Chad Bryant

A TALE OF ONE CITY: TOPOGRAPHIES OF PRAGUE BEFORE 1848

On the surface Franz Klutschak and Karel Vladislav Zap would appear to have little in common. Klutschak, born in Prague in 1814, began writing for "Bohemia" in 1836 and became the journal's editor in 1844, a post that he held until 1877. Throughout his life he remained committed to liberalism, *Bildung,* and cooperation among nationalities.[1] Zap, born in 1812 in Prague, first established himself as a writer of note while working as a Habsburg civil servant in Galicia, where he translated works from Polish and published various travel accounts. In 1848 he co-organized the Slavic Congress. Throughout his life he remained committed to advancing various Czech national causes.[2] Yet both men had at least one thing in common. Each wrote well-regarded topographies of Prague in the years before 1848. In 1838 Klutschak published, in German, the highly regarded "Guidebook to Prague".[3] The book was an immense success, enjoying thirteen editions through 1878. Zap completed a monograph about Prague's churches before graduating from secondary school.[4] In 1835 he published "A Description of the Royal Capital City of Prague", the first Czech-language topography of Prague.[5] In 1847 he published, again in Czech, "A Guide to Prague: A Necessary and Useful Book for Everyone Who Wants to Become Familiar with the Memorabilities of the Bohemian Capital City". Zap's "Guide" also enjoyed considerable success. His publisher released an extract from the book and a second edition before the tumultuous spring days of 1848. A German translation appeared that same year as well.[6]

---

[1] *Wurzbach,* Constant von (ed.): Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oestterreich. Bd. 12. Wien 1864, 129-130. – *Santifaller,* Leo: Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815-1950. Bd. III. Graz, Köln 1965, 426.

[2] *Zap,* Karel Vladislav. In: Národní listy, 3 Jan. 1871, no. 2, 2. – *Zap,* Karel Vladislav. In: Ottův Slovník naučný [Otto's Encyclopedia]. Vol. 27. Praha 1888-1909, 430-432. – *Kunský,* Josef: Čeští cestovatelé [Czech Travelers]. Vol. I. Praha 1961, 344. – *Sayer,* Derek: The Coasts of Bohemia: A Czech History. Princeton 1998, 129-130. – *Štěpanová,* Irena: Obrazy a zrcadla. Etnografika a slavika v díle manželů Zapových [Images and Mirrors: Ethnography and Slavic Studies in the Works of the Zaps]. In: Český lid 93 (2006) no. 2, 137-151, especially 139-143.

[3] *Klutschak,* Franz: Der Führer durch Prag. Mit einem alphabetischen Verzeichnisse der Sehenswürdigkeiten Prags und seiner Umgebung und einigen belehrenden Notizen für Fremde. Prag 1838.

[4] *Kunský:* Čeští cestovatelé I, 344 (cf. fn. 2).

[5] *Zap,* Karel Vladislav: Popsání kr. hlavního města Prahy pro cizince i domácí [A Description of the Royal Capital City of Prague for Foreigners and Locals]. Praha 1835.

[6] In the course of my research I have been unable to locate a first edition of Zap's "Guide". Thus, this article will rely on the second edition: *Zap,* Karel Vladislav: Průwodce po Praze: Potřebna příruční kniha pro každého, kdo se s pamětnostmi českého hlawního města sez-

This article is not, however, about these two men's varying life trajectories. Instead, it compares the 1845 edition of Klutschak's "Guide to Prague"[7] with Zap's 1847 work in order to interrogate two related sets of questions related to the history of Prague in the period of Vormärz. First, the two works reveal much about the changing form, content, and popularity of topographies, a genre with deep roots in Bohemian and European history. By the late eighteenth century topographies of Prague drew from numerous archival sources and census records to offer patriotic members of the nobility scholarly information about the city's climate, population, history, and, most importantly, physical structures. After the Napoleonic Wars a surprising influx of travelers to Prague combined with a growing local interest in the city among the city's rising middle classes to transform the genre. By 1845 topographies, including those written by two of those rising elites, Klutschak and Zap, had adapted to these growing audiences while retaining their scholarly apparatus, thus remaining distinct from the guidebooks written by Karl Baedecker and John Murray.[8] As such, Klutschak and Zap's topographies not only reveal much about the history of travel and the guidebook, but also point to one way in which Prague's rising elites and outsiders inspired local authors to write about their city.[9]

