155 fo. 67.

<sup>9</sup>31.III.1832, p. 203.

<sup>10</sup>'Slavonian Poetry', *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* 1 (May 1832), pp. 172–83.

---

postačí, aby censura celý spis potlačila.<sup>11</sup> According to him six copies of the book had recently arrived 'sub rosa', and he quotes Bowring's acclamatory words on Žižka, Hus and Jiří z Poděbrad: 'Svět jmenoval prý až dosud Žižku buřičem (rebell), Husa kacířem (heretic) a Poděbrada usurpatorem (usurper); Bowring k tomu odpovídá: „Time will tear away the scrolls which falsehood has attached to their histories and write patriot – reformator – hero, and the words will be indelible.“ Napsal jsem Vám doslovně úsudek učeného Bowringa na důkaz, že v cizině jména velikých mužův našich v lidské paměti zůstávají, byt i v tuzemsku se doléhalo na to, aby v úplné přišla zapomenutí.'

One of the volumes of Jeník's 'Bohemica', a manuscript miscellany, contains three copied-out specimens of songs from the Czech anthology, prefaced by an apocryphal account of 'Lord' Bowring's Slavonic pursuits, only worth quoting for its almost complete inaccuracy and exaggeration.<sup>12</sup>

Lord John Bowring, Angličan, jsa před mnoha lety při anglickém Vyslanství v Petersburgu. Tam | v krátkém čase udělal s hezským děvčátkem ruským jakousi známost, – zamiloval se velmi. – – Nemoha však s tou svou Milenkou povolně rozmlouvati, – ona se vynasnažila jej v řeči ruské vyučovati. – Lord mladý, ke všemu schopný, brzičko řeč ruskou pochopil. – A od té doby bylať jest ovšemť jejich obcování mnohem laskavější, a zajímavější. – Když se pak tento Lord víc a víc v ruské řeči utvrdil, oddal se teď jedině Literatuře slovenské. –

p.109

Po několika letech napotom, navrátiv se do své Vlasti, sešel se jednoho času, v Městě Londonu s jakýmsi Čechem, kteréhož hned k sobě pozval, a v svém domě několik dní znamenitě uctil. – A od kteréhož té známosti nabyt, jací učení Čechové jejich v Češtině krásně vzdělané Spisy v Praze v Tisk uvádějí. – Lord neobmeškal, i hned do Vídně psali, aby mu tamnější Vyslanec anglický mnoho kněh českých z Prahy opatřil, – a ochotně do Londonu odeslal. A – tak se stalo.

Lord Bowring obíraje se teď s Literaturou českou, zalíbili se mu nejvíce Písně Národní české, kteréž p. Čelakovský v Praze vydal. A tu, hned z prvu, učinil jest londonským obyvatelům do Návěstí, že by v Evropě žádný Národ se nenalezl, kteréhožby obecný tak nazvaný sprostý lid tolik vtípu, a lahodnosti ve svých Písní [sic] na jevu dával jako Lid sprostý Národu Českého. – A, že on si předeval, ty české národní Písně do anglické řeči, též v Rytmech, přeložiti, a je pak, pro obecnost v tisk uvédsti. – Vyplniv slib svůj, vydal jest teprv léta 1832. svou nemalou práci na světlo. – Tohle první vydání odchází v Londonu náramně, – k Nám, sem do Prahy, přišlo jest jen pět Exemplárů.

Another note after the specimens points out Bowring's omission of obscene songs, which he recommends as being among the best and wittiest, and better and wittier

---

<sup>11</sup>2.XI.1832, *Z dob našeho probuzení*, ed. F. Čenský, 1875, pp. 238–9.

<sup>12</sup>Bohemica I (Bohemica Buriana) pp. 1–7, *Nár. muz. Prague IV G 13*, dated 'V Praze leta 1838'.

p.110 than their German counterparts. His 'Bohemica' record numerous such verses and are quite invaluable for this reason. Such examples of the popular genius were however incompatible with the highly selective image of 'pure' and 'true' folk song propagated by the literati for genteel consumption. 'Zajisto, tento z ohledu své Učenosti v | celé Evropě známý Angličan John Bowring byl by se mnohem více zpěvu českému (: našeho sprostého lidu:) náramně podivil, kdyby jemu ještě ty mnohé pohoršlivé Písně téhož obecného Lidu, kteréžby Censura v tisk také uvédsti, nikoliv nedopustila, – Též povědomé byly, proto že zrovna takový tak nazvaný pohoršlivé Písně s nejvtipnějšími – a pak nejpodivnějšími Nápady naplněné jsou.'

— — —

An extract from Bowring introducing the Dvůr Králové MS was printed in French translation in the *Almanach de Carlsbad* for 1834. This periodical was edited by Jean de Carro, an eminent Swiss physician trained at Edinburgh and practising at the famous spa of Karlovy Vary.<sup>13</sup> Vinařický wrote several sketch surveys of Czech literature for de Carro's *Almanach*, one of which mentioned Bowring,<sup>14</sup> and subsequently Jean de Carro had the idea of trying to have English versions printed through Bowring's offices.

p.111 He informed Vinařický in 1843 that he had written to Bowring, sending the letter by a Polish colleague Dr. Konarski 'qui Joannem Bowring optime noscit.'<sup>15</sup> Hanka forwarded some books to Bowring by the same bearer. But on 4th August de Carro had to tell Vinařický that Bowring had failed him and he enclosed a transcript | of the apologetic letter. Bowring pleaded the high cost of book production as well as his own present preoccupation with other business. The message was packaged in his usual inflated language.<sup>16</sup>

Though drawn away – I may say absorbed by the fascinating claims of public controversies and parliamentary business – I should have been most happy to have aided in giving to my country a better knowledge of the Bohemian portion of the great Slavonic field of Literature and language. But booksellers look only to profits – and in this land, where the necessary outlay upon a book is considerable, there is great unwillingness to embark on seas of foreign discovery. To me the struggle of the Slavonian races for literary eminence, the patriotic passion with which they seek to spread the knowledge of their distinguished men and meritorious productions in the world of letters is most interesting and attractive; and I would fain help the effort by every means in my power. I beg you will without hesitation favor me with your communications whenever I may be serviceable to you.

A small sequel to this occurred in the summer of 1845, when an English vicar, Rev. Samuel Montgomery, paid a visit to the spa. De Carro wrote to Vinařický that he

---

<sup>13</sup>'De l'Épopée des Bohèmes', *Almanach de Carlsbad* 4 (1834), pp. 204–14, with an extract by Edgar Quinet from *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Paris 1831, and notes by Fr. Palacký.

<sup>14</sup>'Sur l'état présent de la littérature bohème par Charles Winařický', *Almanach de Carlsbad* 1 (1831), p. 201.

<sup>15</sup>26.V.1843, *Karla Aloisa Vinařického Korrespondence a spisy pamětní*, ed. V. A. Slavík, 1903–25, 2i no. 495.

<sup>16</sup>Slavík 2i no. 506, quotes Bowr. to de Carro 3.VII.1843

---

hoped to insert some information on Czech writing into a travel article projected by the visiting clergyman. 'Ich habe ihn Besseres gelehrt und ordentlich erklärt, dass er alle diese Touristen-Nachrichten mit vortrefflichen Berichten über die böhmische Literatur verbinden könnte, da er sie nur aus meinem Almanach zu übersetzen haben wird. Ihr erster Coup d'oeil, im Alm. 1831, hat ihn entzückt und seinen Entschluss ganz fest gemacht. Er fängt heute an und ich werde mit Freude | die Mühe der Collationierung der Manuscripts auf mich nehmen. Viele andere böhmische Gegenstände werden damit vereinigt, wie der Texte du Sacre, die Zigeuner, die Rusalken etc. etc. wie er dieselben in dem Almanach finden wird.'<sup>17</sup> Little enough can be added to this, while the article itself, if ever written or published, remains untraced. Samuel Faulkner Montgomery, born in 1807, eldest son of Andrew Montgomery of 'The Knocks', Co. Kildare, entered Trinity College, Dublin in 1824. In 1831 he matriculated at Corpus Christi, Cambridge, where he took the degrees of B.A. in 1834 and M.A. in 1842. In 1842 he was ordained into the priesthood and from 1842 to 1847 served as the vicar of St. Peter's, Upper Gornal with Sedgley, Staffs., near Wolverhampton. He had just accepted a post as missionary to the Borneo Church Missionary Society when he died suddenly of a fever in November 1847, aged forty.<sup>18</sup> The last reference to his article is in a letter from de Carro to Vinařický on 12th June 1845, where it is called 'A Summer at the Sprudel'.

p.112

Hanka reprinted Bowring's translations in a polyglot edition of the *Dvůr Králové* MS in 1843, a copy of which he probably presented to the author.<sup>19</sup> Another, enlarged polyglot edition came out in 1852, retaining Bowring's introduction, but substituting new translations by Albert Wratistaw.<sup>20</sup> A similar was produced in 1876.<sup>21</sup> |

p.113

In 1846 there occurred perhaps Bowring's last personal contact with Bohemia and Czech literature before he left for the Far East as Consul to Canton. In August 1846 the romantic revolutionary and poet Josef Václav Frič arrived virtually penniless in London, where he acquainted himself with Polish emigré society. He stayed until January 1847. The seventeen-year-old youth decided to call on the illustrious friend of the Slavs, Dr. John Bowring, in December, shortly before Frič left for Paris. He found him absorbed with other more pressing matters and failed to interest him in Mácha, of whom Frič was an ecstatic devotee. The record of the encounter displays the exaggerated notion Frič had brought with him of Bowring's concern for matters Czech and Slav:<sup>22</sup>

Přijal mne sice dosti vlídně, ale přec mu nešlo jaksi na mysl, co mu vlastně chci, když tehdy již do studií asiatských jazyků zabrán, připravoval se k nastoupení státní služby, myslím, že dokonce v Číně. Přirozeno, že se tudíž už pramálo staral o další úkazy vývoje naší krásné literatury, ač

---

<sup>17</sup>5.VI.1845, Slavík 2i no. 583; also 12.VI.1845 no. 584.

<sup>18</sup>*Alumni Cantabrigienses*, ed. J. A. Venn, pt 2, vol. 4; *Alumni Dublinenses*, ed. Burtchaell, Sadleir, Dublin 1935, p. 589; *The Clergy List for 1845*, 1845, p. 156; E. A. Underhill, *The Story of the Ancient Manor of Sedgley*, Tipton 1942, pp. 277, 307.

<sup>19</sup>'Manuscript of the Queen's Court', in *Rukopis kralodvorský*, ed. V. Hanka, 1843, pp. 274–316.

<sup>20</sup>*Polyglotta kralodvorského rukopisu*, 1852.

<sup>21</sup>*Polyglotta kralodvorského rukopisu*, 1876.

<sup>22</sup>*Paměti Josefa Václ. Friče*, Část první, sv. 2, 1886, p. 77.

bych jej byl tak rád seznámil s Máchovým Májem a přiměl k anglickému téže básně převodu. Představiv se mu co nastávající dramatický spisovatel český, nebyl jsem tak šťasten vzbuditi jeho pozornost ani pro naše snahy národní ani pro svou osobu; předstíraje, že jest pracemi a starostmi všeho druhu příliš zahrnut, než aby mi mohl častěji sluchu přát, byl patrně rád, že jsem se mu po nejkratší rozmluvě pěkně poroučel, při kteréž příležitosti vručil jsem mu ještě exemplář svého 'Kochana Ratiborského' na památku, a pokloniv se i vzdychnuv si z hluboka, ubíral jsem se o jednu krátkou illusi chudší zase domů.

p.114 | A week later Bowring left a note at Frič's lodgings with some money attached, leaving the impression that he had regarded the visit as more or less a polite form of begging, as Frič rightly put it. A scrap of paper, the one to which the money was appended, by all appearances, survives to this day, addressed to 'Herr J. Hron', which was one of Frič's cryptonyms.<sup>23</sup>

Bowring's knowledge of Russian literary matters had lapsed also, as the description of a Russian traveller A. Vysheslavtsev, who met him at Hong Kong in 1858, confirms. However, he was pleased enough by the meeting and reminisced about his visit to Russia in 1819. 'Он рассказывал о друге своем Карамзине, и говорил с восторгом о Державине. О новой русской литературе, начиная с Пушкина, он не имел понятия.'<sup>24</sup>

At the same time he had by no means abandoned all interest in Eastern Europe. Hungary and its literature had in particular retained his attention. Returning from Turkey up the Danube on government business, Bowring made an overnight stop in Pest on 17th July 1858, where he met Ferenc Toldy and Vorösmarty and went to the theatre.<sup>25</sup> In Vienna on the same journey, nearly everyone he wanted to meet was away for the | summer; he discerned there 'very much fear of Russia.'<sup>26</sup> This appears to be the nearest he came to visiting Bohemia. His Hungarian correspondence continued with Toldy and Károly Kertbeny, and he published a book of translations from Petőfi in 1866.<sup>27</sup>

p.115

Czech authors continued to remember Bowring with touching affection and reverence. The first study in 1873 by Ferdinand Schulz in *Osvěta* is almost a panegyric,<sup>28</sup> and Hálek, commenting on it with approval in the newspaper *Národní listy*, quoted several purple passages from this article.<sup>29</sup> Jan Pravoslav Koubek wrote a rhetorical sonnet in his honour, contrasting him with the despising German and 'zpupný Frank', wont to

<sup>23</sup> 'Ihrem Freund ů Diener / J Bowring / 1 Queens Sq W1 / 23 Dec 1846 / Herrn / Herrn J. Hron / 21. Noel Street / Berwick Mews / Soho Square', LAPNP.

<sup>24</sup> A. Vysheslavtsev, *Очерки пером и карандашом из кругосветного плавания*, St. Petersburg 1862, pp. 190–1, as in V. Desnitskii, *Избранные статьи по русской литературе XVIII–XIX вв.*, Moscow Leningrad 1958, pp. 201–2.

<sup>25</sup> A. Varannai, *Acta Litteraria* 6, pp. 124–5; also, Varannai, *John Bowring és a magyar irodalom*, p. 126.

<sup>26</sup> Bowring to Campbell 10.VIII.1838, BM Add 37461 fo. 84.

<sup>27</sup> *Translations from Alexander Petőfi the Magyar Poet*, 1866; see note 25.

<sup>28</sup> 'Vzpomínka na Johna Bowringa', *Osvěta* 3i (1873), pp. 299 seq.

<sup>29</sup> *Národní listy* 4.IV.1873, in *Spisy V. Háalka*, 1924–5, 10, pp. 146–50.



---

confuse Czechs or Bohemians with gypsies, 'plémě Římanů odrodilých'.<sup>30</sup> Vrchlický that most prolific of poets went so far as to render into Czech Bowring's dedicatory poem to Čelakovský which headed the anthology.<sup>31</sup>

By comparison with his Hungarian enthusiasms, for one, Bowring's active Czech interests were short-lived. By dint of being drawn into local controversies and the jealous rivalries among the literary patriots on the other hand Bowring caused rather more of a stir in Bohemia than elsewhere. This has kept his name alive in the standard histories of Czech literature. Such | significance as Bowring's Bohemian work possesses lies therefore more in what it betrays about the internecine warfare of words between the Czech literary cliques, than in its minute impingement upon the senses of the largely oblivious, and, where not oblivious, often belittling, ironising or bored English reading public. p.116

---

<sup>30</sup> ČČM 1907, p. 310, orig. in LAPNP.

<sup>31</sup> Acc. to OSN *Dodatky* 'Bowring' in *Zvon* 1914.



## Chapter 8

# Wratislaw's Early Czech Studies, 1849–58

Albert Henry Wratislaw was born on 5th November 1821, the eldest son of William Ferdinand and Charlotte Anne Keele.<sup>1</sup> The family lived at Rugby where the father practised as a solicitor. Albert's grandfather Marc, who died in 1796, claimed to have come from Hranice (Weisskirchen) in Moravia and belong to the family of Counts Wratislav z Mitrovic.<sup>2</sup> Marc apparently came to England about 1770, later becoming French Master at Rugby School. The *Rugby School Register* for 1784 describes him as 'Marc Mari Emanuel, Count Wratislaw. . . A Count of Hungary, and of the Holy Roman Empire.'<sup>3</sup> It also claims that he was 'an Attaché to the Austrian Embassy at Paris at the marriage of Marie Antoinette.' (The dates are plausible at least: Marie Antoinette left Vienna for France on 21st April 1770.)<sup>4</sup> An account by Albert Wratislaw himself, written in the third person, and for the information of his Czech correspondent Josef Jireček, does not refer to this story, nor to his grandfather's precise ancestry. It does however add some further detail, which may justify quoting at length:<sup>5</sup> |

His grandfather came to England in the year 1770 under the name of Marc Wratislavia, nor did he acknowledge his real name of Wratislaw until he was denizised in 1793, when he described himself as of Weisskirch

---

<sup>1</sup>Date of birth often wrongly stated as 1822, but see: MS autobiogr. sketch, pozůst. J. Jirečka, LAPNP; *Rugby School Register*, ed. G. A. Solly, 1, Rugby 1933, p. 284; biography also: *Dictionary of National Biography (DNB)*; *Alumni Cantabr.*, ed. Venn, pt 2 vol. 6, 1954, p. 585; Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon*, 58, Wien 1889, pp. 163–4; O. Vočadlo, 'The Wratislavs', in *Gorski Vijenac*, ed. R. Auty et al., Cambr. 1970, pp. 290–302; *Světozor* 2.VIII.1867, p. 34, portrait, p. 32; information of Wratislaw family.

<sup>2</sup>See W. F. Wratislaw, 'Wratislaw of Rugby', *The Legal Observer* 26 (6, 13 Jan 1849), pp. 185–7, 206–10, esp., 209; Original Denizations, Public Record Office (PRO), Court of Chancery C. 97 piece 13; *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization. . . 1701–1800*, ed. W. A. Shaw, 1923, p. 200, from Patent Roll, 33 Geo. III., part 9.

<sup>3</sup>1, p. xx.

<sup>4</sup>M. de la Rocheterre, *Histoire de Marie-Antoinette*, 1, Paris 1890, p. 19; marriage at Versailles, 16.V.1770, *Encycl. Brit.* 11th ed.

<sup>5</sup>MS sketch LAPNP.

[Weisskirchen=Hranice] in Moravia. Neither did he acknowledge his rank, until in his last illness he informed his second wife, that she was a countess in her own right. He died at Rugby in Warwickshire, where he had been several years Modern language Master at the celebrated school. It is said that he spoke seven languages. A discussion having arisen among the Rugby masters respecting something that occurred in the battle of Prague,<sup>6</sup> he corrected their error from his own personal knowledge, informing them, that with his tutor he had himself been a spectator of the battle. Why he left his native country has never been satisfactorily ascertained, all his papers in German and other languages having been heedlessly destroyed at his death. But in England he was always both a Liberal and a Protestant, neither of which could he have been in 1770 in Austria. He was married for the first time in 1773, and during his first wife's lifetime an ineffectual effort was made by his brother to induce him to return. His first wife died in 1779, leaving one son, who subsequently died in Jamaica. In 1784 he married a second time and left by his second wife four sons and four daughters. The subject of this memoir is the eldest son of the third son, William Ferdinand Wratistlaw.

There is little to add to this. Albert's father William Ferdinand claimed to have traced Marc to Birmingham in 1773 under the name of Marc Wratistlawia, and wrote once in a letter that he landed at Harwich.<sup>7</sup> According to this account 'he came to England in 1769, and my Tutor Mr. Birch says he went to Oxford with a recommendation to a Canon of Christs Church.' The 'Original Denization' document of 1793 reads as follows: 'Mark Wratistlaw formerly of Weiskirchen near Olmutz in the Kingdom of Austria but now of Rugby in the County of Warwick | Gentleman.'<sup>8</sup>

p.119

As to his affiliation to the Counts Vratistlav z Mitrovic no conclusion can yet be reached. Albert's father claimed in an article that Marc was the second son of Wratistlaw Maximilian, Governor of Teschen in Silesia, and born 9th November 1735,<sup>9</sup> but the name of this son is usually given as Martin. This difficulty he was aware of, for he also wrote that his 'real description' was 'Count Martin Wratistlaw'.<sup>10</sup> Albert does not seem to have trusted this identification, or at least never seems to have referred to it in writing.

William Ferdinand was energetic in his attempts to solve the family's ancestry and set them up as accredited Counts of the Empire, making several visits to Bohemia where he established contact with members of the family. His confusing and confused efforts, and the difficulties met with from an outwardly friendly but possibly uneasy family, worried about legal wrangles over the inheritance, are described in letters to his nephew John and associated correspondence. These letters refer to visits to Bohemia

---

<sup>6</sup>Nov. 1741 – Franco-Bavarian occupation.

<sup>7</sup>To Rev. P. Bliss 3.II.1845, BM Add. 34,575 fo. 486.

<sup>8</sup>Original Denization of 1793.

<sup>9</sup>Article note 2.

<sup>10</sup>W. F. Wratistlaw to Bliss 3.II.1845.

---

in 1844, 1845 and 1847.<sup>11</sup> The result to judge by the correspondence was indecisive.

p.120

Albert entered Rugby School, then under Dr. Arnold, in August 1829, following in his father's footsteps.<sup>12</sup> He left at fifteen and was at first intended for the legal profession. He was 'articled to his father at Rugby, but before completing the term of his articles entered in 1840 at Trinity College, Cambridge.'<sup>13</sup> He apparently had a strong inclination for the ministry. In 1842 he migrated as a Scholar to Christ's, and in 1844 took a Second Class in Mathematics and a First in Classics, upon which he obtained a fellowship. He was a Fellow of Christ's from 1844–53, and Tutor 1847–52. 'In 1845 he was ordained deacon and in 1846 priest upon his fellowship.'<sup>14</sup>

His father's letters give us a glimpse or two of his life at this time. In November 1844 he wrote to John his nephew: 'Albert has written to say he has asked his Tutor Backhouse of Trinity to spend his Xmas with him here. . .'<sup>15</sup> In 1845 he wrote: 'Albert intends taking orders at Whitsuntide, so I presume I shall have him no more on my Continental trips, as he w<sup>d</sup> go wild seeing me in their churches, and probably think it wrong to enter them.'<sup>16</sup> And in March 1846: 'They have had a sharp shindy with the town and Cambridge and all the | windows of Christ's were smashed next their street.'<sup>17</sup>

p.121

Albert's religious fervour is reflected in a book of sermons he published in 1846 with Charles A. Swainson, theologian and Fellow of Christ's, and Master from 1881.<sup>18</sup> He was also active in questions of educational and university reform, and wrote several pamphlets on the subject.<sup>19</sup> In later life he published in the fields of theology and church politics,<sup>20</sup> education<sup>21</sup> and the classics.<sup>22</sup>

His Czech studies commenced while at Christ's. In 1845 there was published at Rugby a little work entitled *Wratislaw, a Bohemian Ballad*, which Albert had translated for his father from the German, and which claimed to be drawn from a Czech original.<sup>23</sup> His father described it in the preface as 'found, upon my recent visit to Bohemia, translated into German in the "Libussa", an Annual edited by Paul Aloys Klar'; and

---

<sup>11</sup>Transcripts provided by family.

<sup>12</sup>Rugby Sch. Reg., 1, pp. 136, 284.

<sup>13</sup>*Světlozor* 1867, p. 34; see note 5.

<sup>14</sup>See note 5; *Alumni Cantab.*

<sup>15</sup>W. F. Wratislaw to John M. T. Wratislaw 27.XI.1844, family.

<sup>16</sup>Same 21.III.1845.

<sup>17</sup>Same 18.III.1846.

<sup>18</sup>*Loci Communes – Common Places*, Cambr. 1846.

<sup>19</sup>*Further remarks on the Univ. system of education*, Cambr. 1848; *Observations on the Cambr. System*, Cambr. 1850; *Reasons for refusing to sign the report of the statutes revision syndicate*, Cambr. 1852.

<sup>20</sup>*Barabbas the Scapegoat*, 1859; *Intercourse and Intercommunication among Christians*, 1866; *The means of obtaining greater unity among ourselves. . .*, 1868; *Notes and dissertations principally on difficulties in the Scriptures of the New Covenant*, 1863.

<sup>21</sup>*Middle class and non-gremial examinations, Cui bono?*, Cambr. 1860; *A plea for the ancient Charitable Foundation of Rugby School*, 1864.

<sup>22</sup>*Ellisian Greek Exercises*, 1855; *Grammar School Classics – Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii*, 1869, with F. N. Sutton.

<sup>23</sup>'A. H. Wratislaw's Slavonic Books in the Library of Christ's College, Cambridge', *Trans. of the Cambr. Bibliographical Society* 5i (1969), pp. 36–46, no. 118, hereafter 'Libr. bibl.'

continued: 'Mr. Klar presented this work to me, as a remembrance of his connexion with our House, he having married my truly amiable kinswoman, the Countess Caroline Wratislaw of Mitrowitz.'<sup>24</sup>

p.122 There is no reason to think that Albert had started to learn the Czech language as yet. However, during the Vacation of 1848 he went to Bonn to study | German<sup>25</sup> and in 1849 realised a long-standing wish to visit the land of his fathers, where he stayed in Prague and travelled about the country with his hosts Karel Tieftrunk and Karel's brother Václav.<sup>26</sup> The result was an anthology of Czech verse entitled *Lyra Czechoslovanská* published in the same year. In it he expressed his gratitude to 'Dr. Tieftrunk and to his two nephews Vaclaw and Karel, my teachers, through whose well-directed assistance – although our only medium of communication was German, the language of all others least adapted to assist in the study of Slavonic – I was enabled to attain a considerable proficiencie in Bohemian, and make the translations I now lay before the public, in the short period of a Cambridge Long Vacation.'<sup>27</sup> He also thanked Hanka, Librarian of the National Museum and 'my friends in Bohemia and Moravia... the members of the Citizens-resource in Prague.'

p.123 He had arrived in Prague shortly before 9th July 1849, according to *Pražský večerní list*: 'chce prý se zde trochu blížeji seznámiti s literaturou českou a přeložiti plody některých básníků českých.'<sup>28</sup> *Pražské Noviny* wrote inaccurately: 'Tyto dni přijel do Prahy Wratislaw, professor z Londýna, aby se v literatuře české zdokonalil. Pobyde tady delší čas | a bude naše výtečnější básníky na anglický jazyk překládati. Jest to znamenitý Angličan, který v tomto poli vystupuje. Jak známo, obíral se již dříve anglický státník Lord John Bowring s naší literaturou, přeloživ větší díl Královského rukopisu, jako i mnoho básní od Kollára a Čelakovského na jazyk anglický.'<sup>29</sup> The same newspaper reported in September: 'Líbí se mu u nás jak náleží dobře, po roce hodlá Prahu opět navštívit.'<sup>30</sup>

Wratislaw attended a concert in late September in the Měšťanská beseda or 'Citizens' Resource', where the pianist Smolař, just returned from Russia, gave a performance with others in a programme of patriotic music. *Pražský večerní list* gave a detailed account and held the young English visitor up as a shining example of national pride. 'Těž Angličan Vratislav profesor v Cambridge (Kembridži) velmi si liboval v slovanském živlu – hovořili jsme s ním veskrz po česku, v kterémž jazyku on za tak krátký čas neočekávaně prospěl. Zamýšlí seznamovati anglickou literaturu s našimi výtečnějšími plody. Odebere se za týden do Anglicka. Odrodilci mohli by si vzíti tohoto mladého muže za příklad.'<sup>31</sup>

<sup>24</sup>Paul Alois Klar (Klaar), 1801–60, publ. German annual Libussa 1842–60; wife, Marie Karolina, roz. hraběnka Vratislavová z Mitrovic, 1816–95.

<sup>25</sup>*Světozor* 1867, p. 34.

<sup>26</sup>Karel Tieftrunk, 1829–97, historian; brother Václav.

<sup>27</sup>Libr. bibl. no. 68; quotations from preface.

<sup>28</sup>1849, č. 161, příloha, p. 769.

<sup>29</sup>10.VII.1849, pp. 533–4.

<sup>30</sup>21.IX.1849, p. 787; also, *Národní noviny* 9.VII, 22.IX.1849.

<sup>31</sup>28.IX.1849, pp. 1090–1.

---

*Česko-bratrský hlasatel* commented: 'Vůbec musíme podotknouti, že o Slovanstvu svět až posud jen málo ví, | tak drželi k.p. Francouzové Čechy za cikány; proto nás těšiti musí, že Angličané okazují chuť a vůli k seznání nás.'<sup>32</sup> According to them Wratislaw left for England on 4th October, 'naučiv za tak krátký čas obstojně česky mluvití.'<sup>33</sup> They also have a curious mistaken account of his ancestry, which exploits the standard emotional national theme of the Counter-Reformation: 'Předkové jeho byli Češi, po nešťastné bitvě na Bílé hoře vystěhovali se, skrze náboženství pronásledovaní z vlasti pryč. A hle, po více než 200 letech vrací se jejich potomek do Čech, aby se české naučil řeči. Veze sebou do vlasti své malou knihovnu českou, a je spoloudem Matice české.'<sup>34</sup> p.124

A list of contributors to the funds of Matice česká for September 1849 records 50 zl. as having been received from Albert Wratislaw.<sup>35</sup> Strangely enough he was their second English member. He joined in 1849,<sup>36</sup> but the first member, Connop Thirlwall, Bishop of St. David's, Carmarthen,<sup>37</sup> had joined in 1847.

*Lyra Czecho-slovanská*, the second anthology of Czech poetry in English, was printed shortly after Wratislaw's return to England. It is dedicated to the Polish Protestant exile Valerian Krasinski, author in 1848 of *Panslavism and Germanism*. The preface further demonstrates the influence of family allegiance in Wratislaw's desire to learn the Czech vernacular. | 'Connected with the Bohemian Slavonians in no distant degree by blood and name, and a member of their oldest, once their royal family, though myself a native of England, I have thought it a sacred duty to make myself personally acquainted with their language, their feelings and their striving, and as far as my isolated efforts can avail, to make them known in the country of my birth and education.'<sup>38</sup> p.125

The selection began with specimens from the Dvůr Králové MS, reprinted the ballad 'Wratislaw' of Karl Rain, and continued with verse by Jablonský, Hanka, Čelakovský, Kollár (one specimen only), Vinařický, Villani, Pícek (fifteen no less), and two anonymous pieces. The remainder of the volume was somewhat unsuitably padded out with original pieces of his own: 'from what I hope will not be construed into any thing worse than a harmless and pardonable vanity.' Its aims are not ambitious, as he writes himself: 'indeed my translations may more fitly be called a selection from my own reading, than from the productions of the Bohemian Muse.'

His family piety easily allied itself to nationalist sentiments and aspirations, to Czech-language loyalties bolstered by reverence for Protestant traditions and strivings. The introduction to the anthology shows this | blending of religious and national emotions, sometimes quite Pan-Slav in tendency: 'It seems, in short, that this long sleep of the Bohemian people was ordained by God's providence, in order that all Slavonic nations might awake to self-consciousness and arise together, to assume that position' p.126

---

<sup>32</sup>11.VII.1849, p. 289 (ed. by Jos. Růžička, B. V. Košut).

<sup>33</sup>3.X.1849, p. 438.

<sup>34</sup>Same.

<sup>35</sup>ČČM 23 (1850) sv. 3, p. 178.

<sup>36</sup>č. listu zakl. 2655, ČČM 26 (1851) sv. 2, after p. 236.

<sup>37</sup>č. 2128.

<sup>38</sup>Quotations here and below from preface; see Libr. bibl. no. 61, inscr. Krasiński 3.X.1854.

in the world, of which their natural capacity and activity is undoubtedly capable and towards which I believe them to be as undoubtedly hastening.' Wratlslaw emphasised the Protestant links with England through Wycliffe: 'I do not think that England could at the present time make a more acceptable or useful present to Bohemia, than a reprint of the text of the *old* Bohemian translations of the Bible with the new orthography. Church reform is one of the universal topics of conversation here, and the old Bohemian brethren are shewing strong symptoms of revival.'

p.127 In his politics he adopted the Czechs' antipathy for Germans and Hungarians and their dreams of a federation: 'I shall not shrink from recording my conviction, that the selfish policy of the Germans and Madjars – the former attempting to swallow up a large portion of the Austrian Empire in an imaginary Germany by means of the Frankfurt Parliament, the latter endeavouring to raise themselves upon its ruins and both plotting the | subjugation and oppression of their Slavonic neighbours – has prevented and destroyed the fairest prospects ever opened to a great empire consisting of multifarious and in some cases even heterogeneous elements, the fairest prospects of peace and brotherhood, or independent development and mutual assistance...'. And thus his views represented quite a usual mixture of cultural Pan-Slavism and political loyalty, with criticism, to the Habsburg regime.

One copy of *Lyra Czecho-slovanská* in the National Museum in Prague is personally inscribed to the poet Boleslav Jablonský, whom he may have met, along with 39 others of the translated writers.<sup>39</sup>

— — —

p.128 Proof that Wratlslaw had learnt a considerable amount of Czech is supplied by his earliest known letter to a Czech correspondent. It is addressed to Václav Hanka and dated 2nd July 1850: 'S velikou radostí četl sem v novinách že Čechové velké pokroky v politických ohledech učinili. Dej Pán Bůh žeby to se ještě dale dalo!<sup>40</sup> The letter asked Hanka to show his friend Swainson, and Swainson's sister, round the Museum and introduce them to the Beseda měšťanská: 'I v skutku já mu mluvil, že pívo, co je v besedě měšťanské k dostání, je lepší než Anglické; račte pak ho do besedy uvesti, | aby se toho ujistoval, i že Čechové jsou nejupřímnější a nejlepší lidé v celém světě. Račte moje pritele v besedě pozdravit. Já půjdu do Krakova, abych se polsky učil; doufám ale že Vás posleze v roku viděl.'

In the summer of 1850 Wratlslaw visited Cracow. A Church Slavonic Bible presented by the Librarian of the Jagellonian University Józef Muczkowski records the day of his departure from the city, 20th September.<sup>41</sup> Perhaps he was encouraged in this plan by Krasinski. His library at Christ's contains a few Polish items dating to this period. Whether Wratlslaw also passed through Prague on this occasion remains unestablished.

---

<sup>39</sup>Nár. muz. sign. 70 I 391.

<sup>40</sup>2.VII.1850, LAPNP (all correspondence of A. H. Wratlslaw hereafter quoted from orig. in LAPNP unless otherwise stated; all original grammatical and orthographical errors have been reproduced); Charles A. Swainson, 1820–87, theologian, fellow and master of Christ's, see note 18.

<sup>41</sup>Libr. bibl. no. 3.



---

He paid a further visit to Bohemia in 1851, in July.<sup>42</sup> In August the Czech newspapers announced his latest publication entitled *Patriotism*, which was a version of the poem 'Záboj' from the Dvůr Králové MS.<sup>43</sup>

Wratislaw's second letter to Hanka, written on his return to Cambridge shows that he had been in touch with the Wratislaw family in Bohemia, as well as meeting people from the literary world and the Protestant churches. It mentioned that Count Josef Wratislaw<sup>44</sup> had attempted to call on him in Cambridge while he was away, and referred to correspondence with the Czech patriot Ludmilla Countess Berchtold, née | Wratislaw, Count Josef's sister.<sup>45</sup> He sent greetings to Palacký, Čelakovský, Karel Tieftrunk, Franta Šumavský,<sup>46</sup> and Řivnáč, the bookseller who handled the publications of Maticе česká.<sup>47</sup> Lastly he spoke of a letter to Krasinski from Bedřich V. Košut, founder of an independent congregation of the Evangelist Reformed Church in Prague.<sup>48</sup> Presumably these were all people he had met. There are thus three main strands in Wratislaw's relations with Bohemia, family ties, literary-scholarly and clerical connections. All three elements contribute to his published work, and his adopted Czech patriotism.

p.129

He was now engaged on a complete version of the Dvůr Králové poems to replace Bowring's in a new polyglot edition being prepared by Hanka. He wrote to Hanka in October 1851: 'Posílám k Vašnosti „Jahody“ a „Čestmír a Vlaslav“ po Anglicku. . . Máte již „Oldřich a Boleslav“ i některé jiné. Ich werde mich nun mit den übrigen beschäftigen.'<sup>49</sup> By December he was sending the rest.<sup>50</sup> They were published in 1852 both as part of *Polyglotta kralodvorského rukopisu*<sup>51</sup> and as a separate book.<sup>52</sup> At the same time Wratislaw had them published in England<sup>53</sup> and promised copies for Hanka, Countess Berchtold and Felice Francesconi.<sup>54</sup> Francesconi was responsible for the Italian translation and for the proof-reading. He taught Italian and French at the | Deutsche Karl-Ferdinands-Universität.<sup>55</sup> Another copy was sent to Tieftrunk.<sup>56</sup>

p.130

In a curious letter to *Notes and Queries* some twenty years later a Mr. D. Blair of Melbourne, Australia, told how he had picked up a copy of the Prague edition as a makeweight, and he recommended it to ballad readers. Wratislaw responded in another

---

<sup>42</sup>Lumír 10.VII.1851 č. 23, p. 549; Pražské noviny 8.VII.1851 č. 159.

<sup>43</sup>Lumír 21.VIII.1851 č. 29, p. 692; Pražský prostonárodní list 22.VIII.1851 č. 22, p. 151; Pražské noviny 22.VIII.1851 č. 198.

<sup>44</sup>AHW to Hanka 24.X.1851; Count Josef Xaver Adam, 1818–69.

<sup>45</sup>1808–79.

<sup>46</sup>1796–1857, philologist.

<sup>47</sup>František Řivnáč, 1807–88.

<sup>48</sup>Bedřich Vilém Košut, 1819–93.

<sup>49</sup>24.X.1851.

<sup>50</sup>AHW to Hanka 1.XII.1851.

<sup>51</sup>Ed. V. Hanka, 1852, Libr. bibl. no. 28; another ed. 1876.

<sup>52</sup>Manuscript of the Queen's Court, Prague 1852.

<sup>53</sup>The Queen's Court Manuscript, Cambr. 1852, dedic. to Countess Ludmilla Berchtold.

<sup>54</sup>AHW to Hanka 2.I.1852.

<sup>55</sup>Die deutsche Karl-Ferdinands-Univ. in Prag, Prague 1899, p. 461; see also, *Poesie nazionali lyrico-epiche della Boema, tratte dal codice di Králové Dvůr*, Prague 1851.

<sup>56</sup>AHW to Hanka 8.III.1852.

issue warning that the Prague edition was 'full of typographical errors – the press having been corrected from my MS. by an Italian.' He recommended the Cambridge edition, 'which is still to be had.' Evidently it had not sold well.<sup>57</sup>

Wratisslaw told Hanka in March 1852 of a recommendation of his *Queen's Court Manuscript* which had appeared in the *Critic*,<sup>58</sup> and another notice in the same journal in May quoted his version of 'The Lark'.<sup>59</sup> The *Athenaeum*, which in 1848 had reviewed Wratisslaw's pamphlet *Further Remarks on the University System of Education*, failed to notice either his *Lyra Czecho-slovanská* or his *Queen's Court Manuscript*. The latter is the last of Wratisslaw's earliest group of publications on Czech literature, produced between 1845 and 1852. A decline ensued, and the next belong to the sixties.

p.131 Part of Wratisslaw's correspondence with Hanka is devoted to church affairs. In 1838 Richard Whately, Professor of Political Economy at Oxford in 1829, and | Anglican Archbishop of Dublin from 1831, had produced a small work entitled *Easy Lessons on Christian Evidences*,<sup>60</sup> which ran to many editions. Whately was keen on obtaining foreign translations, and Wratisslaw wrote about a Czech version in 1851 to Hanka, asking him to discuss it with Palacký or Josef Růžička, vicar of the United German Evangelical Church, later Director of the Evangelical College.<sup>61</sup> The book was then sent with a German version to Josef Procházka, a Protestant minister found to do the job.<sup>62</sup> He was an Evangelical Reformed pastor, in 1848 a member of Slovanská lípa, who then became Polish preacher in Namyslov, Prussia, returning only after 1861 to Lysá nad Labem. Letters were exchanged with Procházka, and Wratisslaw reported to Hanka that he gave 'melancholické noviny o stavu náboženstevnické literatury v Čechách.'<sup>63</sup> Along with Whately, who had guaranteed the financial side of the enterprise,<sup>64</sup> the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge seems to have had a hand in the venture. Wratisslaw wrote in March 1852 that the SPCK had accepted Procházka's translation,<sup>65</sup> but later ascribed the 'writing' ('psání') to Václav Zelený, a translator of Macaulay, and only the introduction to Procházka.<sup>66</sup> This tallies with a statement in the published volume that Procházka had done the | translation with the help of a friend.<sup>67</sup> The book was printed in 1852 with a subsidy of forty pounds from England, and a second edition appeared in 1860.

p.132

<sup>57</sup>4th ser. 5 (11.VI.1870), p. 556, (25.VI.1870), p. 605.

<sup>58</sup>'The Critic Abroad', 11 (15 March 1852), p. 154; AHW to Hanka 17.III.1852.

<sup>59</sup>1.V.1852, p. 239.

<sup>60</sup>With Charles Dickinson, Bishop of Meath, 7th ed. 1846, 14th ed. 1855, renamed 'Introductory Lessons...'.  
<sup>61</sup>1.XII.1851; Josef Růžička, 1808–72, 2nd vicar of United Evangelical Church 1834–, Director of Evang. College 1854–, member of National Committee and Slav Congress 1848; see also, E. Jane Whately, *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately*, new ed. 1868, p. 157.

<sup>62</sup>AHW to Hanka 2.I.1852.

<sup>63</sup>8.III.1852.

<sup>64</sup>AHW to Hanka 1.XII.1851, 2.I.1852.

<sup>65</sup>AHW to Hanka 17.III.1852.

<sup>66</sup>AHW to Hanka 27.VII.1852; Václav Zelený, 1825–75, transl. Sheridan, *Klevety* (1855) and *Dějiny anglické Macaulaye* (1861), friend of Palacký.  
<sup>67</sup>*Světélé důkazy božského původu náboženství křesťanského, původně anglicky sepsáno, a do češtiny přeloženo*, od Josefa Procházky, Prague 1852, p. 8.

---

Other scraps of news about Wratislaw's Czech studies can be gleaned from the letters to Hanka. In March 1852 he requested the Czech original of *Příhody Václava Vratislava z Mitrovic*, a famous work about the author's travels and captivity in Turkey: 'poněvadž mam tutiž knížku do Anglického přeložit.'<sup>68</sup> (He also had the German version.) He also requested 'Cesta Drzlava Vratislava do svaté země.'<sup>69</sup> The family link is obvious. In June he wrote that Klar had sent an issue of *Libussa* containing Hanka's portrait, which was now framed and hanging in his study.<sup>70</sup> A list of books owned by Wratislaw while Fellow of Christ's is to be found in the published bibliography of his library, left to the college on his death.<sup>71</sup>

— — —

In the summer of 1852 Wratislaw left Christ's to become Headmaster of Felsted School in Essex, then in an unhealthy state.<sup>72</sup> He told Hanka in June, 'Ich gedenke kein anderes Jahr in Cambridge zuzubringen',<sup>73</sup> and wrote from Felsted on 27th July, describing how Hanka's portrait was decorating his living-room wall, beneath a picture of Erasmus, and watching him as he sat.<sup>74</sup> At the close of the year he married Frances | Helm, who was 'sister of a well-known left-handed University bowler',<sup>75</sup> and in January he informed Hanka that he now had forty-seven boys in the school.<sup>76</sup> The amount of work involved in setting up house and putting the school back on its feet may well serve to explain a noticeable slackening-off in Wratislaw's Czech studies.

p.133

Some reading continued, however, although he published nothing for some years. In July 1852 he suggested that Hanka might forward the *Příhody Václava Vratislava* through a Fellow of Christ's John Hays, who was about to visit Prague.<sup>77</sup> He also enquired whether Volume 2 of Palacký's history of Bohemia had yet appeared in Czech (he had the German version): in fact it was delayed until 1875–6. Wratislaw's copy of Volume 3 Part 1 of the Czech version (1850) is personally inscribed, 'Panu Wratislawowi Angličanu na znamení swé úcty spisowatel Palacký.'<sup>78</sup> A letter to Hanka in November made a rare reference to a novel, Tyl's *Rozina Ruthardová*, which he had just read, but his comments are not very illuminating: 'Novela jest dobrá, osoby nastíněny pérem umělym, učastenství čtenáře nepřestává, historie jest puvabná, a čítatel se na konci uspokoji.'<sup>79</sup> Klar had sent him the *Příhody*, | and Hanka had told him of the death of

p.134

---

<sup>68</sup>17.III.1852; *Příhody*, MS 1599, publ. ed. Pelcl 1777, eds. 1807, 1855, German 1786; Russian, Libr. bibl. no. 115.

<sup>69</sup>Not identified.

<sup>70</sup>2.VI.1852.

<sup>71</sup>Libr. bibl.

<sup>72</sup>*Alumni Cantab.; Alumni Felstediensis. . . May, 1564 – September, 1931*, ed. F. S. Moller, 1931.

<sup>73</sup>2.VI.1852.

<sup>74</sup>27.VII.1852.

<sup>75</sup>Rev. George H. Statham, *Reminiscences of a Septuagenarian*, MS condensation of diary, 1913, p. 114 (15.VIII.1865), property of grandson M. P. Statham, County Archivist, Bury St. Edmunds and West Suffolk Record Office; family.

<sup>76</sup>22.I.1853.

<sup>77</sup>27.VII.1852; John Hays, 1823–93, fellow and dean, Christ's.

<sup>78</sup>Libr. bibl. no. 76, other eds nos. 77–9.

<sup>79</sup>30.XI.1852; see Libr. bibl. no. 114 (vol. 3), no. 113.

Čelakovský.<sup>80</sup> The next letter, in January 1853, was written entirely in German<sup>81</sup> and no other Czech letter from Wratislaw is known of before 1869, itself a mark of decline. He spoke of his plans to translate the *Přihody* in their entirety, at least partly out of family piety. 'Ich habe jetzt bei mir das böhmische Original der Wratislawischen Fahrt nach Constantinopel, und mein Vater dringt auf mich am heftigsten die zuwünschende [sic] Uebersetzung auszuführen.'