Second, Klutschak and Zap's topographies reveal a great deal about how the two men thought about the past and the present, which in turn points to numerous ways in which Prague's elites, whether primarily Czech- or German-speaking, shared a common cultural and mental universe. Both men drew from a common "usable past" and followed similar chronological contours in their detailed histories of the city. Both felt that the city's past remained embedded in Prague's structures and spaces. Both held these structures, and the histories they contained, in great rever-

---

námiti chce [A Guide to Prague: A Necessary and Useful Book for Everyone Who Wants to Become Familiar with the Memorabilities of the Bohemian Capital City]. Praha 1848. – Publication of the 1847 edition was announced in the winter edition of Časopis českého Museum 21 (1847) no. 4, 465. – Just before the revolution, the same journal announced the publication of the 1848 edition. See: Časopis českého Museum 22 (1848) no. 3, 324. – In the interim Zap's publisher released his chapter on the Hradčany district of Prague, probably in the final months of 1847, despite the listed publication date. *Zap,* Karel Vladislav: Popsání král. hradu, chrámu sv. Wita a všech ostatních památnosti na Hradčanech w Praze [A Description of the Royal Castle, St. Vitus Cathedral, and the other Monuments on Hradčany in Prague]. Praha 1848. – See: Časopis českého Museum 21 (1847) no. 6, 673. – The precise publication date of the German translation is unclear. Given the fact that the German translation makes no mention of the revolution we might assume that it was published before or shortly after March 1848. *Zap,* Karel Vladislav: Wegweiser durch Prag. Ein nothwendiges Handbuch für Fremde, die sich mit den Merkwürdigkeiten der böhmischen Hauptstadt bekannt zu machen wünschen. Übersetzt von Ludwig Ritter von Rittersberg. Prag 1848.

7   *Klutschak,* Franz: Der Führer durch Prag. 4., verm. und verb. Auflage. Prag 1845.
8   *Baedeker,* Karl: Handbuch für Reisende durch Deutschland und den oesterreichischen Kaiserstaat. Coblenz 1842, 190-198. – *Murray,* John: A Handbook for Travelers in Southern Germany. London 1843, 385-399.
9   For an excellent discussion of Prague's Czech-speaking elites and their relationship to the city's other elites before 1848, see *Štaif,* Jiří: Obezřetná elita. Česká společnost mezi tradicí a revolucí 1830-1851 [Cautious Elites: Czech Society between Tradition and Revolution, 1830-1851]. Praha 2005.

ence during a time of immense political, social, and economic upheaval. The two men had differing views of contemporary events, however. Inspired by the increasing pace of industrialization and the arrival of the railroad in Prague in 1845, Klutschak imagined Prague to be entering a new, golden age of wealth and prosperity. He argued that Prague artfully combined a romantic past full of tragedies and triumphs with promises of a vibrant, progressive future that would place the city at the center of Europe. Zap also embraced Prague's past as a series of romantically interpreted triumphs and tragedies, but seemed content with Prague's current status as a peripheral city on the edges of the Habsburg monarchy. He was more circumspect than Klutschak about the many changes coming to the city. The two men, in short, reveal two sides of an ongoing debate about the wrenching changes experienced in the years before 1848 as well as two ways in which urban elites made sense of their common past, present, and future.

It is certainly no coincidence that the first modern topography of Prague dedicated to the city, its structures, and history appeared shortly after the reign of Emperor Josef II had come to an end. Jaroslaus Schaller's four-volume "Description of the Royal Capital and Imperial Residence of Prague", while no doubt inspired by urban topographies published elsewhere in Europe, was both a product of Habsburg enlightened absolutism and a reaction against it.[10] The introduction included population statistics, statistics on consumption, and other data gathered during Prague's first census in 1770. After census-takers visited a building they numbered each house with black paint – numbers that Schaller then used to label the structures that he described in his book.[11] In 1784 Joseph II had decreed that the New Town, Old Town, Lesser Town, and Hradčany districts would henceforth be fused into one administrative unit, allowing Schaller and others to more easily imagine the city as a coherent whole.[12] More generally, the book speaks to a larger Enlightenment effort to label and categorize. The bulk of the book is organized into chapters corresponding to the city's four quaters. Within each chapter the sites are organized by type (churches, squares, houses of note, and so on) while distinguishing "noteworthy" sites from the rest, which are not included in the book. Each site receives a de-