— — —

Over a year later, on 17th July 1854, he wrote to Hanka from Bonn, where he had gone for a holiday with his wife and newly-born daughter Gertrude Ludmilla.<sup>82</sup> He apologised for the long silence, but he had promised himself not to write until he had finished reading the *Přihody* through in the original. Now it only remained for him to translate it into English. Once the railway from Cologne to Prague was open he hoped to make a trip to Prague, 'doch Weib und Kind und Kinderwärterin herumzuführen ist eine sehr kostspielige Geschichte.'

p.135 While in Bonn Wratislaw met Dr. Anton Springer, the Czech-born historian, publicist, and later, from 1860, Professor of Art History at Bonn University. | Springer had been active in 1848 as a Bohemian Liberal, but later he adopted an increasingly pro-German standpoint which made him thoroughly invidious to the Czech nationalists.<sup>83</sup> Springer and Wratislaw discussed together a scheme which was afoot to have Palacký's history of the Hussite Wars translated into English,<sup>84</sup> but Wratislaw decided that at present he was busy occupied with writing his *Ellisian Greek Exercises* (1855). 'Mit dem Springer hab' ich über die Uebersetzung des Palackischen Hussitenkriegs gesprochen, und ich hätte gern mich als Uebersetzer desselben noch einmal dargeboten, wäre ich nicht gegenwartig mit einem Griechisch-aufgaben-buche für meine Schule beschäftigt. Schade dass der Palacký sich so sehr auf den Noel verlies, da ich damals im Stande war die Uebersetzung sogleich übernommen zu haben.'<sup>85</sup>

p.136 Robert R. Noel was an English friend of Palacký and Springer who lived at Rosawitz near Děčín (Tetschen) in Northern Bohemia. His father was Rev. Thomas Noel, illegitimate son of Lord Wentworth, and he was cousin to Anne Isabella, Lady Noel Byron. He was known as a 'noted phrenologist in that golden age of phrenology.'<sup>86</sup> Rieger also knew him: 'bylť žil delší dobu v Čechách – | kde se oženil s baronkou Hennigrovou a byl v přátelských stycích s rodinou hr. Františka a Lva Thuna...'<sup>87</sup>

<sup>80</sup> 5.VIII.1852.

<sup>81</sup> AHW to Hanka 22.I.1853.

<sup>82</sup> Born 21.I.1854, family.

<sup>83</sup> See Jan Heidler, *Antonín Springer a česká politika v letech 1848–1850*, 1914.

<sup>84</sup> i.e. *Geschichte/Dějiny* vol. 3 (1403–39), 3 pts.

<sup>85</sup> AHW to Hanka 17.VII.1854.

<sup>86</sup> E. C. Mayne, *The Life and Letters of... Lady Noel Byron*, 1929, p. 375.

<sup>87</sup> Vlastní vzpomínky F. L. Riegra na kroměřížský sněm a cestu do Francie a Anglie, 1849–50, MS in Archív Nár. muz., Prague, pozůst. Riegra karton č. 1,2, also in K. Kadlec ed., *Drobné spisy Bohuše svob. pána Riegra*, 1915, vol. 2, pp. 628–47; Robert Ralph Noel married Ludovika Henniger ze Seeberka, 1837, acc. to OSN; see also, G. H. Needler, *Letters of Anna Jameson to Ottilie von Goethe*, 1939; A. Springer, *Aus meinem Leben*, Berlin 1892; J. Heidler, *Přispěvky k listáři Dra. Frant. Lad. Riegra*, vol. 1, 1924; G. S. Haight, *The George Eliot Letters*, 1, p. 355; 2, p. 144; Ian Milner, 'Herr Klesmer: George Eliot's Portrait of the Artist',

---

Rieger, Springer and Noel travelled together to England in 1850, and Springer later delighted in depicting Rieger's awkwardness and ignorance of English during this sojourn. One of the people Springer met was the young George Eliot, another Thomas Carlyle. Palacký later asked Robert Noel to help him find an English publisher for his account of the Hussite Wars, and a letter in 1853 from Noel explained his vain attempts.<sup>88</sup> Passing through London at Whitsuntide he had entrusted the business to a friend until he returned from military exercises – he was a Captain in the Militia.<sup>89</sup> Afterwards he had tried himself, to no avail, even when he had offered the translation free of charge. 'Einer, sagte mir gerade zu, dass sich nur die oberflächlichen, unterhaltenden oder ganz populäre wissenschaftliche Werke rentieren, und dass alles was ich ihm von den Gediegenheit Ihres Werkes erzählte, ihn um so mehr bestimmte nichts damit zu thun zu haben. Wenn es sich für ein Shilling-Band der Railway library, oder people's library etc geeignet hätte, würde er darauf reflechirt haben, etc. Er sagte hinzu, dass es eine Biographie Hussens in der englischen Sprache gäbe, und diese | enthielte alles was die Engländer über den Hussiten-Krieg zu wissen brauchten.'

p.137

Two fairly recent works by François de Bonnechose had been translated from the French by Campbell Mackenzie, both published at Edinburgh: *The Reformers before the Reformation* (1844) and *Letters of John Huss* (1846). There were in addition several histories of the United Brethren, who had churches in England, but Palacký's work was scarcely to be treated in the same class as these, even if for practical commercial purposes it was probably so. A publisher might nevertheless have been found more easily north of the border, where interest in Hus was stronger among the Scottish Presbyterians.

Noel suggested to Palacký that it would be useful to get in touch with Wratislaw for a further attempt. 'Ich wünsche daher mich mit Herrn Wratislaw in Verkehr zu setzen und ersuche Sie mir seine Adresse, falls Sie sie kennen, zu schicken. Ich habe mich schon bei Herrn auf Oxford, nach ihm erkundigt, doch keinen gefunden, der ihn kannte. Vielleicht möchte er noch die Übersetz[ung] besorgen, und es wäre möglich einen Universitäts-verleger zu finden, der mit dem Absatz bei Besitzern von Bibliotheken und weniger Geschichtsfreunde, und mit einem mässigen | Gewinn zufrieden wäre.' Wratislaw may, as his letter to Hanka from Bonn suggested, have been somewhat piqued to discover that he had not been approached in the first instance.

p.138

This project seems to have lain dormant for some years, perhaps passing through several abortive transformations. A notice in 1873, twenty years later, in the Czech Protestant organ *Hlasy ze Siona*, mentioned the selfsame scheme. According to this the work was even carried out, but by whom it does not say: 'záměr, aby jeho dílo „o době husitské“, do angličiny přeložené, a pohotově léžící, v Anglicku se uveřejnilo, a pojednou všechny historické škváry, z ciziny tam přivezené, a věc naši hyzdící, se vytiskly, posud se neuskutečnil. (Víme o tom z úst Dr. Palackého, a upozorňujeme na to přátele naše skotské; uveřejněním tohoto díla posloužilo by se jim i nám velice.)'<sup>90</sup>

---

*Philologica Pragensia*, 1964, pp. 353–358, attempts, doubtfully, to identify Springer with Klesmer, in *Daniel Deronda*.

<sup>88</sup>Noel to Palacký, Homberg 7.VII.1853, LAPNP.

<sup>89</sup>Rieger, *Vzpomínky*; Needler, p. 210.

<sup>90</sup>'Britické hlasy o Češích', 25.II.1873, pp. 26–7.

p.139 Wratislaw, in an earlier letter to Vojta Náprstek in 1865, cited a different report. 'A Bohemian, whom I know in London, has sent me a copy of the "Národ" newspaper containing a statement, that Mrs. Hay-Kerr has translated Šafařík's Antiquities and has begun to translate Palacký's History.'<sup>91</sup> Mrs. Louisa Hay Kerr was the translator of Leopold Ranke's *History of Servia and the Servian Revolution*,<sup>92</sup> so the report is not | implausible. She would have translated from German. Wratislaw himself makes only an oblique reference to the project in his known letters to Palacký.

— — —

In 1855 Wratislaw left Felsted on being appointed Headmaster of Edward VI Grammar School, Bury St. Edmunds, where he remained almost a quarter century. The decline in his Czech studies at first continued, although it seems his church connections may have persisted as before.

In 1856 he supported the publication of an edition of Daniel Sartorius's *Summovni postilla* by Josef Růžička.<sup>93</sup> In the following year, in his first short letter to Palacký, dated 10th October 1857, he enquired about the Evangelical church at Velenice near Poděbrady, having received a sad report of its condition.<sup>94</sup> He added, in what appears to be a reference to the proposed English translation: 'Mit dem höchsten Interesse hab' ich Ihre Geschichte der Hussitischen Zeiten gelesen.'

p.140 Wratislaw's last surviving letter to Hanka, in March 1858, congratulated him on the fortieth anniversary of the Dvůr Králové MS discovery. He remarked on the lapse in his Czech studies: 'Ich | erröthe es einzugestehen, aber ich befinde mich noch nicht von weitem so mächtig der böhmischen Sprache wie vorher, und in der That befürchte ich beinahe, dass Sie mich in der beseda kaum aufnehmen werden, wenn ich etwas Zeit der Erholung der untergebliebenen böhmischen Studien nicht widme.'<sup>95</sup> That year he visited Prague again in July, after a long absence.<sup>96</sup> *Lumír* announced: 'bude tu čerpati nový material k publikacím o Čechách a o naší národní literatuře,'<sup>97</sup> and even went so far as to print on its front page translations by Edmund B. Kaizl of original poems by Wratislaw from *Lyra Czecho-slovanská*.<sup>98</sup> They were not good poems, but then they were little worse, if at all, than many of the literary verses in a folk song mould which he had chosen to translate for the anthology. They may have made a good impression.

Wratislaw's Czech enthusiasm began with his family traditions, and his father's excursions to Bohemia in search of his family's credentials, and from there broadened out into the linguistic, literary and historical fields. From the start these interests were coupled with an active concern for Czech Protestantism and the fostering of connections

<sup>91</sup>30.X.1865, archív Náprstkova muzea, Prague.

<sup>92</sup>1847, 2nd ed. 1848, 3rd 1853; Libr. bibl. no. 89, 'from the translator'; B. Hoeft, L. v. Ranke, *Neue Briefe*, Hamburg 1949, p. 324 and indexes.

<sup>93</sup>2 vols, 1856; see Růžička to AHW 11.V.1869, draft, also Růžička to Herrschel 21.VI.1869, in J. Lukášek, *J. Růžička – jeho život a dílo*, 1929, pp. 95–7.

<sup>94</sup>10.X.1857.

<sup>95</sup>20.III.1858.

<sup>96</sup>*Pražské noviny* 23.VII.1858 č. 172.

<sup>97</sup>8 (29.VII.1858) č. 30, p. 719.

<sup>98</sup>8 (12.VIII.1858) č. 32, pp. 745–6: 'Na břehu Réna', 'Buchlov na Moravě', 'Pomněnka'.

---

between the Protestant churches of England and Bohemia. |

p.141

This is an essential factor to be reckoned with in all his studies of early Czech literature and history, Hus, Štítný and the Pre-Reformation, which were to characterise his later work. His attention hardly ever returned to nineteenth-century belles-lettres after the first years, and this absence of interest is reflected in his library. *Lyra Czecho-slovanská* is an odd man out in this respect, and it probably went even more unnoticed in England than Bowring's anthology had done; deservedly so.





## Chapter 9

# Wratislaw's Protestant Studies, 1859–73

A fellow teacher at Bury St. Edmunds, Rev. George H. Statham, introduced Wratislaw in his diary as 'a Bohemian by birth as one could tell by looking at his face... a man of great intellect' who 'could successfully take up any subject by mere force of brain-power... a Broad Churchman, and a Liberal in an orthodox and Conservative neighbourhood... an enthusiastic entomologist... he could play the pianoforte correctly tho' he had absolutely no ear for music.' He was 'no disciplinarian... was so simple that boys could easily impose on him.'<sup>1</sup> p.142

Josef Frič had met John Bowring on his first visit to London, with disappointing results.<sup>2</sup> In 1859–60 he was again in England, in quest of Herzen's support for the Czech national cause.<sup>3</sup> As well as attempting to earn a living by journalism he apparently tried to obtain some language teaching in London and also, according to a letter to his father, solicited Wratislaw for a teaching post at Bury St. Edmunds: 'V pravé již desperaci, vždyť se Vám konečně mohlo | zdáti, že se nic nepřičiňuji, odejel jsem do Bury St. Edmunds a chtěl jsem se tam zahrabat – přijmutím při tamějším gymnasium profesury německého i francouzského jazyka, však pan Wratislaw slíbil mi to místo teprv za rok! – Tak dlouho nemohl jsem čekat – ubohá žena moje byla by se zatím utrápila – odejel jsem do Paříže.'<sup>4</sup> Wratislaw presented him with a copy of the *Book of Common Prayer*, inscribed personally with the date 1859.<sup>5</sup> p.143

In the summer of 1861 Wratislaw went again to Bohemia.<sup>6</sup> An article written after described it as 'a little tour... for the express purpose of observing and recording the

---

<sup>1</sup>Rev. George H. Statham (2nd Master, Bury St. Edmunds Grammar School, 1865–75), *Reminiscences*, p. 114 (entry 15.VIII.1865).

<sup>2</sup>See Ch. 7, pp. 113–4.

<sup>3</sup>Sh. Sh. Bogatyrev, 'Чешские связи Герцена (1850-е – 1860-е гг.)', *Литературное наследство*, 64, pp. 779–809; A. Herzen, *Собрание сочинений*, Moscow 1954–65, vol. 26, letters nos. 266, 272, 275, 332, vol. 27, nos. 5, 180.

<sup>4</sup>To JUDr Josef Frič, Paris 21.VIII.1860, *J. V. Frič v dopisech a denících*, 1955, p. 102.

<sup>5</sup>See R. Khel and J. Jakšová, *Knihovna J. V. Friče: Bibliografický soupis*, 1965, no. 549.

<sup>6</sup>*Pražské noviny* 31.VII.1861 č. 179; *Národní listy* 29.VII.1861 č. 206.

condition of the Slavonic Protestants.<sup>7</sup> He visited the congregation of Josef Procházka in Namyslov, in Prussia, where he found his Polish very rusty and 'could rarely catch an entire sentence.' After a night at Veletrusy he travelled to Lešice by springless carriage, observing the 'want of good bye-roads.' There he saw the church and a small school for 113 pupils, whose general condition he found less than adequate ('the chickens appeared more at home than they ought to have been in a place dedicated to education'). Next morning he attended Sunday service at Krabšice and observed the  
 p.144 election of a presbytery under a new constitution granted the previous April. | En route he enjoyed an excellent view of the legendary mount of Říp.

In Prague,<sup>8</sup> he heard Rev. Šubert preach Sunday sermon and was shown over a Catholic school. He detected a great polarisation in politics. The man who took him to the parish school of Sv. Jiří was 'an old friend, a Mr. *Krug*, who by the way was the only really loyal Austrian we met, everybody else, who took any interest in politics at all, being fanatical either for the German or Slavonic party.' Wratistlaw took part of a lesson, dictating 'eight lines from Maria Czacká, which we happened to know by heart.' Classes were in both Czech and German. When he remarked on 'the absence of historical teaching; the lives of one or two saints and three Hapsburg emperors being all that was contained in the books of the upper classes', his Roman Catholic friends remarked: 'They dare not allow it to be taught.' Wratistlaw concluded: 'Can either the government or the dominant church be in a proper relation to the people of Bohemia, if it is necessary to their existence that the Bohemians should be kept in ignorance of their own history?' In fact this was a somewhat partisan judgment. Rather more Czech  
 p.145 history was taught at secondary level, as part of Austrian history: V. V. | Tomek's *Děje mocnářství rakouského* was a prescribed textbook. Jan Šafránek in his history of Czech schools praised many aspects of the primary curriculum at this time.<sup>9</sup>

Elsewhere Wratistlaw dramatised exceedingly the admittedly gloomy Czech nationalist outlook in the early sixties, writing: 'Last summer I met a Bohemian gentleman who addressed me thus:- "sir, you are come to visit a dead and buried and forgotten nation."<sup>10</sup> In a pamphlet produced after the visit called *Historical and Statistical Sketch of the Slavonic Protestants in the North of the Austrian Empire* the Czechs are credited as 'a nation, that has done and suffered more perhaps than any nation in Europe in the cause of civilisation and religious liberty.'<sup>11</sup>

Appended to this were extracts from Václav Wratistlaw's *Příhody*. In 1862 the translation was published in full as *Adventures of Baron Wenceslas Wratistlaw*. It was deservedly honoured by an approving notice in the *Athenaeum*, mainly summarising the action of the book. The reviewer concluded: 'The story of Baron Wratistlaw may take its place beside Silvio Pellico "Prigione", – beside the story of the imprisonment of the missionaries in the first Burmese War, – in fact | beside any record of captivity and patient heroism with which we are acquainted. As a book for reading aloud, in a family  
 p.146 circle, it will be fascinating. The spirit breathed throughout is noble and chivalrous. It

<sup>7</sup>'A few days amongst the Slavonic Protestants of Central Europe', *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 4th ser.

---

is not often we have met with a book that has interested us so much.<sup>12</sup> This book was the first translation of any extended Czech prose work in nineteenth-century England, and may well have been the most successful.

In 1862 Vojtěch Náprstek, later founder of the Prague Industrial Museum, was visiting London for the World Industrial Exhibition. He paid a visit to Wratislaw and a letter survives dated 8th July, more personal in tone than usual by being written in English. 'We were in London not long ago and sorry that we did not meet you at my brother's, who was expecting you to smoke a pipe with him...I have just been putting the portraits you brought me into a photograph book, and intend to keep them carefully. Tomorrow we go to Poet's Cottage, Aldeburgh on the sea coast of Suffolk, where we propose to stay 3 weeks. With kind remembrances from Mrs. Wratislaw and Miss Helen, and hoping that you will pay us another visit before you return to your native country.'<sup>13</sup> Wratislaw tried to engage Náprstek's help in arranging a Czech translation of another of Bishop Whately's books.<sup>14</sup>

p.147

Several articles on Czech Protestantism flowed from his pen in the ensuing years.<sup>15</sup> In *Good Words* in 1862 he explained the new constitution accorded to the Protestant churches and expounded, in the more optimistic atmosphere now prevailing among Czech Protestants, on what one might call his Providential Anti-Popist View of History-In-The-Long-Run:<sup>16</sup>

See how the Lord has turned to his own good and wise purposes the necessities of statesmen and rulers! When the aid of Russia had rendered the Hapsburg dynasty safe, apparently, on the throne of Vienna, had crushed the Hungarian rebellion, and rendered the Austrian Government for the time master of the situation, the Jesuits and the agents of Popery had it all their own way, and were able to obtain the celebrated Concordat which was intended to put a stop to the progress of Protestantism for ever. But suddenly a new actor, the French Emperor, Napoleon III., appeared upon the scene, and the mighty army, on which the Austrian Government had relied, broke, like a reed, at the battles of Magenta and Solferino, and there was nothing left for the Emperor to do but to call new statesmen to his councils, and grant both liberal institutions and religious freedom to the whole community. And now, though but little is being done in the world of politics in Austria, owing to the refusal of the Hungarians to send deputies to the Reichsrath, yet a great deal is being done in the religious world.

---

4 (Jan 1864), pp. 286–301, quotations, pp. 286–7, 289–90, 296–7, 300–1.

<sup>8</sup>See *Národní listy* 29.VII.1861 č. 206.

<sup>9</sup>See J. Šafránek, *Školy české*, 2, 1919, p. 127 etc.

<sup>10</sup>*Adventures of Baron Wenceslas Wratislaw*, 1862, p. xxxviii.

<sup>11</sup>1861, p. 3.

<sup>12</sup>6.IX.1862, pp. 298–301.

<sup>13</sup>AHW to V. Náprstek 8.VII.1862, archív Náprstkova muzea.

<sup>14</sup>*Introductory Lessons on the History of Religious Worship*, 1849.

<sup>15</sup>See bibliography.

<sup>16</sup>'Bohemian Protestants', *Good Words* 1862, pp. 607–8.

p.148 1863 was the tenth centenary of the mission of Cyril and Methodius, and Wratistlaw wanted the Protestants to make their mark (the Catholics were also celebrating). He sent a notice to the English press on the event, reproduced in a letter of his to Hlasy ze Siona.<sup>17</sup> | The letter also asked about Procházka, now at Lysá nad Labem, for whose projected school he was collecting money: he had written twice without answer. The *Clerical Journal* subsequently reported the sending of fifty pounds, twenty of which was profit from the successful *Adventures of Baron Wenceslas Wratistlaw*.<sup>18</sup> That book's introduction had also taken up the theme of the tenth centenary: 'Will England remain uninterested and indifferent at this approaching jubilee? England, from whose Wycliffe came the enlightenment that, by God's grace, enabled Hus and Jerome to give their bodies to be burned at Constance? The little flame which arose, in 1781, out of the long and cruelly smothered embers of the torch thus transmitted from England to Bohemia, is now becoming larger and larger, and brighter and brighter, and promises to burst into a sun-bright splendour of religious enlightenment, if not neglected by those who ought to interest themselves in it.'<sup>19</sup>

Another letter to Náprstek in 1863 told him that he might visit Bohemia next summer, 'but 7 children tie one very tightly by the leg.'<sup>20</sup>

p.149 Wratistlaw now turned to attack the special saint of the Czech Catholics, St. John Nepomucen,<sup>21</sup> canonised | through the efforts of the Jesuits in 1729. He sought help from Palacký, who had been obliged to be vague on the subject in his history, in a letter in 1866. 'Sie sprechen am Fusse der 62ten Seite des dritten Bandes der deutschen Ausgabe über eine „vermittelnde Ansicht“ in Beziehung auf die Identität des Johann von Pomuk und Johann von Nepomuk. Ich finde aber keine Spur des Märter-todes des Heiligen im Jahre 1383, auch keine des Todes eines Beichtvaters der Königin Johanna. Ich weiss dass die Censur noch im Jahre 1845, wo dieser Band erschien, noch in voller Blüthe war; hat wohl nicht dieselbe einen gewissen Einfluss auf Ihre Bemerkungen ausgeübt?'<sup>22</sup> Palacký replied promptly on 13th November,<sup>23</sup> and Wratistlaw put pen to paper with no less speed. His ten-page pamphlet *How Saints are made at Rome in Modern Days* was dated 19th November, and proclaimed that 'through M. Palacký's kindness, I am enabled to bring forward matter unknown even to himself, when, in 1845, he

<sup>17</sup>Hlasy ze Siona 3 (1863), p. 181.

<sup>18</sup>'Protestant School at Lysá in Bohemia', May 1864, p. 452.

<sup>19</sup>*Adventures*, p. xliv.

<sup>20</sup>30.X.1863, archiv Náprstkova muzea.

<sup>21</sup>'St. John Nepomucen' (AHW; Alban Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, 1956 ed. vol. 2; *Dictionary of Catholic Biography*, 1962; *The Book of Saints*, 5th ed. 1966), 'St. John Nepomucene' (F. G. Holweck, *A Biographical Dictionary of the Saints*, St. Louis 1924; *Catholic Encycl.*, 1910), 'St. John of Nepomuc' (*New Catholic Encycl.*, 1967), 'St. John of Nepomuk [Pomuk]' or 'John Nepomucen' (*Encycl. Brit.*, 15th ed. 1974), 'John of Nepomuk' (*Catholic Encycl.*, 1910, text): canonised by Pope Benedict XIII in 1729; 'however in 1961 the Sacred Congregation of Rites suppressed his feast in the calendar of the universal church [Ephem Liturg 75 (1961) 424]' (*New Catholic Encycl.*, 1967); the lit. on the case is large, but see esp. P. de Vooght, *Hussiana*, Louvain 1960, pp. 400–441.

<sup>22</sup>6.XI.1866.

<sup>23</sup>Letter marked 'odp. 13/11'.

---

published the volume of his great *History of Bohemia*.<sup>24</sup>

After quoting Alban Butler's conventional account in *Lives of the Saints*,<sup>25</sup> Wratislaw gave Palacký's of the death of the Vicar-General John of Pomuk ten years later, for supporting his Archbishop against King Wenceslas IV. He added a note about a possible genuine connection | between John of Pomuk and the seal of confession. 'I learn from Palacký himself, that in 1849 he discovered a genuine proof of the early existence of a report connecting John of Pomuk or Nepomuk with the "seal of Confession".' Thomas Ebendorfer (1388–1464) had written in *Liber Augustalis*: 'Ut fertur, quia sigillum confessionis violare detrectavit, ipsum (Wenceslaus) in Moldavia suffocari praecepit.'<sup>26</sup> Wratislaw interprets this as follows: 'For my own part, I cannot see here any reference to any *Queen's* confession whatever, and from Palacký's historical account of John of Pomuk I should infer, that the reported refusal to violate the seal of confession, mentioned by Ebendorfer, was simply a refusal to mention, under torture, matters relating to the Archbishop of Prague and others implicated in the transaction above described, some of which may possibly have become known to him under the seal of confession.'<sup>27</sup>

p.150

This is Wratislaw's first article with any claim to historiographical originality and it shows him trying to make use of sources not previously available to the English reader, – in order of course to carry out his original aim, which was to expose the legend as a fabrication of the Jesuits. |

p.151

A Czech version of the pamphlet on St. John Nepomucen was published by Josef Procházka in *Hlasy ze Siona* as being of obvious concern to Czech Protestants.<sup>28</sup>

This investigation of a Roman Catholic saint was succeeded by a number of articles on the Czech Reformers, which would seem to match a rise in general interest in Wycliffe and the Pre-Reformation in England. Wratislaw wrote to Palacký in 1867: 'Es wird augenblicklich in England viel gehandelt über das Episcopat der jetzigen „Mährer“ ehemals Böhmischer Brüder.'<sup>29</sup> In April Wratislaw had reviewed for the *Journal of Sacred Literature* Daniel Benham's *Notes on the Origin and Episcopate of the Bohemian Brethren* – quoting Palacký in the review – and probably the remark on a quickening of interest here derives mainly from this circumstance.<sup>30</sup>

In the summer of 1867 Wratislaw was again in Bohemia. The illustrated magazine *Světobzor*, very much on English lines, typically Victorian in illustration and format, printed his biography, embellished with a severe-looking portrait by K. Maixner. The piece has the customary patriotic fervour common to much nineteenth-century Czech journalism, and reflects | the more optimistic outlook of the late sixties: 'Právě nyní opět k nám zavítal a s potěšením praví, že nebyv u nás již od r. 1861 pozoruje znamenitý pokrok. Popřáno budiž jemu i nám, aby ještě častokráte nás navštěvuje, svědkem byl

p.152

---

<sup>24</sup>1866, p. 3.

<sup>25</sup>Ed. H. Thurston, D. Attwater, 1956, vol. 2, pp. 332–3.

<sup>26</sup>MS, Imperial Library, Vienna.

<sup>27</sup>*How Saints Are Made*, p. 9.

<sup>28</sup>'Legenda o Janu Nepomuckém a skutečná historie', *Hlasy ze Siona* 7 (1867), pp. 124–6, 143–4.

<sup>29</sup>14.IV.1867, 'beantw.' 19.IV.1867.

<sup>30</sup>5th ser. 1 (April 1867), pp. 251–2.

lepší národa našeho budoucnosti!<sup>31</sup>

A letter written by Wratistlaw after his return from Prague that year to Antonín Vrtátko, Hanka's successor at the National Museum, suggests that communications with *Malice česká*, which Wratistlaw had joined in 1849, had not been very efficient in the intervening years.<sup>32</sup> Both he and Connop Thirlwall, Bishop of St. David's,<sup>33</sup> had failed to receive various *Malice* publications, and the Bishop had told Wratistlaw in fact that he had not received any for many years. The society did not apparently as a rule arrange for its books to be despatched: members were supposed to collect them in person or find someone to do it for them. This would however have been an unreasonable obstacle in Wratistlaw's and Thirlwall's cases.<sup>34</sup> Various books did subsequently arrive for both, but gaps still remained.<sup>35</sup> Wratistlaw complained about not having received issues of the Museum journal for 1850–53, and this gap was never filled.<sup>36</sup> |

p.153

Wratistlaw was now embarking on a more intensive study of the Hussite period and he informed Vrtátko of his intention to propagate recent Czech work on Pre-Reformation literature in England.<sup>37</sup> In October 1867 a first article 'Johannes Hus Redivivus' appeared in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*. It contained a version of Erben's preface to his collected Czech works of Hus, Hus's preface to his *Postilla*, and the Gospel for the 1st Sunday in Advent.<sup>38</sup> In November he wrote to Vrtátko: 'Ich wende fast alle meine freie Zeit an die böhmische Literatur, aber ich finde den *Vyklad* desatero božieho prikazanie viel schwieriger; und grösstentheils weniger interessant, als den *Vyklad* na vieru von Hus. Ich komme doch, mit Hilfe des Jungmannischen Wörterbuchs ziemlich auf durch, und zweifle nicht dass eine Beschreibung des ersterwähnten im Stande sein wird, am ersten April zu erscheinen.'<sup>39</sup> The sequel article dealt with Hus's Exposition of the Creed, the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer.<sup>40</sup>

Wratistlaw's relations with the Czech Protestant churches continued.<sup>41</sup> He encouraged a new edition of the Confession of the Bohemian Brethren, writing to Palacký to ask him if he would supply a preface.<sup>42</sup> Palacký must have replied however that he wished to | preserve a more neutral stance in religious affairs (for political reasons), to judge from Wratistlaw's response: 'Obwohl ich bedauere dass Sie Sich nicht im Stande finden, meine letzte Bitte zu erfüllen, doch erkenne ich vollkommen die Gültigkeit Ihrer

p.154

<sup>31</sup>1 (2.VIII.1867), p. 34.

<sup>32</sup>22.VIII.1867.

<sup>33</sup>See Ch. 8, p. 124.

<sup>34</sup>See ČČM 1851 sv. 4, p. 180.

<sup>35</sup>AHW to Vrtátko 9.XI.1867.

<sup>36</sup>Libr. bibl., 46 note.

<sup>37</sup>22.VIII.1867.

<sup>38</sup>5th ser. 2, pp. 97–105.

<sup>39</sup>9.XI.1867.

<sup>40</sup>Johannes Hus Redivivus No. II', *Journal of Sacred Literature* 5th ser. 2 (Jan 1868), pp. 329–36.

<sup>41</sup>E.g. *Hlasy ze Siona* 8 (1868), p. 41, version instigated by AHW of a Pastoral Letter from the Conference of Anglican Bishops at Lambeth, Sept 1867.

<sup>42</sup>6.IX.1868, 'odp. 4.10.68'.

---

Gründe und die Wichtigkeit Ihrer neutralen Stellung.<sup>43</sup>

Wratislaw had mentioned a sum of forty pounds needed for the printing, which he and some friends were willing to provide, and it was evidently by this means that the book *Konfessí bratrská* was published, in 1869.<sup>44</sup> Procházka's introduction quoted an extract by Wratislaw setting out his attitude to Czech Protestantism, as himself a loyal Anglican:<sup>45</sup>

Duch, který ovládá strany náboženské téměř mezi všemi společenstvími, vedeť k tomu, že každá z nich svědomě neb nesevědomě domnívá se býti tou pravověřící společností, církev Kristovu představující, kdežto vlastně každá z nich nemůže ničím býti, než částkou její, více neb méně čistě zřízenou. A z této strany, zdá se mi, přibližuje se nebezpečství veliké k evangelíkům českým, že totiž v pokušení upadají, aby k vůli časné podpoře a k vůli účastenství u cizích evangelíků obětovali vážnost k sobě samým a původní základ, který jinak obdržeti nemohou, než postaví-li se na půdu slavné někdy, ale násilně přetržené historie českých církví. Co se mne týče, jsemť já údem církve anglikánské a, jakž doufám, ne nehodným, cítím však, že bych jednal spíš jako zrádce, než jako přítel Čechů, kdybych je neměl k tomu, aby obraceli oči své k své vlastní historii raději, než k církvi anglikánské, buď v jejím minulém neb přítomném stavu.

Rev. Josef Růžička was also in touch with Wratislaw about a fifth edition of the *Postilla Daniele Sartoris* | in 1869, but it never materialised.<sup>46</sup>

p.155

In the midst of his Pre-Reformation Hussite work Wratislaw wrote an article of a philological nature, vaguely allied to his published work on Greek textual exegesis. It appeared in the *Journal of Philology* entitled 'The Pronunciation of Ancient Greek Illustrated by That of Modern Bohemian',<sup>47</sup> and was written at the behest of William G. Clark, one of the editors.<sup>48</sup> Being rather out of his depth he had written to Palacký about the idea in 1868: 'Es wird etwas heutzutage in England über die Aussprache der altgriechischen Sprache – besonders in Cambridge – gestritten, und ein Freund von mir, der "Orator Publicus" der Universität von Cambridge, hat eine Aufgabe darüber geschrieben, welche baldigst erscheinen soll. Unlängst besuchte er mich auf einen Stunde, und ich sagte ihm, die böhmische Sprache habe den Unterschied zwischen Quantität und Accent noch immer beibehalten. Er forderte, ich solle ihm eine kurze Note darüber schreiben, um zum Anhang seiner Aufgabe zu dienen. Das hab' ich, mittels des Lehrbuches von Tomíček, gethan, aber nun schreibt er mir, er finde es nicht zweckmässig, so eine Note einzuschieben, und fordert, ich solle eine Aufgabe darüber schreiben, welche in einem künftigen | Numero des „Journal of Philology“

p.156

---

<sup>43</sup>12.XI.1868.

<sup>44</sup>*Konfessí bratrská aneb Počet z víry a učení, i náboženství Jednoty bratří českých*, ed. J. Procházka, 1869.

<sup>45</sup>*Konfessí* p. x; supposedly from an article by AHW 'Národnost a náboženství v Čechách' in *Hlasy ze*

erscheinen solle.<sup>49</sup> Wratistaw frankly admitted he had trouble with the distinction between quantity and stress when he tried to speak Czech: 'Nun weiss ich recht gut, dass ich diesen Unterschied zwischen Quantität und Accent der Sylben bei der Aussprache der böhmischen Sprache immer recht schwierig gefunden habe, doch finde ich mich gar nicht im Stande ihn, besonders was seinen Einfluss auf die altböhmischen Poesie betrifft, zu würdigen und zu erklären.'

Palacký had engaged in the past in disputation over Czech accentual and quantitative meters, on the side of quantity.<sup>50</sup> He sent Wratistaw a book containing versions of the Psalms in classical meters, with an introduction by Josef Jireček.<sup>51</sup> Wratistaw later commented on his progress: 'Was die Hexametren von Comenius und anderen betrifft, bin ich Ihnen höchst verbunden, und, mir däucht, ich bin jetzt im Stande analogisch zu beweisen, das die Altgriechen nur die Quantität der Sylben beim Versus beobachtet haben, ohne Bezug auf den Ton oder Akcent der Sylben zu nehmen. Das ist aber, wenn ich Recht habe, indem ich glaube, dass die urböhmische Versification, wie in der Königinhofer Handschrift, in Kollars „Slavy dcera“ etc., eine nur akcentuel gewesen sei. Aj: byl / rýk sto/nānī / | žalost/ívo.'<sup>52</sup>

p.157

In the article Wratistaw opened by noting the shared distinction between quantity and accent in Czech and Ancient Greek, although the Greek accent was mobile. (Furthermore, it might today be added, it is considered to have had a tonal accent or musical one, not affecting the rhythm.) Czech prosody he thought was originally accentual (based on stress), 'accented monosyllables however having nearly as great power as prepositions in drawing the accent of the following word to themselves.' He described later medieval and post-medieval verse as syllabic; it was the humanists who first attempted to employ classical meters. In his view these were feasible, but hampered by the inapplicability of positional rules about short vowels before double consonants. 'I cannot think that poetry written upon the principle of *quantity* will ever be more to the Bohemians than an exercise of skill and ingenuity.'

In return for his help over Czech prosody Wratistaw was able to do Palacký a small service as a contribution to his collection of source material *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus* (1869). Wratistaw sent him details of a MS of 1415 in the Edinburgh University Library, a letter of protest by Bohemian nobles to the Council of Constance against the burning of John Hus. It is the second of eight versions | and only surviving original. Wratistaw referred to an article supplying the full text by John Small, Librarian to the University.<sup>53</sup> The MS letter had been bequeathed to the library in a will of 1657 by

p.158

*Siona*, but not there.

<sup>46</sup>J. Lukášek, *Josef Růžička – jeho život a dílo*, pp. 95–7.

<sup>47</sup>2 (1869) no. 3, pp. 42–7.

<sup>48</sup>William G. Clark, 1821–78, also ed. *Cambridge Shakespeare* 1863–6.

<sup>49</sup>12.XI.1868, reply 5.XII.1868.

<sup>50</sup>See Palacký and Šafárik, *Počátkové českého básnictví, obzvlášť prozodie*, Pressburg Prague 1818.

<sup>51</sup>J. Jireček, *Časoměrné překlady žalmův Komenského, Blahoslava a Benedikta Nudožského*, Vienna 1861; article.

<sup>52</sup>To Palacký 14.XII.1868.

<sup>53</sup>MS note by AHW, LAPNP pozůst. Palackého; see John Small, 'Some Account of the Original Protest



---

Dr. William Guild, former Principal of King's College, Aberdeen. Its earlier vicissitudes are unclear, but according to one source it was 'brought from the Library of Dantzick'. Palacký already knew of its existence from copies, but was not apparently aware of the article or of the MS's history.<sup>54</sup>

In 1869 a curious letter on an obscure area of Anglo-Bohemian relations reached Palacký from Rev. W. G. Searle, encouraged by Wratislaw. Searle was writing a history of Queens' College, Cambridge.<sup>55</sup> One President of the College, Humphrey Tyndall, born 1549, was a member of a family which claimed Czech royal descent.<sup>56</sup> He was the great-great-great-grandson of Alana de Felbrigg, daughter and heir of Simon de Felbrigg and his first wife Margaret, described on her memorial brass as 'nacione et generoso sanguine Boema.' Various accounts agreed that she had come to England in the entourage of Anne, sister to Wenceslas IV, who married Richard II of England in 1381. One version made her out to be daughter to Přemyslav (Przemislaus) Duke of Teschen in Silesia, a member of the marriage embassy. Another called her | daughter of Přemyslav's brother Semovit (Semovitus). In this account her mother was supposed to be Elizabeth daughter of John of Luxemburg, the basis of the royal claim: Semovit was believed to have died without male heirs in 1391. However, according to Palacký in his history of Bohemia, this Elizabeth had died in infancy. Searle asked for any clarification possible, but must have received no satisfactory answer. The published book states merely that 'what the actual pedigree of Margaret de Felbrigg was, the lack of historical monuments makes it difficult to decide.' As a story this is intriguing – several more Czech followers from Anne's entourage can be traced in the contemporary records as having settled in England – but it was probably too esoteric a matter for Palacký to elucidate. p.159

Wratislaw's correspondence continued to map the progress of his Hussite Pre-Reformation studies. In November 1868 he had requested Palacký to keep him informed on his latest works,<sup>57</sup> and in March 1869 he acknowledged Palacký's gift of 'O stycích a poměru sekty Waldenské' k někdejšími sektám v Čechách.' He was reading Štítný's *O obecných věcech křesťanských*.<sup>58</sup> At the same time he announced a forthcoming article in the Contemporary Review, 'An Account of the Writings of John Huss | in the Czeskish or Bohemian Language'.<sup>59</sup> In May he pointed out to Palacký with some gratification a quoted paragraph from this in *Naše Listy*.<sup>60</sup> He also acknowledged receipt of Palacký's *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus*, which he noticed for the Contemporary Review.<sup>61</sup> English public opinion was hard to arouse on behalf of the Czechs, he p.160

---

of the Bohemian Nobles Against the Burning of John Hus', *Proc. of the Soc. of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 80th session 1859–60, vol. 3 pt 3 (1862), pp. 408–24; AHW to Palacký 2.III.1869.

<sup>54</sup>See *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus*, note, p. 585; F. M. Bartoš, *Husitská revoluce*, 1, 1965, pp. 16–7.

<sup>55</sup>Hockington 29.VI.1869, LAPNP.

<sup>56</sup>See W. G. Searle, *The History of the Queens' College*, pt 2, Cambr. 1871, pp. 367–71; R. W. Ketton-Cremer, *Felbrigg, The Story of a House*, 1962, pp. 18–20; Isenburg, *Stammtafeln*, 1, Marburg 1956, no. 197.

<sup>57</sup>12.XI.1868.

<sup>58</sup>AHW to Palacký 2.III.1869.

<sup>59</sup>10 (April 1869), pp. 530–55.

<sup>60</sup>9.V.1869; 'Literatura a umění', *Naše listy* 6.IV.1869.

<sup>61</sup>11 (July 1869), pp. 449–51; also, *The Clerical Journal* 25 (15.VII.1869), p. 64, *The American Presbyterian*

complained: 'Das deutsche Publikum scheint gegen die Czechen aufgesetzt zu sein, aber das englische leidet an einer Art Taubstummheit, und bietet eine „vis incertiae“ dar, welche sehr schwer zu überwinden ist.'<sup>62</sup> Two more Pre-Reformation articles for the *Contemporary Review* were listed in a letter to Palacký in January 1870:<sup>63</sup> a notice of Palacký's 'O stycích a poměru sekty Waldenské',<sup>64</sup> and 'The Precursors of John Hus in Bohemia'.<sup>65</sup> He remarked again on the difficulty of arousing English attention, but among those favourably disposed to Czech aspirations he named Alford, Deacon of Canterbury, who was then editor of the *Contemporary Review*, the Bishop of St. David's Connop Thirlwall, Sir Bartle Frere, and the Russian scholar William Shedden Ralston.

On another tack, he enquired whether he could obtain an unexpurgated text of 'Denník panoše Jaroslava' which Palacký had published in a censored version in 1827.<sup>66</sup> p.161 He intended to travel out to Bohemia this year | via Constance, spending about three weeks in Prague.<sup>67</sup> His arrival was duly reported by *Národní listy*: 'po delší dobu zde se pozdrží, aby konal zde u pramenů historická studia v dobách husitských. Zejména obírá se londýnský hrabě Vratislav speciálními studii o Jeronýmovi a bratřích českomoravských.'<sup>68</sup> The planned version of 'Denník panoše Jaroslava' was published the following year as *Diary of an Embassy from King George of Bohemia to King Louis XI. of France*. The censored passages remained absent, for the original manuscript had since disappeared. When it turned up again Kalousek published it in full and sent a copy to Wratislav. In the introduction to his translation Wratislav wrote that he 'made it from Palacký's printed transcript in July last at Prague, and went carefully over the more difficult passages with Pan Vrtatko.'<sup>69</sup> *Diary of an Embassy*, which was perhaps trying to tap the same seam as his previous *Adventures of Baron Wenceslas Wratislav*, was favourably reviewed by the *Athenaeum*<sup>70</sup>, and also by the French Slavist Louis Leger in the *Academy*.<sup>71</sup>

Leger had recently reviewed some other Slavonic works for the *Academy*, including a reprint of Šafárik's *Geschichte*<sup>72</sup> and Šembera's *Dějiny řeči a literatury české*.<sup>73</sup> Wratislav wrote to thank him, and commented in a rare piece of political analysis, without p.162 reference | to Divine Providence, on attitudes of the English towards the conflicts of the Slavs and Germans in the Austro-Hungarian Empire:<sup>74</sup>

Les crises, qui se sont succédées avec une rapidité étonnante dans les

*Review* 5 (1869), pp. 228 seq.; also rev. by Acton, *North British Review*, Oct 1870, p. 243.

<sup>62</sup>To Palacký 9.V.1869.

<sup>63</sup>30.I.1870.

<sup>64</sup>*Contemp. Review* 13 (March 1870), pp. 486–9.

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid* 13 (Feb 1870), pp. 196–210.

<sup>66</sup>'Denník poselství českého do Francie roku 1460ho', ČČM 1 (1827) sv. 1, pp. 40–67.

<sup>67</sup>To Palacký 30.I.1870.

<sup>68</sup>'Hosté z Anglie', 16.VII.1870 č. 190.

<sup>69</sup>p. 5.

<sup>70</sup>18.III.1871, p. 331.

<sup>71</sup>1.XI.1871, p. 503.

<sup>72</sup>11.XII.1869, pp. 61–2.

<sup>73</sup>11.VI.1870, p. 226.

<sup>74</sup>14.XI.1871, LAPNP.

---

affaires Autrichiennes, font une impression profonde en Angleterre, mais une impression très défavorable aux Slaves. Tout le monde me semble croire, qu'il n'y a qu'une nation civilisée dans l'est de l'Europe, et qu'il faut être ou Allemand ou barbare. Tout le monde a peur aussi, que l'Autriche, je veux dire la grosse Autriche, n'aille se démembler, et qu'il ne doive rester, que des débris, qui ne pourront que tomber en proie à la Russie, à moins que la Prusse ne s'empare de quelques bons morceaux. Il y en a qui croient que la Bohême va détruire l'empire Autrichien, mais qu'elle sera elle-même détruite en la détruisant. Pour moi je n'entrevois pas l'avenir du tout, mais je ne m'empêche pas de croire, qu'il est possible après tout, que les Tchèques entendent leur propre chose assez bien, que nous autres, qui voulons les instruire et les mener dans la voie, qu'il doivent poursuivre...

He added that he found it hard to get his articles accepted by the journals, who preferred the information of what he called in an unusually racial outburst the Israelite-German press: 'Personne ne veut de la lumière sur ces choses, et tout le monde se trouve satisfait des renseignements de la presse israélite-allemande.' Leger was then resident in Prague, where Wratislaw had met him. He had visited Prague in July 1871 again, at the same time as the Oxford Slavist William Morfill.<sup>75</sup> Louis Leger had gone there in March and edited his journal *Correspondance Slave* in Prague until the end of the year.<sup>76</sup> |

p.163

Wratislaw's first wife had died in 1868, and in February 1871 he had become engaged to a Miss E. Shelford, who 'kept a girls' school in the town.' They were married on July 4th.<sup>77</sup> His colleague wrote, evidently not partial to the new spouse: 'Whatever she may have been as a wife she was not a kind stepmother and the children left home as soon as they could.' In September 1872 misfortune struck when Wratislaw's eldest son was drowned at Lamlash, Isle of Arran, while on holiday.<sup>78</sup>

In January 1872 another article 'John Huss and the Ultramontanes' appeared in the *Contemporary Review*.<sup>79</sup> He also translated some old Czech hymns from Erben's *Výbor z literatury české* for the *Sunday Magazine* that year:<sup>80</sup> 'Chvála svatých',<sup>81</sup> 'Ktož ste boží bojovníci' and 'Sluší Čechuom spomínati'.<sup>82</sup> He returned to the subject of St. John Nepomucen, writing again to Palacký for certain advice.<sup>83</sup> He hoped to visit Karlovy

---

<sup>75</sup> *Pokrok* 20.VII.1871.

<sup>76</sup> Fr. Zákrejs, 'Louis Leger', *Osvěta* 3ii (1873), pp. 571–82; *Correspondance slave*, 1869–73, ed. Leger 1871–2, see F. Roubík, *Bibliografie časopisectva v Čechách z let 1863–1895*, 1936.

<sup>77</sup> Statham, *Reminiscences*, pp. 141, 155.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 114, 165.

<sup>79</sup> 19 (Jan 1872), pp. 238–59; also, *Littell's Living Age*, 4th ser. 24 (1872), pp. 427–39.

<sup>80</sup> *Výbor*, vol. 2, 1868, pp. 1152–4, 283, 303.

<sup>81</sup> *Sunday Magazine*, new ser. 1 (1872), p. 400.