---

[10] *Schaller,* Jaroslaus: Beschreibung der königlichen Haupt- und Residenzstadt Prag sammt allen darinn befindlichen sehenswürdigen Merkwürdigkeiten. 4 vols. Prag 1794-1797. – See also *Huber,* Helmuth: Beschreibung der Königlicher Haupt- und Residenzstadt Prag. Prag 1781. – *Opiz,* Jan Ferdinand: Vollständige Beschreibung der königlichen Haupt- und Residenzstadt Prag. Prag, Wien 1787. – For topographies elsewhere see, for example, the topographies of Rome discussed in *Sweet,* Rosemary: The Changing View of Rome in the Long Eighteenth Century. In: Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies 33 (2010) no. 2, 145-164.

[11] *Tantner,* Anton: Ordnung der Häuser, Beschreibung der Seelen: Hausnummerierung und Seelenkonskription in der Habsburgermonarchie. Innsbruck 2007. – It was these authors' reliance on census data and on archival research that distinguished their topographies from those of their predecessors. See, for example, *Redel,* Carl Adolph / *Friedrich,* Johann Friedrich: Das sehenswürdige Prag. Nürnberg, Prag 1710.

[12] *Vlk,* Jan / *Bělina,* Jan (eds.): Dějiny Prahy [The History of Prague]. Vol. II. Praha 1997-1998, 15-17. – *Janáček,* Josef: Malé dějiny Prahy [A Short History of Prague]. Praha 1968, 243-244.

scription detailing its provenance, its relationship to major historical events and personalities, and its present state.

Schaller's intended readers, however, were not supporters of enlightened absolutism, but rather local nobility who embraced Bohemian history in an attempt to resist centralization from Vienna.[13] As such, his topography speaks to a larger effort by those same nobles to erect structures such as the Nostic National Theater (now the Estates' Theater) and the Chain Bridge (now the Legionnaires' Bridge) that embraced French styles and a peculiar form of *Landespatriotismus*.[14] After the Napoleonic Wars topographies appealed to additional audiences. A growing Habsburg bureaucracy centered in Prague, industrialization, and increasing trade made possible by Prague's excellent communications network led to the rise of German- and Czech-speaking bourgeois elites who took a new interest in their city.[15] At the same time, Prague was becoming a popular destination for German travelers, especially those coming from Dresden or the spas of Karlovy Vary/Karlsbad.[16] Pan-Slav enthusiasts traveled to Prague as well, often depending on the existence of informal networks of hosts.[17] Travelers arrived through gates that opened out to roads and early nineteenth-century "super-highways" leading to Vienna, Cracow, Budějovice, Plzeň, Linz, Dresden, and other cities throughout Central and Eastern Europe.[18] After 1845 many arrived by train at the Imperial Railroad Station (now Masaryk Station).[19] After 1847 many arrived on the "Bohemia," a steamship that travelled every four days from Dresden to Prague.[20]

---

[13] On the Bohemian nobility's *Landespatriotismus* and their embrace of history, see *Agnew,* Hugh: Origins of the Czech National Renaissance. Pittsburgh 1993.

[14] *Marek,* Michaela: Kunst und Identitätspolitik. Architektur und Bildkünste im Prozess der tschechischen Nationsbildung. Köln 2004, 20-23, 33-47, 77-78.

[15] On these transformations and the rise of bourgeois elites, see *Štaif:* Obezřetná elita 70-78 (cf. fn. 9). – On the Czech national movement's interest in Prague, see *Macura,* Vladimír: Prague. In: *Macura,* Vladimír: The Mystifications of the Nation: The "Potato Bug" and Other Essays on Czech Culture. Trans. by Hana Píchová and Craig Cravens. Madison 2010, 35-46.

[16] On the popularity of Prague as a destination for Germans, see *Demetz,* Peter: Prague in Black and Gold: Scenes from the Life of a European City. New York 1998, 272-274. – See also the voluminous quotations from various German travel writers in: *Schottky,* Julius Max: Prag wie es war und wie es ist. Prag 1831, 15-31. – A number of German-speaking British travelers ventured off the Grand Tour to visit Prague as well. *Bugge,* Peter: "Something in the *view* which *makes* you *linger*": Bohemia and Bohemians in British Travel Writing, 1836-1857. In: Central Europe 7 (May 2009) no. 1, 3-29.

[17] *Bracewell,* Wendy: Travels Through the Slav World. In: *Bracewell,* Wendy/*Drace-Francis,* Alex (eds.): Under Eastern Eyes: A Comparative Introduction to East European Travel Writing on Europe. Budapest, New York 2008, 147-195, esp. 177-178. – On pan-Slavism more generally, see *Kohn,* Hans: Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology. New York 1960. – Prague's informal network of guides is described well in: *Hurban,* Josef Miloslav: Cesta Slováka ku bratrům slavenským na Moravě a v Čechách [Travels of a Slovak to his Slavic Brothers in Moravia and Bohemia]. Žilina, Košice 1929 [1841] 103-111.

[18] *Zap:* Průwodce 53 (cf. fn. 6). – On the road system and carriage travel in early nineteenth-century Bohemia, see *Hlavačka,* Milan: Cestování v éře dostavníku. Všední den na středoevropských cestách [Travels in the Age of the Carriage: An Ordinary Day on the Road in Central Europe]. Praha 1996.

[19] On the arrival of the train in Prague see *Pohl,* Rudolf (ed.): Osudový vlak: Sborník

Publishers responded in turn. By the 1840s travelers and interested locals could choose from a number of topographies of Prague.[21] Topographies were not the only works to roll off the printing presses, however. By the 1840s Murray and Baedeker included long descriptions of Prague in their guidebooks through German-speaking Central Europe.[22] František Palacký penned a history of Prague intended primarily for Europeans enjoying brief excursions to his home town.[23] In 1820 Josef Jüttner published the first map of Prague drawn using modern cartographical methods – a map that included all of Prague's buildings, with appropriate numbers, at a scale of 1:4,320. Jüttner's work provided the basis for the maps of Prague that followed.[24] Similar to their counterparts elsewhere in Europe, inhabitants of Prague became intrigued by panoramic views of their city, as reproduced in the lithographs of Vincenc Morstadt and in Antonín Langweil's paper maché model of the city. Technological advances in printing made it possible for artists such as Morstadt – and publishers of topographies – to reach a wider audience more cheaply.[25] A whole publishing industry dedicated to providing outsiders and locals with detailed information about the city had now emerged.

Bourgeois locals and, perhaps more importantly, travelers also inspired authors to transform the topography genre. Independent members of the middle classes preferred to explore the city without the aid of hired guides, instead moving independently with a book and map in hand. As with travel literature more generally, self-reflection now combined with the duty to observe and catalogue.[26] Schaller was

---

příspěvků stejnojemné vědecké conference k 150. výročí příjezdu prvního vlaku do Prahy [The Fateful Train: A Collection of Essays from the Scholarly Conference of the Same Name on the Occasion of the 150th Anniversary of the Arrival of the First Train in Prague]. Praha 1995. – On the ways in which modern modes of transportation not only increased opportunities to travel, but also conditioned travelers to see the world as a modern tourist might, see *Müller,* Susanne: Zur Medienkulturgeschichte des Reisehandbuchs. In: *Jaworski,* Rudolf / *Loew,* Peter Oliver / *Pletzing,* Christian (eds.): Der genormte Blick aufs Fremde. Reiseführer in und über Ostmitteleuropa. 2011, 38-43.

[20]   *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 133 (cf. fn. 7).

[21]   See, for example, *Gerle,* W. A.: Prag und seine Merkwürdigkeiten. Prag 1830. – *Griesel,* A. W.: Griesel's neuestes Gemälde von Prag. Prag 1827. – *Schottky:* Prag (cf. fn. 16). – *Seidlitz,* Julius: Wanderung Durch Prag: Mit einem Situationsplan und 4 Original-Ansichten. Prag 1844. – Zap, however, remained the only author to pen a Czech-language topography of Prague.

[22]   *Baedeker:* Handbuch für Reisende 190-198 (cf. fn. 8). – *Murray:* A Handbook for Travelers 385-399 (cf. fn. 8).

[23]   *Palacký,* František: Guide des étrangers à Prague. Prague 1836. – The original German manuscript remained unpublished until 1998. *Palacký,* František: Skizze einer Geschichte von Prag. Prag 1998.

[24]   *Semotanová,* Eva: Mapy Čech, Moravy, a Slezska zrcadla stáletí [Maps of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia through the Centuries]. Praha 2001, 133-134.