<sup>82</sup> 'Two Scenes from the Hussite Wars', *Sunday Mag.*, new ser. 1 (1872), pp. 830–5; also offered to *Blackwood's*, see AHW to Blackwood's 26.IX.1871, 2.I.1872, Nat. Libr. of Scotland MS 4283 fo. 221, MS 4298 fo. 212.

<sup>83</sup> 4.III.1872.

p.164 Vary on the way to Prague that summer.<sup>84</sup> Subsequently in his book *Life, Legend and Canonisation of St. John Nepomucen*, published after this visit in 1873, he acknowledged the additional help of Vrtátko, A. Frind, author of a book on the saint,<sup>85</sup> and Zeidler, Librarian of the Imperial or University Library. | Especial indebtedness was expressed to Tomek's article in *Riegrův slovník naučný*. A quotation from a letter received from Palacký declared that 'Dle mého uznání náleží sv. Jan Nepom. jen do legendy, nikoli do historie České.'<sup>86</sup> Wratisslaw's literary and historical studies never seem to represent more than a brief interlude in his propagandist work for Czech Protestantism, except when the two interests could be strung together, and this seems especially true of all this middle period of his Czech endeavours.

p.165 Like Leger, Wratisslaw began to do a few reviews for the *Academy*. In July 1872 he reviewed Tieftrunk's *Odpor stavův českých proti Ferdinandovi I.*<sup>87</sup> Leger and he may have met in the autumn of 1873. Wratisslaw wrote inviting him while on holiday at Pampisford Vicarage, near Cambridge. 'Palacký has given me his real opinion about the saint, which he was obliged to conceal in his history. . . I have just begun a little Russian, but have not made much progress as yet.'<sup>88</sup> He seems to have felt less restrained in expressing opinions when not writing to the Czechs themselves, and also, which may be more important, when not writing in Czech or German, in neither of which language was he ever very comfortable. |

Statham visited Wratisslaw at Pampisford, writing: 'I remember we went in the church in the dark and up to the gallery where there was a barrel organ and pulled out stop after stop, waiting with curiosity to see what tunes would come out.'<sup>89</sup> This little human note is regrettably absent from most of his awkward Czech or German correspondence, so that it is difficult to tell on how close terms of friendship he was with his Czech acquaintances. The letters to Náprstek, in English, are more relaxed in tone.

---

<sup>84</sup>AHW to Palacký 20.VI.1872; *Národní listy* 17.VII.1872 č. 195.

<sup>85</sup>*Der geschichtl. hl. Johannes v. Nep.*, Cheb 1861.

<sup>86</sup>Palacký to AHW 12.III.1872, as quoted in *Life, Legend and Canonization of St. John Nepomucen*, 1873, p. 77.

<sup>87</sup>3 (15.VII.1872), pp. 275–6.

<sup>88</sup>3.VIII.1873, LAPNP.

<sup>89</sup>Reminiscences, p. 172.

## Chapter 10

# Wratislaw's Medieval and Hussite Studies, 1874–92

In 1874 Wratislaw produced another church missionary article 'The Gustavus Adolphus Society',<sup>1</sup> and a historical article for the Royal Historical Society on Krištof Harant z Polžic's account of his journey to the Holy Land in 1608.<sup>2</sup> p.166

Then, in December, he wrote to Vrtátko with a notable discovery: 'Před nedávnem mi psal známý pan z „Trinity College“ Cambridge, že jest tam v bibliotece starý rukopis, asi z 14ho věku, který není těžký k čtení co do písmen, ale že žádný člověk jazyka nerozumí...'<sup>3</sup> He had travelled to Cambridge and examined the MS which he found to be a version of the Czech Dalimil chronicle. He asked whether he should make a transcript. Vrtátko replied agreeing, and he returned to Cambridge, copied the preface and last chapter,<sup>4</sup> photographing one page and describing the MS in more detail, and claimed one pound ten shillings in expenses.<sup>5</sup> The Librarian Rev. Robert Sinker, whom he had informed about *Malice česká*, had asked to obtain the Czech version of 'Testamenta XII Patriarcharum', an edition of which he had published | in 1869.<sup>6</sup> p.167 Wratislaw put a notice about the discovery in the *Athenaeum* reporting that 'An edition of the chronicle was in preparation by Pan Jireczek, at Prague, but had happily not gone to press when intelligence of the Cambridge MS arrived, and this now waits for a transcript of the newly discovered treasure.'<sup>7</sup> The progress of Wratislaw's transcription can be followed in the next few letters. On 27 January 1875 he told Vrtátko he would receive the MS for transcribing at Bury St. Edmunds on 12th February, and Sinker

---

<sup>1</sup>*Sunday Mag.* new ser. 3 (1874), pp. 546–51.

<sup>2</sup>'Adventures of a Bohemian Nobleman...', *Trans. of RHS* 3 (1874), pp. 346–71.

<sup>3</sup>16.XII.1874.

<sup>4</sup>Orig. in LAPNP, 'opsal A. H. Wratislaw... 30<sup>ho</sup> Prosince 1874.'

<sup>5</sup>AHW to Vrtátko 3.I.1875, misdated '1874'.

<sup>6</sup>*Testamenta XII Patriarcharum*, Cambr. 1869, Appendix, Cambr. 1879; cf. Jungmann, *Historie lit. české*, 2nd ed., 1849, oddělení II č. 136; J. Jireček, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české do konce XVIII věku*, 1875–6, 2, 134.

<sup>7</sup>'Bohemian (Slavonic) Manuscript in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge', 6.II.1875, p. 192.

would arrange a photograph.<sup>8</sup> During February Wratislav sent 20 pages of transcript and a photograph of page one which he thought of poor quality.<sup>9</sup> In March he sent pages 83–140,<sup>10</sup> in April a further 70 and a new photograph made at Bury,<sup>11</sup> and in May another 60 pages and the last instalment of 62 pages.<sup>12</sup> The identification of this manuscript was one of Wratislav's most useful services to Czech literature, perhaps his most useful of all.<sup>13</sup>

p.168 There was other work in hand at the same time. For example, Wratislav had written an article on Palacký's conflicts with the censorship, based on his *Zur böhmischen Geschichtschreibung* and published in *Fraser's Magazine* as 'How History is Sometimes Written' (the title was the magazine's).<sup>14</sup> In June he was to lecture on the | Legend of St. Procopius at the Royal Historical Society, having already spoken on Pre-Hussite satirical poetry.<sup>15</sup> In April he wrote that he had been reading Tieftrunk's history 'o věcech Czeských po té smutné bitvě na Bílé hoře.'<sup>16</sup> (The Dalimil work had an insidious effect on his Czech orthography.) Bishop Thirlwall, he had learnt, was very ill: 'Ztratil všecku silu v pravé ruce a se stal skoro slepém. Některý jiný psal mi odpověď k mému psání pro něho v jeho jmeně, řka „Nebudu ještě více Česky čisti.“'<sup>17</sup> In June Wratislav returned the Dalimil MS to Trinity College Library,<sup>18</sup> to which several older Matice publications were presented.<sup>19</sup>

p.169 In the summer of 1875 he and his wife went to Prague, where they renewed their acquaintance with Náprstek. Newspaper notices of Náprstek's 'French Conversation and Reading' nights at the Černý pivovar, on Karlovo náměstí, on Fridays 2nd, 9th and 15th July, appear to name him as one of the active participants. On 2nd July 'pan Wratislav' was down to read the part of Rouodi in a French extract from Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*; on 9th July Bossuet's 'Exorde et l'oraison funèbre de la Reine d'Angleterre'; and on 16th July Demahis's 'Le Duel'.<sup>20</sup> It is curious to note that these 'francouzské dýchánky' had begun in 1864 under the watchful eyes of | the police department, fearful of revolutionary stirrings and assisted by their diligent informer Karel Sabina.<sup>21</sup>

Wratislav's name is absent from later notices of these events, and he had in fact departed about this time for Lysá nad Labem, to stay with his friend Procházka. After returning to Prague, where they were staying at the hotel 'U černého koně', he wrote to Náprstek that he had been ill. 'I am so sorry I have been obliged to be away from

<sup>8</sup>27.I.1875.

<sup>9</sup>To Vrtátko 18.II.1875.

<sup>10</sup>Same 27.III.1875.

<sup>11</sup>Same 25.IV.1875.

<sup>12</sup>Same 12.V.1875, 26.V.1875.

<sup>13</sup>See also AHW to J. Jireček 12.V.1875.

<sup>14</sup>12 (1875), pp. 519–27.

<sup>15</sup>AHW to Vrtátko 27.III.1875.

<sup>16</sup>To Vrtátko 25.IV.1875.

<sup>17</sup>To Vrtátko 27.III.1875.

<sup>18</sup>AHW to Vrtátko 26.V.1875.

<sup>19</sup>K. Tieftrunk, *Dějiny Matice české*, 1881, p. 256; also, AHW to Vrtátko 6.X.1875.

<sup>20</sup>*Pokrok* 1, p. 8 and 15.VII.1875.

<sup>21</sup>J. Purš, *K případu Karla Sabiny*, 1959, pp. 43, 70–4.

---

Prague so long, but I was so ill, that I felt obliged to go to some mountainous place to recruit myself. So we went from Lysá to Hrubá Skalá and lived on the top of the mountain for 3 days in a little inn. I consulted Professor Hamerník who put me on a very strict diet, and now I am quite well again I am thankful to say. My wife is very anxious about the ladies of the American Club, who asked to learn English. She would be delighted, if they would come tomorrow at 3 and have a lesson here (No 60 is our room) till 4 o'clock.<sup>22</sup> (The Americký klub dám had been founded by Náprstek in 1865.) Wratislaw also visited the South of Bohemia, Koloděje, Prachatice, and Lenora (south of Vimperk), where he spent a morning fishing. At Prachatice he heard of the death of the Bishop of St. Davids Connop Thirlwall, the first English | member of Maticе česká.<sup>23</sup>

p.170

By September he was back in Bury St. Edmunds; he sent Vrtátko his own Latin translation of 'Libušin soud'<sup>24</sup> He was reading volume three of Tomek's *Dějepis Prahy*.<sup>25</sup> In one of his now more frequent comments on current affairs he wrote to Náprstek: 'I wish the Turks could be cleared out of Europe, but the jealousies of the great powers seem likely to keep them going as long as they can.'<sup>26</sup>

The year 1876 brought quite a flow of articles. The Royal Historical Society published his talk on the Legend of St. Procopius.<sup>27</sup> Another article in *Fraser's* opposed a historical fiction perpetuated by non-Czech historians in which Wenceslas IV was portrayed as a villain of the deepest dye.<sup>28</sup> He singled out Baring-Gould's *Life of St. John Nepomucen* for especial censure in this respect.<sup>29</sup> Wratislaw also tried, unsuccessfully, to get *Blackwood's* to accept his paper on 'Bohemian Satirical poetry in the 14th century.'<sup>30</sup> Another article for the *Journal of Philology* on the 'Origin of the Word "Gypsy"'<sup>31</sup> presented a theory from a book by Count Rudolf Wratislaw on the gypsies that their name was derived from Aegyptos, a town near the mouth of the Danube named by Ovid (the usual derivation is from Egypt).<sup>32</sup> |

p.171

František Palacký died on 26th May 1876, and Wratislaw wrote a detailed obituary published in the *Athenaeum* for June 10th.<sup>33</sup> He partly takes issue with Palacký over why he failed to achieve his national aims. These he regards to have been too ambitious, in the light of the actual circumstances of power politics in Central Europe. He writes of his Political Testament of 1872 that it was:

---

<sup>22</sup>'U černého koně Sunday morning', archív Náprstkova muzea.

<sup>23</sup>AHW to V. Náprstek, Kalladei 4.VIII.1875, Bury 9.IX.1875, archív Náprstkova muzea; to Vrtátko, Prachatice 6.VIII.1875.

<sup>24</sup>2.IX.1875.

<sup>25</sup>AHW to Náprstek 9.IX.1875.

<sup>26</sup>9.IX.1875.

<sup>27</sup>*Trans. of the RHS* 4 (1876), pp. 439–48.

<sup>28</sup>*Fraser's new series* 14 (1876), pp. 294–301.

<sup>29</sup>S. Baring-Gould, *The Lives of the Saints*, vol. for May, 1873, pp. 227–236.

<sup>30</sup>AHW to *Blackwood's* 1.VI.1876, Nat. Libr. of Scotland MS 4350 fo. 231.

<sup>31</sup>6 (1876), pp. 83–4.

<sup>32</sup>*Versuch einer Darstellung der Lebensweise, Herkunft und Sprache der Zigeuner im Allgemeinen und der in Oesterreich lebenden Zigeuner insbesondere*, Prague 1868.

<sup>33</sup>p. 795.

... an account of his political career and its comparative failure – a failure which he ascribed principally to the great fault of placing confidence in the rectitude and righteousness of the German people. To us it seems rather – although his complaints against both the Germans and Magyars are true to the letter – that the contemplation of the historical rights and glories of the Bohemian crown blinded him comparatively to the external circumstances surrounding the five millions of Slavonians in Bohemia and Moravia and led him to seek for a position for his country which was simply unattainable, instead of contenting himself with a minor compromise, which, at one time, might have been obtained. Still, if his views, or a modification of them, had been carried out, in a Federal Austria, we should not now have been gazing with dread on the selfish policy of Hungary threatening Europe with a general war simply because the Magyars, or Hungarians proper, will not condescend to live on equal terms with their Slavonian fellow-countrymen, and dare not contemplate the erection of another free Slavonic state, like Servia, in Turkey, for fear of their own downtrodden vassals gravitating towards it.

p.172 If Wratislaw's pro-Slav enthusiasms come through mutedly here, elsewhere he lets them show with more emotion. The Russo-Turkish War of 1877 was greatly to stimulate Slav and Pan-Slav racial morale, and Wratislaw was following events eagerly as they developed. He wrote in June 1876 to Vrťátko: 'Jak každé Slovanské srdce | musí klopati na kazdé noviny od Turska, od Serbska, od Černé hory! Škoda že Katolici nemíní upřimně s Řeckými. Řiká se na našich Novinách že držejí raději s Turky než se svými jinak věřícími bratry.'<sup>34</sup>

Wratislaw's Slavonic studies seem to show the effect of these events in the Balkans, by their wider range of attention. For example, he was now contemplating a translation of Erben's *Sto prstonárodních pohádek a pověstí slovanských* which he declared better than Grimms' fairy-tales: 'a myslím žeby děti Anglické je velmi vítali. Čital jsem 131 stran, a nyní běloruské nářečí mi něco těžké jest, ale s časem a vytrvalostí doufám že věc bude se mi dokonce vesti.'<sup>35</sup> Then, in December 1876, he published an article 'Adoptive Brotherhood among the Servians'<sup>36</sup> based on a pamphlet in Czech by Jan V. Lego.<sup>37</sup> In August 1877 he wrote to Vrťátko in another patriotically Czech and pro-Slav passage: 'Doufám... že čeština rozmáhá se v Čechách a v Moravě každodenně. Stydím se o násí Anglické Vládě, a její závisti k Rusům...'<sup>38</sup> Jan Lego wrote to thank Wratislaw for his version of 'Pobratimství', 'přispěv tím k lepšímu poznání Jihoslovanů u Anglického národa.'<sup>39</sup> It is the only original, as opposed to copy, of any letter from

---

<sup>34</sup>25.VI.1876.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>*Sunday Mag.* new ser. 6, pp. 204–208.

<sup>37</sup>Jan V. Lego, b. 1833, scriptor at the Museum library from 1875, writer on Slovenes, d. 1906; article/pamphlet not traced.

<sup>38</sup>19.VIII.1877.

<sup>39</sup>Photocopy of orig. letter supplied by Wratislaw family, found in pages of a book, letter undated, but



---

Bohemia to Wratislaw that has so far come | to light. Lego sent several books with the letter: 'Přijměte, prosím, přiložené dílo Mažuranicovo „Smrt Smail-Age Čengijića“ 1. v originalu, 2. ve dvojím českém překladu a 3. v jednom německém překladu. Mám za to, že by tato výtečná hrdinská báseň, byvši do anglického jazyka přeložena, velmi přispěla, Jiho-slovanům sympathie Angličanů získati. Kdy byste se k překladu tomu odhodlal a snad se přál, míti český neb německý překlad úvodu Markovičova, rád bych Vám pak posloužil. Přijmětež dále ještě dva výtisky mé Medusy; jest to zpracování větším dílem podle anglického originalu.'<sup>40</sup> Wratislaw told Jireček about his receipt of 'Smrt Smail-Age Čengijića': 'Mám grammatiku Illirskou Berličovu, a jsem četl Chorvátský díl díla Erbenova „Sto prostonárodních pohádek“, doufám tudíž, že budu moci i tu báseň s rozumením čísti.'<sup>41</sup> He had also published an article on the Roumanians in the *Athenaeum* based on Konstantin Jireček's history of Bulgaria.<sup>42</sup> Here is evidence, clearly, of some widening of Wratislaw interests at this period to the Slav field in general. Earlier he had started to learn Russian. This may be put down partly to the influence of Czech scholarship – the work of Erben, Lego and Konstantin Jireček, Josef Jireček's son, for example – , partly perhaps also to the example of William Morfill at Oxford, but it would | seem that the political and military events in the Balkans also played a strong role. p.173

His excursions to Bohemia were halted about this time, in 1877, first by family circumstances,<sup>43</sup> then by retirement, and later by ill-health. His Slavonic work at first continued unabated however.

In April 1877 Wratislaw was to deliver the Ilchester Lectures at Oxford. He took as his subject the fourteenth-century literature of Bohemia, and this, with its origins in Wratislaw's studies of the religious history and writing of the Pre-Reformation period in Bohemia, brought him back to literature per se, as well as treating a subject scarcely touched in England since John Bowring's time. Náprstek provided some help in the way of books on Štítý. He sent him copies of *Knížky šestery* and *Knihy naučení křesťanského*, and also Hanuš's *Rozbor filosofie Tomy ze Štítého*.<sup>44</sup> The lectures were published afterwards as *The Native Literature of Bohemia in the Fourteenth Century*.<sup>45</sup> Wratislaw had written to Náprstek that the Ilchester foundation would give him 'a subvention towards printing my Lectures, that will cover half the expenses', but in spite of this he lost money over it.<sup>46</sup> p.174

Another article 'The Bohemian Thomas-a-Beckett' was offered to *Blackwood's* in September 1877 but turned | down.<sup>47</sup> Obviously he kept on trying *Blackwood's* because p.175

---

ante 20.VI.1878; a MS transcript of AHW's article 'Adoptive Brotherhood... ' in LAPNP pozůst. Lego.

<sup>40</sup>Ivan Mažuranić, 'Smrt Čengić-age (později „Smrt Smail-age Čengijića“)', *Jiskra*, ed. Havlíček, 1846; Czech version, Jos. Kolář, ČČM 1860, pp. 473–4; Jan Lego, *Ztroskotání fregaty Medusy*, 1876.

<sup>41</sup>20.VI.1878; Libr. bibl. no. 13.

<sup>42</sup>20.IV.1878, pp. 506–7; see Libr. bibl. no. 50.

<sup>43</sup>AHW to Vrtátko 19.VIII.1871.

<sup>44</sup>'Denník 1875–80', pp. 222, 239, archiv Náprstkova muzea; Libr. bibl. nos. 105, 104, 40.

<sup>45</sup>1878, see bibliography for reviews.

<sup>46</sup>15.XI.1877, archiv Náprstkova muzea.

<sup>47</sup>AHW to *Blackwood's* 19.IX.1877, Nat. Libr. of Scotland MS 4367 fo. 282.

of its large readership.

In January 1878 Jireček sent Wratlslaw his edition of the satire 'Podkoní a žák', which Wratlslaw thought not to be by Smil Flaška, 'proto, že jest vtipnější a obratnější než nepochybné dílo toho skladatele, o mnoho obratnější než „Rada Otce“'.<sup>48</sup> He supplied Jireček some further information about the past ownership and history of the Cambridge MS of the Dalimil chronicle,<sup>49</sup> and reviewed Jireček's edition in the *Academy*.<sup>50</sup> Jireček informed him about the renewed controversy over the Dvůr Králové and associated MSS, which was to grow increasingly furious. Wratlslaw inserted a notice in the *Athenaeum* in July<sup>51</sup> citing Jireček's refutations of Šembera's attacks on 'Libušin soud' and the St. John's Gospel fragments.<sup>52</sup> This illustrated Wratlslaw's unswerving support for the documents: 'certain it is that a more complete and victorious refutation has rarely come before the public... If "Libussa's Judgment" is to be assailed again, I hope it will be attacked by some one who will be better versed in old Bohemian and the cognate dialects, and will yield Herr Jireczek a less easy victory, if victory at all, than Professor Schembera.' |

p.176

Meanwhile in the summer of 1878 Wratlslaw was preparing to retire from his headmastership. He hoped to be given a parish by his old college to keep him in his old age, and it does not sound, from his description to Jireček, as though, with a large family of children, his income left very much surplus in savings: 'Nevím kdy mi bude možná Vaše drahé Čechy opět navštívit. Pravě nyní žiju v veliké nejistotě. Mají veliké proměny se státi zde, a gymnasium naše má utvořeno býti dle nového návrhu. Proměny budou velmi dobré, ale já jsem již příliš starý abych začal nové zivobyť jak první učitel aneb rektor. Proto jak mile ten nový návrh se stane skutkem, mám odstoupiti s výslužbou. Zatím doufám že muj Kollej v Cambridge bude mi farní obroči darovati. Bude-li že ta fára dobrá jest, budu se usilovati Čechy a staroslavnu Prahu opět navštívit; bude-li že jest menší, nebude mi možná.'<sup>53</sup>

At Easter 1879 Wratlslaw 'removed with a small pension to the Vicarage of Manorbere in Pembrokeshire, to which he was presented by his College.'<sup>54</sup>

The spot is sketched out in his next letter to Jireček, his closest Czech correspondent in these later years:<sup>55</sup> |

p.177

Toto místo jest velmi půvabné, mohl bych říci, luzněkrásné. Jsou 'hory nevysoké', jest zámek starý, veliký, od středního věku; jest chobot moře překrásný se skálami, s uskálími, se mnohem písku, kdež se dobře chodí, když voda odtočila; jest kostel od normanských věkův, kdež mám kázovati

<sup>48</sup>To Jireček 19.I.1878.

<sup>49</sup>29.I.1878.

<sup>50</sup>13 (8.VI.1878), p. 504.

<sup>51</sup>27.VII.1878, p. 113.

<sup>52</sup>J. Jireček, 'O nejnovějších námitkách proti pravosti našich starých památek', ČČM 52 (1878), pp. 119–153.

<sup>53</sup>20.VI.1878.

<sup>54</sup>MS autobiogr. sketch sent 11.VI.1879, LAPNP pozůst. J. Jirečka.

<sup>55</sup>19.V.1879.

---

dvakrát každé neděle. Dům farní jest pěkný a pohovný, ale neco menší než do mé celedi...

A short biographical memoir sent to Jireček shortly after was used almost verbatim for a short article in *Světlozor*, accompanying his portrait.<sup>56</sup> For this the description of Manorbere (or Manorbier as he also spelt it) was additionally employed. It is curious to see how Jireček felt obliged to 'refine' the style, not only correcting grammatical and spelling errors which Wratislaw was always quite unable to eradicate, but also changing the order of words, in order to stiffen and formalise the tone of the passage.<sup>57</sup>

„Místo toto“, tak psal jednomu ze svých přátel hned po přestěhování, „jest velmi půvabné, ba mohl bych říci, luzně krásné. Jsou tu hory nevysoké, jest tu veliký starý zámek středověký, chobot mořský překrásný se skalami, s útesy a s písčínami, po kterých, když voda přílivní odstoupí, velmi příjemně se chodí, kostel normanského založení a slohu, farní dům pěkný a pohodlný.“

In May 1879 Wratislaw was received as a corresponding member of Královská česká společnost nauk.<sup>58</sup> In January Jireček had been presented with the Honorary Diploma of the Royal Historical Society,<sup>59</sup> and he proposed Wratislaw for this reciprocating honour.

Wratislaw had various Czech projects in hand during | these first years of retirement. He was planning a revised edition of his *Dvůr Králové* translations, using Jireček's recent German version.<sup>60</sup> 'Opravil jsem sice mnoho míst u pana Vrtátka a s jeho pomocí, ale kniha opravena jest v bibliotece v Praze, a nemám prespisu řadek opravených.'<sup>61</sup> In 1879 he published a translation of another medieval work, continuing the work on the fourteenth-century literature. This was 'Dvě kroniky o Štilfridovi a Bruncvíkovi', printed at the Northgate Press, Bury St. Edmunds, in an edition of fifty copies. The business had just been set up by a friend of his.<sup>62</sup> Jireček also suggested to Wratislaw that he should write a history of the Hussite period, but Wratislaw cautiously replied by returning to the obstacle of finance which had cropped up in the past, notably with the plan to translate Palacký: 'nic mi bylo by libější než dějiny hussitských dob psáti podle Tomka a vydáti v Angličanách. Ale víte-li co takové dilo mi bylo by stalo? Nejméně 1000 zlatých. Žádný knihkupec chtěl by takovou knihu ujmouti, a já bych musil jí vydáti na své naklady. Ztratil jsem 300 zlatých skrz vydání svých Oxfordských přednesení, ačkoli Universita Oxfordská mi 150 zlatých za podporu darovala.'<sup>63</sup>

A present of some books from the Czech writer | Holeček<sup>64</sup> in the summer of p.179

---

<sup>56</sup>13 (14.VIII.1879) č. 33, p. 385, portrait, p. 394.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid, p. 385.

<sup>58</sup>KČSN Osobní spisy, Archív Akademie věd, Prague.

<sup>59</sup>Charles Rogers, Secretary of RHS, to J. Jireček 22.I.1879, and draft reply, LAPNP.

<sup>60</sup>Libr. bibl. no. 26.

<sup>61</sup>See Hanka's copy of *The Queen's Court Manuscript*, Cambr. 1852, with AHW's annotations, Knihovna

1879 reflected Wratislaw's wider ranging Slav enthusiasm. He wrote to thank him: 'Vy ste velkou službu Slovanům prokazali, že ste té pěkné ale až dotud neznamé kusy Bulharské a Hercegovské do češtiny přeložili. Jest povinnost každého Slovana tak souditi: „slavonicus sum; nihil Slavonicum a me alienum puto.“'<sup>65</sup> His Russian was also advancing, he told Jireček: 'Jistý „Riola“ vydál velmi užitečnou knihu „How to learn Russian“, z které psávám cvičení se kdyžkoli mám času dosti.'<sup>66</sup> These wider studies were reflected in 1880 by an article 'Vladimir Monomachus, Grand Prince of Kyjev' for the Royal Historical Society.<sup>67</sup> Another in 1881 dealt with the 'Life and Writings of Dubravius, Bishop of Olmutz, 1542–1553.'<sup>68</sup> For this he used articles by A. Rybička<sup>69</sup> and Tieftrunk's *Odpor stavův českých proti Ferdinandovi I.*

A recurring theme of his correspondence in the eighties was the controversy over the Dvůr Králové MS. In April 1880 he wrote to Jireček condemning the fanaticism of the conflict, but otherwise expressing himself too vaguely to permit of much analysis: 'Pan prof. Šembera mi poslal některé stránky tiskovany s jmeny mnohých profesorů jeho práci chválujících, ale neměl | jsem času dosti, abych jeho důkazy pilně dočetl. Pan Morfill chylí se k straně Rukopis Kralodvorský za falšovaný májících. Ale dějiny našich starých balladů podají podobné zjevení-se k rukopisu kralodvorskému, a není dle pravosti jen co zdá se byti proti věci, ale také co zdá se byti pro věc, spolu sebrati a potom dokonce souditi. Ale mnozí lidé se stárají více o vítězství než o pravdě.'<sup>70</sup> A further article in the debate reached Wratislaw in 1883. As before he accepted Jireček's case without critical comments, which indeed he would scarcely have been qualified to make on linguistic matters: 'Děkuji Vam srdečně za Vaš velmi zajímavý, učený a důkladný článek o latinskými „nullus, nemo“ v staré češtině. . . Na tom času, na kterém ten rukopis byl nalezen, nebylo na světě takové znamosti o starech zaporných slovech, aby byla možná věc falsatora se takové lapačky uvarovati.'<sup>71</sup> Wratislaw was naturally inclined to believe in the genuineness of the manuscripts; he was however quite unable to enter the argument with any authority.

Another recurring theme was his difficulties over book supplies from Maticе česká. He complained again to Jireček about this in 1880, as well he might: 'Zdá se že jest osudný úsudek, že ta jedna osoba, která | má vůli i čísti i uživati českých časopisů a českých psání a sepsání, má také nejnáramnější nesnaze co do dostání českých knih.'<sup>72</sup> He sent some unsold copies of *The Native Literature of Bohemia in the Fourteenth Century* to Prague to be put on sale by the bookseller Řivnáč. In January 1883 he asked him

Nár. muzea, Prague, 63 E 27.

<sup>62</sup>See AHW to Jireček 23.VIII.1879.

<sup>63</sup>13.IX.1879.

<sup>64</sup>Libr. bibl. nos. 44, 45.

<sup>65</sup>26.VIII.1879.

<sup>66</sup>11.1879; Henry Riola, *How To Learn Russian*, 1878.

<sup>67</sup>*Trans. of the RHS* 8 (1880), pp. 12–19.

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid* 9 (1881), pp. 137–151.

<sup>69</sup>'Jan z Doubravky a z Hradiště, biskup olomoucký', *ČČM* 52 (1878), pp. 106–18, 243–51.

<sup>70</sup>17.IV.1880.

<sup>71</sup>To Jireček 29.III.1883.

<sup>72</sup>22.VII.1880.

---

if the proceeds could be used for buying him some Czech books.<sup>73</sup> A second letter acknowledged receipt of Bílek's *Dějiny konfiskací v Čechách po r. 1618*, volume two, but observed that he did not possess volume one 'ani nedostávám žádných Musejníků již dlouho, dlouho.'<sup>74</sup> He had written about Matice česká in the *Athenaeum*, but 'nemohu nic vice dělati, protože nedostávám žádných knih.' Considering Wratislaw's frequent visits to Bohemia and his continued correspondence, along with the interest of Hanka, Palacký, Jireček and Kalousek in his work, this picture of semi-isolation is somewhat incongruous.

In 1881 he embarked on the culminating work of his Pre-Reformation and Hussite studies, a biography of Hus, and Jerome, commissioned by the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. It was published in 1882 under the title *John Hus – The Commencement of Resistance to Papal Authority on the Part of the Inferior Clergy*.<sup>75</sup> The ideological message is clear | from the title. He wrote to Tomek asking his permission to make extensive use of his work, which he would acknowledge in the preface.<sup>76</sup> Another letter asked a few questions about the meaning of some Latin words. The remoteness of his parish made access to reference works difficult: 'Bylo jinak v Bury St. Edmunds: nepotřebovalo se než abych do nadrazí šel, a v Cambridge výborná biblioteka hotova stávala.'<sup>77</sup> He also began to correspond about this time with the historian Josef Kalousek, like Jireček a defender of the manuscripts and regular contributor to the conservative magazine *Osvěta*.<sup>78</sup>

p.182

Apart from the major work of 1882 *John Hus* Wratislaw also wrote a sixteen-page pamphlet on Hus for the Religious Tract Society,<sup>79</sup> unsuccessfully submitted an article on 'Nestor, the early Russian Chronicler' to *Blackwood's*,<sup>80</sup> and published two short pieces on 'The History of the Matice Czeská' in the *Athenaeum*.<sup>81</sup>

*John Hus* was given a short notice in the *Academy*.<sup>82</sup> It was reviewed at greater length by Kalousek in *Osvěta*.<sup>83</sup> Kalousek was very favourable. He preferred to describe the contents and general approach rather than make specific criticisms, writing that in order to achieve a clear exposition the author had had to avoid many details and controversies. Where Palacký differed from Tomek the | latter's account was generally followed. Wratislaw preferred Hus's works in the vernacular, finding the Latin writings too laden with scholastic phraseology. The whole, Kalousek remarked, was clearly written from the Protestant standpoint, but, he found, moderate in tone. In December 1882 Wratislaw sent Tomek a congratulatory ode in Latin on his recent appointment as Rector of the

p.183

---

<sup>73</sup>5.I.1883, archív Matice české, archív Národního muzea, Prague.

<sup>74</sup>21.VII.1883, archív Matice české.

<sup>75</sup>SPCK, The Home Library, 1882.

<sup>76</sup>11.VI.1881.

<sup>77</sup>To Tomek 7.X.1881.

<sup>78</sup>3.IX.1881.

<sup>79</sup>New Biographical Series No. 12, 16pp, London: refers to the 1882 work on p. 14.

<sup>80</sup>AHW to Blackwood's 15.IV.1882, Nat. Libr. of Scotland MS 4440 fo. 149.

<sup>81</sup>4.XI.1882, pp. 597–8, 2.XII.1882, pp. 734–5.

<sup>82</sup>6.I.1883, p. 7.

<sup>83</sup>1883 díl 2, pp. 1038–9.

University.<sup>84</sup> He presented a copy of *John Hus* to W. E. Gladstone, accompanied by a letter dated 26th December 1883, hoping perhaps to gain his support for the Czech national movement by drawing his attention to their present cultural life and past Protestant traditions: '... owing to the system of secrecy and concealment with regard to historical documents so long pursued by the Austrian government, it has hitherto been impossible to write a correct life of this extraordinary man for want of proper materials. These have since 1848 been gradually collected and published, though to a great extent only in the Bohemian or Czeskish language, to the study of which I have devoted a great deal of time. The Life of Hus is also interesting as exhibiting the true relation between Hus and Wycliffe, which was not what it has generally been supposed to be.'<sup>85</sup>

p.184 A controversy had arisen between the Czech writers | on Hus and the German author Johann Loserth, who maintained that Hus was a quite unoriginal figure, his theology entirely dependent on Wycliffe, without acknowledgment. Wratislaw opposed this view fiercely, like the Czechs, and agreed with what Kalousek had written in the Czech *Athenaeum*: 'Vy máte docela právo co do Loserthova psání. Nebylo možno Husovi v okolnostech tehdejších citaty z Wiklefových spisů zejména uvozovati. Ale Němci nynější nemají žádného pravdocitu, jestliže o Slovanovi řeč jest. Jiné citaty Hus uvozuje zejména až do sytivosti.'<sup>86</sup> A review of Loserth's book, and its English translation, in 1884 in the London *Athenaeum* is clearly attributable to Wratislaw especially by its advocacy of the Czech writings. He raised a non-theological point in favour of Hus's importance as a great reformer: 'Prof. Loserth is not able to distinguish between the theologian and scholastic philosopher and the reformer... there is a great difference between writing a book, and stirring up a whole people to fight, if necessary, against Rome and sacrificing one's life for one's convictions. . . [Loserth] should, therefore, have examined Huss's Bohemian writings, which surely had more to do with bringing about the Hussite movement than his Latin works. It will always remain the greatest |  
p.185 distinction of the Bohemian nation that it was the first in the natural development of European culture – as a whole people – to rise against Rome, and such a national movement cannot be explained as the effect of learned Latin tracts.'<sup>87</sup>

Other articles were also written during 1884. Wratislaw mentioned to Kalousek for example an article eventually published in 1886 as 'Jan Ziska, "The Modern Hannibal"'.<sup>88</sup> He wrote to Tomek about another, which may never have been published: 'Já sepsám nyní vypravování o reformaci katoličkou v Čechách (1650–1781) vedle pan Bilkových článků v Časopise (1881) a o sektách odtud povstalých vedle článků sv. p. Helfertových.'<sup>89</sup> In the same letter to Tomek he brought up again the subject

<sup>84</sup>Manorbere postmark 27.XII.1882.

<sup>85</sup>BM Add 44484 fo. 328.

<sup>86</sup>To Kalousek 24.III.1884.

<sup>87</sup>17.V.1884, 625–6; Dr. Johann Loserth, *Hus und Wiclif*, Prague 1884; English transl. by Rev. M. J. Evans, *Wiclif and Hus*, 1884; see also *Národní listy* 10.VI.1884, *Pokrok* 5.X.1884.

<sup>88</sup>23.XII.1884; *The Churchman* no. 77 (Feb 1886), pp. 340–59.

<sup>89</sup>11.III.1884; T. V. Bílek, 'Reformace katolická v Čechách 1650–1781', *ČČM* 55 (1881), pp. 56–72, 224–44, 403–23; J. A. Helfert, 'O tak řečených blouznivcích náboženských...', *ČČM* 51 (1877), pp. 201–27, 533–57,

---

of the supposed Bohemian connection of the Tyndall family, but like Palacký earlier Tomek was probably equally unable to help.<sup>90</sup>

Family disaster and ill-health were the marks of his latter years. In 1880 his seven-year-old daughter had died of diphtheria, and his sixteen-year-old son had also been seriously ill.<sup>91</sup> Towards the end of 1884 he began to be attacked by arthritis, and ill-fortune deprived him of the sight of his left eye. By the end of 1885, he wrote to Kalousek, he had had to | hand over his parish duties: 'Ku konci přešlého roku začínala mi dna útok na jednu patu učiniti, potom na celý život. Navstivil jsem váry, a zdalo se že se lepe mi vedlo. Najednou ztratil jsem zrak levého oka od zakalu, který již dlouho se zmahal. Jak mile byl jsem zvyknul užíváním jednoho oka, dna se uchopila slepého oka a levé strany hlavy, odkud již čtvrtý měsíc trpím. Před nedávném plicní nemoc se přidala. Ale nyní, Bohu díky, zdá se že všechno lepe se vede, ačkoli nemám žádného úfání na plné pozdravování se před jarem. Rozumí se že nemohu již dlouho pracovati, a naměstek mou praci duchovní učini.'<sup>92</sup> At the same time, showing that he had not relinquished scholarly activity, he suggested an emendation to a phrase in Erben's edition of Hus.<sup>93</sup>

p.186

In the spring of 1886 he wrote to Jireček that his health was a little better, but he was not able to read for any length of time: 'Dostal jsem Dějiny Prazské a časopisy za 1885, ale nemohl jsem ještě je čísti. Před svou chorobou čítal jsem zivotopis Hraběte Kapliře, doufaje že mohl bych článek dosti zajímavý pro Anglické čtenaři vytahnouti. Možná že mi bude poroučeno některé německé vary, ku příkladu Wiesbaden, navštívití, a kdyby mé zdraví se tam rychle polepšilo, | možná take že budu moci vyletění až do předrahé Prahy učiniti. Ale to jest přítomně nic než pouhý sen.'<sup>94</sup>

p.187

By June he had arrived in Wiesbaden, and there he dictated a note to Kalousek: 'Má nemoc nebylá, bohužel, pouhým zakalem ale glaukoma. Měl jsem operaci odkud hlava se velice zlehčila ale zření docela na vzdy ztraceno. V takových okolnostech není možná předrahou Prahu navštívití musím brzo do Angličan se Vratiti ale doufam zde zimnu traviti. Prosím o odpustnost že tak kratký list posílám ale nemohu sam pro sebe psáti a má manželka neumí česky, ačkoli píše ten listek na diktování. Zapověděno mi vice psati s Pánem Bohem!'<sup>95</sup> A report subsequently in *Hlas Národa* by Kalousek claimed he had gone blind, but in fact Wratislav meant he had lost the sight of his left eye only.<sup>96</sup> He wrote shortly after: 'Jedno oko mi zůstává, zření druhého na vždy ztraceno.'<sup>97</sup>

Kalousek's next letter, preserved in a carbon copy of the typescript, described for Wratislav the renewed attacks on the manuscripts, especially by Gebauer and Masaryk

---

and 53 (1879), pp. 212–58.

<sup>90</sup>See pp. 158–9.

<sup>91</sup>AHW to Jireček 18.VIII.1880, 13.IX.1880.

<sup>92</sup>17.XII.1885.

<sup>93</sup>*Sebr. spisy*, 1, p. 268 'pro slib'; MS has 'přeslib', which AHW emends to 'přes slib'; also, AHW to Jireček 27.III.1886.

<sup>94</sup>27.III.1886; F. Mareš, 'Hrabě Kašpar Zdeněk Kaplíř. . .', *ČČM* 57 (1883), pp. 3–45, 219–54.

<sup>95</sup>Tanus Hotel 16.VI.1886.

<sup>96</sup>*Hlas Národa* 20.VI.1886, 'J. Kk' i.e. Kalousek.

<sup>97</sup>To Kalousek 25.VI.1886.

p.188 in the Czech *Athenaeum*. He hoped that they would be successfully repulsed: 'My zde v Praze jsme již od měsíce celí rozehvělí obnoveným sporem o pravost rukopisu Kralodvorského a Zeleno|horského. Jistě ten spor také Vašnost dojíhá, ač-li při své oční chorobě a při své vzdálenosti od Čech něco se o něm dovídáte. Máme naději, že naše vzácné rukopisy i tento ze všech dosavadních útoků nejhorší šťastně a vítězně přestojí. Již nyní možno říci, že většina nových námitek jest vyvrácena, ale několik málo zbývá ovšem ještě takových, které dosud nepodařilo se dostatečně odstraniti. Pan Josef Jireček chystá v té záležitosti spis do Společnosti Náuk – zakládati se bude na jednom velkém náboženském rukopise Olomouckém z roku 1420, v němž jest plno linguistických podivností jinde z řídka přicházejících, těž archaismů a neoterismů, tak že žádný jiný dosud známý spis staročeský nemá jazyka tak pestrého a tomuto rovného.'<sup>98</sup>

After a time in England Wratislaw returned in 1887 to Wiesbaden, where his blind eye was finally extracted, as he told Kalousek: 'To mi tlak na hlavě ulehčilo, a nyní začínám něco čísti. Čítám „Rostlins[t]vo v národním podání slovanském“ od Prima Sobotky. Obmyšlím budoucího měsíce do Baden-Badenu na dvě měsíce cestovati.'<sup>99</sup> Kalousek in reply told him of the happy rediscovery of the MS of 'Denník panoše Jaroslava', which, in a censored version, Wratislaw had previously translated.<sup>100</sup> On p.189 28th April Wratislaw wrote from Lichtenthal near | Baden-Baden that he was to stay there a month: 'Operací na oko šťastně se dokončilo, ale trpím nyní na hlavě, a nemohu pracovati.'<sup>101</sup> On 4th May he thanked Kalousek for his edition of the 'Denník'.<sup>102</sup>

After returning to England Wratislaw removed from Manorbier to his native town of Rugby and declared that his health immediately improved.<sup>103</sup> He was able to work again, and agreed to write a short history of Czech literature for *Chambers's Encyclopaedia*. Later he regretfully found that it had been cut by half, so that it became only a shadow of what it was.<sup>104</sup> As one would expect it was not very strong on recent authors of prose and poetry and concentrated on his main interests, the medieval literature, Hussites, etc.

Near the end of 1888 he wrote from a new address in Stoke Newington, North London, thanking Kalousek for an article on Rieger: 'Dříve byl jsem myslil, že on býval příliš prudký, ale nyní, čtiv Vaš článek, změnil jsem své mínění. Četl jsem také v Anglických novinách jeho výbornou řeč o potřebnost mocných Rakousk k Čechům s velikou oblibou.'<sup>105</sup> Behind all his pro-Slav opinions Wratislaw, like many a Czech, was a supporter of the idea of the necessity of Austria.

<sup>98</sup>27.VI.1886; see J. Jireček, 'O zvláštnostech češtiny v starých rukopisech moravských', *Pojedn. Král. Spol. nauk* 1887.

<sup>99</sup>13.III.1887; see *Libr. bibl.* no. 97.

<sup>100</sup>See AHW to Kalousek 18.III. 1887; 'Denník' publ. complete by Kalousek in *Archiv český* díl 7 (1887), pp. 427–45, and in AHW's library at Christ's (omitted by *Libr. bibl.*).

<sup>101</sup>To Kalousek, Hotel zum goldenen Löwen.

<sup>102</sup>4.V.1887; see note 100.

<sup>103</sup>To Kalousek, Clifton Road, Rugby 14.I.1888.

<sup>104</sup>AHW to Kalousek, 26A Market Place, Rugby 31.I.1888; *Chambers's Encycl.*, new ed., vol. 2, 1888, pp. 267–8.

<sup>105</sup>9.XII.1888 90 Manor Rd.; 'K jubileum dr. Frant. Lad. Riegra', *Osvěta* 1888 2, pp. 1053 seq.



---

Wratislaw was now busy translating Slav fairy-tales | from Erben's collection, p.190  
renewing a project of several years standing. Kalousek sent him some information  
on the mythical spirit Kurent in the Krainian tales from Professor Gregor Krek.<sup>106</sup>  
Publication, as he wrote, depended on finding a willing firm, because he was no  
longer able to print privately (for financial reasons). The SPCK were found willing,  
however, and Wratislaw's last book *Sixty Folk-Tales from exclusively Slavonic sources* was  
published in 1889.<sup>107</sup> The book received a notice in *Hlas Národa*.<sup>108</sup> In England the  
*Athenaeum* reviewer had some criticism to make, although he found it a 'singularly  
interesting book' especially for its Carniolan tales where he thought to detect pagan  
survivals. He did not however agree with Wratislaw's nature-myth theories, which was  
rather a dated aspect of the book (later Walter Strickland was to present some similar  
eccentricities): 'Mr. Wratislaw's introductions and notes are not so full of information  
as could be desired, and they contain some unscientific attempts to interpret folk-tales  
as nature-myths.'<sup>109</sup> The book had fallen between two stools in a way: it was neither a  
true scholarly work of research nor an attractively produced book for children. There  
were no illustrations and the style, if compared with Strickland's less accurate versions,  
is somewhat pedestrian. |

Josef Jireček had died on 25th November 1888. With Kalousek he had been one of  
Wratislaw's closest Czech correspondents in later years. Wratislaw wrote his obituary  
for the *Athenaeum*,<sup>110</sup> which *Hlas Národa* wrongly thought to be the first extended  
obituary to any prominent Czech in that journal – Wratislaw had also written one  
for Palacký in 1876.<sup>111</sup> Writing to Kalousek, whom he had heard was ill, in March  
1890, Wratislaw told him that his health was improved: 'jsem s to, abych dvě hodiny  
denně pracovati mohl.'<sup>112</sup> In July perhaps his last Slavonic article appeared in *The  
Churchman*, entitled 'Turkish-Speaking Christians in Bulgaria'.<sup>113</sup> At the end of 1890  
he sent Kalousek New Year greetings and his best wishes to Karel Tieftrunk, Tomek,  
Náprstek, Emler and Vřátko.<sup>114</sup>

At this point the record of his Czech correspondence breaks off, although Wratislaw  
lived a couple of years longer. It may be that ill-health recurred and made letter-writing  
quite impracticable. He died on 3rd November 1892, aged 70, at Graythwaite, Alhambra  
Road, Southsea.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup>See AHW to Kalousek 8.I.1889.

<sup>107</sup>See AHW to Kalousek 14.X.1889.

<sup>108</sup>*Hlas Národa* 15.X.1889.

<sup>109</sup>6.IX.1890, p. 317.