[25]   On Morstadt, see *Hlavsa,* Václav: Praha v obrazech Vincence Morstadta [Prague as Depicted by Vincenc Morstadt]. Praha 1973. – On Langweil, see *Bečková,* Kateřina: Svědectví Langweilova modelu Prahy [Evidence Concerning Langweil's Model of Prague]. Praha 1996. – *Semotanová:* Mapy 134 (cf. fn. 24).

[26]   On these developments more generally, see *Buzard,* James: The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature, and the Ways to Culture, 1800-1918. Oxford 1993. – *Bohls,* Elisabeth

among the first to adapt to this new audience. In 1820 a local publisher released a shortened version of Schaller's topography intended, as the subtitle indicated, 'for travelers, as well as anyone who would like to become acquainted with [Prague's] peculiarities." [27] The preface began with general praise for the city before describing what might strike the foreigner upon first entering Prague: the constant motion of carriages and people; the mixing of different classes; the labyrinthine streets of the Old Town; and the multitude of churches and spires. The author then walks the reader to Petřín/Laurenziberg, which provides an opportunity to describe a panoramic view of the city and its immediate surroundings. [28] Another chapter offers information on postal carriages as well as "first-class inns," and tips for finding hot and cold drinks, including punch. Establishments selling this English drink could be found on every street, Schaller writes, claiming that no other city in the German lands drank more punch than Prague. [29] Other chapters listed educational establishments, libraries, learned societies, and other organizations that might appeal to the traveler. Yet another offered suggested walks beyond the city's walls. The topographical descriptions of Prague's structures and spaces had been reduced to 151 pages. The book concludes with excerpts from travelers' descriptions of the city. Schaller's successors including Zap and Klutschak followed a similar format. It became a cliché to begin one's topography with a description of the city as seen from atop Petřín/ Laurenziberg. Nearly all of these topographies included a map and several lithographs depicting some of the city's notable sites.

Yet topographies remained distinct from guidebooks proper in that the former placed the utmost emphasis on detailed information about Prague's structures and spaces. Erudition and scholarship, while giving way partially to the needs of the traveler, remained paramount. "A 'Guide to Prague' is what I should have written," Zap wrote in the opening lines to his 1847 publication, "yet instead there arose a more extensive description of our Prague – and no wonder; there is so much material: so much important, wonderful, and interesting material offers itself that it simply was not possible to remain within the limits of a dry guidebook." [30] However, Klutschak and Zap did introduce one important convention from the guidebook into their respective topographies. Unlike their predecessors, Klutschak and Zap included suggested walks in their books. And while Klutschak organized his entries about Prague's various structures alphabetically, Zap presented descriptions of longer walks in the relevant places of each district of the city. The change is significant, for it altered the way in which readers were supposed to see the city and its structures.

A.: Introduction. In: *Bohls,* Elizabeth A./*Duncan,* Ian (eds.): Travel Writing 1700-1830: An Anthology. Oxford 2005, xiii-xxvii. – *Parsons,* N.: Worth the Detour: A History of the Guidebook. Stroud 2007.

[27] *Schaller,* Jaroslaus: Beschreibung der königlichen Haupt- und Residenzstadt Prag. Prag 1820. – See, however, *Edler Geissau von,* Anton Ferdinand: Kurze Beschreibung der Königlichen Haupt- und Residenzstadt Prag im Königreiche Böhmen. Prag, Wien 1805.

[28] *Schaller:* Beschreibung 1-11 (cf. fn. 27).

[29] *Ibid.* 43-45.

[30] *Zap:* Průwodce i (cf. fn. 6).

Previously, authors such as Schaller had organized the city's most "noteworthy" sites among the city's four districts, and then according to type. Rather than imagine the city's structures as existing within categorical boxes (churches, squares, buildings of note, etc.) Klutschak and Zap linked these various structures and spaces along paths. Rather than a collection of structures sorted according to type, this was a city that was meant to be experienced on foot.