<sup>110</sup>24.VIII.1889, 256–7, based, according to *Hlas Národa* 3.IX.1889, on J. A. Helfert, 'J. J. Biographisch-literarische Skizze', *Wiener Zig.* 1889, also separately Vienna 1889.

<sup>111</sup>*Hlas Národa* 3.IX.1889.

<sup>112</sup>5.III.1890.

<sup>113</sup>No. 46 new ser. (July 1890), pp. 550–6.

<sup>114</sup>31.XII.1890.

<sup>115</sup>Obituaries, *Athenaeum* 12.XI, *The Times* 5.XI, *Guardian* 9.XI.1892, and see DNB.



## Chapter 11

# Travellers and Others, 1836–47

Between Bowring's anthology of 1832 and Wratislaw's of 1849 English writers were not entirely silent on the subject of Czech vernacular literature and the literary revival, although what was written was mostly incidental to historical narrative or discussion of current affairs. There were, for example, several travellers' accounts which touched on the subject at least in passing. p.192

One of these was by Henry Reeve, later staff member of the *Times* and editor of the *Edinburgh Review*.<sup>1</sup> He described his visit of 1836 to Prague in the *Metropolitan Magazine*.<sup>2</sup>

His education had been completed at Geneva, where he met the Polish exiles Adam Czartoryski, Zamoyski, Krasiński and Mickiewicz, whose 'Faris' he translated. With the poet Krasiński he made a tour in Italy, and they corresponded extensively.<sup>3</sup> In 1836 while in Paris Reeve arranged with the Thun family, who had strong English connections, to visit them at Děčín in Northern Bohemia. Count Franz Thun came to fetch him from Dresden, and Reeve went on to Prague, from where he wrote to his mother of his first experiences: 'I found my friend, Leo Thun, very busy with his judicial function, and I have plenty of time to myself, which I am likely to employ very agreeably in reading up the history of the country, in visiting the endless wonders of a city where every house is a work of art, and in observing the manifold peculiarities of a people which interests me more every day.'<sup>4</sup> He lodged near the Thuns and was present at the coronation of Ferdinand, with a whole group of eminent English visitors invited for the occasion. But as well as acquainting himself with Austrian aristocratic society, as his family connections enabled him to do, Reeve was also learning about the Czechs: 'I am working very hard at Bohemian history and the present state of the country, and have already got nearly a volume of notes. My love of the Slavonians increases every half-hour, and I shall bring home a head full of Bohemian heroisms, p.193

---

<sup>1</sup>Biography, *DNB*.

<sup>2</sup>'Sketches of Bohemia, and the Slavonian Provinces of the Austrian Empire', 18 (1837), pp. 349–63; 19, pp. 30–44, 157–76, 225–43.

<sup>3</sup>*Correspondance de Sigismond Krasiński et de Henry Reeve*, ed. M. J. Kallenbach, 2 vols, Paris 1902.

<sup>4</sup>25.VIII.1836, *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Henry Reeve*, ed. J. K. Laughton, 2 vols, 1898, 1, pp. 67 seq.

p.194 and a trunk-full of Bohemian books and antiquities, to be elaborated this winter in the little room at Hampstead.<sup>5</sup> By early October he was in Vienna: ‘The last days of my stay in Prague were very agreeable, and I need not tell you with what regret I left a city which had awakened all my admiration, stimulated my inquiries by its inexhaustible treasures, and opened to my eyes an entirely new | view of history and of Europe. I have sent off my trunk to Dresden, laden with spoils of various kinds, and with a collection of fine old Bohemian psalmody, which I flatter myself you will allow to surpass the unfortunate author of the “Old Hundredth” himself.’<sup>6</sup>

Reeve’s published sketches are by and large historical and descriptive in the manner of the guidebook, but they show some acquaintance with Bohemian patriotic sentiments. At the outset of the series he expounds a Palacký-like conception of Czech history (in 1836 Palacký had printed the first German volume of his history): ‘at a very early period, a struggle between the German and Slavonian races began, of which Bohemia, seated in the centre of Europe, and herself belonging to the German empire, was the principal theatre and constant victim.’<sup>7</sup> He remonstrates against the negative attitude of Western historians towards Charles IV (notably Gibbon).<sup>8</sup> Prague he describe as ‘the cradle of Protestantism’.<sup>9</sup> He was present at the ninth jubilee commemoration of the martyrdom of St. Wenceslas on 28th September and quotes with translation the first stanza of the early hymn ‘Svatý Václave / Vévodo české země’.<sup>10</sup> An opinion of extreme animosity towards the cult of St. John Nepomucen is also recorded: | ‘These honours are now so intimately connected with the system in which they originated, that I once heard a distinguished Bohemian declare that no good could befall his country till St. John Nepomuck was once more thrown into the Moldau.’<sup>11</sup>

Contemporary literature is scarcely mentioned. The section on the University of Prague has most to say on the subject of Czech writers, dealing with the period of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries: ‘Perhaps in no country in Europe was the vernacular tongue so frequently employed by the statesmen, historians, and professors of the time, more especially by those who were Protestants... the exertions of that learned body (the Carolinum) were unceasingly directed to improve their native Cheskian language – the most perfect, the most energetic, and the most complicated of all the Slavonian dialects.’<sup>12</sup> He lists several authors, quoted here in his own spelling: Radowsky of Hustirzan, John of Hodiejowna, Charles of Zierotin, Hagek, Daubrawriczky (Dubravius), Wartowsky, and Blahoslaw. Besides this exaggerated account of the flourishing of the Czech vernacular before the Counter-Reformation Reeve draws attention in an amateurish way to what he considers the unpronounceable phonetics exemplifying | with the old artificial tongue-twister ‘STRČ PRST SKRZ

<sup>5</sup>To Mrs. Reeve 7.IX.1836, Laughton, pp. 67 seq.

<sup>6</sup>Same, 7.X.1836, Laughton, pp. 67 seq.

<sup>7</sup>*Metrop. Mag.* 18, p. 349.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 355.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 349.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 358 footnote.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 359.

<sup>12</sup>*Metrop. Mag.* 19, p. 35.

---

KRK'.<sup>13</sup>

More noteworthy perhaps is his nicely ironic description of the coronation of Ferdinand as King of Bohemia on 1st September. He finds a conspicuous lack of popular loyalty behind the outward pomp and circumstance of the occasion: 'This magnificence, however, must not be attributed so much to the zeal of the inhabitants, as to the excellence of the police, which had taken care to inform the people, about ten days beforehand, how much enthusiasm they were to expend. . . The national hymn played as the emperor passed, and he returned the faint huzzas of the people by a cold, mechanical motion of the hand.'<sup>14</sup> At the same time Reeve has an admiring description of Metternich, whom he 'had daily opportunities of meeting. . . both in public and in private.'<sup>15</sup> But his description of Vienna further emphasises his picture of a state lacking in bonds of common loyalty: 'It presents the anomaly of a great city in a small territory connected with the kingdoms, which feed its splendour, by no ties but those of the administration, and regarded by them with no feelings but those of envy and distrust.'<sup>16</sup>

It is a little disappointing that Reeve did not | write more about the Czechs of his own day, but his relations were mostly with the aristocracy present in force for the coronation. The enthusiasm expressed for the Slavs presumably reflected the Bohemian patriotism of the magnates, who became more hostile to pro-Slav sentiments after 1848. Later Reeve seems to have taken a strong pro-Austrian stance.<sup>17</sup> p.197

In 1839 a travel book entitled *Germany, Bohemia, and Hungary, Visited in 1837*<sup>18</sup> appeared which incorporated parts of Reeve's sketches. It was written by Rev. George R. Gleig, then Chaplain to the Royal Hospital, Chelsea. Author of various historical and biographical works, he was a conservative in politics and an early contributor to *Fraser's*.<sup>19</sup> His journey, on which he was accompanied by his thirteen-year-old son, began as a walking tour in Northern Bohemia and Silesia, and he continued to Teplice, Prague, Brno and Vienna. He was drawn to Bohemia, as he relates, by his knowledge of the Hussite period and a curiosity about the gypsies.<sup>20</sup>

After painting a picture of a rather democratic society before the Thirty Years' War and describing the feudalising and Germanising of the Hapsburgs, Gleig manages to convey the impression that the Slavonic | speech became almost extinct (he also seems to confuse Slovak and Slavonic): 'Even for conversational purposes, the rich and musical dialect of the Slavacs ceased to be used, except among the lowest of the peasantry; and the use of it was, in consequence, taken as an unerring test of humble birth and a rude education.'<sup>21</sup> Again he writes: 'It is worthy of remark, that not a single lecture p.198

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid, p. 35.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid, pp. 157 seq, 'The Coronation of Ferdinand'.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid, pp. 157 seq.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid, pp. 157 seq.

<sup>17</sup>'The Austrian Revolution', *Quarterly Review* 87 (June 1850), pp. 190–238, attr. in *Wellesley Index*, 1; for visits to Bohemia in 1846 and 1857 see Laughton 1, pp. 179–81, 382.

<sup>18</sup>3 vols.

<sup>19</sup>*DNB*.

<sup>20</sup>Gleig, vol. 1, pp. 273 seq.

<sup>21</sup>Gleig 1, pp. 293 seq.

is delivered in the vernacular language of the country. German is, indeed, employed where Latin may have grown into disrepute; but the Bohemian is a dialect of which the use seems restricted to the very lowest and most despised of the peasantry.<sup>22</sup>

While admiring the peacefulness of the country, which he makes too idyllic to be believed, he deprecates the regulation of opinion and regimentation he finds to emanate from an authoritarian centralist administration: ““You are certainly getting on too fast in England now,” said a Bohemian nobleman to me, “. . . but we are in a state of torpor. . . I don’t mean to say that any of us are now desirous of following your footsteps, for you have overleaped the *juste milieu* with a vengeance, – but I do wish and so do all classes among us, that we had something more to say in the management of our own affairs.”

p.199 I came to the conclusion that the day even of Bohemian | regeneration cannot be very far distant.<sup>23</sup> Gleig, like Henry Reeve, had connections with the nobility, ‘my friend, the Honourable Francis Scott, having kindly introduced me to Count Thun’,<sup>24</sup> and again his opinions are likely to have derived themselves from the Bohemian patriotism of the aristocracy.

Gleig expounds, partly from personal experience, on the role of the police and government in the regulation of education and circulation of literature. There is, for example, a reference to Bowring’s article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* being treated with great caution: ‘I visited a gentleman in Prague, and found upon his table a number of the *Foreign Quarterly Review*. There was an article in it which bore upon the existing condition of Bohemia, – an able paper on the whole, though here and there inaccurate. I conversed with him about it, and, having an hour to spare, I accepted his offer to carry it to my hotel, and there read it. “When you send it back,” said he, “be so good as to wrap it carefully up in paper. We don’t know where we are safe, in this country; and your *Foreign Quarterly* is not one of the favoured publications which we are licensed to import.” What a pitiable state of existence is this, – what a perfect bondage of mind, for which the utmost | security to person and property can never make amends.<sup>25</sup> We easily recognise a familiar tug-of-war between the themes of ‘Law and Order’ and ‘Freedom of Speech’.

p.200 Another work entitled *Austria* by Peter Evan Turnbull<sup>26</sup> is more unambiguously and forthrightly pro-Hapsburg than Gleig, but it realises that the Czech vernacular is quite alive and kicking. Societies have been formed, he writes, and ‘plays are performed in the Bohemian language, at the theatre of Prague.’<sup>27</sup> Turnbull regards the government as wise in having conceded to the Bohemians in questions of language and institutions, on the grounds that sudden change in such matters is impracticable and attempts often counter-productive. He points out the problem of long-standing German-Czech antagonism: ‘However the highest magnates may have been inclined upon this subject, the great body of resident nobility at all events, the landowners, traders, and men of

---

<sup>22</sup>Gleig 2, p. 330.

<sup>23</sup>Gleig 1, pp. 293 seq.

<sup>24</sup>Same.

<sup>25</sup>Gleig 2, p. 331.

<sup>26</sup>2 vols, 1840.

<sup>27</sup>Turnbull 1, p. 112.

---

science, partook the feelings of the people.' In the end however he trusts in the ultimate wisdom of the central government, which, he says, 'never long forgets, that the strength of its rule depends on the quiet submissive affection of the masses...'<sup>28</sup>

Both Gleig's and Turnbull's volumes were among | a group of books about the Hapsburg Empire reviewed in the *Quarterly Review* in 1839.<sup>29</sup> The reviewer, the barrister and essayist Abraham Hayward apparently,<sup>30</sup> does not attach much importance to Gleig's indications of local hankering after greater independence among the Bohemians: 'we rather think their lamentations are much of the same sort as those of Andrew Fairservice over the consequences of the Union; and throughout the whole of the German States of the empire there is the most perfect confidence in the continued good intentions of their emperors.'<sup>31</sup> p.201

A later work entitled *Austria* condensed from the German of J. G. Kohl and published in 1843 had more to say about the Czech literary-national movement in its section on 'The national movement among the Bohemians'.<sup>32</sup> Kohl describes one bookshop frequented by the Czech patriots, which sounds like Neureuter's in Jesuitská, later Karlova ulice:<sup>33</sup>

One of my first walks in Prague was to a Tshekhian bookshop, and to the Museum of the Patriotic Association. I was anxious to see what new blossoms the Bohemian tree had shot forth, and what ancient fruits it had garnered up. The shop in which the literary novelties of Bohemia are offered to a patronizing public, is situated in a narrow gloomy lane, and the man who owns the shop, and is the chief publisher of modern Bohemian literature, is a German. His shop is small, but is often visited by the young patriots, – the advocates, the students, and the | literati, – who go there to turn over his Bohemian, Illyrian, Polish, and Russian books, and sometimes to buy them. All these Slavonian languages are at present studied with great zeal by the Bohemian patriots; and it is a singular coincidence, that in Russia, also there is at present quite a rage for the study of Bohemian, Polish and Illyrian. p.202

Kohl mentions the low level to which Czech literature had declined in the eighteenth century, and how 'some very learned people had only an indistinct notion, that in some parts of Germany the population was of Slavonian origin.'<sup>34</sup> A curious wrong-headed note by the unknown English translator remarks that 'Bohemian poetry, like that of most of the Slavonian languages, is destitute of rhyme.'<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup>Turnbull 1, pp. 110–111.

<sup>29</sup>65 (Dec 1839), pp. 234–72.

<sup>30</sup>*Wellesley Index* 1.

<sup>31</sup>*Quarterly Review* 65, pp. 26–27.

<sup>32</sup>See esp., pp. 61–8; translator anonymous.

<sup>33</sup>Kohl, pp. 61–2; bookseller: see Bily 3i, p. 31 note 3.

<sup>34</sup>Kohl, p. 62.

<sup>35</sup>Kohl, p. 62 note.

Kohl is pro-German and particularly deplores sympathies with Tsarist Russia. A supporter of German culture is brought in as a mouthpiece for words of warning about the Czech patriotic party. The analysis of political prospects is by no means naive or farfetched, though at the same time highly redolent of feelings of German racial superiority:<sup>36</sup>

p.203

It is a kind of luxury...in which a few idle young men indulge, and in which they are encouraged by the professors and antiquaries; but it is no movement originating in the wants, or emanating from the wishes, of the people. All that is eminent with us is German. Our men of education read Schiller and Goethe in preference to any other writers; every official man, down to the humblest clerk, writes and speaks German; and as every Bohemian feels that he cannot get on in the world without a knowledge of German, he seeks to learn it himself, and teach it to his children, and has no time to trouble himself | about the fantastic visions of the Tshekian patriots...No nation, while yet a breath of life is in it, becomes reconciled to the loss of its independence; and though the Bohemians, the Slovaks, and the other Slavonians, would do better to attach themselves more and more to the mild sceptre of Austria, than to stretch out their hands after the questionable independence which seems to be offered them from the East, yet nations, like individuals, are not exempt from acts of folly...The less instructed Bohemians, indeed, look upon much that they hear of Russia as mere German calumnies; but those among us who stand higher, have had opportunities, many of them, of seeing with their own eyes. In short, should it ever come to a struggle between the Slavonian and German elements, the Tshekhs, in spite of their sympathies and antipathies, will be found fighting on the side of the Germans, and it will be for their advantage to do so.

None of these writers, Reeve, Gleig, Turnbull, or Kohl, get beyond the fringes of the language question *per se*, but one anonymous writer gives a little information about the literature itself, and prints three translations of Czech folk songs in an article in *Fraser's* in 1846 called 'A Glance at Prague during the Feast of St. Nepomuk.'<sup>37</sup>

p.204

The author had met a 'real Bohemian', full of enthusiasm for the beauties of his language: 'The national feeling is very strong now in the country; the Bohemian language is universally studied, and rising with the literature of the land. One of the *savans* told me that it is one of the fullest and most perfect in the world. It certainly sounds rich and sweet, and as it abounds in | rhymes, is most suited for singing and for poetry.'<sup>38</sup> His 'real Bohemian' was evidently an enthusiast for theories of Indo-Slav affinities associated with the Jungmann school, as well as a lover of folk song: 'He was an enlightened Romanist and a genuine patriot; his country was his paragon – he did not think he could exist long out of it; his language was his love, and so partial was he

---

<sup>36</sup>Kohl, pp. 63–4.

<sup>37</sup>34 (Sept 1846), pp. 339–346.

<sup>38</sup>*Ibid*, p. 341.



---

to the fact of its Eastern origin, that he would have liked the Sanscrit character adopted in printing it. He was a very pleasing enthusiast, and when he sang, as one breathing out his soul, his national airs, he reminded us of the swan singing her last.<sup>39</sup> The songs, given in straightforward prose versions, are: 'Když jsem plela len', 'Horo, horo, vysoká jsi' and 'Osířelo dítě o půldruhém lítě'. The Dvůr Králové MS is also briefly mentioned in passing: 'Some ancient Bohemian manuscripts were found a few years ago in an old tower; they are perfectly legible and comprehensible, and consist of some poems as old as the eighth and ninth centuries.'<sup>40</sup> Whoever it was who met him and supplied the songs, the Englishman portrays him as a bit of an eccentric – he was quite possibly a member of the circle of Hanka, Jungmann and Čelakovský, if not actually one of these.

p.205

The most informative English article to deal with contemporary Czech literature in this period was probably that of the Italian nationalist Giuseppe Mazzini, entitled 'On the Slavonian National Movement.' It appeared in two parts in *Lowe's Edinburgh Magazine* for July and September 1847, and reflected the upsurge in national spirit preceding the stormy year of 1848.<sup>41</sup>

Near the beginning of the first instalment Mazzini drew the reader's attention to the future significance for Europe of the Slavs and their political groupings: 'Struck with the general indifference that prevails among us to the approach of a new power, destined, sooner or later, to change the conditions of the European world, and with the almost total ignorance of the facts which are its source, we have at heart here only to awaken attention to this phenomenon, and briefly to show its reality and importance.'<sup>42</sup>

Like Mickiewicz, in his Paris lectures at the Collège de France, which he cited, Mazzini was aware of Bowring's series of anthologies. Indeed, he had reviewed in Italian Bowring's *Cheskian Anthology* of 1832.<sup>43</sup>

The second instalment devotes a section specifically to the Czechs and Slovaks. A couple of pages are devoted to Kollár, whom he considers far and away their best poet. | His conception is very similar to Bowring's. He then gives descriptions of the work of Šafárik and Palacký, *Matice česká*, Czech journals, and the Slovaks. One passage enigmatically relates how Mazzini 'met a young Bohemian here in England, scarce two years since, who distributed, at his own expense, 10,000 copies of a Slavonian pamphlet, entitled *A Word on the Education of the Tchekh Youth*, by Professor Smetana.'<sup>44</sup> This was probably Josef Frič, in England in 1846.

p.206

Although he writes that 'Jablonski is the author whom the Bohemians place at the head of their national poets' and also lists the names amongst others of Tyl, Malý,

---

<sup>39</sup>Ibid, p. 343.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid, p. 341.

<sup>41</sup>New ser. 2, pp. 182–92, 540–6; reprinted in: *Scritti editi ed inediti di Giuseppe Mazzini*, vol. 36, Imola 1922, pp. 109–215.

<sup>42</sup>*Scritti* 36, p. 113.

<sup>43</sup>*Cheskian Anthology*, ecc. – Letteratura poetica della Boemia. Opera di Giovanni Bowring, Londra 1832', *Giovine Italia* fasc. 4 (1833), pp. 222–7; reprinted, *Scritti*, vol. 1, Imola 1906, pp. 377–81, and see p. xxiii.

<sup>44</sup>*Scritti*, vol. 36, pp. 173–4.

Vocel, Čelakovský, Erben and Sabina, he considers recent Czech literature on the whole undistinctive and derivative: 'The Tchekhs, to speak the truth, have hitherto no poetry. They have dramas by Turinsky and others, but these are more or less imitations of French or Spanish models; they have nothing characteristic, nothing spontaneous, in a word, nothing national. They have many poets, but apart from Kollar, who is an exception, they have none who stand out from the poets of the second class, that abound in other parts of Europe, and the same may be said of every branch of literature properly so called, of that in which invention should be the | dominant ingredient.'<sup>45</sup>

p.207

The character of the national movement in Bohemia he described as 'especially historical, philological, scientific', and he concluded that this was why it had up to now been easily tolerated by the central government. Nevertheless he was of the opinion that all the antiquarianism would eventually lead to transformation in the life of the nation: 'There is nothing immediately threatening to her in all these labours of calm and patient literary men. And while she seeks to drown, even in blood, the least vestige of national life in her Polish province – while she takes fright and dreams of massacres and intervention, at the faintest cry of liberty uttered on the frontiers of her Italian provinces – she looks on in silence at all that is passing in Bohemia; she hopes that by dint of digging up the past, the Tchekhs will at last become immovably fixed in it. She is very much mistaken. The smallest thought always seeks out for itself a material simbol. Ideas end by becoming incarnate in acts.'<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup>Ibid, pp. 177–8.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid, pp. 179–80.

## Chapter 12

# Morfill and the Czechs, 1870–1909

William Richard Morfill was born in Maidstone, the son of a professional musician.<sup>1</sup> His Slavonic studies are reputed to have commenced when a schoolmaster of his gave him a Russian grammar. He went to Oriel College, Oxford, on leaving school, and in 1855 took first-class honours in Classical Moderations. Subsequently he entered the Literae Humaniores School but took ill during Finals and lost the chance of a fellowship. He remained thereafter in Oxford tutoring for the Schools, lectured at Wren's in London, examined, and did reviewing for the *Athenaeum*.<sup>2</sup> From 1870 he lectured periodically on Slavonic themes at Oxford under the terms of the Ilchester Fund which had been established to that end. It was only in 1889 that he was appointed University Reader in Russian at the Taylor Institution, England's first professional Slavist, and he became Professor of Russian and the Slavonic Languages in 1900. His papers were destroyed after his death in accordance with his will, but his large library of Slavonic books, many with writers' | personal inscriptions, gives many clues as to the extent of his interests and Slav connections.<sup>3</sup>

Vacation trips apparently took Morfill all over Eastern Europe, Russia, and as far as Georgia. The earliest Czech volume in his library, Šafárik's *Počátkové staročeské mluvnice*, is inscribed with the date 1870,<sup>4</sup> but his first recorded visit to Prague would seem to have been in 1871, when Wratislaw was also there. *Pokrok* reported their arrival and wrote of Morfill: 'Ruštiny jest úplně mocen, také v jihoslovanštině se zná, i česky čte a zakoupil sobě částku knih českých. V Museu pozorně prohlížel sobě staré památky literatury naší, jmenovitě rukopisy Královodvorský a Zelenohorský.'<sup>5</sup> *Národní listy* misspelt his name, as well as imagining he had a full-time chair in Slavonic languages: 'Stolici jižto zastává, nadal jistý anglický lord k tomu konci, aby fundace vydržoval se docent jazyků slovanských. Pan Moafaill vydá spis o jazycích a dějinách slovanských.'<sup>6</sup> The

<sup>1</sup>J. A. H. Murray, 'William Richard Morfill 1834–1909', *Proc. of the British Academy* 4 (1909–10) , pp. 368–74; *DNB*.

<sup>2</sup>See note 1.

<sup>3</sup>Morfill Collection, Library of the Taylor Institution, Oxford.

<sup>4</sup>Morfill Coll.

<sup>5</sup>20.VII.1871.

<sup>6</sup>27.VII.1871 č. 203.

p.210 fund set up by the will of Lord Ilchester was employed for lectures and not for a chair in Slavonic studies.<sup>7</sup> There is one letter from Morfill to Louis Leger probably attributable to the time of this visit.<sup>8</sup> Leger was then resident in Prague, where he edited a journal *Correspondance Slave*.<sup>9</sup> This may | have been their first meeting. Morfill's library contains about twenty-five volumes marked 'Prague, 1871' in his own hand, a number of which are Matices publications which had been presented to him when he became a member. The volumes acquired in Prague included historical works, translations of Shakespeare, and also, as one might expect, an edition of the *Dvůr Králové MS*.<sup>10</sup>

It seems certain that Morfill had met Wratislaw in Prague if not before. In 1878 he reviewed Wratislaw's Ilchester Lectures *The Native Literature of Bohemia in the Fourteenth Century* in the *Athenaeum*. Although the review is anonymous, especially typical of Morfill is the reference to 'Polabish' or Sorbian. **The annotated editorial volume in the City University Library, London, duly confirms his authorship.**<sup>11</sup>

p.211 He suggested that prose renderings of the verse extracts would have produced happier results (the versions were sometimes rather in the manner of the metrical psalms): 'In good plain prose we get rid of the tags which rhyme necessitates.' Impressed by the prose of Štítný, evidence to him of a highly cultured tongue, he took the opportunity to attack anti-Czech prejudice among the Germans: 'At that time the Bohemian language was a tongue of culture and progress, and not a patois of boors, which its German neighbours would even now willingly see it become.' He had seen a beautifully | illuminated Štítný manuscript in Prague. Observing the omission of Mastičkář he merely commented that 'there are many good reasons for omitting it'. These were reasons of prurience of course. He praised *Baron Wenceslas* and mentioned Wratislaw's identification of the Cambridge MS of the Dalimil chronicle.

The review was headed by some general remarks about a surge of interest in Slav affairs consequent upon the Crimean War. In general, though, he was gloomy about the future of philological studies in England: 'How far Lord Ilchester's bequest to the University of Oxford is likely to improve this condition of affairs it would be impossible to predict... The English have never been called, even by their greatest admirers, a nation of philologists, and there are depressing influences at work. We shall probably for years to come have all our books on the science of language imported from Germany.'

Morfill returned to the subject of Czech literature in 1879, in an article for the *Westminster Review* called 'The Bohemians and Slovaks'.<sup>12</sup> Morfill considered the Czech national and literary resurgence to be 'one of the most remarkable phenomena of our

<sup>7</sup>Sir Charles Firth, *Modern Languages at Oxford 1724–1929*, 1929; also J. S. G. Simmons, *Notes on the Slavonic Collections in the Library of the Taylor Institution, Oxford*, Oxford 1969.

<sup>8</sup>'Prague, Thursday afternoon', LAPNP (all letters from Morfill in LAPNP unless otherwise stated).

<sup>9</sup>Fr. Zákřejs, 'Louis Leger', *Osvěta* 3ii, pp. 571–82.

<sup>10</sup>Morfill Coll.; K. Tieftrunk, *Dějiny Matice české*, 1881, p. 258.

<sup>11</sup>16.II.1878, p. 217; see G. Stone, 'Morfill and the Sorbs', *Oxford Slavonic Papers* new ser. 4 (1971), pp. 125–31.

<sup>12</sup>56 (1879), pp. 413–44.

---

own days.' He recorded the pessimism of Dobrovský about the future of | the language and Pelcl's comparison with the position of "Lusatian-Wendish" or "Sorbish" at Leipzig in the fourteenth century. Although still occasionally encountered in very third-hand non-Czech sources, this near-miracle view is scarcely propoundable today. p.212

Most of Morfill's article dealt with the pre-revival literature. His opinion on the MSS was further along the road to rejection than Wratisslaw's. He wrote that the 'Love Songs of King Wenceslaus' and 'Song on the Vyšehrad' have been 'ascertained to be spurious'. As for 'Libušin soud' he notes Šembera's view that it was the work of Linda and Hanka, quotes Dobrovský's warning to Bowring from the *Cheskian Anthology*, and concludes 'we must confess ourselves but half-satisfied with its genuineness.' On the Dvůr Králové MS, of which he gives some prose translations, he quotes such hostile arguments as their sentimental tone and anachronisms, as well as citing Josef and Hermenegild Jireček's defence in *Die Echtheit der Königinhofer Handschrift*. He does not himself regard them as of great value, beyond their supposed antiquity, 'nor can we see that Hanka (to judge from his acknowledged pieces) was incapable of forging them.' Remarking on the Mater Verborum forgeries investigated by Patera and Baum, he writes finally: 'A cloud rests upon the name | of the former librarian of the Museum, which does not seem likely to be removed.' p.213

He expresses his likes and dislikes for individual works of medieval literature in no uncertain terms. He has little time for the chronicles and legends. Dalimil, he calls a 'tedious and somewhat colourless production... The literatures of most European countries have productions of the same kind, destitute of poetical merit, but interesting to the philologist and antiquarian.' He notes the 'frantic hate of the Germans' it expresses and compares Přemysl with the Russian Mikula Selyaninovich and the Polish Piast; Rhys had found him among the Kelts. Similarly, the *Alexandreida* is declared: 'but poor stuff, and at best only a translation from the German or Latin.' He finds the Legend of St. Procopius 'also a very tedious poem,' which 'can only interest the antiquarian.' With considerable ingratitude he adds: 'It is a pity that Mr. Wratisslaw has wasted his time in giving translations from these.'

Morfill is fond of making vague comparisons with English medieval literature. For instance, he approves of 'Satiry o řemeslnících' and 'Desatero kázanie božie': 'Some of these pieces show a good deal of humour, and remind us of Dunbar and Lyndsay.' Smil Flaška's *Nová | rada* is for him just 'one of the innumerable beast-epics so much in vogue in the Middle Ages', but he likes 'Podkoní a žák' and compares Tkadleček to Skelton's *Garlande of Laurell*. Pride of place, however, is reserved for Thomas Štítný 'the great glory of Bohemian literature in the fourteenth century... we can see from his writings that Bohemian prose was developed at a time when our own was in but a rudimentary state. In some respects we might compare him as a theologian with our own Reginald Pecocke, who, however, flourished a century later than Štítný.' Through such references to English authors Morfill is certainly trying to invoke the sympathy of the English reader for an obscure subject, but some proper analysis of the particular qualities of the works so glibly compared would have been better by far than this name-dropping. p.214

He recommends Jireček's anthology of early Czech literature to any converts:<sup>13</sup> 'The goodly array of authors cited is quite enough to repel the sneers of the Germans, and those who, for political purposes, are willing to ignore the existence of a Bohemian literature.' As well as attacking the German attitude – and this he was to do constantly, and belligerently – he draws a parallel between the Counter-Reformation in Bohemia and the policies of the English in Ireland: 'We are reminded of the penal laws passed against the Irish language, and the extirpation of the native population in Ulster – one of the most iniquitous things in all history.' Morfill ends the article by sketching in the revival period. Noting Josef II's sweeping reforms, which ameliorated the condition of the Protestants, he attacks his Germanising policies: 'He did mischief, however, by endeavouring to regulate all the different nationalities which composed his dominions by a kind of procrustean bed, and in nothing did he fail more than in his attempt to Germanise Bohemia.' Discussing Kollár he returns to his quasi-comparative method, and compares his wild antiquarian and philological theorising to Donaldson's *Varronianus*, once a textbook. 'In the same way in England we have had our Keltomaniacs, and that the race is not extirpated our literary journals of three or four years ago would show.' *Slávy dcera* does not meet with approval, and in this Morfill strongly dissents from Bowring: 'we doubt whether it will meet with a favourable reception among foreigners.' Lastly he writes of the Germanisation and Magyarisation of the Slovaks. Listing the writers Hollý, Hodža, Chalupka and Sládkovič, he opposes their adoption of a new literary standard: 'The attempt to form a new literary language was, perhaps, on some grounds to be deplored. . . How long this small nationality will be able to resist Magyarisation is doubtful. If they unite with their brother Bohemians they are more likely to be successful.'

*Lumír* reported Morfill's article on Czech literature in 1879 in an article 'Angličan o Češích', but mistakenly attributed it to Jeremiah Curtin, former secretary at the American embassy in Petrograd, who later translated folk tales from Erben.<sup>14</sup>

In 1880 Morfill contributed a note on Slavonic studies in England to *Archiv für Slavische Philologie*.<sup>15</sup> In it he dismisses Bowring in bald terms: 'Bowring war ein oberflächlicher Mann, der nach dem eitlen Ruhme eines Universalphilologen strebte. . . Sein modus operandi war von der einfachsten Art: er arbeitete nach deutschen Uebersetzungen. . . Ich habe selbst verschiedenes der Art angemerkt, dessen Anführung den Leser zum Lachen bringen. . . Another passage relates that he and Wratismaw had searched together through the Zouch collection at Cambridge for a Slavonic item in 1877: 'doch fanden wir unter ihren Schätzen leider nicht die Bulgarische Chronik mit Illustrationen, von der die Herren Drinov | und Jireček sprechen. Wahrscheinlich liegt hier eine Verwechslung vor mit einer schönen Evangelien-handschrift, die Porträts eines bulgarischen Caren und seiner Familie enthält. . .'

Morfill contributed a further article to the *Westminster Review* on 'The Latest

<sup>13</sup>J. Jireček, *Anthologie ze staré literatury české*, 1860.

<sup>14</sup>7 (1879), p. 575; J. Curtin, *Myths and Folk-Tales of the Russians, Western Slavs, and Magyars*, Boston London 1890.

<sup>15</sup>4 (1880), pp. 349–52; ČČM 1828 sv. 3, pp. 132–6, in fact on the FQR article by Bowring.

---

Bohemian Literature' in 1881.<sup>16</sup> It once again attacks conventional English attitudes to the Slavs, particularly the habit of assuming them to make common cause with the Russian government, which was felt to constitute a military threat to British interests: 'His hatred of "Russian encroachment" prevents him from having sympathy with any other Slavonic race whatever. He has a vague idea that because their origin is the same, all these peoples speak a language mutually intelligible, and have a community of interest. Alas! had the Slavs in earlier days understood the importance of cohesion, their position in European politics at the present time would have been a very different one.' Czechs, he finds, are either mistaken for Germans, or shuddered at for their supposed Panslavism. He re-uses his Irish parallel to compare German and English racial prejudice: 'While writing these lines we are reminded of a conversation we once had with a German professor, who, expressing surprise that we took any interest in the subject, | added contemptuously, "You know, we Germans look upon these people as an inferior race, as you English consider the Irish."' Later the English are chided again, for overmuch favour to the Hungarians: 'In fact, the Magyar has been a little overpraised, and we have been told too much about his picturesque habits and fine, "inborn capacity for government", whatever that curious expression of the Turcophile may mean, which possibly, being interpreted, signifies a disposition to live luxuriously on the earnings of other people. In more Western parts of Europe we have not yet got rid of the interesting person who shows the "hereditary inborn capacity for government."' Morfill consistently connects the Czech and Slovak national movements with democratic aspirations, while dissociating them from Tsarist imperialism. p.218

In Czech poetry Morfill finds the lyric form dominant over the epic, and in this respect he compares the epic poems of Vrchlický, Zeyer and others with the similarly fragmented epic in recent English verse, citing Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*. Similarly he writes that 'the drama appears to be but poorly cultivated among them, as indeed is the case with us.' In fiction he finds the 'social romance or novel of domestic life' | predominant, despite some attempts to revive the historical genre like Zeyer's *Ondřej Černyšev*. Among the first genre he names Světlá's *Vesnický román*, the writings of Podlipská, Šmilovský's *Starý varhaník* and Martin Oliva, which he compares to Auerbach and Zschokke; and in the historical genre he lists works of Zeyer, Cidlinský and Vlček. (With the novels of Jirásek the historical novel had again come back to popularity.) p.219

Most of his attention is given over to poetry. Ignoring Mácha, as all the English writers managed to do, Morfill finds Erben a seminal figure: 'It is by Erben that the modern Bohemian poets have all, more or less, been inspired.' Here he contrasts the favour for the ballad form, and use of national legends, local colour and oral literature with the English position, which he regrets: 'Among our own people popular poetry, in the true sense of the word, is dead; we have nothing but the swashbuckler patriotism and mawkish sentimentality of the music-halls.' The Czechs he says 'have not yet become prey to the "Vulture whose wings are dull realities", as Edgar Allan Poe wrote.

His quasi-comparative method is again employed generously. After Erben's 'great sweetness and national | colouring' he goes on to Hálek, who, as a narrative poet, is p.220

---

<sup>16</sup>116 (1881), pp. 372–91.

compared to Tennyson, with the ‘dreaminess and mysticism of Krasinski’; Manfred and Faust are also invoked. In Hálek’s lyrical verse he observes a ‘considerable descriptive power, with strong subjective tendencies,’ and he compares him, along with Neruda (‘a meditative and subjective poet’), to the school of Wordsworth; he suggests as another parallel the ‘Waldeinsamkeit of the Germans.’ Krásnohorská is made a Mrs. Hemans, but stronger and bolder. When he comes to Heyduk (‘according to some Bohemian critics the greatest of their modern lyric poets’), he notes the inspiration of the South and adduces Byron and Shelley. He approves of his avoiding the ‘fallacy of using the Slovakish dialect’ though a Slovak by birth,\* and comments that he is ‘full of patriotism’ and ‘grapples with the insolence of the Magyars.’

\* Not in fact Slovak: born at Rychmburk near Skuteč in the Česko-moravská vrchovina.

Special personal favour seems to be reserved, however, for Sládek and more particularly Vrchlický. He marks down Sládek’s American experience as a formative influence: ‘He has seen the development of manly aspirations in a more ample domain than the Austro-Hungarian Empire, with its narrow and sectarian jealousies, and its military instincts can show him.’ On Vrchlický’s ‘Sandalfon’ he writes, perhaps copying  
 p.221 | Schulz in the London *Athenaeum*,<sup>17</sup> that ‘Everywhere the poet is in the dreamland of ideals: but the love of woman is the central power of his dreams.’ He shows great promise, he thinks, and may rank in future with Pushkin and Mickiewicz, with an imagination worthy of Keats, a fulness of vocabulary reminding of some of the best of William Morris. He is apt to become imitative being young, he says, and identifies traits of Hugo, Musset, Banville, Shelley and Swinburne.

As in the first *Westminster Review* article Morfill is far too ready to indulge in name-dropping, when a thorough analysis with specimens would be more welcome. In some cases, notably Vrchlický’s, his judgments do nevertheless give the impression of being based on an actual reading, and he was quite probably the first Englishman to know some of the verses of these poets at first hand.

Morfill’s library contains works published before 1881 personally inscribed by Neruda, Heyduk, Čech, Sládek and Vrchlický. At least one of these was certainly received before Morfill’s article on the recent literature: Sládek’s *Jiskry na moři* inscribed  
 p.222 9th February 1880.<sup>18</sup> Some were perhaps sent after the publication of the article. |

The praise of Vrchlický elicited a letter from the poet in the summer of 1882. Morfill replied in July, having just returned from ‘a tour in Spain’, and was fulsome again in his praises. He regarded him as a poet of real European stature: ‘I have been very much pleased with your writings and should count myself happy, if I were able to make them better known to my countrymen, which I shall seek all opportunities of doing. The only reason that you have not been more widely known out of Bohemia is that unfortunately the Čech language is so little studied. But your books will do a great deal to make people of foreign countries desire to learn it.’<sup>19</sup> He acknowledged the gift of Vrchlický’s newly published versions of Victor Hugo, ‘whose poems I admire very

<sup>17</sup>25.XII.1880, pp. 842–3: see text p. 268.

<sup>18</sup>Morfill Coll.

<sup>19</sup>17.VII.1882.



---

much', and marvelled at the prolific scale of his output: 'I am quite astonished how you can find time for so much production, and now, as the paper shews me, you are a candidate for the honours of dramatic composition! You have done a great deal in so short a time. I am flattered that my article should have pleased you – unfortunately it was full of misprints for all Čech words are printed here in a terrible manner.'

In 1885 Morfill thanked Vrchlický for another | present, his collection *Perspektivy*, and lauded his linguistic virtuosity and service to his nation: 'You shew in this, as in your other works, a great fertility of expression and we can see how flexible and harmonious the Čech language can be made by one who is acquainted with all its resources. I congratulate you and hope that you may produce many more works to the glory of your own name and that of the long-suffering Bohemian nation, for which better days are in store, as we can plainly see.'<sup>20</sup> p.223

Another thank-you letter in 1888 continued the seemingly mutual chain of sweet compliment: 'The vigour of your pen shews no relaxation and by your writings and those of others, but especially yours, the Čech language shews itself capable of the highest efforts of poetry. I have been comparing the vision of Dante with the original and find it very close and musical... In the inscription to the books you speak very kindly of me as a friend of the Čech muse:- perhaps I may claim some part of that title. Quod potui, feci... I have always tried to bring [the Čechs] forward as much as possible, and latterly when I wrote the articles on the Slavonic literatures for the Encyclopaedia Britannica I took care that Bohemia | should have a good amount of space, and I told the English of you and your doings – I hope to write a good deal more on the subject, so that I will take with pleasure the kindly title you gave me. I have also spoken with sympathy of the Bohemian national struggles in some articles which I have communicated to the English Historical Review. With many thanks for your interesting books and a hearty hand-shake across the water.'<sup>21</sup> p.224

Morfill's article on the Slavs in the Ninth Edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* included a section on Czech literature, and he wrote separate articles on Palacký and Šafárik.<sup>22</sup> This account represented, however, no particular advance over the pieces already produced for the *Westminster Review*, though they might claim a larger audience. It is notable that Mácha is still not mentioned. In the previous year, 1886, Morfill had begun a series of Slavonic book reviews for the *English Historical Review*. These included some books on Czech or Czech-related themes: De Schweinitz's *The History of the Church known as the Unitas Fratrum*, noticed in 1886,<sup>23</sup> and Charvériat's *Les Affaires Religieuses en Bohême au Seizième Siècle* in 1888.<sup>24</sup>

In 1894 Morfill thanked Vrchlický for his *Moderní | básnici francouzšti*, and praised as usual his skill in handling the language: 'You have greatly developed the poetical capacities of the Čech language and I am amazed at the dexterity with which you

 p.225

---

<sup>20</sup> 1.V.1885.

<sup>21</sup> 16.III.1888.

<sup>22</sup> 'Slavs', vol. 22, Edinburgh 1887, pp. 151–3; 'Palacký' vol. 18, 1885, p. 142; 'Schafarik' vol. 21, 1886, p. 386.

<sup>23</sup> 1 (1886), pp. 793–8.

<sup>24</sup> 3 (1888), pp. 172–4.

handle it. One can see how fine and expressive a language it is, when properly managed...<sup>25</sup> In the same year Morfill provided a letter of introduction to Vrchlický for the music critic William H. Hadow of Oxford, whom he described as a ‘great admirer of Slavonic music and popular literature’ who ‘would like very much to make your acquaintance, as the foremost poet of the Čechs.’<sup>26</sup> Hadow was likewise furnished with an introduction to Vojta Náprstek.<sup>27</sup> Hadow, later Sir William Hadow, was one of the propagators of Antonín Dvořák’s music in England, to which he devoted a chapter in his *Studies in Modern Music* (volume two, 1895). After the visit Morfill thanked Vrchlický for his hospitality: ‘In a short note which I received from my friend, Mr. Hadow, he wrote with great enthusiasm of the kindness he had experienced at Prague, and I must thank you heartily for your amiability to him. He is a nice young man, full of enthusiasm for music, and I hope his talent has been stimulated in Bohemia, the home of music.’<sup>28</sup> Strangely this is the only English meeting-point between | Czech music and Czech literature to be recorded in this narrative, although the music was popular and the literature quite obscure.

p.226

Morfill’s reputation as the number-one English Slavist was used on occasion to lend the weight of authority to literary judgments. A review of Krásnohorská’s translation from Byron *Child Haroldova pouť* in *Lumír* during 1890 wrote: ‘Zde teprv vidíme, čeho náš jazyk jest schopen. Neříkáme to sami, ale uvádíme jenom výrok anglického slavisty prof. Morfila [sic], jenž praví: „Jaký to rozdíl mezi jazykem českým nynějším a tím, jímž psáno v letech dvacátých a třicátých. Co do ohebnosti a schopnosti k výrazu poetickému rovná se teď jazyk český každému jinému jazyku v Evropě.“<sup>29</sup>

p.227

Vrchlický wrote to Goll in the same year, on his own translations from Poe *Havran a jiné básně*, using Morfill the Englishman as ballast in the scales against the young writers of the nineties: ‘Musíme být ovšem připraveni, že nám Moderna vynadá, neboť jejich zásadou jest, že se má *poesie* překládat *prózou*: tak strhal zase ondy Kárásek mého Poea v Literárních listech, ač anglický slavista Morfill byl docela jiného mínění. Ale kdo by toho dbal, když a dokud chce a může něco dělat.’<sup>30</sup> Such pious respect for an English opinion | was surely out of all proportion to the modest information-purveying and gentle comparisons with English authors exhibited by Morfill’s articles on Czech literature.

Vrchlický was not Morfill’s only or most long-lasting Czech correspondent. In 1883 a new correspondence began between Morfill and the historian Josef Kalousek, a friend of Count Lützow and also in touch with Wratislaw. Letters were exchanged until 1908, shortly before Morfill’s death, and Kalousek became a cornerstone in Morfill’s scholarly Czech relations.

Kalousek himself set the ball rolling, probably as a result of Morfill’s article on early

<sup>25</sup>20.VIII.1894.

<sup>26</sup>19.VI.1894; on Hadow see *DNB*.

<sup>27</sup>Morfill to V. Náprstek, 19.VI.1894; archiv Náprstkova muzea.

<sup>28</sup>20.VIII.1894.

<sup>29</sup>1890, p. 192.

<sup>30</sup>V. Stupka, ‘Vrchlický a Goll, překladatelé Baudelaira’, *Sborník Společnosti J. Vrchlického* 10 (1930/31), p. 97, cited by J. Levý, *České theorie překladu*, 1957, p. 193.