It was also a city in which travelers, locals, and publishers had created a consensus on the city's "must-sees." Cartographers framed their maps with images of St. Vitus, Charles Bridge, and the Old Town's City Hall. In 1838 Josef Miloslav Hurban's guide took him to see the sites, "St.Vitus, Nosticovský palace, Hradčany, and so on," he wrote.[31] And thus, not surprisingly, Zap and Klutschak's one-, two-, and three-day walks though the city were remarkably similar. Klutschak set out a grueling itinerary for his one-day walk: from the Powder Tower down Celetná/Zeltnergasse to the Old Town Square; Týn Church/Teynkirche; City Hall; through the winding streets of the Old Town and across Charles Bridge following the King's Way to Hradčany and St. Vitus before walking to the Loreto, Strahov monastery, and numerous sites on the way to lunch on the island of Žofín/Sophieninsel. After lunch, the reader was meant to walk to Cattle Square (now Karlovo náměstí); board a carriage to Vyšehrad; return by carriage through the gate at Horse Square (now Václavské náměstí); wind his way to the railroad station, through the newly constructed suburb of Karlín just beyond the city wall; and finally re-enter the city through Poříčí/Poritzer Gate.[32] Zap's one-day walk differed only in that it was less ambitious and ended the day on the island Žofín.[33] There were, of course, minor differences. Klutschak, unlike Zap, takes readers through the Jewish quarter during his longer walks, while Zap does not. Zap highlights the Bohemian Museum in his walks, whereas Klutschak does not. But Klutschak's readers would certainly have encountered Zap's counterparts while following their respective authors' suggested paths through the city.

Klutschak and Zap, in sum, shared a desire to reach a diverse audience of nobles, rising local elites, and travelers seeking scholarly yet accessible knowledge about the city. As the topography adapted to the demands of these audiences, Klutschak and Zap did as well, mimicking innovations introduced by Schaller after the Napoleonic Wars. Both authors sought to balance popular demands with an adherence to scholarship, thus hoping to lay the foundation for an educated appreciation of their city. Yet the books speak to a more significant theme. Both men shared a common understanding of the city's past and the significance of its physical structures, even if they disagreed about Prague's present and future.

Zap and Klutschak were writing at a time when Europeans had become deeply interested in history. History, many Enlightenment thinkers argued, revealed the laws that governed human society, a belief that continued to inform thinkers into the next century. Nationalists drew upon history for a sense of legitimization and a

---

[31] *Hurban:* Cesta Slováka 111 (cf. fn. 17).
[32] *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 41 (cf. fn. 7).
[33] *Zap:* Průwodce 332-333 (cf. fn. 6).

means of uniting future co-nationals around common myths and understandings of the past. The immense changes brought about by the French Revolution and industrialization not only suggested ways in which people's lives were historically determined. The dual revolution also provoked a nostalgic longing for a quieter, simpler past. The opportunities to study history increased as well. Over the course of the nineteenth century archives once in private hands or jealously guarded by the state opened their doors to professional historians and members of the public. Public museums housed not just written materials but all sorts of relics from various historical periods. The early nineteenth century saw the rise of historical novelists such as Sir Walter Scott and a vast array of painters who created sentimental portrayals of the past. Lithography, invented by the Prague native, Johann Alois Senefelder, in 1796, allowed the mass production of scenes from the past in picture books and popular histories throughout Europe. In the 1830s the Commission des Monuments Historiques began to inventory France's historic buildings and archeological sites. Historical preservation, which combined pedagogical goals with nostalgia for bygone eras, had begun.[34]

A deep appreciation of history rises from nearly every page of the topographies of Klutschak and Zap. Neither author, however, imagined history in linear terms, as a slow yet inexorable march of progress toward higher civilization and well-being. Instead, Klutschak and Zap drew inspiration from Schaller's cyclical understanding of history in which each era of prosperity, political unity, and architectural achievement was followed by an era of decline. As Klutschak writes:

Each glorious period is followed by a time of abominations and devastation; as soon as Prague's rulers and inhabitants had accumulated treasure this [wealth] fell victim to foreign lands and cities seeking enrichment or to destruction [...]. And thus Otakar II's glorious reign was followed by the Brandenburg plundering, thus the gathered riches of Wenceslaus II fell into the hands of the thieving desires of various thugs, thus the noble achievements of the era of Charles IV fell victim to the horrors of the Hussite Wars, and then the Rudolfine era was followed by the horrific events of the Thirty Years War.[35]

In the period between the glorious rule of Bohemia's first Christian king, Bořivoj, and the rejuvenation of the city under Otakar II, Prague was "either robbed, or under siege, or otherwise attacked" more than eleven times, Zap writes.[36] Natural disasters also took their toll. A plague outbreak in 1681 left half the population dead.[37] A few years later, in 1689, fire destroyed large sections of the Jewish ghetto, the Old Town, and the New Town, devouring 800 houses, palaces, and churches.[38] Together, this admixture of glory and tragedy fills the city's air. "Golden dreams, difficult fates [...] ardor and indifference, wonder and modesty" characterize Prague's history, Zap writes.[39]

---

[34] For an excellent overview see *Jefferies,* Matthew: The Age of Historism. In: *Berger,* Stefan (ed.): A Companion to Nineteenth-Century Europe, 1789-1914. Malden 2006.