---

Czech literature, when he sent an article of his 'Über den Umfang des böhmischen Reiches unter Boleslav II'. Morfill's reply is in English, like all his letters to Czechs so far located, and he excuses himself for this: 'although familiar with the German and Čech languages, I have thought that I could express myself better in my own.'<sup>31</sup> In his second letter he asked Kalousek to write to him in Czech, which he did,<sup>32</sup> and continued: 'in the Winter Term I hope to give some lectures before the University of Oxford on old Slavonic law, in which of course I shall | not forget Ondřej z Dubé and other works.' He sent Kalousek some of his own articles on Slavonic themes (from the *Westminster Review*), but spoke of them with self-deprecatory modesty: 'I am afraid that you will find them very rudimentary, merely *ébauches*, as the French say, but there is great ignorance on Slavonic subjects in this country and (I am afraid) not much interest felt. I have done what I could for the Slavonic cause, for I believe the Slavs have a great future before them.' In Czech literature, Morfill never got beyond such 'ébauches'. The Czech grammar of 1899 was the one more weighty achievement, and that contained such errors as to gravely reduce its usefulness. p.228

Kalousek reviewed Morfill's first *Westminster Review* article in *Osvěta*.<sup>33</sup> He was justly perturbed by Morfill's dismissive remarks about much of the medieval literature ('není pochlebníkem'), but was somewhat mollified by the praise lavished on Štítný. Morfill thanked him for his on the whole favourable notice in November 1883. Here he provides further evidence that the sequel article had been assisted, or even prompted, by the receipt of various contemporary authors' works: 'Since writing the article on Bohemian poetry, I have made acquaintance with many | of the works of the new school of Čech poets, not mentioned in Jiřeček [sic], such as Vrchlický (Frida), Heyduk, Zeyer, Čech and others, many of whom kindly sent me their works.'<sup>34</sup> Morfill also wrote that he had 'been already informed by Sládek that the Bohemian poets are very dissatisfied with the account... of them' in Pypin and Spasovich's *Исторія Славянскихъ Литературъ* (St. Petersburg 1879–80). p.229

A weak acquiescence in the same letter to Kalousek's views about Šembera is merely a way of avoiding a real discussion of the MSS controversy: 'I quite see that in the latter part of his life Šembera gave himself up to many prejudices and had lost the vigour of his intellect.' None of the English commentators felt able to enter this arena with any confidence, nor were they at all competent to do so.

Morfill published his series of *Westminster Review* articles on the Slavonic literatures in book form. Kalousek reviewed *Slavonic Literature* in October 1884 in *Pokrok*, commenting that he had read the passages on the MSS most eagerly, 'nebot p. Morfill před pěti léty ve „Westminster Review“ vydal rozpravu o literatuře české, kdež dosti zjevně přidával se k těm, kdož tyto památky pokládají za padělané.'<sup>35</sup> In fact, an examination of the chapter | reveals that Morfill had not reversed his inclinations, since it was only p.230

---

<sup>31</sup>13.IV.1883; *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. böhm. Ges. d. Wissenschaften*, 1883.

<sup>32</sup>27.IV.1883.

<sup>33</sup>1883 díl 2, pp. 1039–40.

<sup>34</sup>21.XI.1883.

<sup>35</sup>14.X.1884; *Slavonic Literature*, 1883.

a slightly altered version of the original article.

The correspondence of the next few years was mostly concerned with exchanges of books, articles, and information of a miscellaneous nature: Kalousek sent Morfill the parts of Bačkovský's *Zevrubné dějiny písemnictví českého doby nové* (1885–7) as they appeared, and also his articles on the MS disputes in *Osvěta*.<sup>36</sup>

A new connection was established in 1889 between an English historian and the Czech nationalists through Morfill's offices. In September a colleague of his at Oxford Edward A. Freeman, Professor of Modern History, published a short article in the *Manchester Guardian* on 'The Crown of Bohemia', favourable to Czech national rights.<sup>37</sup> Morfill sent a copy to Kalousek, and Kalousek reported on it in *Hlas Národa*.<sup>38</sup> He asked Morfill in his next letter whether it might be a good idea to send this person some literature and arrange for him to receive a regular copy of a political daily.<sup>39</sup> Morfill replied telling him that Freeman was 'a great friend of mine and a thorough Slavophile... I have continually urged him to employ his powerful pen in the interests of the Slavs, and he has done good service.'<sup>40</sup> Kalousek then wrote | to Freeman himself in November saying that he had contacted the editor of *Politik*, the German-language organ of the National Party, to have it sent to him free.<sup>41</sup> He also sent Freeman some of his own works, including *Einige Grundlager des böhmischen Staatsrechtes*.

In the same year Morfill became Reader in Russian at the Taylor Institution. At the end of 1890 he was proposed, and elected, as a corresponding member of the *Královská česká společnost nauk*, at Kalousek's suggestion.<sup>42</sup> In 1892 Kalousek sent Morfill the second edition of *České státní právo*, a work central to his nationalist thinking. Morfill wrote that he had been lecturing on the Czechs: 'I have already given a public lecture in the University on the Bohemians and hope to give another shortly.'<sup>43</sup>

Morfill completed a history of Poland for the series 'The Story of the Nations' in 1893 and sent Kalousek a copy.<sup>44</sup> His history of Russia in the same series had already appeared in 1885.<sup>45</sup> Kalousek praised the volume on Poland as a good general account avoiding too much detail and voiced a hope to see a similar work on the Czechs.<sup>46</sup> As it happened, however, the volume on Bohemia, published in 1896, was commissioned from the historian Charles E. Maurice.<sup>47</sup> It is clear that Morfill had entertained hopes of writing this volume also. He | wrote to Kalousek of his 'O staročeském právě dědickém'

<sup>36</sup>See Morfill to Kalousek 9.VIII.1885, 21.X.1885, 9.XI.1885, 18.XI.1885, 31.V, 10.VIII, 2.IX, and 26.XI.1886, postmark 6.V.1887, 14.VI.1888; carbon copy Kalousek to Morfill 19.VI.1888, LAPNP.

<sup>37</sup>23.IX.1889, p. 8.

<sup>38</sup>See Morfill to Kalousek 31.X.1889, 9.X.1889.

<sup>39</sup>Kalousek to Morfill, carbon 17.X.1889, LAPNP.

<sup>40</sup>31.X.1889.

<sup>41</sup>Carbon 6.XI.1889, LAPNP.

<sup>42</sup>Návrh členství, Prague 3.XII.1890, KČSN Osobní spisy, Ústřední archiv Akademie věd, Prague; see Morfill to Kalousek 21.I.1891.

<sup>43</sup>11.XI.1892.

<sup>44</sup>1893, 2nd ed. 1923.

<sup>45</sup>2nd ed. 1904.

<sup>46</sup>Kalousek to Morfill, copy 18.IV.1893, LAPNP.

<sup>47</sup>*Bohemia*, 1896, 2nd ed. 1922.

---

that it 'contains a quantity of valuable matter of which I hope to avail myself, if I can induce the publishers of the Series of the "Story of the Nations" to include a history of Bohemia, which certainly ought to be written, if it were only that English readers should be able to understand the country not seen merely from a German standpoint.'<sup>48</sup> Later Morfill wrote again: 'Unfortunately I can't yet persuade the publishers of the "Story of the Nations" to admit Bohemia into the series...'<sup>49</sup> The same letter incidentally mentioned a public lecture he was to give at Oxford on 'the Hussite movement as illustrated by Bohemian literature.'

Another correspondent of Morfill's in the eighteen nineties and after was the Czech folklorist, ethnographer and historical bibliographer Čeněk Zíbrt. Most of the communications were in postcard form and dealt with gifts of books. At the beginning of 1892 Morfill received Zíbrt's *Dějiny kroje v zemích českých od dob nejstarších až do války husitské*,<sup>50</sup> which he reviewed later that year in the *Academy*.<sup>51</sup> The following year in December he drew attention in the *Academy* to the journal of Czech ethnography *Český lid*, founded by Zíbrt, which he was now being sent regularly.<sup>52</sup> In 1896 the receipt of Zíbrt's *Bibliografický | přehled českých národních písní* aroused some comment from Morfill anent Bowring's translations of Czech folk songs in the *Cheskian Anthology* listed in the bibliography (he also thanked Zíbrt for some 'interesting folk-lore notes from Chanovský and Jeník'): 'I must however candidly acknowledge that I do not like the translations of Bowring. He is altogether too free and expands the original too much. Sometimes he seems to me to mistake the sense of the original. From some of his translations from Kollár in his "Cheskian Anthology", as he calls it – you can see that he is working from a German translation.'<sup>53</sup> Altogether twenty-four postcards and letters from Morfill to Zíbrt survive amongst Zíbrt's papers,<sup>54</sup> but they are far less substantial than those to Kalousek which perforce form the backbone of the present account.

p.233

During the last decade or so of the century one or two new writers began to enter the very sparsely populated field of Czech literary and historical studies in England, and one of the first signs of competition, if that is not too strong an expression, was the failure of Morfill to secure the commission for the volume on Bohemia in the series of 'The Story of the Nations'. |

p.234

Another author James Baker was to become a prolific writer of travel articles and books about Bohemia. In October 1894 Morfill reviewed his solidly produced *Pictures from Bohemia* in the *Academy*,<sup>55</sup> and in 1895 his book on Payne, the English Wycliffite and follower of Hus, entitled *A Forgotten Great Englishman*.<sup>56</sup> Morfill criticised Baker's

---

<sup>48</sup>17.V.1894; 'O staročeském...', *Rozpravy I. tř. České akademie*, 1894.

<sup>49</sup>3.XI.1894.

<sup>50</sup>Morfill to Zíbrt 29.II.1892, misdated '1891'.

<sup>51</sup>42 (17.IX.1892), pp. 232–3.

<sup>52</sup>'Slavica', 44 (16.XII.1893), pp. 548–9; Morfill to Zíbrt 13.XII.1893, 8.I.1894.

<sup>53</sup>17.III.1896.

<sup>54</sup>29.II.1891 – 7.II.1906.

<sup>55</sup>46 (27.X.1894), pp. 324–5.

<sup>56</sup>47 (23.III.1895), p. 252.

use of German names in place of Czech, calling him ‘saturated with Germanisms’, and also observed that this was not as claimed the first English work on Payne because he had mentioned him in his own *Slavonic Literature*.

In 1896 there appeared two works on the history of Bohemia, where previously there had been none in English at all. One was the volume by Charles E. Maurice in ‘The Story of the Nations’ series, the other Count Lützow’s *Bohemia, an Historical Sketch*.<sup>57</sup> Both presumably had to compete for the same market, and both also survived to be reprinted, although Lützow’s is the better known today. These, together with Lützow’s other works and James Baker’s, began what may justifiably perhaps be termed a new wave of English Bohemica extending up to the Great War and the establishment of an independent Czechoslovak Republic.

p.235 Morfill reviewed Lützow’s book approvingly in the *Academy* in June 1896,<sup>58</sup> and Maurice’s less approvingly | in September.<sup>59</sup> Kalousek divided the honours more equally in his review for *Osvěta*.<sup>60</sup>

At the beginning of 1897 Morfill was asked by Kalousek if he would write a contribution to a memorial volume of essays on František Palacký. He replied favourably: ‘The subject, I think, which I could handle to the best advantage would be the importance of the History of Palacký as *revealing* to the West of Europe and to outsiders generally – the existence of a real Bohemian (Čech) nation, which had been hidden temporarily under the German japanning which it had undergone.’<sup>61</sup> Kalousek liked the idea and suggested that Palacký’s whole literary and political activity, and not only his *Dějiny* should be reviewed for the article: ‘onť byl vůdcem při volbách sněmovních 1848 a opět 1861, kteréž ukázaly světu, že pod německým nátěrem žije v Čechách a v Moravě národ český, slovanský, který chce žítí vlastním životem. V tom ohledu nejdůležitější skutek Palackého jest tuším jeho psaní do Frankfurta z 11. dubna 1848, kterým postavil se proti volbám do parlamentu německého. . . ’<sup>62</sup>

p.236 Morfill subsequently wrote enclosing the article, which Kalousek then translated into Czech.<sup>63</sup> Morfill talked of the difficulties of publishing articles on the Czechs in England, although, as he claimed, ‘among the | liberals in this country (and indeed among all educated men) there is much sympathy with the Čechs.’ He continued a little boastfully: ‘I have often however written an article and not been able to get it inserted, but I may boldly say always when you see in any of our literary journals a favourable notice of Bohemian matters, *it is by me*.’<sup>64</sup> This was not so.

Kalousek’s reply, preserved in a carbon copy of the typescript, lifted the correspondence into a more lively and topical realm. He began by thanking Morfill for the essay, one phrase of which would have to be altered for prudency’s sake where Morfill had

<sup>57</sup>London, New York 1896.

<sup>58</sup>49 (13.VI.1896), p. 483.

<sup>59</sup>50 (5.IX.1896), pp. 156–7.

<sup>60</sup>1896 díl 2, pp. 969–75.

<sup>61</sup>11.III.1897.

<sup>62</sup>13.III.1897, LAPNP, carbon.

<sup>63</sup>3.IX.1897.

<sup>64</sup>Same.

---

written 'after the fatal union with the Habsburgs'. He continued: 'O obtížích, s jakými takové snahy potkávají se u anglického obecnstva, vyprávěl mi nedávno také p. hrabě Lützow, jehož knihu o české historii jste recenzoval.'<sup>65</sup> The English and French, Kalousek agreed, had until recently used German spectacles with which to view the Czechs, but he thought he saw some change in this. He recommended writing a full and detailed topical account of all the language and constitutional struggles between the Germans and Czechs, a subject which he thought would attract a good readership:<sup>66</sup>

Bylo by zábavno i poučno, kdyby někdo tento odvěký zápas českoněmecký objasnil Angličanům na | letošních bouřlivých příkladech: kterak jazyková nařízení, jimiž hr. Badeni poskytuje Čechům nový kousek rovného práva, ale Němcům ponechává ještě hodný kus nadpráví, vyhlašována jsou od Němců za útisk nesnesitelný a za hrozný útok na národnost německou, a kterak v říšské radě, když většina snaží se zabrániti, aby menšina pustým randalováním nemařila všelikou činnost, k níž ten parlament zřízen jest, menšina to vyhlašuje za nezákonnost a za ohavnost prý neslýchanou. Věrné vylíčení těchto jazykových a ústavních zápasů muselo by bavit vzdálené nepředpojaté čtenářstvo; ale authentický materiál, kterého k tomu by bylo potřebí, tuším sotva bude v Oxfordě na snadě.

p.237

Kalousek felt that this kind of subject matter, topical and political, was more likely to gain readers and win friends for the Czechs than scholarly antiquarianism, or so he indicated.

Morfill's essay in the *Památník Fr. Palackého* turns out to be only a rather general tribute, and is less informative than the contributions by Maurice and Lützow.<sup>67</sup> He notes that the English on the whole concern themselves little with foreign languages, and that to arouse their attention it is necessary to do more than point to a glorious literature in the past. The existence of German editions of Palacký's history, and of Šafárik's *Starožitnosti*, made their work accessible to the rest of Europe. They provide a picture of how the Czechs struggled for religious and civic freedoms and defended their constitution and language at an early period. He notes Palacký's service in revealing the period of Jiří z Poděbrad to Europe almost for the | first time. Palacký shows for Morfill how almost all that is worthy of memory in his country is Slav or such that it naturally opposed trends of Germanisation. He is a prophet and interpreter of his people to the rest of Europe, as well as to themselves.

p.238

Some time before Morfill had commenced work on another book, which, if it had been well carried out, could have been very useful: 'You will perhaps be surprised when I tell you that I have for some time been working at and hope to publish before long a grammar of the Bohemian language for Englishmen. I have accumulated a great

---

<sup>65</sup>7.IX.1897, LAPNP, carbon.

<sup>66</sup>Same.

<sup>67</sup>'Palacký a Evropa', in *Památník na oslavu stých narozenin Františka Palackého*, Prague 1898; in same: C. E. Maurice, 'Kterak pohlíží anglický historik na dílo Palackého'; Count Lützow, 'Několik zmínek o Palackém ve spisích anglických spisovatelů' (all translated from English).

deal of matter, and have plenty of books to consult, among others the *Vergleichende Gram.* of Miklosich and the two volumes which have appeared of Gebauer's great work.<sup>68</sup> Kalousek responded with his opinion of what a practical grammar should try to achieve, and how contemporary school grammars of the language failed to do this. It was a partial attack on the diachronic approach: 'Čeští filologové myslí, že do grammatik psaných pro střední školy musejí dávatí také všeliké vědecké objevy, které samy v sobě ovšem jsou dobré a záslužné, ale hodí se jenom pro filologické theoretiky. Grammatiky české v posledních 50 letech vždy více odstrašují žáky a odvracují od studia jazyka českého. I rodilý Čech se zhrozí, když vidí v deklinaci substantiv asi 20 paradigmát, a v konjugaci chaos doprosta nepřehledný. Dle mého mínění jest toho pilná potřeba, aby grammatika pro praktickou potřebu opět se zjednodušila, počet paradigmát měl by se co nejvíce zmenšiti, odchylky od nich měly by se uváděti jakožto výjimky, tak jak se zdarem děje se ku př. v grammatice latinské, třeba by se to i nesrovnávalo s vysokou filologickou vědou a jejími novými výzkumy. . . ale u českých filologů panuje dosud směr opačný.'<sup>69</sup> He considered this approach still more advisable in a grammar for foreigners.

Morfill's *Grammar of the Bohemian or Čech Language* was published early in 1899. He wrote to Vrchlický in February: 'I sent a copy of my grammar to Mr. J. V. Sládek. . . I hope the little grammar may do good. The Čechs will soon have a desperate contest with the Germans, and it may pick up a few friends for them. I should be ashamed to tell you what absurd ideas prevail in this country about the Bohemian language. I have more than once been asked whether it was not – a *German dialect*.<sup>70</sup> And he wrote to Zíbrt: 'I requested the authorities of the Press here to send you a copy of my little Bohemian grammar. . . I was pleased at having a very kind letter about it from Count Lützow.'<sup>71</sup>

The grammar was reviewed in Bohemia by Zíbrt in the *Museum* journal,<sup>72</sup> Kalousek in *Hlas Národa*,<sup>73</sup> Mourek in *Osvěta*,<sup>74</sup> and by a writer in *Politik* (review untraced). The English anonymous review in the *Athenaeum*, very probably Lützow again by Mourek, according to the annotated volume in the City University Library, London,<sup>75</sup> regards the work, as Morfill did, as another plank in the pro-Czech platform: 'Whoever considers how very slowly in the West right notions of the Slavonic East find admittance, and how difficult it is to fight against the disparaging and widely spread representatives of the Germans – further, whoever takes into account the antipathy against the Slavonic world which is likely to prevail in England in consequence of political rivalry – will see what an important step Mr. Morfill has succeeded in taking. This new result of his many years of effort against almost insurmountable obstacles ought to be welcomed.'

<sup>68</sup>To Kalousek 3.IX.1897.

<sup>69</sup>7.IX.1897.

<sup>70</sup>24.II.1899.

<sup>71</sup>6.III.1899.

<sup>72</sup>ČČM 73 (1899), pp. 460–2.

<sup>73</sup>28.II.1899.

<sup>74</sup>1899, 1, pp. 275–7.

<sup>75</sup>3.VI.1899, pp. 684–5.



---

This reviewer mentioned the occurrence of wrong or misplaced diacritics, but Morfill was more disturbed by the notice in *Politik*, which he reacted to with some alarm in a letter to Kalousek: 'I welcome all honest criticism. As you are well acquainted with the English language, I venture to ask if you will send me on a piece of paper a notice of any of the grosser mistakes which you have found in my book. The writer in *Politik* | talks about "mancher Irrthum". Of course I have been for many years a student of "Slavistik" and am anxious not to make gross blunders.'<sup>76</sup> He pleaded the inevitability of misprints and defended his original aims. It was not intended to be a 'grammar for conversation' but a scholarly work demonstrating the high culture of Bohemia and the Slavs (strange that a grammar should be seen as a work of propaganda):<sup>77</sup> p.241

I see that some of the reviews talk about its not being a grammar for conversation but that was not at all my object. No Englishman will ever take the trouble to learn conversational Bohemian, and if he did, it would not serve your cause. My object, if you will pardon my boldness of language, was to lift the Čech language out of the mud. In this country it is considered either the talk of the gypsies (!! ) or a dialect of German (!! ) or if anybody knows that it is Slavonic, it is supposed to be a vulgar patois spoken only by clowns and common people. I wished to shew (1st.) that it is an old dignified language (2ndly.) that it has a very curious and valuable old literature (3rdly.) that it was developed for literature at a very early period (e.g. Štítýn in the 14th. cent.) (4thly.) that it is a well-constructed logical and expressive language (it was for this reason that I quoted Sládek's translation of Coleridge) (5thly.) that it is well worth studying for the purposes of comparative Philology. My whole object was, if I may so speak, to give the language an *Academic Status*. Hence the frequent citations of Greek and Latin to shew the Englishman how this rich and logical old language was in harmony with the Aryan system. The book being printed at the Univ. Press increases this significance. Whether I have done it well or not is another question – but this was the thing to *be done* – *Linguae Bohemicae inter primas Europae linguas civitatem dare*. Any notes you can send me I shall welcome and I hope to have a second edition.

Kalousek answered at great length, on ten sides | of typewritten paper, with detailed lists of errors and suggested emendations.<sup>78</sup> He dissented over the point that the critics had mistaken the purpose, observing that this was not entirely the impression the book gave by its format: 'Avšak cvičení přidaná ve Vaší knize ku překládání z jednoho jazyka do druhého přece ukazují, že chcete podávati návod ne-li k mluvení, aspoň ku porozumění jazyku českému psanému. Pročež dle mého mínění měla by mluvnická pravidla býti doprovázena vokabulemi a cvičeními v postupu methodickém asi tak, jak se to nachází v grammatikách latinských a řeckých, kterých

---

<sup>76</sup>27.VI.1899.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid.

<sup>78</sup>24–26.VII.1899, LAPNP, carbon.

se užívá v našich gymnasiích.' He noted generally a superabundance of printing errors ('přílišné množství chyb tiskových') and gave up trying to record every one: 'Vůbec podotýkám, že chyb ve znaménkách nad písmeny jest v té knize na sta, pročez ani se nepokouším vytknouti takové chyby.' He thought, rightly, that the proofs should have been sent to Bohemia for correction, to Sládek, or Mourek, as a philologist and respecter of Morfill's work. No Czech would be surprised, he added, to find he had made mistakes arising from the closeness of the other Slavonic languages: 'A ježto Vy pěstujete všechny jazyky slovanské, není divu, že se Vám časem jeden s druhým plete.' p.243 He returned to | the problem of the practical as against the scholarly historical grammar in the letter. He regarded Miklošič's as too scholarly for practical purposes, and it was for the same reason that Hattala's was not used in schools: 'Gebauerova mluvnice školská jest sice rovněž toho způsobu vědeckého a pedantsky systematického, ale také není v českých gymnasiích žádná druhá kniha, která by se žákům tak ošklivila, jako česká mluvnice, a proto také výsledek v žádném jiném učebném předměte není tak neuspokojivý, jako v češtině: málo který absolvent českého gymnasia umí po česku psáti bez hrubých chyb mluvnických a pravopisných. Tím méně se hodí ten učený system pro cizince.'<sup>79</sup>

Morfill replied in August to this devastating letter from Kalousek, which by uncovering so much inaccuracy in the execution of the grammar, cast doubt on its value as a teaching tool. What might have been a basically sound, even if in Kalousek's view somewhat misconceived work was spoiled by carelessness. Morfill expressed himself rather sweepingly about mere conversational grammars:<sup>80</sup>

The object of my book is purely scholastic. It is to introduce Čech into lectures on Comparative Slavonic Philology. I never had the idea of writing a practical conversational grammar for which I have not the requisite knowledge, although I have read Bohemian for many years. Certainly the University of Oxford would require a higher standard. Such books | are no doubt very useful with dialogues enabling foreigners to order their dinner etc. but they are hardly University text-books. My book is on comparative lines...As a member of this University I want to get Čech studied as a literary language – hence my book – a modest compilation to supply the want of a text-book, and, excepting a few misprints, a *philologically* sound book!...I have never met any Englishman besides myself who had studied the Čech language – even Mr. James Baker who had travelled so much in Bohemia and has written well about the country does not know it. Of course my friend, the late Mr. Wratislaw, is not a case in point. He was of Bohemian descent and felt the truth of the saying of the ancients *Antiquam exquirite matrem*. It will be a long time before an Englishman (I grieve to say) will attempt colloquial Bohemian.

p.244

<sup>79</sup>Ibid.

<sup>80</sup>13.VIII.1899.

---

A letter from Morfill to Count Lützow in 1899 thanked him for his *History of Bohemian Literature*.<sup>81</sup> In the letter he mentioned his friendship with Wratislaw: 'I have worked at Čech for many years but have found but little encouragement hitherto. While Wratislaw was alive I had a sympathetic friend – We frequently corresponded.'<sup>82</sup> A review of Lützow's book in the *Athenaeum* is probably by Morfill,<sup>83</sup> since both letter and review mention Wratislaw and his account of Harant's travels.<sup>84</sup> Of Wratislaw the reviewer in the *Athenaeum* wrote: 'Unfortunately, he too often allowed the zeal of the philologist to overpower the requirements of verse. He succeeded in showing that the Bohemians had a considerable literature at that time, but did not perhaps allure the general public to make themselves acquainted with it. Morfill's anti- | German views are clearly expressed as elsewhere: 'Woe, indeed, to the smaller nationalities! A short time ago we were reading a manual of German history in which one of the compilers expressed, as a Teuton, a regret that the Germans did not in old time make short work with all these small Slavonic peoples.'

p.245

Morfill made a last reference to his grammar to Zíbrt in February 1900. His remarks are suitably modest and a little nervous: 'Thanks also for reviewing my little grammar. I hope you have not been too severe on its errors – My object in writing it was to have a book to use with my pupils in reading some of the old Bohemian literature and working at Bohemian philology.'<sup>85</sup>

In the same year Kalousek gave Morfill a little article he had written on the English Christmas carol 'Good King Wenceslas' estimating it to be about five hundred years old.<sup>86</sup> In fact it was of nineteenth-century origin, as Morfill observed in his reply, and now it was Kalousek's turn to feel disconcerted.<sup>87</sup> A draft copy of Kalousek's reply exclaimed 'Tak se člověk může mýlit při domněnce, založené jenom na kombinacích!'<sup>88</sup> A later letter, still puzzled, returned to the subject, after duly congratulating Morfill on his promotion in 1900 to | Professor of Russian and the Slavonic Languages: 'Jest mi ovšem podivno, že by v národě tak konservativním [sic] jako jest Váš národ Anglický, při obvyklém oslavování svátků vánočních mohla se ujmout píseň nová, týkající se historické osoby jinonárodní, Angličanům zcela cizí.'<sup>89</sup> He was wrong about the supposed conservatism, which was just a myth: the English had after all adopted the Christmas tree from Germany and Prince Albert, and Santa Claus is based on St. Nicholas. Morfill responded in August, after returning from Cracow where he had taken part in the University jubilee,<sup>90</sup> and repeated his previous assertion in more detail: 'The author was undoubtedly the *Rev. John Mason Neale* (1818–1866) who was a

p.246

---

<sup>81</sup> 16.V.1899, LAPNP.

<sup>82</sup> Nothing further known of Morfill's corresp. with AHW.

<sup>83</sup> 8.VII.1899, pp. 56–57.

<sup>84</sup> *Trans. of the RHS* 3 (1874), 346–71.

<sup>85</sup> 6.II.1900.

<sup>86</sup> 27.IV.1900, LAPNP; see ČČM 1900, pp. 113, 481, 557.

<sup>87</sup> Morfill to Kalousek 11.V.1900.

<sup>88</sup> After 11.V.1900, copy on reverse of letter, note 87.

<sup>89</sup> 14.VII.1900, LAPNP, carbon.

<sup>90</sup> See Kalousek to Morfill 14.VII.1900, R. Filipović, 'Iz Jagičeve korespondencije, Morfillova pisma Jagiću', *Gradja za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 21 (1951), pp. 285–301.

great writer of hymns, and translated some from Greek and Latin. I suppose he got the story from some of the *Vitae Sanctorum*; the song is certainly in quite modern English. It has never been a *Volkslied* but is sung sometimes at Christmas by members of the upper-classes. I cannot yet find out in what exact *year*, it was written, but if I do, I will send you the information on a postcard. Neale was rather fond of mystifications, and frequently hymns, which he declared to be ancient – especially some which purported to be from the Greek –... were his own compositions. Some of these I referred to the Head of the Ecclesiastical Seminary at Kiev in | Russia, but he said that the Greek originals were unknown. It is strange that a clergyman should have been fond of such a *pia fraus*.<sup>91</sup>

Kalousek was still not quite convinced, and in his draft reply urged on Morfill the importance of establishing dates of publication, adding: 'Když jsem 4/8 byl u hr. Lützowa, angličtí hosté jeho vyprávěli, že tu píseň zpívají chudé děti pod okny, i že jest nepochybně stará; a jeden pravil, že již jeho praděd ji zpíval. Všichni mínili, že jest stará.'<sup>92</sup> Kalousek was a regular guest at Lützow's residence at Žampach.<sup>93</sup> There is a transcript of the carol among his papers inscribed 'Miss Maud Armytage / Psala anglická dáma na Žampachu 1899...'<sup>94</sup> also a card from Goll pointing out the singing of the carol at the end of Kipling's *Indické povídky* ('Tedy píseň, kterou zná každý').<sup>95</sup> But Morfill, who had doubtless exaggerated when he spoke of the carol being limited to the upper classes, stuck to his account: 'The song was written by Neale about fifty years ago, and as a proof that it was composed by him, it had the benefit of the law of copyright in this country and has only recently been allowed to be reprinted by any publisher.'<sup>96</sup> The carol was apparently first published in *Carols for | Christmas Tide: Set to Ancient Melodies by the Rev. T. Helmore* in 1853, and the tune used was that of the medieval spring carol 'Tempus adest floridum'.<sup>97</sup>

In the ensuing years Kalousek continued to send Morfill various of his articles, especially those about Hus and his writings.<sup>98</sup> From Zíbrt he received further parts of *Bibliografie české historie*. Other personally inscribed volumes in Morfill's library are: J. Goll's *Čechy a Prusky ve středověku* sent in 1900, Václav Hladík's *Ze samoty a ze společnosti* inscribed at Oxford on 10th June 1904, Kvačala's *Korrespondence J. A. Komenského* in 1899, and Švambara's *Kongo* (1901).<sup>99</sup>

In 1902 Morfill received a review from Kalousek of Feodor Sigel's *Lectures on Slavonic Law* (given at Oxford in 1900).<sup>100</sup> Thanking him he remarked also that Lützow's *The Story of Prague* was just out and 'ought to find many readers.' He mentioned the work of

<sup>91</sup>29.VIII.1900.

<sup>92</sup>Draft 2.IX.1900, on reverse of Morfill 29.VIII.1900.

<sup>93</sup>O. Josek, *Život a dílo Josefa Kalouska*, 1922, pp. 152, 324–6.

<sup>94</sup>LAPNP, pozůst. Kalouska.

<sup>95</sup>9.VIII.1900, LAPNP.

<sup>96</sup>9.IX.1900.

<sup>97</sup>René Wellek, *Essays on Czech Literature*, The Hague 1963, p. 130.

<sup>98</sup>Morfill to Kalousek 17.X.1900, 22.X.1902, 10.VII.1903.

<sup>99</sup>Morfill Coll.

<sup>100</sup>Morfill to Kalousek 11.VII.1902; review by Mourek, *Osvěta* 1902, 1, pp. 370–2.

---

Lützow again to Zíbrt in 1905: 'Last year Count Lützow gave us some good lectures on the Bohemian historians, and I hope his book when it is published. . . will give English people more just ideas about the nationality and progress of the Bohemians. . . I *think* the Count's lectures have aroused a general interest – as he speaks our language well and understands how to keep fixed the attention of his audience.'<sup>101</sup> Lützow's Lectures on the | *Historians of Bohemia*, the Ilchester lectures for 1904, are referred to by Morfill in a letter to Kalousek in 1905 – he reviewed the book in *Osvěta* – : 'They will help the Bohemian cause.'<sup>102</sup> Later Morfill wrote again: 'The Germans are too much masters of the field but Lutzow had distracted them a little in this country.'<sup>103</sup>

p.249

In 1903 Morfill acknowledged a pamphlet from Kalousek on Rieger, commenting: 'These are very reactionary days: the great countries everywhere oust the small ones. . . Where will Imperialism end?'<sup>104</sup> In 1905 he was elected an overseas member of the Bohemian Academy of Sciences, proposed by Mourek.<sup>105</sup> His last letter to Kalousek was in 1908 and congratulated him on his seventieth birthday: 'I send you my heartiest congratulations and good wishes and thank you most warmly for all your valuable publications on Bohemian Constitutional Law and History. I have indeed learned much from them and your *České Státní Právo* especially. You have done much to remove the ignorance of foreigners. I have carefully preserved your pamphlets and essays etc. and these are on my shelves carefully bound together. I hope you may have many years of useful labour still.'<sup>106</sup> Four months before his death Morfill received an honorary PhD from the Czech University of Prague.<sup>107</sup> |

p.250

One of his last works was entitled *The Last Days of John Hus*, his only extended Czech translation. It was taken from the Czech version of a fake eyewitness account of Hus supposed to be by the Italian humanist Gian Francesco Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459). This originally appeared as *Hussens letzte Tage und Feuertod, In Sendschreiben von Poggius an L. Nicolai* (Reutlingen, 1846). It went through various versions including the Czech one used by Morfill *Mistr Jan Hus na koncilu kostnickém* (Prague 1902–3) illustrated by Alfons Mucha and J. Dědina.<sup>108</sup> Morfill's soundest legacy, however, to the knowledge of Czech literature in England was his library – his history of Slavonic literature and faulty Czech grammar have virtually sunk into that limbo of all forgotten books, along with this slight oddity of a translation. It must be remembered, nevertheless, that along with Wratislaw he was one of the few nineteenth-century Englishmen to read Czech, and the first to show a real informed interest in its contemporary poetry.

---

<sup>101</sup> 16.I.1905; Mourek reviewed *The Story of Prague* in *Osvěta* 1902, 2, p. 841.

<sup>102</sup> 9.III.1905; *Osvěta* 1905, 1, pp. 468–9.

<sup>103</sup> To Kalousek 8.IV.1907.

<sup>104</sup> 2.V.1903; *O dr. F. L. Riegrovi*, 1903 (Politická knihovna Hlasu Národa č. 8), lecture to Historický klub, 1903.

<sup>105</sup> 'Volební protokol sepsaný v zasedání III třídy české Akademie dne 9. června 1905', also Morfill to Česká Akad. 21.X.1905, Archív Akademie věd, Prague.

<sup>106</sup> Postmark Oxford 23.IV.1908.

<sup>107</sup> Murray, *Proc. of the British Acad.* 4, pp. 368–74.

<sup>108</sup> *The Last Days of John Hus, a historical romance*, 1909; see Č. Zíbrt, *Bibliografie české historie*, 2, 1902, č. 14870–5.



## Chapter 13

# Athenaeum Surveys, 1874–1900

A constant source of up-to-date information on Czech literature for the last quarter of the century were the annual surveys published in the London *Athenaeum* from 1874, with a few gaps. These reports were supplied by Czech writers: Josef Durdík (1874–9), Ferdinand Schulz (1880), Josef Sládek (1881), František Bačkovský (1886–7), Antonín Truhlář with Václav Emanuel Mourek (1889), Bohuslav Čermák (1890–1), Jan Krejčí (1895) and Václav Tille (1892–4, 1896–8, 1900). In many cases these short notices, about two to three columns in length, succumb to the near inevitable and are little more than a catalogue of names and titles. Nevertheless, taken in their entirety, they seem to display certain general features indicative of the state of literature and literary criticism in Bohemia in those years. One finds often a notable mixture of conflicting sentiments, where national pride vies with feelings of insecurity about the indifferent reception of Czech writing in Western European countries, especially England. p.251

A short notice by the Russian scholar William | Shedden Ralston preceded the series of surveys proper.<sup>1</sup> Dated 'Prague, May 27, 1870' it was evidently written while Ralston was in Bohemia on a follow-up to a visit in 1869, when he had attended the Hus Festival in Prague and Husinec along with other official overseas guests. Ralston described the events in the devotional magazine *Good Words*,<sup>2</sup> and followed this account with another article called 'The Poor of Prague'<sup>3</sup> which sprang from his interest in charities and philanthropic institutions. This, as well as the festival, may have brought him in touch with that organiser of charitable enterprises Vojta Náprstek. In a letter to the French Slavist Louis Leger in 1873 Ralston wrote: 'I heard a great deal about you in Prague from our friends Naprstek, Vrtatko, Kaizl, Rieger and others. . .'<sup>4</sup> p.252

The *Athenaeum* notice by Ralston gave some account of Josef Durdík's recently published *O poesii a povaze Lorda Byrona* naming some Czech writers influenced by Byron: Mácha (a rare mention in England), Pflieger (in *Pan Vyšinski*) and Rudolf Mayer.

---

<sup>1</sup>'Bohemian Literature', 11.VI.1870, p. 772; see M. P. Alexeyev, 'William Ralston and Russian Writers of the Later 19th Century', *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 11 (1964), 83–93; *DNB*.

<sup>2</sup>'The Huss Festival at Prague', 1.XII.1869, pp. 839–47.

<sup>3</sup>*Good Words* 1.IV.1870, 257–62.

<sup>4</sup>Ralston to Louis Leger, 20.I.1873, LAPNP.

p.253 It also noticed the first volume of Havlíček’s collected works, and mentioned especially his ‘series of covert attacks upon Austria...purporting to be essays on the state of Ireland, in which, to the great amusement of all who were in the | secret, and to the utter mystification of the Austrian authorities, he used to be always quoting at great length from a quite imaginary “Tipperary Gazette”.’ Ralston also picked out his *Král Lavra* and epigrams ‘full of bitter attacks upon the clergy and the bureaucracy...quoted with great satisfaction by his countrymen, who are by no means devoted either to the one or to the other.’<sup>5</sup> A similar notice on ‘Slavonic Literature’ by Ralston in October 1870 (based on an account by Leger for *Revue Bibliographique*) also named a few Czech works.<sup>6</sup>

The first regular survey was obtained by the *Athenaeum* through Vojta Náprstek, who had probably had a hand in Ralston’s notice, and who possessed wide-ranging links of business and friendship both in England and America.<sup>7</sup> In 1862 Náprstek was a member of an unofficial Czech delegation which visited the International Exhibition in London (Rieger was another). One of the five royal commissioners for the Exhibition was Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, proprietor of the *Athenaeum*.<sup>8</sup> His elder son Sir Charles Wentworth the politician succeeded to the proprietorship on his father’s death in 1869 and took an active part in running it. The younger son Ashton Wentworth Dilke | was a student of Russian life and letters, who in 1878 published a translation of Turgenev’s *Virgin Soil*. He attended Trinity College, Cambridge, but left before taking his degree, being, as it is said, ‘anxious to travel in Russia, and acquire a knowledge of the condition of that empire.’<sup>9</sup> He died at Algiers in 1883 in his early thirties.

Vojta Náprstek had presumably made the acquaintance of the Dilke family during the 1862 Exhibition. He was one of the people Ashton Dilke went to see when he passed through Prague in 1871 during his travels in Eastern Europe and Russia. He apparently missed Rieger, but one of the first people he met was Náprstek’s friend Jindřich Malý. He wrote to his brother Charles: ‘Rieger is away, Malý came directly to see me, Náprstek I shall see today. Malý is immeasurably patriotic and vociferous, and volunteers immense quantities of information, which from his imperfect English and my still more doubtful German, becomes a good deal diluted on the road.’<sup>10</sup> He described Náprstek picturesquely in a following letter: ‘Náprstek is not by any means the revolutionary being with long hair, spectacles and a sallow face you generally expect, and does not look in the least like a man who has been condemned to death, but is a punchy little man, | with a very red nose, and red hair about an inch long rising erectly from all sides. He is the greatest vodka brewer in Prague, and his brother the greatest beer brewer. I had no idea how much beer a man could consume till I saw

---

<sup>5</sup>See note 1.

<sup>6</sup>15.X.1870, p. 495.

<sup>7</sup>OSN; J. Malý and E. Rainbow, *Vojta Náprstek: A Memoir*, Prague 1906; on visit to Intern. Exhib. see Jan Krejčí, *Cesta po Německu, Švýcarsku, Francii, Anglii a Belgii roku 1862, 1865*.

<sup>8</sup>DNB.

<sup>9</sup>Norman MacColl in DNB.

<sup>10</sup>Prague, Hostinec u černého koně, 6.IX.1871, Dilke Papers, Churchill College, Cambridge.



---

the Czechs.<sup>11</sup>

Ashton Dilke observed that he was 'a perfect infant here'<sup>12</sup> and some of his comments are rather slapdash. He wrote that he 'was very much disgusted with them for not having the Commune, which I thought every Slav nation possessed',<sup>13</sup> and then, on the Czech language: 'It seems very strange to read (apparently) Russian inscriptions on the shops, in ordinary characters. Czech is easier than Russian, I should say, and the words themselves seem to bear affinity to Russ, the grammatical forms to Polish. The sound is smooth and agreeable being extremely liquid. The constant repetition of 'v' in words seems to me to denote a race of less civilized form, it being always a tendency of barbarian nations to repeat syllables. I see it everywhere here, in words like vévody for voda etc.'<sup>14</sup>

But later he was 'intensely disgusted with Vienna... Asking a man who has seen the Volga to go and look at the Danube is disrespectful to the Volga. Of all the muddy little ditches, this is the muddiest and littlest | I ever saw.'<sup>15</sup> So Prague fared rather better than Vienna in spite of housing a 'race of less civilized form.' These were of course rather jocular letters written to amuse his brother. p.256

A letter in 1874 from Jindřich Malý to Ashton Dilke thanked him for an article on Siberia: 'in my fancy I made the travel with you, throwing off all the shudders connected with any thought of this land, which we imagine to be the vast centre of all horrors, nature can bring up to frighten men.'<sup>16</sup> Ashton Dilke was planning to publish a book on Russia, two chapters of which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review*,<sup>17</sup> but it came to nothing.

Náprstek was also in touch with him about this time, for by December 1874 a survey of Czech literature was ready to be forwarded to the *Athenaeum*, and he wrote to Dilke: 'Enclosed I send you the account on Bohemian Literature for 1874 and the photogr. likeness of Prof. J. Durdík, the writer of the report; I thank you once more for your kind willingness to introduce our Literature into the noble drawing-room of the *Athenaeum*. Prof Durdík introduced the subject with a preface which I hope you will not find too long. Some corrections will also be necessary regarding the Queens English.'<sup>18</sup> | p.257

The published version was a severely edited one, and Dilke explained why it had to be cut down so drastically: 'I am much obliged both to you and Dr. Durdík for the article on Čech literature. I am sorry however to say that it is much too long, as it contains nearly 4000 words. You will see that this would make 7 columns in the *Athenaeum*, which if multiplied by some 20 nations would be an impossible amount for us to insert... you will perceive that other nations claim a larger space than yours

---

<sup>11</sup>To C. W. Dilke 11.IX.1871, Dilke Papers.

<sup>12</sup>Same.

<sup>13</sup>Same.

<sup>14</sup>6.IX.1871.

<sup>15</sup>To C. W. Dilke 14.IX.1871, Dilke Papers.

<sup>16</sup>15.V.1874, Dilke Papers.

<sup>17</sup>21 (May 1874), pp. 565–81; 22 (Oct 1874), pp. 451–70.

<sup>18</sup>4.XII.1874, Dilke Papers.

and that to insert them all would add over 50 pages to our issue.<sup>19</sup> Shortly after he wrote enclosing a proof copy and explained his tinkering with the spelling, which made 'Čech' into 'Czech' and perhaps influenced general usage: 'You will see that the Čech accents cannot be represented in English, so I have had to use the Polish form, which will be generally understood.'<sup>20</sup> Durdík was sent a cheque for two pounds for his contribution.<sup>21</sup>

p.258 Albert Wratislaw was disappointed by the article, writing to Vrtátko: 'škoda že to psaní pane Durdíkovo tak suchoparno bylo. Divím se o tom, protože ten pan učený a zajímavý člověk jest.'<sup>22</sup> Its dullness was perhaps to be explained at least in part by the drastic cutting it had undergone. |

Karel Jonáš,<sup>23</sup> a leading member of the Czech emigrant community in Wisconsin U.S.A., sounded more satisfied, but took exception to the use of the word 'Czech' instead of 'Bohemian' – the latter was clearly standard in America for identifying their community. He wrote to Náprstek's wife Josefa:<sup>24</sup>

'The Athenaeum' došlo nás a měl jsem velikou radost, že dr. Durdík začíná přispívati o literatuře české. Ale nesmím též zamlčeti, že nedělá pěkný dojem zavádění názvu 'Czech' v angličtině i do listu tak vážného. Když jsem to čísti dal zde, ptali se mne hned 'what do you mean by Czech', což arci žádný ani vysloviti nemůže. Pokud se slušně a správně nazývají Němci 'Germans', a 'Dutch' je pouhá přezdívka, potud i my jsme 'Bohemians', a nevím proč bychom to poctivě historické jméno zamítali. Němec z Čech žádný se nejmenuje 'Bohemian', vždy jen 'German'. 'Bohemians' jsme my: a kdybychom název ten ztratili, nevím věru jak by nás zde měli jmenovati. 'Czech' je každému hádankou, a 'Check' mohlo by býti nejvyšší nadávkou. Adjective 'slovanský' zní ve článku dra. Durdíka někde 'Slavic', někde 'Slavonic'; noun je Sláv. G. Popovič opět přijímá Slavonian; toto mělo by nejspíše v angličtině zdomácniti.

p.259 Durdík visited England in the summer of 1875, meeting amongst others Ashton Dilke, the bookseller Quaritch, with whom Náprstek was in correspondence, and Charles Darwin. Bernard Quaritch was a 'Wend by race, born in Prussian Saxony' and an antiquarian bookseller in Piccadilly. He also published in a small way, issuing some Turkish and Arabic grammars and dictionaries during the Crimean War, and he was responsible for Fitzgerald's Crabbe and Omar Khayyám.<sup>25</sup> | Náprstek kept Durdík supplied with magazines and newspapers from home and was keen to learn how he

<sup>19</sup>To V. Náprstek 9.XII.1874, archív Náprstkova muzea, Prague.

<sup>20</sup>Same 16.XII.1874, archív Náprstkova muzea.

<sup>21</sup>*Athenaeum* (John Francis and A. W. Dilke) to V. Náprstek 15.I.1875, archív Náprstkova muzea.

<sup>22</sup>25.IV.1875, LAPNP.

<sup>23</sup>1840–96, emigr. to USA 1863, publ. *Slovník česko-anglický*, Chicago 1876, later US consul in Germany, Prague; OSN.

<sup>24</sup>Racine, Wisconsin, 31.III.1875, archív Náprstkova muzea.

<sup>25</sup>*Athen.* 23.XII.1899, pp. 865–6; letters to Náprstek in archív Náprstkova muzea.

---

fared with Dilke, as a draft letter shows: ‘Velice nás potěšilo, že Vás Dilke srdečně přijal, zajisté že jeho prostřednictvím bude Vám umožněno učiniti rozsáhlé známosti; Mr D is the most prominent friend of our nationality (na 2 místě stojící Vratislav a Ralston); through his most important connections with the press Mr Dilke will make by and by, so we hope, the English public more and more acquainted with the history, politics and literature of the Bohemians. . .’<sup>26</sup>

Durdík was lodged in London under one roof with a Parsee, which inspired requests for information from Náprstek about their charitable institutions.<sup>27</sup> Durdík wrote that he was tired by his exertions: ‘Anglii chtějí poznat jednou 3- neb 4 nedělní cestou je holá nemožnost.’<sup>28</sup> He also exhibited homesickness: ‘nikdo zde neumí česky; i na universitách sotva vědí, co je to Slovan! Však nic nedělá – snad se to dovědí brzo. . . stydím se skoro vyznat, že na Čechy myslím stále a stále – abyste to nevykládali za slabost, co já spíše pozakládám za sílu.’<sup>29</sup>

Because it was summer the only person on his list of eminent men he managed to meet was Darwin: ‘U Darwina jsem ovšem byl; v rozkošné krajině a tak comfortable, nic jináč než jako u vrchnosti. . .’<sup>30</sup> An account of his | experiences in England appeared in *Světobzor*,<sup>31</sup> and a separate account of his visit to Darwin in *Osvěta*.<sup>32</sup> In the *Osvěta* article he lists his failures: Herbert Spencer had been in Wales, the historian Gardiner in Venice, John Tyndall in the Alps, and Arnold at Oxford also away. He had met him briefly at Fridrich Rückert’s eleven years earlier. Charles Darwin, however, was at home. He describes their meeting somewhat in the manner of Stanley meeting Livingstone: ‘tu vstoupil do dveří muž, jehož jsem hned poznal. Pokročil jsem jemu vstříc a bez dalších poklon oslovil jej: Vy jste Darwin! „Yes, I am Darwin,“ odvětil mi.’<sup>33</sup> They chatted together over wine and biscuits, discussing the relation of Darwinism to philosophy and the higher interests of humanity, and Durdík tried to give him the gist of his coming lectures on the relation of Darwinism to the philosophy of Kant: ‘V hovoru tak mnoho příležitostí poskytujícím poznal jsem všelicos a slyšel, co málo kdy jiný slyšel z úst Darwinových, zejména bych v celku to naznačil tak, že jsem ho shledal asi na stanovisku Kantovském. Jemu se dostalo náhledu toho skrze positivismus anglický, ale ten je pozdější než Kantův kriticismus. O Kantovi věděl a mluvil o něm s velikou úctou, ač spisův jeho bezprostředně nezná, jak se přiznal. Ale pravou hrůzu měl přede jménem tak mnohého jiného filosofa.’<sup>34</sup> He | knew of the famed beauty of Prague, and Durdík told him about the state of natural sciences at the university, keeping a discreet silence about Darwin’s opponents there. The talk also reached the subject of Czechs and Germans in Bohemia: ‘Pak o poměrech našich dvou národností: že jsou v Čechách

p.260

p.261

---

<sup>26</sup>Prague 9.VIII.1875, archív Náprstkova muzea.

<sup>27</sup>Náprstek to Durdík, draft 9.VII.1875; Durdík to Náprstek 26.VIII.1875, archív N-va muzea.

<sup>28</sup>To Náprstek 19.VIII.1875, archív N-va muzea.

<sup>29</sup>Same 22.VIII.1875, archív N-va muzea.

<sup>30</sup>Durdík to Náprstek 27.VIII.1875, also Paris 1.IX.1875, archív N-va muzea.

<sup>31</sup>‘Výlet do Anglie’, 1875, 16 parts, pp. 411 seq. – 615 seq.

<sup>32</sup>‘Návštěva u Darwina’, 1876, díl 2, pp. 717–27.

<sup>33</sup>*Osvěta* 1872 díl 2, p. 721.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid*, p. 725.

dva kmeny, více věděl, než jsem očekával – a že já po česku přednáším, nepovažoval za zhoubu, ani si toho příliš nelekł.<sup>35</sup>

Durdík's *Athenaeum* reports on Czech literature were apt to devote a lot of space to scholarly works (history, philosophy, aesthetics, philology, etc.). This was remarked on by the editor Norman MacColl in 1878: 'I trust you are progressing with the account of Bohemian Literature of the year. Pray kindly remember that the article should be mainly confined to Literature pure and simple – and that technical works and school books should be very lightly noticed. Is there any hope of an article on Polish Literature?'<sup>36</sup>

p.262 His place was taken by Schulz in 1880 and by Sládek in 1881. Sládek's survey was noticed by *Pokrok*, who stated that it had been abridged by the *Athenaeum*.<sup>37</sup> There followed a gap, until Bačkovský stepped in for 1885 and 1886. *Pokrok* wrote on this occasion: 'Již po tři roky chyběla česká literatura mezi výročními přehledy... | Nyní pak horlivou péčí universitního profesora dra. Jos. Durdíka Bačkovský přehled bude psáti koncem každého roku.'<sup>38</sup> Bačkovský also had his contribution abbreviated, as they lamented. After another gap Truhlář and Mourek wrote a report for 1888–9, and Bohuslav Čermák reports for 1889–90 and 1890–1. Václav Tille was then found to take over and he wrote all except one survey by Jan Krejčí through into the twentieth century. He was obtained for the job through the offices of Durdík and possibly also Sládek. MacColl wrote to Sládek: 'Many thanks for your obliging note and for all the trouble you have taken on our behalf. Professor Durdík has since been good enough to send me the article by M. Tille of which I hope to send him a proof tomorrow.'<sup>39</sup> Sládek informed Zeyer, forgetful apparently of his own previous contribution: 'Mám také dva dopisy od redaktora Athenaea p. N. Maccolla. Psal mi sám, nevím, kde mou adresu dostal. Bude přijímati notičky o naší literatuře.'<sup>40</sup>

p.263 Sládek is the only very well-known poet amongst the contributors. Ferdinand Schulz wrote historical novels. Professor Durdík wrote mainly on philosophy and aesthetics; Václav Tille was a literary historian, critic, collector of folk tales and later professor of comparative literature at Prague; Antonín Truhlář was a headmaster, editor and literary historian, and Václav | Emanuel Mourek a German and English scholar; Jan Krejčí was a Germanist; Bohuslav Čermák a poet, fiction writer and scriptor at the Prague University Library.

These reports listed altogether a very large number of works of Czech literature, and were the best source in English on the subject for the contemporary period. There is little point in repeating exactly which works these surveys named, item by item, but something may be gleaned of a more general import from the more original or analytic remarks they contain.

Durdík's reports devote much space to non-fiction. The first cites some published English sources for the modern period: 'In poetry and lighter writing the fertility has

<sup>35</sup>Ibid, p. 726.

<sup>36</sup>To Durdík 28.X.1878, LAPNP.

<sup>37</sup>3.I.1881.

<sup>38</sup>16.I.1886.

<sup>39</sup>13.VI.1892, LAPNP.

<sup>40</sup>21.VI.1892, *Sládek, Zeyer, Vzájemná korespondence*, ed. J. Š. Kvapil, 1957, pp. 265–6.

---

been so great that I must refer your readers to the accounts of Talvj, Bowring, Wratislaw and Gardiner.<sup>41</sup> In 1875 he observes utilitarian tendencies in literary production and a 'preponderance of historical researches over creative literature.' There is also an abundance of translations, and he comments: 'It would be well if the West returned the compliment and paid more attention to Slavonic poetry, which hitherto it has almost entirely ignored.' This is | the confident side of his patriotism showing itself, but Durdík also exhibits the insecure side, although this may of course be seen a healthy sign of readiness to criticise: 'The numbers of papers and magazines is so enormous, that the literary energy of the nation is mainly spent in periodical writing; and it is undoubtedly true that the amount of original literature is not what it ought to be, considering our numbers and education. A thorough explanation of this would be out of place here.'<sup>42</sup> The 1876 report strikes a slightly brighter note, while still disapproving of the state of public life: 'Although the political situation of the day is unfavourable to literature, and we are doomed to feel more keenly than many other nations the reality of the connexion between literature and the other factors of public life, there is a great deal that is pleasant to relate in this year's report.'<sup>43</sup> He is gloomy about the taste of the general reader: 'The demand for fiction in Bohemia is mainly supplied by translations: and as less regard unfortunately is paid to quality than a taking title and high colouring, much is translated that is not worth translation... On the whole journals and school-books still constitute the chief products of Bohemian Literature.' Similar comments could equally | have been made about original popular English literature of the time – Durdík is a little too ambitious in his desire for excellence. p.264 p.265

He praises Vrchlický very highly in 1878, making a generous estimation of the quality of his versions of French poetry worthy of a true enthusiast for the Czech language: 'they are translations superior to the originals, inasmuch as French metrists only count the syllables, while in Bohemian these are measured, and thus is introduced the charm of a real rhythm; at the same time, all the refinements of French rhyme and the French strophe are reproduced with astonishing fidelity.'<sup>44</sup> Hálek also comes in for approval, and his neglect by foreigners is lamented in a mention of the first volume of his collected works: 'The book is a treasure of genuine poetry, such as foreigners who designedly or undesignedly ignore Slavonic literature little dream exists.' Neruda's feuilletons are mentioned in 1876,<sup>45</sup> and *Povídky malostranské* receive approval in 1877. His description of Neruda's writing accords best perhaps with his 'Trhani': 'he reminds us sometimes of Bret Harte and Mark Twain, but his humour has not been borrowed. His best sketches were produced before the time when these American humourists found readers in our land.'<sup>46</sup> | p.266

Language disputes also find a place. He is against the introduction of Slovak: 'our Slavonic "Nitra" now addresses us in our own tongue, instead of the North Hungarian

---

<sup>41</sup>26.XII.1874, p. 857.

<sup>42</sup>25.XII.1875, p. 859.

<sup>43</sup>30.XII.1876, pp. 863–4.

<sup>44</sup>28.XII.1878, p. 830.

<sup>45</sup>See note 43.

<sup>46</sup>29.XII.1877, pp. 842–3.

dialect formerly employed. The Magyar attempt to put down the Czech language has thus had an effect exactly contrary to that intended.<sup>47</sup> In 1879 he records puristic tendencies: 'A peculiarity of Bohemian literature at the present day is the number of books and treatises on purity and correctness of speech...unluckily many serious errors that modern philology has dissipated are reproduced.'<sup>48</sup> He also notes in the same report the continuing dispute over the MSS.

In philosophy he mentions in 1875 the influence of Herbart, transmitted by Prof. Exner, whose teaching 'has made much way in Bohemia, and, as if is free from any national peculiarities, and is in the noblest sense cosmopolitan, it has numerous adherents and many excellent text-books founded upon it have been written for the schools.'<sup>49</sup> After Hus, Comenius is Durdík's second great Czech thinker: 'J. Amos Comenius, the great pedagogue of the seventeenth century, the recognised reformer of the schools of Europe, was not unknown in England. He was repeatedly invited by Parliament to improve the schools, and as Huss | anticipated Luther's movement by a hundred years, so Comenius preceded the German reformers of education by a century.'<sup>50</sup>

In 1878 Durdík notes an increase in 'intellectual productiveness' and in 1879 he speaks of greater literary activity, growth of interest among the people, and more enterprise shown by publishers. The poets listed in his reports include the following: Čech, Krásnohorská, Hálek, Heyduk, Vrchlický, Červinka, Sládek, Pflieger, Stašek, Rud. Pokorný, Neruda and V. Šťastný. Among prose writers he names also: Světlá, V. Vlček, Bozděch, Zeyer, Havlasa, Jirásek, Fr. Pravda, Arbes, Podlipská, Stankovský, Mühlsteinová, Beneš-Třebízský, Beneš Šumavský, Fr. A. Šubert. In drama also: Jeřábek, Pinkas, Veselý, J. Frič.

Ferdinand Schulz devotes a larger proportion of his article in 1880 to poetry and fiction, at least three-quarters, and poetry takes pride of place. He writes: 'In Bohemia the epic has been the prevailing form of poetry during the year.'<sup>51</sup> He mentions Zeyer's *Vyšehrad* and Čech's *Václav z Michalovic*, both dealing with national history. Schulz gives national themes a high priority: 'Svatopluk Čech set himself the task of poetically remodelling the "Václav z Michalovic" which | may be termed the climax of the entire poetry of Bohemia, belonging to that most terrible period in the history of the people which succeeded the battle of the White Mountain (November 8th 1620). This is the sublimest but also the most difficult task that Bohemian history can propose to our national poetry.' He also praises, for its Slavonic theme, Krásnohorská's *K slovanskému jihu* (about Herzegovina and the Russo-Turkish War) with its 'climax in a grand perspective view...the leaden balls that are gathered up from the battle-field shall be recast into letters, and from these the future Slavonic culture shall take its rise.' Then, listing also Čech's *Ve stínu lípy* and Heyduk's *Dřevorubec*, he passes on to Vrchlický's

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>27.XII.1879, pp. 824–5.

<sup>49</sup>See note 42.

<sup>50</sup>See note 43.

<sup>51</sup>25.XII.1880, pp. 842–3.

---

*Mythy* (part two). Here his comment seems to have influenced Morfill in the *Westminster Review* in 1881:<sup>52</sup> 'Every one of these poems is an apotheosis of poetry and of poetic ideals, of which the love of woman, which overcomes all things, even God himself, is placed by Verchlický in the first rank.' ('Verchlický' was printed in the hope of making the name more pronounceable to the English.) Further examples of epic given are Vajansky's *Tatry a more* and Jan Botto's *Smrt Jánošíkova*: 'a specimen of the modern style of the national Slovak epos, as it is still to be | found in the Carpathian mountains.' p.269

In lyric poetry he names Vrchlický, Otakar Mokřý and Bohdan Jelínek; in drama Šubert, Bozděch and Krajník; and in fiction Jirásek, Šmilovský, Štolba, Zeyer, Herites, Čech and Beneš-Třebízský. In the course of two short paragraphs on science and history Durdík is credited with having solved the question of the relation between quantitative and accentual meter.

Sládek's report in 1881 is practically all devoted to poetry and fiction. He agrees with Durdík in observing a continued increased activity, constituting the beginning of a new era, but mainly in the magazines: 'Still, some meritorious books are printed, and they do credit to a little band of authors of established reputation.'<sup>53</sup> The 'indefatigable' Vrchlický is as usual given eminent ranking: 'What Mr. Swinburne is to the English literature of today J. Verchlicky may be said to be to ours, and what most charms in Keats we can trace in Verchlicky's stanzas. This poet will yet be heard of outside Bohemia. English readers would be interested by his beautiful ballad of Prince Harry and some elaborate themes of Gaelic origin. Others given space are Čech (his contributions to *Květy*), Zeyer (he calls his 'Zrada v domě Han' 'exquisite'), himself, | Karel Leger, O. Červinka, Heyduk ('the Burns of Bohemia') L. Quis, R. Pokorný, and Irma Geisslová (her *Divoké kořeni*; 'wild and wayward fancies, somewhat bold in their humour, but throughout lively and original'). p.270

In drama he lists Krásnohorská, Vlček, Durdík, Šubert, Zeyer, Vrchlický, etc., remarking that 'the drama, as yet by far the weakest part of our literature, at last seems to be improving.'

In fiction he includes Podlipská, Jirásek, V. Beneš-Třebízský, A. Šubert, J. Arbes, Stroupežnický and J. Holeček. He remarks that 'both Jirásek and Beneš are much read', and comments on the former: 'This author has greatly contributed to the revival of our historical romance, is a hard worker, and has a peculiar style of his own, admirably adapted to the plots he chooses.' Sládek praises Arbes for his *Mravokárné románky*, 'a series of queer stories... that would make many a moralist shudder at the consequences of his teachings.' It is regrettable that Sládek did not provide any more reports for the *Athenaeum*, with his eye for the unconventional and more outspoken specimens of a largely conformist literature.

There ensued an interregnum of three years.

Bačkovský's first report in January 1886 is pretty much a dull catalogue of names and books. He | also records that 'of late years Bohemian literature has made gratifying p.271

---

<sup>52</sup>See text pp. 220–221.

<sup>53</sup>31.XII.1881, p. 877.

progress.<sup>54</sup> In poetry the highest honours are awarded to Čech, Heyduk, and Vrchlický, followed by Neruda, Sládek, and Zeyer. ‘Besides the writers I have mentioned, some twenty authors have produced each more than one volume of verse during the last four years.’ In drama he names Vrchlický, Durdík, J. J. Kolár, and Šubert. In fiction he records the deaths of Šmilovský and Beneš-Třebízský, and lists Jirásek, Čech, Schulz, Vlček, Arbes, Zeyer (‘distinguished by imagination and a feeling for romance’), Holeček and Štolba.

p.272 The second report in January 1887 is more significant, dividing the poets into ‘National’ and ‘Cosmopolitan’ schools, corresponding to the Ruch and Lumír schools familiar in standard literary history today: ‘The disputes which have occupied our poets for some years past have disappeared, and the end of it all is that both parties are going their own way – one National and the other Cosmopolitan, the National being the more popular.’<sup>55</sup> He is pleased by a contemporary preference for narrative poetry, especially in Čech’s work (e.g. a reprint of Václav z Michalovic), and the appearance of satire and humour (e.g. Čech’s ‘Šotek’ | and ‘Pravda’, of which he writes: ‘These are excellent works, and I think he would be very much read in England if his books were translated into English as they have been into German’). Vrchlický is regarded by Bačkovský as poet number two, after Čech, and definitely highbrow: ‘Vrchlický writes for the most intelligent of the public, those who are widely read, and on account of this he is misunderstood by many people.’ He notes that he wrote the words for Dvořák’s oratorio *Saint Ludmila*. (Whereas Czech music was a notable success in England, an author like Vrchlický was and is for practical purposes quite unknown.) Of Zeyer’s ‘Čechův příchod’ Bačkovský says: ‘he is always, and even in this new poem, more cosmopolitan than Čech, Heyduk, and others.’ In drama Vrchlický is allotted first place, and he recommends that Zeyer’s *Legenda z Erinu* should be translated.

p.273 Finally he shows where he stands vis-à-vis the new attack on the MSS by Gebauer and Masaryk, the fierce disputes over which had half-engulfed Czech cultural and literary life: ‘Finally, I must mention a great controversy which injured the whole of our literary and scientific activity in the year 1886. This was the dispute concerning the Queen’s Court and Green Mountain Manuscripts, which were some years ago translated into English verse by Mr. Wratislaw. The | dispute was begun by Prof. Gebauer and Prof. Masaryk... in the Bohemian *Athenaeum*, the former pronouncing both MSS. to be forgeries... all the other papers have published essays by different scholars in defence of the genuineness of the MSS... it is to be hoped that the MSS. will be proved to be genuine.’

The report of Truhlář and Mourek, in July 1889, after a gap, is another catalogue of titles, but they take up a couple of themes from Bačkovský. They write on patriotic tendencies (i.e. in the National school) that authors ‘are developing a more national tone in their writings than they need to affect.’ Their favours go on the whole to Svatopluk Čech. Commenting on the MSS debate they indicate a sense of inconclusiveness and how people were upset by the attacks, and add: ‘It is satisfactory to feel that, on

<sup>54</sup>2.I.1886, p. 8.

<sup>55</sup>1.I.1887, pp. 8–9.



---

the whole, a more dignified tone is beginning to mark the controversy than formerly prevailed, though there is still room enough for improvement.<sup>56</sup>

In 1890 Bohuslav Čermák finds the national school in decline, with the notable exception of narrative poetry. He calls the other school 'romantic' and 'pessimistic': 'The struggle between two different tendencies, the national and the romantic, the latter | pessimistic in its tone, is still worthy of note, though lacking some of its original intensity.'<sup>57</sup> He sees this as partly due to the silence of some older poets of the national school. Exceptions are Sládek, Geisslová, and patriotic tendencies in the work of Jesenská 'amid much meditative and thoughtful verse'. Otherwise, as far as he is concerned, 'the poets of the romantic school have the field to themselves.' To this group he assigns Vrchlický, Machar, Ant. Klose, Eman. ryt. z Čenkova, Josef Šimon, Ant. Klášterský, and to some extent Krásnohorská: 'All of these show that among the rising generation of poets pessimism has struck deep root.' At the same time 'in narrative poetry the national school is triumphant', and here he assigns Fr. Chalupa, J. Jakubec, both deceased, and Čech. Čermák seems to dislike Zeyer's work, in *Z letopisů lásky*: 'The only narrative poet of the romantic school is Julius Zeyer, whose manner is less brilliant than his matter; and who likes to choose foreign subjects. He has published "Annals of Love" but only one of the stories ("Olgerd Gejstor") has any connexion with Bohemian history; the others lose in value from being poor in style and too obviously dependent on foreign influence.' In fiction Čermák | writes of 'naturalistic tendencies' (listing Vlček, M. A. Šimáček, B. Kaminský, etc.).

p.274

p.275

His second report in 1891 adds a 'realistic' school: 'Alongside of the older schools of thought, the romantically patriotic and the pessimistic, a realistic movement has sprung up which excites much interest.'<sup>58</sup> Lyric poets are described as patriotic (Vojtěch Pakosta, V. J. Pokorný-Pikulík), pessimistic (Vrchlický, Kaminský, Fr. X. Svoboda), younger and naturalistic (Klášterský, z Čenkova, Jar. Kvapil, Z. Janko-Dvorský, who 'go nearly to the extreme of naturalism, and are devoid of all poetic illusion or ideal'), and realistic (most notably Ant. Sova). Narrative poets are either patriotic (Heyduk, Čech) or pessimistic (Kučera, Fr. X. Svoboda, Kaminský, Zeyer, Karel Leger, Červinka), and 'the naturalistic school eschews this department of literature'. Similarly, 'on the whole, our drama still maintains the old romantic colouring, and has been but slightly affected by realism.'

The first three contributions of Václav Tille in 1892–4 have more to say about fiction. In 1892 he separates the social and historical genres: 'Fiction this year is devoted to social questions and Bohemian history. Of those dealing with the former topic none | can compete with what appears abroad. Still, a beginning has been made. A common fault of these attempts is exaggeration and the presence of what the Germans call *Tendenz*.' As social writers he names M. A. Šimáček and J. Laichter and as historical A. Jirásek and Z. Winter. He remarks on the deep historical research underlying the latter's easy mode of narration. The village genre is also distinguished: 'Particular mention is due to the popular tales written about, and for, the people. In her hard struggle for her national

p.276

---

<sup>56</sup>6.VII.1889, pp. 8–9.

<sup>57</sup>5.VII.1890, p. 8.

<sup>58</sup>4.VII.1891, pp. 10–11.

existence our nation feels more than any other the necessity for the direct influence of literature upon the national self-consciousness. The educated classes, therefore, have never lost sight of the country people.' He cites V. Kosmák for his Moravian stories, and F. Sláma as a Silesian writer.<sup>59</sup>

p.277 Tille's second report distinguishes a movement towards a deeper realism, exciting conflict between writers and the church on the one hand, and the old and new generations on the other: 'In the literary world of Bohemia a new and powerful movement towards realism and a deeper conception of popular life has lately set in. A characteristic symptom of this ferment is a violent strife between men of letters generally | and the Roman Catholic press, which, being well organized, rejects all that does not strictly agree with Romish doctrine; another is a feverish agitation among the students of the university; and lastly, a sharp polemic between authors who 'have arrived' and the young school of criticism, which, though as yet only in its beginning, fights with unwonted energy against conventional views.'<sup>60</sup> Among older conventional writers he lists F. Schulz, S. Heller, Václav Vlček, Albieri, Konrád, Renatus, and among the innovatory authors, mostly writing short tales and sketches, Herben, Mrštík, Klostermann, Rais, Čapek-Chod and Herites.

p.278 The third article calls the movement an intellectual revolution: '*Belles-lettres* are from year to year becoming more subject to the new ideas which have for some time stirred all European literature, and are symptoms of a deep intellectual revolution.'<sup>61</sup> Tille identifies the extremes of the modern spirit in the fervent Catholic writer X. Dvořák's *Sursum corda* and Machar's *Tristium Vindobona*, in poetry. Czech fiction comes in for criticism for lagging behind other European writing: 'Bohemian fiction is still waiting for its master. Partly owing to the comparative youth of our modern literature, partly to the mental ferment mentioned above, our authors do not as yet control their plots with a firm hand, and | they are wanting in breadth of conception and dexterity in working out complicated stories. The older authors turn nearly all their attention to matters of machinery and style; psychological and social questions escape them almost entirely.' V. Mrštík's *Santa Lucia* 'forms a series of motley scenes and various minutely detailed recollections. . . But under the incubus of all this the leading ideas grow misty.' Tille locates similar faults in Šimáček's *Dvojí láska* – minute and able description, but the leading idea, the attachment of an engaged official for another girl and his conflicts of conscience, is treated only outwardly, and the character is reminiscent of many old similar romantic types. He notes the psychological analysis in Šlejhar. Children's literature has vastly improved (Dolenský and Rezek's *Obrázkové dějiny národa českého*, Jirásek's *Staré pověsti české*): 'A foreigner can hardly conceive with what trash Bohemian children used to be supplied by writers, male and female, and how hopeless the search for a good children's book was.' On drama he writes in 1892 that 'a real dramatist has not appeared as yet.'<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup>2.VII.1892, pp. 6–7.

<sup>60</sup>1.VII.1893, pp. 8–9.

<sup>61</sup>7.VII.1894, pp. 8–9.

<sup>62</sup>See note 59.

---

Jan Krejčí wrote the report for July 1895 instead of Tille. He notes the recent criticism of Hálek, by Machar, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death: 'His poetry has been criticised anew, and the verdict | of J. S. Machar is considered by many to be fair and candid, while others have raised a sharp opposition to his views, and maintain that a poet cannot be justly judged unless all the circumstances of his time are taken into consideration. At any rate, the whole affair shows that a spirit of earnest self-criticism is gaining ground amongst us. It is the only means by which we can gain our proper place in the literature of the world.' It is something like this feeling of failure to 'gain our proper place in the literature of the world' that underlies the insecurity and vulnerability of Czech literary morale – whatever a 'proper place' may be. Krejčí also reports on the popularity of Čech's *Písně otroka*, which had gone through 23 editions in three to four months, but he regards it as having been misused by the public: 'there was no need to put more into his words than he himself intended, and in this way to mar the aesthetic impression.' Also he notes that Březina's *Tajemné dálky* contains 'several pieces of real poetical beauty' and refers to the Decadents: 'A new aesthetic school, the Decadents, was proudly introduced in J. Karásek's "Walled-up Windows" but there is singularly little true feeling in them.'<sup>63</sup> |

p.279

p.280

Tille's survey in July 1896 identifies the Roman-Catholic party and the Decadents (in *Moderní revue*) as the clearest defined schools. The first congregates around the periodicals *Hlídka* and *Nový svět*: 'They possess all the more importance from the fact that, of our older writers of note, Julius Zeyer openly takes their part'; he cites Zeyer's *Tři legendy o krucifixu*. Outside these schools he places Březina, Sova, Šlejhar, and in literary criticism Salda, Vorel and Krejčí. The manifesto *Moderna* was a compromise attempt, but the authors soon disagreed, and *Almanach secese* was still less successful. In drama he praises Hilbert's *Vina*. Fiction, represented by Rais, Stašek, Stech, Svoboda and Kaminský, is fragmentary: 'As is the case every year, a regular swarm of collections of short tales has come out within these last twelve months, and it is characteristic of the restless condition of our authors that these fragmentary sketches are more common than broadly drawn and thoroughly finished novels.'<sup>64</sup>

His next article parallels the fragmented nature of fiction with a proliferation of slim volumes of verse published at the authors' own expense and goes on: 'In fiction Bohemian literature still lacks the modern novel of character – a want not compensated | by some attempts at shorter tales of this class... The best of them are still those that delineate minutely the life of the Bohemian country people, as the subject itself secures attention.'<sup>65</sup> He cites the names of Rais, Vřesnický and Stašek (NE Bohemia); Klostermann (Bohemian Forest area); the brothers Mrštík (Moravia); and Herites (small country towns). Literary criticism of the day is also found wanting.

p.281

Similarly, in July 1898, he finds more quantity than quality, but notes on the other hand a new impulse in the theatre.<sup>66</sup> He cites as examples Hilbert's *O Boha* (not

---

<sup>63</sup>6.VII.1895, pp. 8–9.

<sup>64</sup>4.VII.1896, pp. 8–9.

<sup>65</sup>3.VII.1897, pp. 8–9.

<sup>66</sup>2.VII.1898, pp. 10–11.

performed on stage because of the censorship), Zeyer's *Radúz a Mahulena*, Vrchlický, Kvapil, and in musical drama Fibich's opera *Šárka* and *Psohlavci* by Kovařovic.

In 1900, after a year's gap, Tille writes that the older generation is passing away. The literary world is waiting for a new figure to unite the diverse small currents. 'Only a very few books rise above the average level. There is a lack of depth and elaboration in literary criticism, but notable promise in younger poets, though it is difficult to single out any original or mature work.' Thus reads the uninspiring, on the whole, last survey for the century – no great master proclaimed.<sup>67</sup> |

Taken together these *Athenaeum* surveys from 1874 to 1900 supply the English reader far more information about the fortunes and broad trends of contemporary Czech literature than any other source. Their authors had a hard job, because they were writing about people almost entirely unknown in England, and who have remained practically unknown. Sometimes they mistakenly prophesied that the English would yet sit up and take notice of Hálek, Čech or Vrchlický, which they never did, even when specimens were translated eventually, – but at other times they reacted to the situation the other way and condemned their own literary scene for characteristics like popular taste or the flood of magazine output or the prevalence of mediocrity which were certainly not peculiar to the Czech situation. At the same time, as Tille, the best of these observers, remarked, Czech prose, particularly the large-scale social novel, was slow in coming to maturity. If an outstanding novelist or two had been produced the reputation of the literature abroad might have been transformed in the course of a decade.

---

<sup>67</sup>7.VII.1900, pp. 6–7.

## Chapter 14

# Translators of the Eighties and Nineties

The eighties and nineties of the century witnessed a few scattered attempts to provide the British reading public with translations of contemporary Czech novels, short stories and poetry. Only the isolated anthologies of Bowring (1832) and Wratislaw (1849) had preceded them in England. p.283

If fairy-tales and folk-tales are admitted as contemporary, another outrider was John Theophilus Naaké's *Slavonic Fairy Tales* of 1874, which contains some Czech tales from Erben. Erben's collection *Sto prstonárodních pohádek* in fact had rather more translators than one would have thought really necessary.<sup>1</sup> Wratislaw's versions of sixty tales were published in 1889, Jeremiah Curtin's *Myths and Folk-Tales of the Russians, Western Slavs and Magyars* in 1890, and Aleksander Chodźko's *Fairy Tales of the Slav Peasants and Herdsmen* in 1896, translated from the French by Emily J. Harding.<sup>2</sup> In addition Walter Strickland published practically all of Erben's tales in a series of four books between 1896 and 1907, so the duplication was considerable.<sup>3</sup>

Various other translations of contemporary Czech literature, and schemes for publications, give signs | of slightly more active attention in England, on the part of a very few individuals. Those books that did get through the presses are on the whole more or less bibliographical rarities. This is disappointing, in view of the greater success at this time, for example, of Russian and Scandinavian literature, indicating a more favourable climate perhaps in general for this kind of endeavour than previously. p.284

One personal point of contact between English and Czech letters that might have proved the most fruitful of all, but came to nothing, was struck up between J. V. Sládek and Edmund Gosse in 1892.

Sládek had spent some time in the United States, and was a notable translator of

---

<sup>1</sup>*Sto prstonárodních pohádek a pověstí slovanských v nářečích původních (Čítanka slovanská s vysvětlením slov)*, 1865; Naaké's book reviewed, *Athen.* 6.VI.1874, p. 759.

<sup>2</sup>Curtin's book, Boston London 1890, reviewed, *Athen.* 30.V.1891, pp. 694–5; Chodźko's in *Athen.* 19.IX.1896, p. 384.

<sup>3</sup>See bibliography.

English poetry. His versions of Shakespeare remain famous. His part in the *Athenaeum* surveys has already been noted. In 1881 he was even for a time teaching Czech by post to an unknown Englishman in Preston, as he told Julius Zeyer: 'čert ho posedl, že musí umět česky. Nemáme gramatiky, a tak jsem vzal tu práci na sebe! Také kus vlastenecké práce!!'<sup>4</sup>

p.285 An incomplete draft of a letter from Sládek to Gosse, dated 8th February 1892, lists Czech translations from English and draws attention to the *Athenaeum* survey for that year.<sup>5</sup> It was probably not sent, as the | first letter from Sládek to Gosse among Gosse's papers is dated 17th May 1892.<sup>6</sup> It asks for advice on his forthcoming Burns anthology. Sládek obviously hoped to establish a useful English literary contact:<sup>7</sup>

The Royal Academy of Science and Letters in Prague is going to publish a Tchèque translation of R. Burns' Songs and Ballads. I have undertaken the work with all possible care and love, though feeling well that any translation must be only a colourless shadow of the original. Only a Selection of about 150 poems is to be made, nevertheless I would not omit anything that is dear to Scotsmen and Englishmen, and would arrange the little book in accordance with the best English Edition of Burns. In this I take the liberty to ask for your kind advice and assistance. I know well, Dear Sir, that you have very little time to spare, but I also know your poems, your essays, and I know you as one of the few English men of letters who care for the poetic literature of foreign lands. This makes me hope, that you will not consider my request an intrusion. I enclose a list of the poems already translated, and if you possibly can find leisure [sic] for answering me, please give me the titles of such Songs as you miss here, and the title of the best English Edition of Burns' poems. Should all this cause you much trouble, please, do not answer, for I myself know well the burden of overwork.

p.286 On 21st June Sládek was able to tell his friend Zeyer that he had had a reply: 'píše tak roztomile a vřele, jak jen poeta psáti může, a žádá mne, abych mu jen brzo psal zase.'<sup>8</sup> Sládek was already planning a volume of short-stories to have published in England, translated by an American lady Flora Kopta. He continued in his letter to Zeyer: 'Doufám, že nabudeme tím spojení pro naše povídky v Anglii. Zejtra píšu pí Koptové, Amerikánce, a pošlu jí Tvé legendy s prosbou, | aby je přeložila. Rád bych pak něco krátkého od Světlé. Co? – Piš. Od Kunětické ty Husy atd. To by byl svazek of „Short Stories“, který by byl asi vítán v Anglii. Heritesovi řekni, aby mi udal, co by ze svých krátkých věcí nejraději viděl přeloženo. Také Čechovi budu psát.' Zeyer's reply expressing a great admiration for Karolina Světlá, suggested her *Několik archů z rodinné kroniky* (1862) or *Nebožka Barbora* (1873) for translation: 'Ty „archy“ mohl by

---

<sup>4</sup>16.IV.1881, Kvapil no. 35.

<sup>5</sup>LAPNP.

<sup>6</sup>Brotherton Collection, Leeds.

<sup>7</sup>Refers to *Výbor z písní a ballad R. Burnse*, 1892.

<sup>8</sup>Kvapil no. 320.

---

podepsat Goethe, řekla velmi trefně jednou pí Braunerová, a Barboru Turgeněv, zdá se zase mně.<sup>9</sup>

Sládek sent Gosse his Burns volume, dedicated to him as an act of ingratiating, and Gosse wrote a letter of thanks dated 27th November 1892.<sup>10</sup> He enquired about Czech novels: 'I only wish I could read Bohemian, but I read German perfectly well, and anything you send me in that language I shall be able to appreciate.' He was editor of Heinemann's International Library, and there was a great opportunity here, if a good novel could have been found: 'I am much interested in novels which represent the latest phases of life in the less-known European countries. Will you, at your leisure, tell me if there is any very striking recent novel in Bohemian – not historical, but a realistic study of contemporary manners, which would interest English | readers, if it were translated?' p.287

Sládek replied suggesting Zeyer's *Jan Maria Plojhar*.<sup>11</sup> He also praised Kunětická's *Husy*, and got together some German versions of Czech poetry and fiction, such as were available, to send to him. The difficulty was to find an English translator:

We have indeed many valuable things in our Prose, but unhappily next to nothing has been translated into German as yet. The two or three little volumes of Bohemian fiction in German I shall send you next week. – A good volume of Short stories could easily be gathered here. By far the best one-volume romance is "Jan Maria Plojhar" by Julius Zeyer. This is an excellent piece of work, modern, deep in feeling and almost perfect in artistic treatment. Louis Couperin's "Footsteps of Fate" can bear no comparison with "Jan Maria Plojhar". – Permit me to say, My dear Sir, that I agree with you in your literary taste. Years ago, when studying the Spanish literature, I translated Pepita Ximenez into Bohemian, just the novel, with which you opened your International Library. There is no doubt that you would like "Jan Maria Plojhar". Unfortunately we have no one here to translate it. Some one of your English translators from Russian should learn Bohemian. He could master it in three months, as the two languages are so very like each other. He could have a rich harvest here.

Some months ago a short story "The Geese" by one of our lady writers appeared here, and so touching a story, so realistic and poetic at once, I do not remember to have read for a long time even in English fiction of which I read a great deal, buying almost anything recommended by the "Athenaeum". I shall try to have the ditty translated for your perusal. There is an American lady here reading Bohemian, but I fear that her feeling is not deep enough for such work.

The lady concerned, Mrs. Flora Pauline Kopta née Wilson, had already been the author of a book entitled *Bohemian Legends and Ballads* reviewed in *Lumír* (which Sládek

---

<sup>9</sup>29.VI.1892, in R. B. Pynsent, *Julius Zeyer, The Path to Decadence*, The Hague 1973, p. 104.

<sup>10</sup>Gosse to Sládek 27.XI.1892, LAPNP

<sup>11</sup>6.XII.1892, Brotherton Collection.

p.288 edited).<sup>12</sup> |

Work may even have started on excerpts and summaries to show to Gosse. Sládek wrote to Zeyer in December 1892 that he was trying to arrange for Flora Kopta to translate *Jan Maria Plojhar*:<sup>13</sup>

Z přiloženého listu seznáš, že jsem jaksi u vyjednávání s p. Gossem o vydání Plojhara v Anglicku. Doufám pevně, že se to podaří. Ty jistě dáš svolení. Překlad obstarala by paní Koptová a Ty bys jej prohledl.

Zatím pošlu Gossemu obsah a přiložím některé scény, které přeloží pí Koptová. – Bylo by to překrásné! Otevřel bys nám v Anglicku brány. Obsah napíšu o svátcích aneb jej napíše pí Koptová sama, což snad bude ještě lépe.

Ona přijede sem ještě před vánoci. Jsem jist, že se bude Plojhar Gossemu líbit. Je to umělec pravý a dobrý, ač trochu anglicky chladná duše. Dedikoval jsem mu Burnse předně proto, že je výborný básník, jehož mám rád, a potom již s tím účelem, abych našel spojení s Anglií pro naši literaturu.

Zeyer's reaction to this was much less indulgent to Czech writing than when he had cheerfully compared Světlá to Goethe and Turgenev. This time he was probably being more soberly sincere, as well as showing suitable modesty about his own accomplishments: 'Ten návrh p. Gosse mě konečně těší, ale iluze si nedělám. Čím může jim celá naše literatura být? Kdyby jen *nám* něčím byla. Ale décourageovat Tě nechci a děkuji Ti, žes si vzpomněl v té věci na mě.'<sup>14</sup> Sládek in reply praised the character of Mrs. Kopta and tried to counter Zeyer's pessimism: 'Dal jsem jí Plojhara. Napíše sama obsah a přeloží některé passage in full. Pak pošlem vše do Anglie. Nesmíš to podceňovat, uveřejní-li tam některou českou | věc. Zvláště Tvé jsou jako stvořeny pro anglické čtenářstvo.'<sup>15</sup> It is not possible to say, however, how far the work progressed. Shortly after Christmas Sládek told Zeyer again: 'Paní Koptová píše obsah Plojhara a překládá části. Jak bude hotova, pošlu věc do Anglie.'<sup>16</sup> But that is the last mention of the subject in Sládek's published correspondence.

p.289

Possible explanations of what happened are, either that the material was sent to Gosse, and he did not like it or at any rate let the matter drop, or that the work was never done or sent to him at all. However, subsequently in 1899 Lützow's *Literature of Bohemia* was published by Heinemann under Gosse's editorship. Another book published with an introduction by Gosse in 1894 – and here is a blow to Czech literary pride – was the Bulgarian author Vazov's novel *Under the Yoke* (*Pod igoto*). A revised edition appeared in 1912. Sládek seems to have bungled his opportunity somehow, since *Jan Maria Plojhar* was not too unpromising a choice, even if much of the story has little to do with Bohemia, as 'a realistic study of contemporary manners.'

<sup>12</sup>Schüttenhofen, A. Janský, 1890, 2nd ed. New York 1896; also *The Forestman of Vimpek*, Boston [1900]; see *Lumír* 20.VIII.1892.

<sup>13</sup>15.XII.1892, Kvapil no. 344.

<sup>14</sup>20.XII.1892, Kvapil no. 345.

<sup>15</sup>23.XII.1892, Kvapil no. 346.

<sup>16</sup>30.XII.1892, Kvapil no. 347.



---

News of Sládek's Burns anthology travelled as far as Ayrshire. An article in *Ayrshire Notes and Queries* written by the editor of the *Burns Chronicle* John Muir | was entitled 'Rab the Ranter in Bohemia'.<sup>17</sup> Muir had received a complimentary copy and a letter from Sládek, from which he quoted. He remarked rather obviously that few if any students of Burns would be able to understand the Czech language, but he was confident that it must be a better translation than the French prose version.

p.290

Another attempt at inducing the English reader to take an interest in Czech writers, and one which got as far as the presses, was set in motion by the Czech Germanist V. E. Mourek, who had an English wife and was the compiler of dictionaries of English and Czech.<sup>18</sup> Other works of his include *Přehled dějin literatury anglické* (1890), *Alfred Tennyson* (1894) and *Učebné listy jazyka anglického pro samouky* (1886–9). He also made a new transcript of the Cambridge MS of the Dalimil chronicle, accomplished on a visit to England in 1887.<sup>19</sup> This journey to England fulfilled a long-standing intention to see the country and improve his English. Hattala had also pointed out the need for a new transcript of the Dalimil MS, and Mourek decided at the same time to conduct a general search for other Czech documents. As far as finding new Czech vernacular MSS was concerned he drew a blank. Morfill, one of his few professional contacts in England, was also away from | Oxford when he visited it.

p.291

Later, Mourek, apparently as a result of the *Athenaeum* connection maintained by the annual surveys,<sup>20</sup> undertook with his English wife Jane the translation of Šmilovský's story *Nebesa* into English, hoping that this would be the first of a series. An account of this project in *Lumír* may actually be by Sládek. Dated 1894 it closely matches the ideas he had expressed during his correspondence with Gosse two years earlier:<sup>21</sup>

Přinesli jsme zprávu londýnského 'Athenaea', že povídka A. V. Šmilovského 'Nebesa' vyjde v Anglii překladem prof. Dra. V. E. Mourka. Dovídáme se dále, že sám redaktor 'Athenaea', pan Macoll, interessuje se o českou belletrii přiměl nakladatelskou firmu Bliss, Sands and Forster, aby se o české práce ucházela. Prof. Mourek se svou chotí, rozenou Angličankou, ujal se na zvláštní vyzvání jmenovaných nakladatelů nesnadného úkolu překladatelského. Honorář učinili nakladatelé zcela závislým na hmotném úspěchu knihy u anglického čtenářstva a jest tedy práce prof. Mourka tím obětavější a záslužnější. Ujme-li se podnik v Anglii, budou následovati překlady jiné. V tom ohledu doporučovali bychom především knížku krátkých povídek (Short Stories) nyní v Anglii tak oblíbených. Mohlo by tu býti zastoupeno více spisovatelů najednou a máme v tomto oboru mnoho prací výborných a samorostlých, které by anglickým čtenářstvem zrovna asi tak vřele vítány

---

<sup>17</sup>1892; similar by Muir in the *Northern Star*, no. 14, p. 224, Sept 1892.

<sup>18</sup>Biography: *OSN* and *Dodatky*.

<sup>19</sup>V. E. Mourek, 'Zpráva o cestě do Anglie...', *Věstník KČSN* 1887, pp. 140–54; also, *Z dnešní Anglie*, 1888.

<sup>20</sup>See Ch. 13.

<sup>21</sup>p. 36; *Heavens*, transl. V. E. and Jane Mourek, London (Bliss, Sands and Forster) 1894.

byly, jako podobné práce norské, dánské a švédské, jichž se teď mnoho překládá.

p.292 The *Athenaeum*, as might have been expected from its own involvement, duly reviewed the book, and pronounced on the whole favourably in a short but warm notice.<sup>22</sup> It criticised the story for structural weakness in the plot (presenting the developed situation at the outset as a *fait accompli*) and for shadowiness in character portrayal: ‘but they are all faults which seem to be | due rather to an undeveloped literary tradition than to any other more serious cause.’ Presumably a ‘more serious cause’ might only be an untypically bad writer. The reviewer praises an ‘entirely delightful picture of unselfishness and unwordliness in the good old village priest’, who reminded him of Theuriet’s Abbé Daniel, and adds: ‘The translation is so well done that in but few passages could it be detected as such.’ It must be supposed that the book did not sell very well, however, as the projected series was not continued.<sup>23</sup>

p.293 One other Englishman translated from Czech literature in the **seventies**, eighties and nineties. This was Walter William Strickland, 9th Baronet, of Boynton and Hildenley, Malton, Yorkshire, a keen amateur naturalist and slightly eccentric free-thinker. Only the skimpiest account of his long and varied life can be given here, partly for lack of documents. Born in 1851, first son of Sir Charles William, he was educated at Harrow and Trinity College, Cambridge, which he entered in 1871. He took his B.A. in 1876. In 1888 he married Eliza Vokes, a kitchen-maid at Boynton, with a reputedly fine contralto voice. She was later something of a concert singer. When he began to travel more and more abroad they lived apart and she settled | in Lancashire. Walter’s father died in 1909, and he inherited the title, but since his father had disapproved of his behaviour and unconventional political, social and religious views, the estate of Boynton was left in the hands of trustees for his lifetime. There is no evidence that he ever returned to England again after the funeral in 1909. His vehement condemnations of the British Empire, colonialism and institutional Christianity may be read in his several volumes of verse, essays and travel letters, characterised by their violence of language.<sup>24</sup>

During the eighteen-nineties he gave his address as Sestri Levante, Liguria, Italy,<sup>25</sup> but by 1909 he had travelled extensively in Malaya, Java, Ceylon, India and Australia.<sup>26</sup> After returning to Europe he spent a while in Paris, where he was in touch with the Hindu colony there. He had acquired an enthusiasm for Indian philosophy and Buddhism. While in Paris he wrote to the English anarchist socialist from the East End of London, Guy A. Aldred, then serving a spell in Brixton, 1909–10, for having written advocating a republic of India. Aldred must have received financial support

---

<sup>22</sup>24.III.1894, p. 375.