[35] *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 10 (cf. fn. 7).

[36] *Zap:* Průwodce 11 (cf. fn. 6).

[37] *Ibid.* 47. – Klutschak writes that the plague killed 32,000 people in 1679 and 1680. *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 10 (cf. fn. 7).

[38] *Ibid.* 10-11. – *Zap:* Průwodce 47 (cf. fn. 6).

[39] *Ibid.* 3.

Both histories, in turn, also sought to explain how each of these periods had bequeathed structures to Prague that survived to their own day. Bořivoj was the first to establish a residence in Hradčany and constructed the Týn church in the Old Town.[40] The rapid, unregulated erection of buildings under Václav II in the second half of the thirteenth century led to the Old Town's current labyrinthine character.[41] The Belvedere stood as a testament to Rudolf II's artistic patronage and Prague's brief moment as an imperial residence.[42] For a hundred years following the 1689 fire, Zap writes, more churches were built in the city than in the previous six hundred years combined.[43] The rule of Charles IV, in particular, stood out both for its historical significance and for its architectural legacy. Zap and Klutschak celebrated the era of Charles IV in ways similar to those in which nineteenth-century European nationalists looked to medieval kingdoms as sources of historical legitimacy and symbols of lost grandeur.[44] Like many nineteenth-century nationalists, Zap and Klutschak compared Prague with other European cities to affirm their city's Europeanness and its rightful place among the continent's great cities. Charles IV, Klutschak writes, created a city whose "brilliance and size could compare with the most celebrated cities of a bygone era, with Rome, Florence, Paris, and Cologne."[45] Here Zap was either copying Klutschak's text or repeating a phrase that had become a cliché: with the rule of Charles IV, he writes, Prague entered a "new, glorious era" from which emerged "a brilliance matched only by the great cities of bygone Europe such as Rome, Paris, Florence, and Cologne."[46] Both celebrated the era of Charles IV as a time when the power of the Holy Roman Empire was concentrated in Prague, when the city became enriched through commerce and trade routes that stretched across the continent. And, of course, Charles IV had given the city Central Europe's first university, Charles Bridge, numerous churches, and the New Town district.

And, crucially, both men believed that Prague's structures exuded the spirit of the past. Or, as Zap wrote, "Prague in its greatness only reveals itself before the eyes of those who know its history."[47] In front of St. Vitus, one of Charles IV's most prominent, yet unfinished, architectural achievements, Zap declared that "a stroll through [the cathedral's] sacred halls is also a stroll through the history of Bohemia" in which the spirit will be filled with thoughts about the past.[48] Both authors remind their readers of a church built by St. Václav that once stood on this spot; the glorious years of Charles IV; the great fire of 1541, which, miraculously, spared most of the cathedral; and the 22,000 cannon balls and shells that Friedrich II (whom Zap compares

---

[40] *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 1 (cf. fn. 7). – *Zap:* Průwodce 7-8 (cf. fn. 6).
[41] *Ibid.* 12.
[42] *Ibid.* 32.
[43] *Ibid.* 41.
[44] *Smith,* Anthony: The "Golden Age" and National Renewal. In: *Hosking,* Geoffrey / *Schöpflin,* George (eds.): Myths and Nationhood. London 1997, 36-59. – My thanks to Kateřina Čapková for pointing me to this work.
[45] *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 6-7 (cf. fn. 7).
[46] *Zap:* Průwodce 17 (cf. fn. 6).
[47] *Ibid.* 47.
[48] *Ibid.* 230.

to Attilla the Hun) rained down on the city in 1757, thirty of which made a direct hit on the cathedral.[49] Prague's glorious eras, and the tragic eras that followed, were also embedded in the various structures of St. Vitus. Rudolf II's mausoleum contains the bones of Charles IV, Rudolf II, and other royalty. The Chapel of St. Václav marks the site where the Bohemian nobility elected Ferdinand their king in 1526.[50] The treasury contains valuable works of art, many crafted from precious metals and stones that recall Prague's various periods of trade and wealth.[51] Monuments to Prague's past, architectural and artistic, "are but the most immediate witnesses, the surest proof of the past," Zap writes. Without Prague's structures, its inhabitants would be left with only books and vague notions of the past, he concludes.[52]