<sup>23</sup>On Mourek’s later visits to Britain see *Z výletu do Skotska*, 1901, and *Z nového výletu do Skotska*, 1907; these, and *Z dnešní Anglie* orig. publ. in *Osvěta*, 1888, 1901, 1907, as was Šmilovský, *Nebesa*, 1880.

<sup>24</sup>J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabr.; Harrow School Register 1845–1925*, ed. J. H. Stogdon, 1925, p. 195; *Who Was Who 1929–1940*; *OSN dodatky*; *Masarykův slovník naučný*; family information; catalogues of British Museum, Cambr. Univ. Library, Bibl. Nat. Paris.

<sup>25</sup>Place of writing of several works, e.g. *Hanuman* ‘Sestri Levante, February 1893’, *Two Mock Epics*, 1894, p. 1.

<sup>26</sup>*Under the Hollow Tree*, Bakunin Press 1913, advert., pp. 23–24.

---

from Strickland and he printed some of Strickland's pamphlets. His | Bakunin Press, p.294  
conducted from private addresses in London and later Glasgow, was renamed the  
Strickland Press in 1939 in honour of Strickland's memory.<sup>27</sup>

After the 1914–18 War Strickland lived a while in Prague, where in 1923 he obtained  
Czechoslovak citizenship. During this period he was active as a zoologist, visiting  
California and donating collections of conches and other zoological specimens to  
the National Museum in Prague. He probably also financed an expedition with Dr.  
J. Štorkán to Mexico in 1927–8. Subsequently he returned to the Far East, spending his  
last years in Java, where he died on 9th August 1938 at Buitenzorg.<sup>28</sup>

A passage by a Yorkshire writer, John Fairfax-Blakeborough, supplies some more  
biographical detail, perhaps with a certain admixture of fiction and exaggeration:<sup>29</sup>

Sir Walter, who never used his title, was a keen naturalist and a man  
with a decided 'kink' – perhaps several. He not only had no affection  
for Yorkshire, he hated England. In 1923 he became a Czech citizen, and  
even in his 'last will and testament' his dislike of the land which gave  
him birth crept in like King Charles's head. He empowered trustees to  
move boxes containing books and manuscripts from Prague to any place –  
'Except that I declare that none of the said boxes, or their contents, shall be  
transferred to any place in England, Scotland, or any other part of the British  
Empire.' The income from his property he directed to go to a Buddhist  
society for propaganda purposes in the spread of Buddhism. He had given  
Sun Yat-Sen £ 10,000 to help him to start a revolt against the Emperor of  
China, | which ended in Sun Yat-Sen becoming President. Sir Walter had p.295  
£ 10,000 a year, but he did not spend more than £ 200 on himself. He  
toured the world, and bought a ranch in California, had property in Tokyo,  
and spent the last ten years of his life in Java with an adopted Mexican  
son; he had lived in Australia, Ceylon, and India, and was a man of great  
intellect – 'Genius is akin to madness'. The eighty-eight-year-old Mr Henry  
Marmaduke Strickland-Constable, of Wassand Hall, succeeded to the title  
on the passing of his half-cousin, which passing was perhaps timely in view  
of what has since happened to the country of Sir Walter's adoption.

What exactly brought Sir Walter to the study of Czech language and literature in  
the first place is a mystery. According to Pokrok he visited Prague in 1883,<sup>30</sup> and later  
in 1886 he wrote himself that he had lodged in Prague 'in Smichoff with an honest  
Bohemian stonemason and his wife.'<sup>31</sup> He was taught Czech with the help of Professor

---

<sup>27</sup>Guy A. Aldred, *No Traitor's Gait*, Glasgow (The Strickland Press) 1955–63, vol. 3 no. 1, pp. 63, 400,  
423, 428; *The Strickland Press List of Books*, Glasgow 1941.

<sup>28</sup>OSN *dotatky*; ČČM 99 (1925) sv. 4, p. 156; *The Times*, 'Deaths', 13.VIII.1938.

<sup>29</sup>John Fairfax-Blakeborough, *Yorkshire – East Riding*, 1951, pp. 31–32, partly taken from *Münchener  
Neueste Nachrichten*, August 1938 (transl. in family scrapbook).

<sup>30</sup>'Hálek v rouše anglickém', 5.I.1886.

<sup>31</sup>*Under the Hollow Tree (Three Stories by Viteslav Halek)*, York 1886, p. iv.

Jan Váňa, a teacher of English and author of textbooks, who possibly had a good say in his choice of material.<sup>32</sup> One of his translations from Czech, of a play by Emanuel Bozděch, *Zkouška státníková*, seems, from the evidence, to date from as early as 1873–4.<sup>33</sup> Both this, and a further printed Bozděch translation, carry the name of the Czech publisher Grégr. Copies are extremely rare and were probably small privately-financed editions. The proof-sheets of the English translation of Bozděch's play *Baron Goertz* are in the British Museum.<sup>34</sup> Printed in London in 1884, they carry the names of the Prague booksellers Grégr and | Valečka. The translator is anonymous, but Strickland was certainly in fact responsible. It was accompanied, according to *Národní listy* in 1885, by acknowledged versions of *Zkouška státníková* and *Z doby kotillonů*.<sup>35</sup> The former was published, apparently earlier, as *A Trial in Statesmanship*, by Grégr and Dattel, and a copy is in the New York Public Library.<sup>36</sup> The third translation has so far proved impossible to trace anywhere. The announcement in *Národní listy* also claimed that versions of Neruda and Hálek were in preparation.

Strickland published his translations from Hálek at York in 1886. The collection contained three short stories, 'Pod dutým stromem', 'Poldík rumař', 'Na vejminku', as well as twenty-eight poems taken from *Večerní písně*.<sup>37</sup> In the preface he attacked the norms of English literature apparently accusing English literary men of lack of true feeling: 'The stories have been twice revised. Once by a learned Bohemian Jew in Prague, to whom I read them aloud and who was kind enough to appreciate them in their English dress. "They are written from the heart to the heart," he said. And again a second time by an English literary man to whom the sentiment of the stories was so obnoxious that he put his pen through about one third part of them. Most of his excisions I have rejected... The stories | appeal to a civilisation developing on different lines from our own, and, although they are a true picture of Slavonic life and sentiment, they will no doubt often appear to English readers fantastic and overstrained.' Strickland's Slavophilism is a corollary to his Anglophobia. *Pokrok* wrote in its notice of the Hálek translations: 'Jak se dovídáme, překládá p. Strickland dále pilně z češtiny a sice první na řadě jsou Jiráskovi „Skaláci“.' Nothing is however known of this translation.<sup>38</sup>

He is supposed to have learnt some more Czech at Chrudim in 1893.<sup>39</sup> Another book, published in London in 1894 by Robert Forder, contains an English translation of Svatopluk Čech's satirical narrative poem *Hanuman*, along with an original poem

<sup>32</sup>*Národní listy* 18.V.1885.

<sup>33</sup>*A Trial in Statesmanship*. 'Translated from the Czech by W. W. Strickland, Trinity College, Cambridge. Prague (Sold by Drs. Greger and Ferd. Datel) 1874. (Printed by Dr. Greger, in Prague, 1873).' [Copy in New York Public Library.] See below.

<sup>34</sup>BM 011779.gg.121, date-stamped 11.XI.1922.

<sup>35</sup>*Národní listy* 18.V.1885.

<sup>36</sup>*New York Publ. Libr., The Research Library, Dictionary Catalog of the Slavonic Collection*, 2nd ed. vol. 38, Boston 1974, 'Strickland'.

<sup>37</sup>*Under the Hollow Tree*.

<sup>38</sup>'Hálek v rouše anglickém', 5.I.1886.

<sup>39</sup>*OSN dodatky*.

---

entitled *Tantum Religio, or, Sir Blasius*.<sup>40</sup> Strickland's prefatory remarks again somewhat lack in coherence at times. He favours inflected languages and is clearly much under the influence of classical literature. His view of what a translation should be was over-exacting and over-ambitious:

In order to preserve as far as possible the original metres and system of double-rhyming. . . much has been deliberately sacrificed. . . in comparison with the Slavonic, our language is poor in rhymes. And not only have the exact combinations of double-rhymes in general been exactly reproduced, but also in many passages the exact rhythms of individual lines. More than this. In by far the greater part of the poem, the translation is not only a phonetic but also a word-for-word reproduction of the text. . . Lastly the classical perfection of form which render Slav humour a thing *sui generis* is necessarily in great part lost. | Literary form is seen in perfection only in highly inflexed languages. Czech is more highly inflexed than Greek or Latin. English is fast returning to the agglutinative stage.

p.298

The translations themselves are still surprisingly readable on the whole, apart from a few mannered archaisms, perhaps partly the result of a public-school classical education too successfully imbibed. For instance, in 'Poldík rumař' the sentence: 'A to hned jdi, sice z tebe nadělám střepy jako z tvého oběda',<sup>41</sup> is rendered: 'Well, go then at once if thou dost not wish to be made a hash of like thine own dinner.'<sup>42</sup> Or: 'Až k loďce provázela je hudba a hoši zpívali veselé písně',<sup>43</sup> comes out as: 'Then the music accompanied them to their shallop, and the boys sang a merry roundelay.'<sup>44</sup> There is, in short, a general failure to strike the original register. Strickland's vocabulary is more mannered and precious than the original's.

After the version of *Hanuman* Strickland turned to the folk-tale, which was unfortunate, since others had been there before him. His versions of nearly all the Erben tales appeared in four books between 1896 and 1907.<sup>45</sup> They were accompanied by an elaborate and fanciful weather-myth interpretation. As he wrote: 'The first volume, "Segnius Irritant", maps out, so to say, the primitive folk-lore weather myth, of which nearly the whole of the succeeding ninety-two stories are wholly or in part reproductions.' Strickland attacked | his English critics: 'If I remember rightly, the few English critics who did me the honour of noticing "Segnius Irritant" limited themselves to vilifying the author and translator.'<sup>46</sup> By the early twentieth century these unifying mythological interpretations were badly dating. Wratislaw had received a pasting for more modest theories of his own back in 1889.

p.299

---

<sup>40</sup>*Two Mock Epics*, 1894.

<sup>41</sup>*Spisy V. Hálka*, 5, 1924, p. 375.

<sup>42</sup>*Under the Hollow Tree*, p. 33.

<sup>43</sup>*Spisy*, p. 380.

<sup>44</sup>*Under the Hollow Tree*, p. 41.

<sup>45</sup>See bibliography.

<sup>46</sup>*Russian and Bulgarian Folk-Lore Stories*, 1907, preface.

Strickland's translations from Hálek and Čech were reprinted in various editions after 1900, and the folk-tales were also republished. One suspects that all these editions had to be privately financed by himself. Little new work appears to have been done, except for a couple of Hálek stories which had perhaps already existed in manuscript before. He is said to have also translated from Němcová, in a periodical, but this has not been traced.<sup>47</sup> Any account of twentieth-century English translations from Czech would be well advised to start with Strickland's truly pioneering work, alongside the efforts of Mourek and Sládek, as they were the real beginning of a breakthrough, insofar as there was any breakthrough at all.

---

<sup>47</sup> *OSN dodatky.*

## Chapter 15

# Conclusion

Slight illuminations of corners of Czech literary history do not necessarily group themselves into general theses, and part of the value of such a study as attempted here may lie precisely amongst the scattered raw data it supplies, nevertheless some broad generalisations may perhaps be made. p.300

English writers tended to perceive Czech literature and the Czech national literary revival more or less as their Czech sources of information wished. They reflect already familiar domestic Czech attitudes – or less familiar ones. Often the English writers are simply mouthpieces for Czech opinion, although there are a few independent perceptions and dissensions from received opinion from time to time. In general, however, none of the few persons who were able to read the language were sufficiently well read in it or sufficiently able to stand back from their Czech personal acquaintances and printed sources of received opinion to make properly founded independent judgments. For instance, none could enter the dispute over the Dvůr Králové MS with any authority or confidence, so they remained largely dependent on their Czech friends and advisors, by far the most influential of whom were pro-Manuscript. | p.301

Albert Wratislaw was the Englishman best equipped to write on the subject with some originality, since he knew the language with a degree of fluency, even if his writing was not grammatically very correct. One obstacle was that he was hampered by shortage of books. Libraries naturally did not possess many of the books he might require, and there were hold-ups in his personal supplies difficult to excuse. One might, perhaps naively and optimistically, have expected him to have received more encouragement from Czech poets and novelists, as a potential means of gaining recognition abroad, but he seems to have been very largely neglected by them. Perhaps this was simply to be explained by his own neglect of contemporary imaginative literature in general, after his early youth and the initial slim anthology, – also by his evangelical Protestant standpoint. Somewhat different was the case of Morfill, who, after his articles in the *Westminster Review*, and as a supposedly scholarly Slavist, was liberally supplied with books, but little came of it after. In the medieval literature, however, Wratislaw was more at home and to some extent following his own bent, and his historical interest in the Czech Hussites and Pre-Reformation. Perhaps his most

p.302 successful translation, also, was the *Adventures of Baron Wenceslas Wratislaw*, inspired by familial piety, as well as his interest in history (Christians against Turks). In spite of his continuous labour, and obvious desire to further the 'Czech cause' in England, he was nevertheless able to achieve very little, one suspects, outside a certain narrow scholarly and clerical circle. His neglect of contemporary imaginative literature leaves an empty space in the middle of the century. Not that he should be personally blamed for this. What is more conspicuous is the apparent lack of activity on the part of Czech writers themselves to remedy this situation, until the first renewed self-advertising in the *Athenaeum* during the seventies, the backing of Morfill's work, and Sládek's propagatory efforts.

Who were the Czechs who deliberately cultivated literary contacts with England? Those who had the closest personal and business ties, and there were a good number of these, were not usually active in promoting Czech literature, and there was no reason why they should.

p.303 The Bohemian aristocracy, lukewarm to the Czech vernacular on the whole, and German in their cultural orientation, possessed in abundance the personal connections with England that the Czech writers largely lacked. There were strong relations at times, however, between the Czech national revival and those of the nobility who cultivated a Bohemian patriotism and fostered national institutions. In the earlier period they often served as employers and patrons to writers. It was because of one such connection, of Palacký with the Counts Thun, that Springer and Rieger visited England in the company of Robert Noel, who certainly had influential English connections. It is notable, however, that Springer, who subsequently turned away from Czech nationalism entirely and acquired more and more anti-Czech German loyalties, appears, with his apparently better knowledge of English, to have exploited the opportunity to greater effect than the typically homesick Rieger. If the Bohemian nobility, vaguely in favour of an autonomous Bohemia, but for their own reasons, not as Czech nationalists per se, had been more active in Czech literature the story might have turned out somewhat differently for Anglo-Czech literary relations. Count Lützow was a rare exception in his active propagation of Czech language and literature, and his aristocratic and upper-class English connections obviously stood him in good stead.

p.304 The most lively Anglo-Czech relations with an element of Czech nationalism existed between the Protestant churches of the two countries. Some of this comes out in the account of Wratislaw. The Church of Scotland had especially strong links, and writers such as Gustav Dörfel and Jan Karafiát were trained at Edinburgh for the ministry.<sup>1</sup> This continued the effect of the powerful religious attraction to Bohemia for Protestants devoted to the memory of Hus, Jerome and the Bohemian, later Moravian Brethren. The Brethren were also established in England, as a result of the Counter-Reformation, but its members were not Czech-speaking and did not propagate Czech literature, even if they wrote histories of the Unity of Bohemian Brethren. These church relations,

<sup>1</sup>Gustav Dörfel, 1855–1902, poet and translator from English; Jan Karafiát, 1846–1929, author of children's book *Broučci*, 1876; on relations with Church of Scotland see esp. J. Lukášek, *Jan Janata a naše minulost*, 1931, pp. 195–218.



---

except in the case of Wratislaw, do not seem to have brought about any significant attention to the Czech language as such, but busied themselves with missionary work and reverence to past history.

Literary relations proper began with the unexpected arrival of Bowring on the scene, attracted by the attentions of Kopitar and Šafárik. Hanka it was who maintained his relations longest, after Čelakovský had become disillusioned, and he also adopted Wratislaw. Hanka was chiefly absorbed with propagating the forged ancient manuscripts abroad. After Čelakovský, Hanka, and Kollár, there is a gap in relations with imaginative writers more or less until Sládek, with only brief appearances by Frič and Holeček which amount to practically nothing. In general, the historians, philologists, antiquarians, librarians and university academics held the tiny field without a break from Šafárik through Palacký to Vřátko, Jireček, | Kalousek, Tomek, and others. In Bowring's day the writers and scholarly antiquarians and historians were closer together, but later, during the fifties and sixties, they grew further apart, and it was the scholars, antiquarians and historians who maintained the stronger contacts with England. Wratislaw's own concerns and character obviously had a lot to do with this, but, equally, the poets and novelists might have approached him on their own account: but perhaps Frič's disappointment with Wratislaw, as with Bowring, is indicative of unfertile soil. Vojta Náprstek was one person who cultivated English connections with great assiduity and success, on behalf of his Industrial Museum and his interest in charitable institutions, but he was an organiser of public life and institutions, not a writer or academic. His relations with Wratislaw seem to carry more warmth than some others, but this may be due to the effect of using English in the correspondence. Náprstek had a great share in beginning the *Athenaeum* surveys, through the Dilkes, but this was the extent of his achievement. In brief, although there were personal connections in comparative abundance, they seldom led to the field of imaginative literature. Writers like Sládek only began to be more active in promoting Czech writing in the eighties and nineties. |

p.305

p.306

The lifeblood of proper knowledge and appreciation of any foreign literature, in the absence of general understanding of the language, is in the provision of translations. If this holds for French, German and Italian, it holds all the more emphatically for little-known tongues like Czech.

As has already been made abundantly clear, the number of contemporary works translated from Czech into English and published in nineteenth-century England was very tiny indeed. If imaginative literature alone is admitted to the list, it is clear that writers of the pre-1848 period were best represented. This is almost entirely due to the existence of Bowring's work, with the slender addition of Wratislaw's 1849 anthology and versions of the MSS. The main genres represented were roughly the following: literary forgeries, folk-songs and their polite imitations, and a more classical didactic style of verse typified by work of Kollár and Jablonský. None of these had a favourable reception or noticeable response in English literary life, although the books obviously had a few scattered readers. Mazzini and Mickiewicz may be counted among those

aware of Bowring and his Czech anthology.<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to see how the works represented could have had any impact, or have been examined with more than a mild curiosity by anyone not specifically seeking out the literature of the Slavs. The style of the folk-lore was familiar from German sources, by and large, and the melodies were missing. Czech literary verse, whether in a pseudo-folk vein or more learned and classical in form, was mostly too narrowly patriotic and nationalist in its sentiments, often couched in a faded and precious pseudo-pastoral rococo rhetoric, tired, ornamental and plodding. Kollár's was the most distinctive achievement, in the estimation of Čelakovský and others, but they acclaimed the propagandist pieces, whose appeal was too narrow and partisan, not the personal and erotic sonnets. Nonetheless, by judicious selection of rather different types of verse a more attractive anthology might have been produced, at a cost of some effort, but where the Czechs' taste failed it was too much to ask an Englishman to improve on it.

p.307

The next contemporary writer to be translated, after the pseudo-folk verses of Písek and others unwisely chosen by Wratislaw, or chosen for him, was the playwright Emanuel Bozděch, by Strickland in the seventies and eighties. He later added Hálek and Čech to the list. There are no signs that these obscure volumes had any more luck than their predecessors, although they have more inherent interest for the English reader. The same goes for the Moureks' version of Šmilovský. The failure to capitalise on the connection between Sládek and Gosse stopped a more hopeful avenue of advance, had the right material emerged. The crucial term is the right material, for there is every sign that the right material was seldom put forward, insofar as it existed. It is generally admitted that Czech literature was stronger in poetry than in prose, and, also, that prose is easier to translate acceptably than poetry. This being so, then the absence of a figure like Turgenev, Ibsen or Strindberg in Czech literature – whose protagonists would most likely retort with the name of a poet, Mácha – makes the obscurity of its reception abroad easier to understand, in purely literary terms.

p.308

There is something in the argument that if an outstanding writer had existed he would probably have been discovered by the rest of Europe, regardless of the extra-literary circumstances. There is also something in the opposing argument that many an excellent writer can go almost unnoticed for years, regardless of the language he writes in. Matters of literary fame and influence are not subject to easy rules of thumb. Obviously where communications are bad between a writer and a reading public, and a language and other languages, more especially if the former is small, excellence may be slower to gain recognition, if at all. |

p.309

In the realm of the musical arts Bohemia needed no introduction, and Czech compositions in a national idiom required no translation. They could be, and were, adopted by German musical circles as they stood, and thence received a wider distribution. Dvořák's music was the greatest success out of all the Czech arts in Victorian England, it may not be too bold to claim. But the favourable reception accorded to the music did nothing for the ignominious fate of Czech literature. Erben's words for the *Spectre's Bride*, and Vrchlický's for the *St. Ludmila Oratorio* were indeed

<sup>2</sup>On Mickiewicz see: Marian Szykowski, *Polská účast v českém národním obrození*, vol. 2, 1935, pp. 433–6.

---

translated into English, but the translator Rev. J. Troutbeck worked from German versions – and the results are generally condemned as unsatisfactory.<sup>3</sup> Certainly Dvořák must have done far more to establish the cultural dignity of the Czechs in England than a few meagre and most unsuccessful translations. Yet penetration abroad of its literary achievements would perhaps have carried more prestige for the Czech nationalist movement in the anti-German cultural crusade it largely espoused. Much of Czech nationalism was after all based on language and its powers of allegiance: to have a strong literature recognised abroad would have been useful to the national ego, just as music undoubtedly was. |

p.310

Without translations the value of critical and literary-historical surveys is limited, in that if such articles succeed in whetting an appetite at all it is for works inaccessible to the reader. Nevertheless they can still have considerable value as general enlightenment on social history and current affairs. The linguistic, literary, historical and racial character of the Czech resurgence, in sharper and sharper opposition to German cultural dominance, with the patriotic propaganda message expressed in very much of its historical and imaginative writing, gave the procedure of observing a people through its vernacular literature a particular relevance. It could illuminate the importance of national linguistic and cultural dissensions to the internal and external politics and whole future of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, helping to get beyond viewing the scene through purely German spectacles, which were more easily available.

Writings in England about Czech literature took a strongly assertive pro-Czech stance, as one would expect, coupled with frequent attacks against German anti-Slav and anti-Czech prejudice. There was a desire to inculcate an awareness that the Czech vernacular possessed a cultivated literature capable of a universal range of discourse. Czech nationalist writers and activists, | in conscious rivalry with German achievements, or at least enormously sensitive of their rival claims and feelings of cultural and social superiority, had a need for recognition and respect abroad, as a boost to pride and confidence. This was as true of Sládek as of Čelakovský, and the years between had done little to break the obscurity, unless it were perhaps in the field of history. There was a mixture of pride in what had been achieved in making up lost ground and doubt as to how well it compared with German, French and English achievements. This mixture of pride and doubt is exhibited in one or two of the *Athenaeum* surveys. The English writers on the other hand, Bowring, Wratislaw, Morfill and Strickland included, were optimistically assertive and not given to complaint or criticism about contemporary standards. They were in fact more full of praise than the Czechs themselves. The assertive pro-Czech stance of the English writers is understandable, as they mostly seemed to possess a strong bias in favour of the Slavs and Czechs before they began writing. A more critical, detached, but still sympathetic attitude might have worked out better for the fortunes of Czech literature in England, and left a more solid and perceptive legacy of writing for posterity. In the event they acquiesced in taking a partisan line. |

p.311

p.312

Often they appear to project their personal ideals of one kind or another onto

---

<sup>3</sup>On Troutbeck see: Otakar Šourek, *Život a dílo A. Dvořáka*, vol. 2, 3rd ed. 1955, pp. 213, 254.

their objects of study and devotion. Bowring finds 'Naturpoesie' in the company of Čelakovský, Wratislaw his modern successors and descendants of the Hussites and Bohemian Brethren, Morfill a truly civilised and democratic race. This oversimplifies to the point of caricature, but illustrates the point. People could find whatever virtues they wished, encouraged greatly, it might be added, by the Czech writers' own pronouncements on the virtues of the Slav and Czech race, contrasted with the German. The Slav or Czech is supposed to be democratic and anti-imperialist, in contrast to the German. The Czechs rose up first against Rome, before Luther, and possessed a Comenius years in advance of the German educationalists etc. etc. The legacy of ideas of Herder, Kollár, Šafárik and Palacký, and of the age-old popular German-Czech hostility, carried itself over into the pronouncements of the English Slavophiles. If England had its numerous Pro-German enthusiasts, it also had a hardy little band of Pro-Slavs in opposition.

p.313 At the same time, the English Czech supporters did not by any means generally look to Russia as the Great Slav Mother. Wratislaw was pro-Austrian, like most of the Czech nationalists usually were at bottom until late in the century, however much they vilified | the actual government. Morfill's anti-imperialism included Russia, Bowring, more perhaps than the others, saw visions of a more unified and politically, as well as culturally co-operative Slavonia, parallel to the concept of a greater Germany – the foil to Pan-Slavism. For the Czech nationalists themselves the hazy Pan-Slav ideal often held up for contemplation was subordinate to and kept theoretically compatible with loyalty to Vienna, though they were given to occasional Pro-Tsarist as well as Pro-Russian sentiments. The idea of a cultural unity and brotherhood taken from Kollár is what is present in the minds of both the English and Czech Slavophiles, rather than an actual Slav State or Empire. English writers were apt to be suspicious of the aspirations of powers like Prussia and Russia, just as these were feared rivals of England on the political and military front.

p.314 More purely politically based discussion of current affairs in Bohemia published in England, and not coming under the umbrella of this study, seems to have been more inclined to adopt German standpoints. One reason was that material written by Germans was the main source of information. Wratislaw complained of an English tendency to regard the Germans as the only civilised people in Central Europe. However, this supposed German bias should not perhaps be | ascribed too general and conscious a currency. Public opinion is not necessarily so firm, monolithic and self-consistent. It was similarly often lamented that the English had not heard of the Czechs as a separate people with their own language at all. Public opinion certainly varied according to the course of British foreign policy: the Crimean War, for instance, turned opinion against Russia. It might, however, with more evidence, be possible to make out a case that by the nineties what had been a general Pro-German bias was starting to meet stiffer competition from dissenting voices.

Sympathy with the Czechs, as displayed by English writers using Czech literature as their text, usually with a good dose of history, especially Hussite and Counter-Reformation, took the form of more or less acting as mouthpiece for Czech propaganda.

---

This did not make for critical attitudes, and might have even made the German claim to superiority appear less overstated than it was, although of course the indebtedness of Czech society, culture and literature to German influence was undeniably great. Partisan blindness, backward-looking historicism, obsession with supposed authentic Slav folklore representing ancient untainted tradition, a narrow patriotism and inward-turning, all | a kind of self-admiring antiquarianism misinformed by perfervid Anti-Germanism – all these were stultifying features of nineteenth-century Czech intellectual society. And paradoxically, it was an antiquarian Anti-Germanism embraced in an Austro-German frame of mind, narrowly moralist, sententious and didactic, largely subservient to Church and State except for matters of history and language. p.315

Czech literature's fortunes in nineteenth-century England were entirely inglorious, and Czech writing made no visible mark in English literary life. Its English spokesmen were by and large mouthpieces of Czech antiquarians, historians, academics and librarians; unpartisan minds were not much in evidence on either side. There was no obviously outstanding literary figure whose work could be translated with easy success, no flourishing novel of manners and psychology which is the genre that might most readily have made its mark abroad. A conventional Czech intellectual nationalistic establishment, clearly perceptible by the fifties, narrowly historicist and cultivating an expurgated folklore and rhetorically didactic aesthetic, was unable to make any real mark outside its own circumscribed bounds of ethnic loyalty. It more or less had the monopoly of Anglo-Czech literary propaganda and the results were commensurate with its standards – quite mediocre.

[Editorial note:

Pages 316 to 351 of the original thesis are absent. They were occupied by the endnotes, now converted into footnotes and inserted in the text above.]



# Bibliography

## Primary Literature

[Translations from Czech listed under translators' names]

p.352

Anonymous

review: Johann Christoph Adelung, *Mithridates, oder Allgemeine Sprachenkunde*, Berlin 1806–17, in *Quarterly Review* 10 (1813), p. 283.

review: Marcel de Serres, *Voyage en Autriche*, Paris 1814, in *Monthly Review* 78 (1815) Appendix, p. 469.

'A Glance at Prague during the Feast of St. Nepomuk', *Fraser's Magazine* 34 (1846), pp. 339–46.

Bačkovský, František

'Bohemia', [annual survey of Czech literature], *Athenaeum*, 2 Jan 1886, p. 8,

1 Jan 1887, pp. 8–9.

Bowring, John

'Popular Poetry', *London Weekly Review* 1828, pp. 90–91 (9 Feb), pp. 122–3 (23 Feb), pp. 185–6 (22 Mar), p. 218 (5 Apr), p. 443 (12 July), pp. 491–2 (2 Aug).

'Bohemian Literature', *Foreign Quarterly Review* 2 (1828), pp. 145–74.

[notices: *London Weekly Review* 23 Feb 1828, p. 120; Fr. Palacký, *ČČM* 1828 sv. 3, pp. 132–6.]

'Littérature et Poésie de la Bohême', *Revue Britannique* 1828, pp. 253–63. [Adaptation of the above.]

'Ancient Bohemian Ballads', *Westminster Review* 12 (1830), pp. 304–21.

*Wýbor z Básnictví Českého. Cheskian Anthology: Being a History of the Poetical Literature of Bohemia, with Translated Specimens*. London 1832.

[notices: *The Times* 8 Mar 1832; *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* 1 (1832), pp. 172–83; *Metropolitan Magazine* 3 (1832), p. 115; *Edinburgh Review* 55 (1832), p. 582 ('List of Publications'); Giuseppe Mazzini, *Giovine Italia* 4 (1833), pp. 222–7.]

p.353

'De l'Épopée des Bohèmes', *Almanach de Carlsbad* 4 (1834), pp. 204–14. [Transl. of extract, on Dvůr Králové MS.]

Manuscript of the Queen's Court, in *Rukopis kralodvorský, a jiné výtečnější národní spěvoprávné básně...*, vydání čtvrté Váceslava Hanky, Prague 1843, pp. 274–316.

[Introduction reprinted, with versions of A. H. Wratislaw substituted, in *Polyglotta*

*kralodvorského rukopisu*, ed. V. Hanka, Prague 1852; also, new ed., Prague 1876.]

[In addition, the following notices in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* may have been partly written with Bowring's help: 1 (1827), p. 292 (from *Revue Encycl.* May 1827, p. 541); 1 (1827), pp. 647, 649; 2 (1828), p. 375; 4 (1829), pp. 335–6 (obituary to J. Dobrovský). Overall responsibility for the section 'Miscellaneous Literary Notices' was claimed by John MacRay, an employee.]

Carlyle, Thomas

[Translation of Libussa tale, from Musaeus] in *German Romance*, vol. 1, Edinburgh 1827, pp. 106–73.

Čermák, Bohuslav

'Bohemia', *Athenaeum* 5 July 1890, p. 8

4 July 1891, pp. 10–11.

Chodźko, Aleksandr

*Fairy Tales of the Slav Peasants and Herdsmen*, transl. by Emily J. Harding from the French, London 1896. [review: *Athenaeum* 19 Sept 1896, p. 384.]

Coxe, William

*History of the House of Austria*, 2 vols, London 1807.

Curtin, Jeremiah

*Myths and Folk-Tales of the Russians, Western Slavs, and Magyars*, Boston – London, 1890.

[review: *Athenaeum* 30 May 1891, pp. 694–5.]

Durdik, Josef

'Bohemia', *Athenaeum* 26 Dec 1874, p. 857, 25 Dec 1875, p. 859, 30 Dec 1876, pp. 863–4, 29 Dec 1877, pp. 842–3, 28 Dec 1878, p. 830, 27 Dec 1879, pp. 824–5.

p.354 Gleig, Rev. George R.

*Germany, Bohemia, and Hungary, Visited in 1837*, 3 vols, London 1839.

[review: Abraham Hayward, *Quarterly Review* 65 (1839), pp. 234–72.]

Jamieson, Robert

Libussa, or the Prince's Table, a Bohemian Tale, in *Illustrations of Northern Antiquities*, with Henry Weber and Walter Scott, Edinburgh 1814, pp. 460–74.

Kohl, J. G.

*Austria*, London 1843.

Krejčí, Jan

'Bohemia', *Athenaeum* 6 July 1895, pp. 8–9.

Lach-Szyrma, Krystyn

'Slavonic Traditional Poetry', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 10 (1821), pp. 145–51.

*Letters, Literary and Political, on Poland; Comprising Observations on Russia and Other Slavonian Nations and Tribes*, Edinburgh 1823.

Mazzini, Giuseppe

'On the Slavonian National Movement', *Lowe's Edinburgh Magazine* new ser. 2 (1847), pp. 182–92, 540–46. [Reprinted in *Scritti editi ed inediti di Giuseppe Mazzini*, vol. 36,



- 
- Imola 1922, pp. 109–215.]
- ‘Cheskian Anthology, ecc. – Letteratura poetica della Boemia. Opera di Giovanni Bowring, *Londra 1832*’, *Giovine Italia* fasc. 4 (1833), pp. 222–7. [Reprinted in *Scritti*, vol. 1, Imola 1906, pp. 377–81.]
- Morfill, William Richard
- review: A. H. Wratislaw, *The Native Literature of Bohemia in the 14th Century*, in *Athenaeum* 16 Feb 1878, p. 217.
- ‘The Bohemians and Slovaks’, *Westminster Review* new ser. 56 (1879), pp. 413–444.
- ‘The Latest Bohemian Literature’, *ibid* new ser. 60, pp. 372–91.
- Slavonic Literature* (The Dawn of European Literature), London 1883.
- [review: J. Kalousek, *Pokrok* 14 Oct 1884.]
- review: E. de Schweinitz, *The History of the Church Known as the Unitas Fratrum, or the Unity of the Brethren*, Bethlehem Penns. 1885, in *The English Historical Review* 1 (1886), pp. 793–9.
- ‘Palacky’, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, ed. T. S. Baynes and W. R. Smith, 9th ed. vol. 18, Edinburgh 1885, p. 142.
- ‘Schafarik’, *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed. vol. 21, 1886, p. 386.
- ‘Bohemian (Chekh)’ and ‘Slovak’, in ‘Slavs’, *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed. vol. 22, 1887, pp. 151–3.
- review: E. Charvériat, *Les Affaires Religieuses en Bohème au Sixième Siècle*, Paris 1886, in *English Historical Review* 3 (1888), pp. 172–4.
- review: Louis Leger, *A History of Austro-Hungary from the Earliest Times to the Year 1889*, trans. by Mrs. Birkbeck Hill, in *Academy* 37 (15 March 1890), pp. 180–1.
- review: Jeremiah Curtin, *Myths and Folk-Tales of the Russians, Western Slavs, and Magyars*, Boston – London 1890, in *Athenaeum* 30 May 1891, pp. 694–5 [ascribable to Morfill].
- review: Dr. Čeněk Zíbrt, *Dějiny kroje v zemích českých od dob nejstarších až do války husitské*, in *Academy* 42 (17 Sept 1892), pp. 232–3.
- ‘Slavica’, [paragraph on periodical *Český lid*], *Academy* 44 (16 Dec 1893), pp. 548–9.
- ‘Slavica’, [mention of Zíbrt, *Seznam pověr a zvyklostí*], *Academy* 46 (1 Sept 1894), p. 151.
- review: James Baker, *Pictures from Bohemia*, in *Academy* 46 (27 Oct 1894), pp. 324–5.
- review: J. Kvačala, *Johann Amos Comenius: sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Leipzig 1892, in *Engl. Hist. Review* 9 (1894), pp. 790–2.
- review: James Baker, *A Forgotten Great Englishman*, in *Academy* 47 (23 March 1895), p. 252.
- review: Č. Zíbrt, *Jak se kdy v Čechách tancovalo*, Prague 1895, in *Saturday Review* 25 May 1895, pp. 676–7.
- ‘Slavica’, [Šafárik’s papers in the Museum], *Academy* 49 (1896), p. 176.
- review: Count F. Lützow, *Bohemia*, London 1896, in *Academy* 49 (13 June 1896), p. 483.
- review: C. E. Maurice, *Bohemia*, London 1896, in *Academy* 50 (5 Sept 1896), pp. 156–7.
- Palacký a Evropa, in *Památník Fr. Palackého*, Prague 1898, [translated by J. Kalousek].
- review: Count F. Lützow, *History of Bohemian Literature*, London 1899, in *Athenaeum* 8 July 1899, pp. 56–7, [ascribable to Morfill].
- A Grammar of the Bohemian or Čech Language*, Oxford 1899. [review: Zíbrt, *ČCM* 73

p.355

p.356

(1899), pp. 460–2; J. Kalousek, *Hlas Národa* 28 Feb 1899; Mourek, *Osvěta* 1899 1, pp. 275–7; *Politik* 1899 untraced; *Athenaeum* 3 June 1899, pp. 684–5.]  
 review: Č. Zíbrt, *Bibliografie české historie*, díl 1, Prague 1900, in *Engl. Hist. Review* 15 (1900), pp. 609–10.  
 review: Hans Schreuer, *Untersuchungen zur Verfassungsgeschichte der böhmischen Sagenzeit*, Leipzig 1902, in *Engl. Hist. Review* 18 (1903), pp. 772–3.  
*The Last Days of John Hus, A Historical Romance, translated from the original Čech, with an introduction by W. R. Morfill*, London 1909.

Mourek, V. E. and Jane

*Heavens*, by A. V. Šmilovský, London 1894. [See also A. Truhlář, below.]

Naaké, J. T.

*Slavonic Fairy Tales*, London 1874.

[review: *Athenaeum* 6 June 1874, p. 759.]

Ralston, William Shedden

'The Huss Festival at Prague', *Good Words* 1 Dec 1869, pp. 839–47.

'The Poor of Prague', *Good Words* 1 April 1870, pp. 257–62.

'Bohemian Literature', *Athenaeum* 11 June 1870, p. 772.

'Slavonic Literature', *Athenaeum* 15 Oct 1870, p. 495.

p.357 Reeve, Henry

'Sketches of Bohemia, and the Slavonian Provinces of the Austrian Empire', *Metropolitan Magazine* 18 (1837), pp. 349–63; 19 (1837), pp. 30–44, 157–76, 225–43.

'The Austrian Revolution', *Quarterly Review* 87 (1850), pp. 190–238. [Attributed by *Wellesley Index*, 1.]

Salvo, Charles Marquis de

*Travels in the Year 1806 from Italy to England*, London 1807.

Schulz, Ferdinand

'Bohemia', *Athenaeum* 25 Dec 1880, pp. 842–3.

Sládek, Josef

'Bohemia', *Athenaeum* 31 Dec 1881, p. 877.

Strickland, Walter William

*A Trial in Statesmanship. Comedy in One Act*, by Em. Bozděch, Prague 1874.

*Baron Goertz; Tragedy in Five Acts*, by Em. Bozděch, Prague, London printed, 1884.

*Three Stories by Viteslav Halek. Under the Hollow Tree. Poldik the Scavenger. On condition, or Pensioned Off. Together with Twenty-Eight Lyrical Pieces*, York 1886.

*Two Mock Epics. Hanuman, by Svatopluk Czech – translated from the 17th edition; and, Tantum Religio, or, Sir Blasius*, London 1894.

*Segnius Irritant; or, Eight Primitive Folk-Lore Stories*, London 1896.

*North-West Slav Legends and Fairy Stories*, London 1897.

*South-Slavonic Folk-Lore Stories*, London 1899.

*Russian and Bulgarian Folk-Lore Stories*, London 1907.

[also some reprints:]

---

*Under the Hollow Tree*, by V. Hálek, London 1913.  
*Hanuman*, in *Poems*, 2 vols, New York 1929, 1, pp. 166–223.  
*Hálek's Stories and Evensongs*, New York 1930.  
*Panslavonic Folk-Lore*, New York 1930.  
[the following are also attested:]  
*Our Grandfather*, by V. Hálek, Prague 1920.  
*Poldik the Scavenger*, by V. Hálek, Prague 1920.  
*Evening Songs*, by V. Hálek, Prague 1920, another ed. 1923.  
*Under the Hollow Tree*, by V. Hálek, Prague 1922.  
*Hanuman*, by Sv. Čech, Prague 1927.

p.358

Tille, Václav

'Bohemia', *Athenaeum* 2 July 1892, pp. 6–7, 1 July 1893, pp. 8–9, 7 July 1894, pp. 8–9, 4 July 1896, pp. 8–9, 3 July 1897, pp. 8–9, 2 July 1898, pp. 10–11, 7 July 1900, pp. 6–7, [also:]  
6 July 1901, pp. 10–11, 5 July 1902, pp. 8–9, 4 July 1903, pp. 8–9, 3 Sept 1904, pp. 296–7.

Truhlář, Antonín, with V. E. Mourek

'Bohemia', *Athenaeum* 6 July 1889, pp. 8–9.

Turnbull, Peter Evan

*Austria*, 2 vols, London 1840.

[review: Abraham Hayward, in *Quarterly Review* 65 (1839), pp. 234–72.]

Wratislaw, Albert Henry

*Wratislaw, a Bohemian Ballad Relating to Incidents in the Thirteenth Century. Translated into German by Karl Rain and from German into English by the Rev. A. H. Wratislaw*, Rugby 1845.

*Lyra Czecho-Slovanská. Bohemian Poems, Ancient and Modern, translated from the original Slavonic, with an introductory essay*, London 1849.

*Patriotism: an ancient lyrico-epic poem, translated from the original Slavonic*, London, Rugby printed, 1851.

*The Queen's Court Manuscript with other ancient Bohemian poems, translated from the original Slavonic into English verse*, Cambridge 1852. [review: *The Critic* 11 (1852), pp. 154, 239.]

*Manuscript of the Queen's Court. A collection of old Bohemian lyrico-epic songs, with other ancient Bohemian poems. Translated by A. H. Wratislaw. Published by Venceslav Hanka*, Prague 1852.

[the same] in *Polyglotta kralodvorského rukopisu*, ed. V. Hanka, Prague 1852.

'Baron Wratislaw's Captivity in Turkey', *Notes and Queries* 2nd ser. 8 (20 Aug 1859), p. 145.

*Historical and Statistical Sketch of the Slavonic Protestants in the North of the Austrian Empire. Also an account of a Residence and Captivity in Turkey in the days of Queen Elizabeth of England. ...from the Bohemian of Baron Wenceslas Wratislaw*, London 1861, ('From the Church and School Circular'), [reviews: *Clerical Journal* 1861, p. 447; *Journal of Sacred Literature* 3rd ser. 14 (1862), p. 477.]

p.359

*Adventures of Baron Wenceslas Wratislaw of Mitrowitz. What he saw in the Turkish metropolis, Constantinople; experienced in his captivity; and after his happy return to his country, committed to writing in. . . 1599. Literally translated from the original Bohemian, London 1862. [reviews: *Athenaeum* 6 Sept 1862, pp. 298–301; *Saturday Review* 13 (21 June 1862), pp. 722–3; *Clerical Journal* 1862, p. 520; *Journal of Sacred Literature* new ser. 1 (1862), pp. 475–6.]*

'Protestants of Bohemia', *Good Words* 3 (1862), pp. 607–8.

'Contributions to Modern Ecclesiastical History No. I. Extracts from the Chronicles of the Helvetian. . . Church of Lysá nad Labem. . . From the Bohemian (MS.) of the Rev. Josef Procházka', *Journal of Sacred Literature* 4th ser. 3 (1863), pp. 366–381.

'The Protestant Clergy in Bohemia', *Journal of Sacred Literature* 4th ser. 2 (1863), pp. 282–9.

'Contributions to Mod. Eccles. Hist. No. III. – A few days amongst the Slavonic Protestants of Central Europe', *Journal of Sacred Literature* 4th ser. 4 (1864), pp. 286–301.

p.360 'Protestant School at Lysá in Bohemia', *Clerical Journal* May 1864, p. 452; also, note to the same, Sept 1864, p. 275.

'How Saints Are Made at Rome in Modern Days.' *An enquiry into the canonization of St. John Nepomucen in 1729*, London 1866.

'Legenda o Janu Nepomuckém a skutečná historie. Od A. H. Vratislava. – Z Anglického přeložil J. Procházka', *Hlasy ze Siona* 7 (1867), pp. 124–6, 143–4.

*A Glimpse at Protestant Education and Literature in Bohemia*, London (1867), ['School Hall, Bury St. Edmund's, Aug. 16th, 1867'].

review: Daniel Bentham, *Notes on the Origin and Episcopate of the Bohemian Brethren*, in *Journal of Sacred Literature* 5th ser. 1 (1867), pp. 251–2.

'Johannes Hus Redivivus', *Journal of Sacred Literature* 5th ser. 2 (1867), pp. 97–105.

'Johannes Hus Redivivus No. II.', *Journal of Sacred Literature* 5th ser. 2 (1868), pp. 329–336.

'An Account of the Writings of John Huss (Mistra Jana Husi sebrané spisy Czeské, Erben)', *Contemporary Review* 10 (1869), pp. 530–55.

review: *Documenta Mag. J. Hus*, ed. Fr. Palacký, Prague 1869, in *Contemporary Review* 11 (1869), pp. 449–51.

review: [same], in *Clerical Journal* 25 (1869), p. 64.

'The Pronunciation of Ancient Greek Illustrated by that of Modern Bohemian', *Journal of Philology* 2 (1869), pp. 42–47.

'An Account of the Writings of John Huss', *American Presbyterian Review* 5 (1869), pp. 228 seq.

'The Precursors of John Huss in Bohemia', *Contemporary Review* 13 (1870), pp. 196–210.

p.361 review: Fr. Palacký, *O stycích a poměru sekty Waldenské. . .* in *Contemporary Review* 13 (1870), pp. 486–9.

*Diary of an Embassy from King George of Bohemia to King Louis XI. of France in. . . 1464. From a contemporary manuscript, literally translated from the original Slavonic*, London 1871. [review: *Athenaeum* 18 March 1871, pp. 331–2.]

'John Huss and the Ultramontanes', *Contemporary Review* 19 (1872), pp. 238–59.

- 
- 'The Praise of the Saints "Chvála Svatých"', *Sunday Magazine* new ser. 1 (1872), p. 400. review: K. Tieftrunk, *Odpor stavův českých proti Ferdinandovi I.*, in *Academy* 3 (15 July 1872), pp. 275–6.
- 'Two Scenes from the Hussite Wars', *Sunday Magazine* new ser. 1 (1872), pp. 830–835.
- 'John Huss and the Ultramontanes', *Living Age* 112 (Boston, Mass., 1872), pp. 427–39.
- Life, Legend and Canonization of St. John Nepomucen*, London 1873. [review: *Saturday Review* 36 (1873), p. 184.]
- 'The Gustavus Adolphus Society', *Sunday Magazine* new ser. 3 (1874), pp. 546–51.
- 'Adventures of a Bohemian Nobleman in Palestine and Egypt in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 3 (1874), pp. 346–71.
- 'Bohemian (Slavonic) Manuscript in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge', *Athenaeum* 6 Feb 1875, p. 192. [see also: 'Literary Gossip' *Athenaeum* 19 June 1875, pp. 821–2.]
- 'How History Is Sometimes Written', *Fraser's Magazine* new ser. 12 (1875), pp. 519–27. [translations from the Dvůr Králové MS. etc.] in *Polyglotta královského rukopisu*, Prague 1876.
- obituary: Fr. Palacký, in *Athenaeum* 10 June 1876, p. 795
- 'Origin of the Word "Gipsy"', *Journal of Philology* 6 (1876), pp. 83–84.
- 'The Bloody Parliament of Wilemow', *Fraser's Magazine* new ser. 14 (1876), pp. 294–301.
- 'Adoptive Brotherhood among the Servians', *Sunday Magazine* new ser. 6 (1876), pp. 204–8.
- 'St. Procop of Bohemia: A Legend of the Eleventh Century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 4 (1876), pp. 439–48.
- 'History of the County of Cilly', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5 (1877), pp. 327–38.
- The Native Literature of Bohemia in the Fourteenth Century. Four lectures delivered before the University of Oxford on the Ilchester Foundation*, London 1878. [reviews: J. Jireček, *ČČM* 52 (1878), pp. 307–10; A. W. Ward, *Macmillan's Magazine* 38 (1878), pp. 40–47.]
- 'John of Jenstein, Archbishop of Prague, 1378–1397', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 7 (1878), pp. 30–57.
- review: J. Jireček ed., *Dalimili Bohemiae Chronicon* (Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum 3i–iii), in *Academy* 13 (8 June 1878), p. 504.
- 'The Roumanians', *Athenaeum* 20 April 1878, pp. 506–7.
- 'Libussa's Judgment', *Athenaeum* 27 July 1878, p. 113.
- Stilfrid and Brunswik: two chivalrous romances of the 14th century. Translated from the original Bohemian*, Bury St. Edmund's 1879.
- 'Vladimir Monomachus, Grand Prince of Kyjev', *Trans. of the Royal Hist. Society* 8 (1880), pp. 12–19.
- 'Life and Writings of Dubravius, Bishop of Olmutz, 1542–1553', *Trans. of the Royal Hist. Society* 9 (1881), pp. 137–51.
- John Hus. The commencement of resistance to papal authority on the part of the inferior clergy*, London 1882, (The Home Library). [reviews: *Academy* 6 Jan 1883, p. 7; J. Kalousek, *Osvěta* 1883 2, pp. 1038–9.]

p.362

- p.363 *John Hus*, London (?)1882, (The Religious Tract Society. New Biographical Series. – No. 12).  
'The History of the Matice Česká', *Athenaeum* 4 Nov 1882, pp. 597–8, 2 Dec 1882, pp. 734–5.  
review: J. Loserth, *Wiclif and Hus*, translated by Rev. M. J. Evans, in *Athenaeum* 17 May 1884, pp. 625–6, [attrib.]  
review: [the same], in *The Churchman* no. 62 (Nov 1884), pp. 93–101.  
'Jan Ziska, "The Modern Hannibal"', *The Churchman* no. 77 (Feb 1886), pp. 340–359.  
'Bohemian Literature', [in article 'Bohemia'], *Chambers's Encyclopaedia*, new ed vol. 2, London 1888, ed. D. Patrick, pp. 267–8; also, ed. 1901 ditto.  
*Sixty Folk-Tales from exclusively Slavonic sources, translated, with brief introductions and notes*, London. [reviews: *Athenaeum* 6 Sept 1890, p. 317; *Hlas Národa* 15 Oct 1889.]  
obituary: Josef Jireček, in *Athenaeum* 24 Aug 1889, pp. 256–7.  
'Turkish-Speaking Christians in Bulgaria', *The Churchman* no. 130, new ser. no. 46 (July 1890), pp. 550–6.

---

## Chief Secondary Literature

[Editions of correspondence and collective works under editors' names where possible.]

- Aldred, Guy A., *No Traitor's Gait*, Glasgow 1955–63, vol. 3 no. 1.
- Alexeyev, M. P., 'William Ralston and Russian Writers of the Later 19th Century', *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 11 (1964), pp. 83–93.
- Anderson, W. E. K., *The Journal of Sir Walter Scott*, Oxford 1972.
- Auty, Robert, 'Some Unpublished Translations from Czech by A. H. Wratislaw', in *Горски Вијенац*, ed. R. Auty, L. R. Lewitter and A. P. Vlasto, Cambridge 1970, pp. 24–30.
- Auty, Robert, and E. P. Tyrrell, 'A. H. Wratislaw's Slavonic Books in the Library of Christ's College, Cambridge', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 5i (1969), pp. 36–46. p.364
- Bartle, George F., 'The Political Career of Sir John Bowring, (1792–1872), between 1820 and 1849', [unpublished Univ. of London M.A. thesis, Library of London Univ.; M.A. Birkbeck College 1959.]
- 'George Borrow's "Old Radical" ', *Notes and Queries* 208 (July 1963), pp. 242–7.
- Beer, Robert, *Korrespondence Johna Bowringa do Čech*, Prague 1904.
- Bílý, František, *Korrespondence a zápisky Frant. Ladislava Čelakovského*, 4 vols. and index vol., Prague 1907–39, (Sbírka pramenův ku poznání lit. života v Čechách. . . , skupina 2, č. 10, 14, 17, 21, 27, 28.)
- Bogatyrev, Sh. Sh., 'Чешские связи Герцена (1850-е — 1860-е гг.)', *Литературное наследство* 64, pp. 779–809.
- Borrow, George, *The Romany Rye*, ed. Cresset Press, London 1948.
- Bowring, John, *Autobiographical Recollections of Sir John Bowring*, ed. Lewin B. Bowring, London 1827.
- Brandl, V., *Život Josefa Dobrovského*, Brno 1883.
- Brewster, Dorothy, *East-West Passage, a study in literary relationships*, London 1954.
- Burian V., *Šafaříkovy dopisy slovinci Jer. Kopitarovi v letech 1826 a 1827*, Prague 1931.
- Čapek, Thomas and A. V., *Bohemian (Čech) Bibliography*, New York 1918.
- Catalogus librorum. . . quae olim ad Bibliothecam Pauli Josephi Šafařík pertinebant*, Vienna 1862.
- Čenský, Ferdinand, *Z dob našeho probuzení*, Prague 1875. p.365
- Chudoba, František, *Listy psané Johnu Bowringovi ve věcech české a slovanské literatury*, Prague 1912.
- Coleman, A. P., 'Talvj's Correspondence with James Gates Percival', *Slavonic Review* 22 (1944), pp. 83–96.
- 'John Bowring and the Poetry of the Slavs', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 84 (1941), pp. 440 seq.
- Curran, Eileen, 'The *Foreign Quarterly Review* on Russian and Polish Literature', *Slavonic Review* 40 (1961), pp. 206–19.
- Cvejn, K., *J. V. Frič v dopisech a denících*, Prague 1955.
- Desnitskii, V., *Избранные статьи по русской литературе XVIII–XIX вв.*, Moscow Leningrad 1958.

- Die Deutsche Karl-Ferdinands-Universität in Prag unter der Regierung seiner Majestät des Kaisers Franz Josef I*, Prague 1899.
- Durdík, Josef, 'Výlet do Anglie', *Světazor* 1875 16 parts, pp. 411 seq – 615 seq.  
 — 'Návštěva u Darwina', *Osvěta* 1876 díl 2, pp. 717–27.  
 — 'A. H. Wratislaw', *Světazor* 13 (14 Aug 1879), p. 385. [portrait, p. 394.]
- Fairfax-Blakeborough, John, *Yorkshire – East Riding*, London 1951.
- Filipović, R., 'Iz Jagićeve korespondencije, Morfillova pisma Jagiću', *Gradja za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 21 (1951), pp. 285–301.  
 — 'Bowring i Kopitar', *Slavistična revija* 4 (1951), pp. 113–130.
- Firth, Sir Charles, *Modern Languages at Oxford 1724–1929*, London 1929.
- Francev, V. A., *Korespondence P. J. Šafaříka, Ii*, Prague 1927.
- p.366 Frič, J. V., *Paměti Josefa Václ. Friče*, část 1, sv. 2, Prague 1886.  
 — *Paměti*, sv. 1–3, uspoř. Karel Cvejn, Prague 1957–63.
- Glonar, J., 'Kopitarjev "Briefjournal" 1816–1829', *Glasnik muzejskega društva za Slovenijo* 19, pp. 142–50.
- Heidler, Jan, *Antonín Springer a česká politika v letech 1848–1850*, Prague 1914.  
 — *Příspěvky k listáři Dra. Frant. Lad. Riegra*, díl 1, Prague 1924, (I. tř. ČAV a Umění v Praze. Hist. archiv 44.)
- Hoef, B., *Leopold von Ranke, Neue Briefe*, Hamburg 1949.
- Houghton, W. E. ed., *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals*, 2 vols, Toronto 1966–72.
- Isenburg, Wilhelm Karl, Prinz von, *Stammtafeln zur Geschichte der europäischen Staaten (Europäische Stammtafeln)*, 4 vols, Marburg 1956–7.
- Jagić, Vatroslav, *Briefwechsel zwischen Dobrowsky und Kopitar, Письма Добровскаго и Копитара въ повременномъ порядке (1808–1828)*, Berlin 1885 (Источники для истории славянской филологии, 1.)  
 — *Новыя письма Добровскаго, Копитара и другихъ югозападныхъ славянъ*, St. Petersburg 1897 (Источники. . . , 2.)
- Jakubec, J., 'Fr. L. Čelakovský', in *Literatura česká 19. století*, vol. 2, ch. 8, Prague 1903.
- Jireček, Josef, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české do konce XVIII věku*, 2 vols, Prague 1875–6.
- Josek, O., *Život a dílo Josefa Kalouska*, Prague 1922.
- Jovanović, Vojislav M., «*La Guzla*» de Prosper Mérimée, Paris 1911.  
 — 'John Bowring i srpska narodna poezija', *Srpski književni glasnik* 21 (1908), pp. 31–43.
- p.367 Jungmann, Josef, *Historie literatury české*, 2nd ed., Prague 1849.
- Kadlec, K., *Drobné spisy Bohuše svob. pána Riegra*, vol. 2, Prague 1915.
- Kallenbach, M. J., *Correspondance de Sigismond Krasiński et de Henry Reeve*, 2 vols, Paris 1902.
- Ketton-Cremer, R. W., *Felbrigg, The Story of a House*, London 1962.
- Khel, R. and J. Jakšová, *Knihovna Josefa Václava Friče: bibliografický soupis*, Prague 1965.
- Kleiner, Kamil, *Sedm set let angločeských vztahů*, London 1942.
- Kowalska, Aniela, *John Bowring – Tłumacz i propagator literatury polskiej w Anglii*, Łódź 1965 (Łódzkie towarzystwo naukowe, Prace wydźiału 1 nr. 62.)  
 — 'John Bowring – tłumacz poetów słowiańskich', *Slavia Orientalis* 12 (1963) nos. 1 and 3.



- 
- Krejčí, Jan, *Cesta po Německu, Švýcarsku, Francii, Anglii a Belgii roku 1862*, Prague 1865.
- Kudělka, Milan, Zdeněk Šimeček a kol., *Československé práce o jazyce, dějinách a kultuře slovanských národů od r. 1760 – Biograficko-bibliografický slovník*, Prague 1972.
- Kvapil, J. Š., *Sládek, Zeyer, Vzájemná korespondence*, Prague 1957.
- Laughton, John Knox, *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Henry Reeve*, 2 vols, London 1898.
- Levý, Jiří, *České teorie překladu*, Prague 1957 (Český překlad, 1.)
- Lewanski, Richard C., *The Literatures of the World in English Translation – A Bibliography*, vol. 2, *The Slavic Literatures*, New York 1967.
- Lewitter, R. L., 'Krystyn Lach-Szyrma', *Wiadomości*, London 1954 nr. 51/52. p.368
- Lukášek, Josef, *J. Růžička, jeho život a dílo*, Prague 1929.
- *Jan Janata a naše minulost*, Prague 1931.
- Macray, John, 'List of writers in "Foreign Quarterly Review"', *Notes and Queries* 2nd ser. 8 (13 Aug 1859), pp. 124–7.
- Malý, Jindřich, 'O nynějším pěstování slavistiky v Anglii', *ČČM* 1912, pp. 172–3.
- with E. Rainbow: *Vojta Náprstek – A Memoir*, Prague 1906.
- Maťovčík, Augustin, *Listy P. J. Šafárika Martinovi Hamuljakovi*, Martin 1965.
- *Listy Martina Hamuljaka, I, (1824–1833)*, Martin 1969.
- Mayne, Ethel Colburn, *The Life and Letters of Anne Isabella, Lady Noel Byron*, London 1929.
- Miklosić, Fr., 'Über Goethe's „Klaggesang von der Edlen Frauen des Asan Aga"', Wien 1883. [also: *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der kais. Akad. der Wissenschaften* 103 Heft 2, pp. 480–2.]
- Milner, Ian, 'Herr Klesmer: George Eliot's Portrait of the Artist', *Philologica Pragensia* 1964, pp. 353–8.
- Milović, J. M., *Goethe, seine Zeitgenossen und die serbokroatische Volkspoese*, Leipzig 1941 (Veröff. des Slav. Inst. an d. F.-W.-Univ. Berlin, 30.)
- *Talovs erste Übertragungen für Goethe und ihre Briefe an Kopitar*, Leipzig 1941, Kraus reprint 1968 (Veröff. des Slav. Inst. an der F.-W.-Univ. Berlin, 33.)
- Mourek, Václav Emanuel, 'Zpráva o cestě do Anglie a pobytu v Londýně, Cambridgi a Oxfordě v červenci a srpnu 1887', *Věstník KCSN* 1887, pp. 140–54.
- *Z dnešní Anglie*, Prague 1888.
- Murray, James A. H., 'William Richard Morfill 1834–1909', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 4 (1909–10), pp. 368–74. p.369
- Needler, George Henry, *Letters of Anna Jameson to Ottilie von Goethe*, London 1939.
- Nejdl, Karel and Jan Meissler, *Jean de Carro a jeho Karlovy Vary*, Karlovy Vary 1958.
- Ottův slovník naučný*, vols 1–27, Prague 1888–1909, *Doplňkový sv.* 28, Prague 1909.
- Ottův slovník naučný nové doby. Dodatky k velkému Ottovu naučnému slovníku*, vols 1–6, in 12, Prague 1930–43.
- Partington, W., *The Private Letter-Books of Sir Walter Scott*, London New York 1930.
- Paul, Karel, 'J. Bowring, Talvj-Robinson a P. J. Šafařík', *Slavia* 9 (1930–1), 329–39.
- *P. J. Šafařík – život a dílo*, Prague 1961.

- Polišenský, J. V., *Britain and Czechoslovakia – A Study in Contacts*, 2nd rev. ed., Prague 1968.
- Pynsent, R. B., *Julius Zeyer – The Path to Decadence*, The Hague 1973.
- Riegrův slovník naučný*, 11 vols, ed. Fr. Lad. Rieger, Prague 1860–74.
- Šafařík, P. J., 'Dopisy Pavla Jos. Šafaříka Janu Kollárovi', *ČČM* 47 (1873), pp. 119–147, 382–407; 48 (1874), pp. 54–90, 278–99, 414–26; 49 (1875), pp. 134–52.
- Šafránek, Jan, 'Jana rytíře de Carro almanach Karlovarský', *Osvěta* 49 (1919).
- Schulz Ferdinand, 'Vzpomínka na Johna Bowringa', *Osvěta* 3 (1983) díl 1, pp. 299 seq.
- Shorter, C. K., *George Borrow and his Circle*, London New York Toronto, 1913.
- p.370 Simmons, J. S. G., *Notes on the Slavonic Collections in the Library of the Taylor Institution*, Oxford, Oxford 1969.
- Slavík, Václav Otakar, *Karla Aloisa Vinařického Korrespondence a spisy pamětní*, 4 vols, vol. 4 ed. Jan Šafránek, Prague 1903–25, (Sbírka pramenův ku poznání... č. 6, 13, 19, 24.).
- Solly, G. A., *Rugby School Register*, vol. 1, Rugby 1933.
- Šourek, Otakar, *Život a dílo A. Dvořáka*, 3rd ed. vol. 2, Prague 1955.
- Stephen, L. and S. Lee, eds, *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 vols, London 1885–1900, supplements and continuations.
- Springer, Anton, *Aus meinem Leben*, Berlin 1892.
- Stojanović, L., *Vukova prepiska*, 7 vols, Belgrade 1907–13.
- Stone, G., 'Morfill and the Sorbs', *Oxford Slavonic Papers* new ser. 4 (1971), pp. 125–31.
- Subotić, Dragutin, 'Serbian Popular Poetry in English Literature', *Slavonic Review* 5 (1926–7), pp. 628–46.
- *Yugoslav Popular Ballads*, Cambridge 1932.
- Szykowski, Marian, *Polská účast v českém národním obrození*, vol. 2, Prague 1935.
- Thirlwall, John Connop, *Connop Thirlwall – Historian and Theologian*, New York 1936.
- Tieftrunk, Karel, *Dějiny Matice české*, Prague 1881.
- Underhill, Edwin Albert, *The Story of the Ancient Manor of Sedgley*, Tipton 1942.
- Valjavec, F., *Kopitars Briefwechsel mit Karl Georg Romy*, München 1942.
- p.371 Varannai, Aurél, 'John Bowring and Hungarian Literature', *Acta Litteraria* 6, pp. 105–48, 287–319.
- *John Bowring és a magyar irodalom*, Budapest 1967.
- Venn, J. A., *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, Part 2, from 1752 to 1900, 6 vols, Cambridge 1940–54.
- Vočadlo, Otakar, 'The Wratislaws', in *Горьку Буженау, A Garland of Essays offered to Prof. Elizabeth Mary Hill*, ed. R. Auty, L. R. Lewitter, A. P. Vlasto, Cambridge 1970, pp. 290–302.
- 'Anglie a Čechy', *Lumír* 1931, pp. 242, 306.
- 'Slovanská studia ve Velké Britanii', *Slovanský přehled* 1914–24 (Prague 1925).
- Volf, J., 'K jmenování Pavla Josefa Šafaříka censorem r. 1837', *Bratislava* 3 (1929), pp. 1062–5.
- Vopravil, Jaroslav, *Slovník pseudonymů v české a slovenské literatuře*, Prague 1973.
- Vrátko, A. J., 'Vzájemné dopisy Václ. Hanky a Jos. Dobrovského', *ČČM* 44 (1870), pp. 215–46, 311–41.

- 
- Votočková-Lauermannová, Olga, *Korespondence J. J. Jungmanna*, Prague 1956.
- Watson, George, *The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, vol. 3 (1800–1900), Cambridge 1969.
- Wellek, René, *Essays on Czech Literature*, The Hague 1963.
- Whately, E. Jane, *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately*, new ed. London 1868.
- Wratislaw, A. H., [anonymous article on] 'Albert Henry Wratislaw', *Světobzor*, 1867, č. 4, p. 34, portrait, p. 32.
- obituaries: *Athenaeum* 12 Nov, *The Times* 5 Nov, *Guardian* 9 Nov 1892. p.372
- Wratislaw, William Ferdinand, 'Wratislaw of Rugby', *The Legal Observer* 26 (6 and 13 Jan 1849), pp. 185–7, 206–10.
- Wurzbach-Tannenberg, Konstant, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, 60 vols in 30, Register (von Eduard Fechtner), Wien 1856–91, 1923.
- Zákrejs, Fr., 'Louis Leger', *Osvěta* 3 (1873) díl 2, pp. 571–82.



# Index of Personal Names

[References are to the original page numbers of the 1977 typescript, as given in the margins of the main text.] p.373

- Adelung Friedrich, 14, 16.  
Adelung Johann C., 7, 14.  
Aeneas Sylvius, 9.  
Albert Prince, 246.  
Albieri Pavel, 277.  
Aldred Guy A., 293.  
Alexander I Tsar, 16.  
Alford Henry, 160.  
Alžběta, see Elizabeth  
Anne of Bohemia, 158, 159.  
Arbes Jakub, 267, 270–1.  
Armytage Maud, 247.  
Arnold Thomas, 120.  
Arnold Matthew, 260.  
Auerbach Berthold, 219.  
Backhouse, 120.  
Bačkovský Fr., 230, 251, 261–2, 270–3.  
Badeni Count, 237  
Baker James, 234, 244.  
Bakunin Mikhail, 294.  
Banville Théodore de, 221.  
Baring-Gould Sabine, 170.  
Baum, 212.  
Beneš-Šumavský Václav, 267.  
Beneš-Třebízský Václav, 267, 269–71.  
Benham Daniel, 151  
Bentham Jeremy, 13, 17.  
Berchtold Ludmilla, 128–9.  
Bílek T. V., 181, 185.  
Birch, 118.  
Blackwood's, 170, 174–5, 182.  
Blahoslav Jan, 195.  
Blair D., 130.  
Bliss, Sands and Forster, 291.  
Bonnehose F. P. E. Boishnormand de, 137.  
Borrow George, 14–5.  
Bossuet Jacques B., 168.  
Botto Ján, 268.  
Bowring Mrs, 66.  
Bowring John, 3–4, 6, 12, 13–116 passim,  
123, 174, 192, 199, 205–6, 212, 215–6,  
233, 263, 283, 304–6, 311–13.  
Bowring Lewin, 105.  
Bozděch Em., 267, 269, 295–6, 307.  
Boleslav II, 227.  
Bracciolini Gian Francesco Poggio, 250.  
Braunerová, 286.  
Březina Otokar, 279, 280.  
z Březové Vavřinec, see Laurentius de  
Březová  
Brlić I. A., 173.  
Brodziński Kazimir, 16–7.  
Burian Tomáš A., 108.  
Burns Robert, 9, 270, 285–6, 288–90.  
Butler Alban, 149.  
Byron Anne Isabella, 135.  
Byron George Gordon, Lord, 9, 220, 226,  
252.  
Čacká Marie, 144.  
Cadell Robert, 80.

- Campbell Thomas, 9.  
Čapek-Chod K. M., 277.  
Carlyle Thomas, 12, 136.  
Carro Jean de, 110–112.  
Čech Svatopluk, 221, 229, 267–9, 271–5,  
279, 282, 286, 297, 299, 307.  
Čelakovský Fr. L., 16–17, 19, 23, 33–43, 45,  
47–8, 50–57, 59, 60, 62, 65, 67, 69, 74, 77,  
79–95, 100–3, 115, 123, 125, 129, 134,  
204, 206, 304, 307, 311, 312.  
z Čenkova Em., 274–5.  
Čermák Bohuslav, 251, 262–3, 273–4,  
Černín Eugene, Count, 63.  
Červinka Ot., 267, 270, 275, 277.  
Chadwick Edwin, 107.  
Chalupa Fr., 274.  
Chalupka Samo, 215.  
Chambers, 189.  
Chanovský Vojtěch, 233.  
Charles I, 294.  
Charles IV, 194. Charvériat E., 224  
Chatterton Thomas, 39, 68.  
Chelčický Petr, 99.  
Chmelenský Josef, 45, 50, 58, 103.  
Chodžko Aleksander, 283.  
Churchill John 105.  
Cidlinský J. B., 219.  
Clark William G., 155.  
Clauren Heinrich, 42.  
Coleridge Samuel T., 241.  
Comenius J. A., 76–7, 99, 156, 248, 266–7,  
312.  
Couperin Louis, 287.  
Coxe William, 6.  
Crabbe George, 258.  
Curtin Jeremiah, 216, 283.  
Cyril, 147.  
Czartoryski, 9.  
Czartoryski Adam, 192.  
Dalimil, 166, 168, 175, 211, 213, 290.  
Dante Alighieri, 223.  
Darwin Charles, 258–61.  
Dattel Eduard, see Grégr  
Dědina J., 250.  
Demahis, 168.  
Derzhavin G. R., 114.  
Dilke family, 84, 254, 305.  
Dilke Ashton W., 253–9.  
Dilke Charles W., elder, 253.  
Dilke Charles W., younger, 253–4.  
Döbrentey Gabor, 27.  
Dobrovský Josef, 11, 21, 30–5, 37–40, 42–3,  
46–8, 53, 57–67, 69–71, 76–7, 93, 95–100,  
102, 211, 212.  
Dolenský Jan, 278.  
Donaldson John W., 215.  
Dörfl Gustav, 303.  
Doubravský ze Skály, see Dubravius  
Drinov Marin, 216.  
z Dubé Ondřej, 228.  
Dubravius Jan, 179, 19 5.  
Dugonics A., 89.  
Dunbar William, 213  
Durdík Josef, 251–2, 256–9, 261–7 269–71.  
Dvořák A., 225, 272, 309.  
Dvořák X., 277.  
Ebendorfer Thomas, 150.  
Eliot George, 136.  
Eliška, see Elizabeth  
Elizabeth, d. of John of Luxemburg, 159.  
Emler Josef, 191.  
Erasmus Desiderius, 132.  
Erben K. J., 153, 163, 172–3, 186, 190, 206,  
216, 219, 283, 298, 309.  
Exner Franz Friedrich, 266.  
Fairfax-Blakeborough John, 294.  
Felbrigg Alana de, 158.  
Felbrigg Margaret de, Boema, 158–9.  
Felbrigg Simon de, 158.  
Ferdinand I, 164, 179.  
Ferdinand V, 193, 196.  
Fibich Zdeněk, 281.  
Fitzgerald Edward, 258.  
Fláška Smil, 175, 213.  
Forder Robert, 297.  
Franz I, 72.

---

Franz Josef, 147.  
 Francesconi Felice, 129–30.  
 Fraser's, 167, 170, 197, 203.  
 Freeman Edward A., 230–1.  
 Frere Bartle, 160.  
 Frič Josef Václav, 113–4, 142, 206, 267, 304–5.  
 Frind A., 163.  
 Gardiner Samuel Rawson, 260, 263.  
 Gebauer Jan, 187, 238, 243, 272–3  
 Geisslová Irma, 270, 274.  
 George, King of Bohemia, 53, 108, 161, 237.  
 Gerhard Wilhelm, 20.  
 Gibbon Edward, 194.  
 Gladstone W. E., 183.  
 Gleig, son of next, 197.  
 Gleig George R., 197–201, 203.  
 Goethe J. W. von, 17, 42, 79–81, 202, 286, 288.  
 Goll Jaroslav, 226, 247, 248.  
 Gosse Edmund, 284–9, 291, 307.  
 Grégr E. and E. Dattel, 296.  
 Grégr and Valečka, 295–6.  
 Grenttel and Wurz, 92.  
 Grimm J. and W., 17, 172.  
 Guild William, 158.  
 Gustavus Adolphus, 166.  
 Hacquet Belsazer, 89.  
 Hadow William H., 225.  
 Hájek z Libočan Václav, 8, 195.  
 Hálek Vítězslav, 115, 220, 265, 267, 278, 282, 296–9, 307.  
 Hamerník Josef, 169.  
 Hamuljak Martin, 21–3, 26–7, 29, 76.  
 Hanka Václav, 30, 32, 40, 48, 51, 58–60, 62–5, 67, 98, 101–2, 110, 112, 122, 125, 127–34, 138–9, 152, 181, 204, 212, 304.  
 Hannibal, 185.  
 Hanslík Jos. Ad., 103.  
 Hanuš I. J., 174.  
 Harant z Polžic Krištof, 166, 244.  
 Harding Emily J., 283.  
 Harte Bret, 265.  
 Hattala Martin, 243, 290.  
 Havlasa Boh., 267.  
 Havlíček Karel, 252.  
 Hay-Kerr Louisa, 138.  
 Hays John, 133.  
 Hayward Abraham, 201.  
 Heinemann, 286, 289.  
 Helfert J. A., 185.  
 Heller Serv., 277.  
 Helm Frances, see Wratislaw Frances  
 Helmore Rev. T., 248.  
 Hemans Mrs, 220.  
 Henniger Ludvika, 136.  
 Herbart Johann F., 266.  
 Herben Jan, 277.  
 Herder J. G., 8, 71, 100, 312.  
 Herites Fr., 269, 277, 281, 286.  
 Herkeř Jan, 23, 76.  
 Herzen Alexander, 142.  
 Herzog J. B. K., 38.  
 Heyduk Adolf, 220–1, 229, 267–8, 270–2, 275.  
 Hieronymus de Praga, see Jerome  
 Hilbert Jar., 280–1.  
 Hladík Václav, 248.  
 Hodějovský z Hodějova Jan, 195.  
 Hodža M. M., 215.  
 Hogg James, 9.  
 Holeček Josef, 179, 270–1, 304.  
 Hollý Jan, 215.  
 Hron J., see Frič J. V.  
 Hugo Victor, 221–2.  
 Hurban Vajanský, see Vajanský  
 Hurdálek Josef Fr., 60.  
 Hus Jan, 53, 98, 108, 137, 141, 148, 153, 157, 159, 160, 163, 181–4, 186, 197, 234, 248, 250, 252, 266, 301, 304, 312, 314.  
 Ibsen Henrik, 308.  
 Ilchester Lord, 174, 208–11, 249.  
 Jablonský Boleslav, 125, 127, 206, 306.  
 Jakob Therese von, 17–9, 263.  
 Jakubec Josef, 274.

- Jamieson Robert, 8.  
Jan Nepomucký, *see* John  
Jandová Žofie, 101–2.  
Janko-Dvorský Z., 275.  
Jaroslav panoš, 160–1, 188.  
Jelínek Bohdan, 269.  
Jeník z Bratřic Jan, 107–10, 233.  
z Jenštejna Jan, 150.  
Jeřábek Fr. V., 267.  
Jerome of Prague, 53, 98, 148, 181, 304.  
Jeroným Pražský, *see* Jerome  
Jesenská Růžena, 274.  
Jirásek Alois, 219, 267, 269–71, 276, 278, 297.  
Jireček Hermenegild, 212  
Jireček Josef, 117, 156, 167, 173, 175–82, 186, 188, 191, 212, 214, 217, 229, 304.  
Jireček Konstantin, 173.  
Jiří z Poděbrad, *see* George  
Johanna, wife of Wenceslas IV, 149.  
John St., 175.  
John Nepomucen St., 148, 149–51, 163–4, 170, 194–5, 203.  
John of Luxemburg, 159.  
Jonáš Karel, 258.  
Josef II, 50, 53, 215.  
Jungmann Josef, 11, 31–2, 34, 39–40, 42, 45, 47, 48, 53–4, 60–2, 65, 71–2, 91, 100–1, 153, 204.  
Jungmann Josef Josefovič, 73–4.  
Kadlinský Felix, 99.  
Kaizl Edmund B., 140.  
Kaizl E. B. or Josef, 252.  
Kalousek Josef, 161, 181–5, 187–91, 227–33, 235–6, 238, 240–3, 245–9, 305.  
Kamarýt J. V., 34–5, 37, 39, 43, 50, 53, 55, 57, 81–2, 85–7, 89–91.  
Kaminský B., 275, 280.  
Kant Immanuel, 260.  
Kaplír Kašpar Zdeněk, 186.  
Karadžić, *see* Vuk  
Karafiát Jan, 303.  
Karamzin N. M., 14, 114.  
Karásek ze Lvovic Jiří, 226, 279.  
Keats John, 221, 269.  
Keele Charlotte, *see* Wratislaw Charlotte  
Kertbeny Károly, 115.  
Khayyám Omar, 258.  
Kinský kníže, 91.  
Kipling Rudyard, 247.  
Kisfaludy Sándor, 105.  
Klarová Marie Karolina, 121.  
Klar Paul Alois, 121, 132–3.  
Klásterský Ant., 274–5.  
Klose Ant., 274.  
Klostermann Karel, 277, 281.  
Kohl J. G., 201–3.  
Kolár J. J., 271.  
Kollár Jan, 22–24, 26–29, 41, 45–6, 48–9, 55–7, 59, 63, 65, 67, 71–7, 101–3, 123, 125, 156, 205–6.  
Komenský, *see* Comenius  
Konarski Dr., 110.  
Konrád J. D., 277.  
Kopitar Jernej, 17–19, 21, 24–6, 29–35, 37, 40, 46, 48, 58–72, 77, 85, 97, 304.  
Kopta Flora, 285, 287–9.  
Kosmák V., 276.  
Košut Bedřich V., 129.  
Koubek Jan Pravoslav, 115.  
Kovařovic Karel, 281.  
Krajník Miroslav, 269.  
Krašínski Valerian, 124, 128–9.  
Krašínski Zygmunt, 192, 220.  
Krásnohorská Eliška, 220, 226–8, 270, 274.  
Krejčí Jan, 251, 262–3, 278–80.  
Krek Gregor, 190.  
Kronberger, 91.  
Krug, 144.  
Krylov I. A., 14.  
Kučera Karel, 275.  
Kunětická Božena Viková, 286–7.  
Kvačala J., 248.  
Kvapil Jar., 275, 281.  
Lach-Szyrma Krystyn, 9–12, 16.  
Laichter J., 276.



- 
- Laurentius de Březová, 93.  
Leake W., 25.  
Leger Karel, 270, 275.  
Leger Louis, 141, 161–2, 209, 252–3.  
Lego Jan V., 172–3.  
Linda Josef, 212.  
Lindsay, see Lyndsay  
Livingstone, 260.  
Loserth Johann, 184.  
Louis XI, 161.  
Lowe, 205.  
Luther Martin, 267, 312.  
Lützow Francis, 4, 227, 234, 236–7, 239–40,  
244, 247–9, 289, 303.  
Lyndsay David, 213.  
MacColl Norman, 261–2, 291.  
Mácha Karel Hynek, 113, 219, 224, 252,  
308.  
Macháček Simeon Karel, 42.  
Machar J. S., 274, 277–9.  
Mackenzie Campbell, 137.  
Macpherson James, 9–10.  
Macray John, 43.  
Maginn William, 105.  
Maglanovich Hyacinthe, 19.  
Maixner K., 151.  
Malten, 75.  
Malý Jakub, 206.  
Malý Jindřich, 254, 256.  
Marek A., 73.  
Margaret de Felbrigg, see Felbrigg  
Marie Antoinette, 117.  
Marković, 173.  
Masaryk Tomáš Garrigue, 187, 272–3.  
Maurice Charles Edmund, 231, 234, 237.  
Mayer Rudolf, 252.  
Mažuranić Ivan, 173.  
Mazzini Giuseppe, 205–6, 306.  
Mérimée Prosper, 19.  
Methodius, 147.  
Metternich, 196.  
Mickiewicz Adam, 192, 205, 221, 306.  
Miklošič Franc, 238, 243.  
Millevoje Charles-Hubert, 16.  
Mokrý Otakar, 269.  
Monomachus Vladimir, 179.  
Montgomery Andrew, 112.  
Montgomery Samuel Faulkner, 111–2.  
Morfill William Richard, 4, 162, 173, 180,  
208–250 passim, 290, 301–2, 311–3.  
Morris William, 221.  
Mourek Jane, 290–1, 307.  
Mourek Václav Emanuel, 240, 242, 249,  
251, 262–3, 273, 290–1, 299, 307.  
Mrštík A., 281.  
Mrštík V., 277–8, 281.  
Mucha Alfons, 250.  
Muczkowski Józef, 128.  
Mühlsteinová Berta, 267.  
Muir John, 289–90.  
Musaeus Johann Karl August, 9, 12.  
Musset Alfred de, 221.  
Naaké John Theophilus, 283.  
Napoleon Bonaparte, 59.  
Napoleon III, 147.  
Náprstek Vojta, 138, 146, 148, 165, 168–70,  
174, 191, 225, 252–4, 256–7, 259, 305.  
Náprstková Josefa, 258.  
Neale Rev. John Mason, 246–7.  
Nejedlý Jan, 85.  
Němcová Božena, 299.  
Nepomucen St. John, see John  
Neruda Jan, 220–1, 265, 267, 271, 296.  
Nestor, 182.  
Neumann, 89.  
Neureuter, 201.  
Nicolai L., 250.  
Noel Robert Ralph, 135–7, 303.  
Noel Rev. Thomas, 135.  
Ossian, 9, 31, 36, 39.  
Ovid, 170.  
Pakosta Vojtěch, 275.  
Palacký František, 41, 43, 61, 64, 76, 88,  
129, 131, 135–9, 149, 151, 153, 155–61,  
163–4, 167, 171, 178, 181–2, 185, 191,  
194, 206, 224, 235, 237, 304, 312.

- Patera Adolf, 212.  
Paul Karel, 77.  
Payne Peter, 234.  
Pelcl Fr. Martin, 7, 212.  
Pecocke Reginald, 214.  
Pellico Silvio, 145.  
Petőfi Sándor, 115.  
Petrarch, 49.  
Pfleger-Moravský Gustav, 252, 267.  
Picek Václav Jaromír, 125, 307.  
Pinkas Ota, 267.  
Plánek Jan, 53.  
Podlipská Sofie, 219, 267, 270.  
Poe Edgar Allan, 219, 226.  
Poggio, see Bracciolini  
Pokorný Rud., 267, 270.  
Pokorný-Pikulík V. J., 275.  
Polak, 87–8.  
Polák Matěj Milota Zdirad, 11.  
Pomuk Jan z, see John  
Popovič G., 258.  
Pradt Abbé de, 89.  
Pravda Fr., 267.  
Přemyslav Duke of Teschen, 158–9.  
Pressl Jan Svatopl., 42.  
Příbil Martin A., 92.  
Procházka F. F., 32.  
Procházka Josef, 131, 143, 148, 151, 154, 169.  
Procopius St., 168, 170, 213.  
Prokop, see Procopius  
Przemislaus, see Přemyslav  
Puchmajer Antonín J., 45, 101.  
Pushkin Aleksandr, 114, 221.  
Pypin A. N., 229.  
Quaritch Bernard, 258.  
Quis L., 270.  
Radovský z Hustiřan, 195.  
Rain Karl, 121, 125.  
Rais Karel Václav, 277, 280–1.  
Ralston William Shedden, 160, 252–3, 259.  
Ranke Leopold, 138.  
Ray John, 83–4.  
Reeve Henry, 192–7, 199, 203.  
Reeve Mrs., 193.  
Renatus F. X., 277.  
Reyer und Schlick, 18.  
Rezek A., 278.  
Richard II, 158.  
Rieger Fr. L., 135–6, 164, 189, 249, 252–4, 303.  
Riola Henry, 179.  
Rittersberg Jan, 33.  
Řivnáč Fr., 129, 181.  
Rhys Ernest, 213.  
Robinson Therese, see Jakob  
Rowley Thomas, 39, 68.  
Rumy Karol, 27–9.  
Rückert Fridrich, 260.  
Růžička Josef, 131, 139, 154.  
Rybička A., 179.  
Sabina Karel, 169, 206.  
Šafárik Pavel Josef, 18, 21–30, 45–6, 48, 52, 63, 71–3, 76, 77, 88–9, 96, 101–3, 138, 161, 206, 209, 224, 237, 304, 312.  
Šafránek Jan, 145.  
Šalda Fr. X., 280.  
Salvo Charles Marquis de, 6.  
Sartorius Daniel, 139, 154.  
Schiller J. C. F., 168, 202.  
Schulz Ferdinand, 115, 221, 251, 261–2, 267, 271, 277.  
Schweinitz E. de, 224.  
Scott Francis, 199.  
Scott Walter, 8–9, 79–82.  
Sedlnitzky Count, 63.  
Searle W. G., 158–9.  
Šembera Alois V., 161, 175, 179, 212, 229.  
Semovít of Teschen, 159.  
Semovitus, see Semovít  
Serres Marcel de, 8.  
Shakespeare William, 210, 284.  
Shelley Percy Bysshe, 220–1.  
Sigel Feodor, 248.  
Šimáček M. A., 275–6, 278.  
Simon de Felbrigg, see Felbrigg

- 
- Šimon Josef, 274.  
Sinker Robert, 166–7.  
Skála Jan, see Dubravius  
Skelton John, 214.  
Sládek Josef Václav, 220–1, 229, 239,  
241–2, 251, 261–2, 267, 269, 271, 274,  
284–91, 299, 302, 304–5, 307, 311.  
Sládkovič Andrej, 215.  
Sláma F., 276.  
Šlejhar Josef K., 278, 280.  
Small John, 158.  
Smetana Prof., 206.  
Šmilovský A. V., 219, 269, 271, 291, 307.  
Smolař, 123.  
Šnajdr K. S., 45, 101–2.  
Sobotka Primus, 188.  
Sova Ant., 275, 280.  
Spasovich V. D., 229.  
Spee Friedrich von, 99.  
Spencer Herbert, 260.  
Springer A., 134–6, 303.  
Stankovský Josef Jiří, 267.  
Stanley, 260.  
Stašek Antal, 267, 280–1.  
Šťastný V., 267.  
Statham George H., 142, 163, 165.  
Stech Václav, 280.  
Štěpnička Fr. Boh., 38.  
Sternberg, 81.  
Štítný Tomáš, 99, 141, 159, 174, 210–1, 214,  
228, 241.  
Štolba Josef, 269, 271.  
Štorkán J., 294.  
Strickland Charles  
William, 292–3.  
Strickland Walter William, 4, 190, 283,  
292–9, 307, 311.  
Strickland-Constable Henry Marmaduke,  
295.  
Strindberg August, 308.  
Stroupežnický Lad., 270.  
Šubert Fr. Adolf, 267, 269–71.  
Šubert Rev. V., 144.  
Šumavský, see Beneš-Š.  
Šumavský Franta, 129.  
Sun Yat-Sen, 294–5.  
Švampera Václav, 248.  
Světlá Karolina, 219, 267, 286, 288.  
Svoboda Fr. X., 275, 280.  
Svoboda V. A., 33, 64, 102.  
Swainson Charles A., 121, 127.  
Swinburne Algernon C, 221, 26 9.  
Szyrma, see Lach-Szyrma  
Tait, 107.  
Talvj, see Jakob  
Taylor, 208.  
Taylor William, 14.  
Tennyson Alfred Lord, 218, 220, 290.  
Thám K. I., 15.  
Theuriet André, 2 92.  
Thirlwall Connop, 124, 152, 160, 168–9.  
Thomas-a-Beckett, 174.  
Thun, 192–3, 199, 303.  
Thun Franz, 136, 192.  
Thun Leo, 136, 193.  
Tieftrunk Dr., 122.  
Tieftrunk Karel, 122, 129, 130, 164, 168,  
179, 191.  
Tieftrunk Václav, 122.  
Tille Václav, 251, 262, 275–8, 280–2.  
Toldy Ferenc, 114–5.  
Tomek V. V., 145, 164, 170, 178, 182–3,  
185, 191, 305.  
Tomíček J. S., 155.  
Tomsa Fr., 42.  
Třebízský, see Beneš-Třebízský  
Trnka Fr., 26, 29.  
Troutbeck Rev. J., 309.  
Truhlář Antonín, 251, 262, 273.  
Turgenev I. S., 254, 286, 288, 308.  
Turinský Fr., 101, 206.  
Turnbull Peter Evan, 200, 203.  
Twain Mark, 265.  
Tyndall, 185.  
Tyndall Humphrey, 158.  
Tyndall John, 2 60.

- Tyl Josef Kajetán, 133, 206.  
Václav, see Wenceslas  
Vajanský Svetožár Hurban, 268.  
Valečka Eduard, 296.  
Váňa Jan, 295.  
Vartovský Jan, 195.  
Vazov Ivan, 289.  
Veselý J. O., 267.  
Villani de Castello Pillonico Karel Ignác, 125.  
Vinařický Karel Alois, 110–112, 125.  
Vlček Václav, 219, 267, 270, 271, 275, 277.  
Vokes Eliza, 292.  
Vocel Jan Erazim, 206.  
Vorel, Jan 280.  
Vörösmarty Mihály, 114.  
Vratislav, see also Wratislaw  
Vratislav Drzlav, 132.  
Vratislav z Mitrovic, 117.  
Vratislav z Mitrovic Václav, 132–4, 145, 148, 161, 211, 301.  
Vrchlický Jaroslav, 115, 218, 220–5, 227, 229, 239, 265, 267–72, 274–5, 281–2, 309.  
Vřesnický Jan, 281.  
Vrátko Antonín, 152–3, 161, 163, 166–7, 170–2, 178, 191, 252, 257, 304.  
Vuk Stefanovič Karadžić, 17–18, 20–5, 34, 70.  
Vysheslavtsev A., 114.  
Weber Henry, 8.  
Wellington Duke of, 13.  
Wenceslas II, 94–5, 212.  
Wenceslas IV, 93, 149–50, 158, 170.  
Wenceslas Saint, 95, 194, 245.  
Wentworth Lord, 135.  
Wenzel, see Wenceslas  
Wenzig Josef, 56, 102.  
Wesely E. Eugen, 23.  
Whately Richard, 130–1, 147.  
Winter Z., 276.  
Wordsworth William, 220.  
Wratislau Marc, see Wratislaw Marc  
Wratislavia Marc, see Wratislaw Marc  
Wratislaw, see also Vratislav  
Wratislaw von Mitrowitz, 117, 119.  
Wratislaw Albert Henry, 4, 112, 117–191 passim, 192, 209–13, 216, 227, 244, 250, 257, 259, 263, 272, 283, 299, 301–7, 311–13.  
Wratislaw children of above, 134, 146, 163, 185.  
Wratislaw Marie Caroline, 121.  
Wratislaw née Keele Charlotte Anne, 117.  
Wratislaw née Shelford E., 16 3, 168–9, 187.  
Wratislaw née Helm Frances, 133, 146, 163.  
Wratislaw Gertrude Ludmilla, 134.  
Wratislaw Helen, 146.  
Wratislaw John Minter Tong, 119–20.  
Wratislaw Josef Xaver Adam, 128–9.  
Wratislaw Ludmilla, see Berchtold  
Wratislaw Marc, 117–119.  
Wratislaw Martin, 119.  
Wratislaw Wratislaw Maximilian, 119.  
Wratislaw Rudolf, 170.  
Wratislaw Wenceslas, see Vratislav Václav  
Wratislaw Wenzel, see Vratislav Václav  
Wratislaw William Ferdinand, 117–21, 134.  
Wren, 208.  
Wycliffe John, 126, 148, 151, 183–4, 234.  
Zamoyski A., 192.  
Zeidler A., 163.  
Zelený Václav, 131.  
z Žerotína Karel, 195.  
Zeyer Julius, 218–9, 229, 262, 267, 269–72, 274–5, 280–1, 284–9.  
Zíbrt Čeněk, 232–3, 239–40, 245, 248.  
Zimmermann Josef Václav, 102.  
Ziska, see Žižka  
Žižka z Trocnova Jan, 45, 53, 98, 101, 108, 185.  
Zouch, 216.  
Zschokke Heinrich, 219.  
Zyvalda Jindřich Václav, 99.