Both authors may have seen history in cyclical terms and believed that Prague's history – good and bad, but significant nonetheless – resided in its physical structures. They differed, however, on whether or not to view that history in nationalist terms. Kluschak sought to avoid questions of national conflict. He refers obliquely to tensions between locals and foreigners in the run-up to the Hussite Wars when "Bohemian fought Bohemian."[53] Czechs and Germans are equally dominant in the city now, he wrote. Despite a period of decline following the Thirty Years' War, he wrote elsewhere, more and more "proper" Czech is being spoken, while Czech literature can proudly stand as a European literature of note.[54] For Klutschak what united inhabitants of Prague, and Prague's history, was not language, but a common sense of a place whose inhabitants – locals and recent immigrants, Czech-speakers and German-speakers – had collectively experienced a cyclical history of tragedies and triumphs. Klutschak's attachment to his home town, at its core, emanates from a territorial identification and shared history.

Zap, on the other hand, understood the history of Prague as a constant tension between "cosmopolitanism" and the city's true Slavic character.[55] At its founding Prague was a Slavic city, but this began to change under Přemyslid rule, when closer relations with the German Reich brought Germans and Jews to the city. German immigration rose again under the rule of Otakar II and continued through the era of Charles IV when Prague, "wedged within Germandom" and "cut off from its Slavic brothers" took on a "cosmopolitan character" that, had the trend continued, would have completely subsumed the city's Slavic elements.[56] Social tensions, however, mapped onto national differences so that the Kutná Hora decrees and then later the Hussite Wars forced many Germans to flee the city. Prague, for a brief period of

---

[49] *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 83-85 (cf. fn. 7). – *Zap:* Průwodce 230-252 (cf. fn. 6).
[50] *Ibid.* 245.
[51] *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 85 (cf. fn. 7).
[52] *Zap:* Průwodce ii (cf. fn. 6).
[53] *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 7 (cf. fn. 7).
[54] *Ibid.* 17.
[55] Interestingly, while Zap claims to have been inspired by Václav Vladivoj Tomek's recently published history of Prague, the latter makes no mention of this tension between cosmopolitanism and Prague's genuine Slavic character. See *Tomek,* Václav Vladivoj: Děje pražské w krátkém nástinu [A Brief Outline of Prague's History]. Praha 1845.
[56] *Zap:* Průwodce 21 (cf. fn. 6).

time, became what it had originally been: "the capital of the Slavic peoples of Bohemia."[57] Cosmopolitanism, however, was on the rise again during the era of Rudolf II and especially after the Thirty Years' War, when the Habsburgs replaced disloyal Bohemian nobles with foreigners.[58] Even the Bohemian nobles who remained had, by the third generation, been entirely disconnected from the people of the nation. Shortly after Joseph II's Germanization of the administration and schooling, Prague's "street corners and nooks swarmed with German civil servants, professionals, and speculators" who, until recently, had only spoken Czech.[59] Only now, thanks to the creation of clubs, the Bohemian Museum, and the printed word, had Prague's Slavic elements begun to emerge again.[60]

Zap also pointed to a means by which this nationalist history could be integrated into the physical landscape. Prague is "our Rome," he wrote, "where our history has been concentrated and monuments [to that history] have been built." "Every good Czech who feels the nation in his heart" was duty-bound to remember and guard these markers of the past.[61] When writing about St. Vitus, for example, Zap warned that only those with a "heightened sense of religiosity and national feeling" should enter the cathedral's doors, the doors of St. Vitus.[62] We learn that in St. Václav's chapel the archbishop of Prague sings "Hospodine pomiluj ny," the oldest known Czech-language choral, during Sunday afternoon vespers.[63] The Bohemian Museum, then located in house number 858 on Na Příkopě, receives a four-page description, more than any other site in the New Town.[64] Prague's Czech-speaking elites who, along with visitors with pan-Slavic inclinations, worked to claim Prague for the Czechs and the Slavs by learning about its topography were no doubt part of Zap's intended audience. Furthermore, with Zap's book in hand, national awakeners and others could further the national cause – and participate in the national community – by walking through a city endowed with powerful new meanings.

And yet it is important not to overstate the point. Zap's other primary theme – Prague's ever-changing material, political, and artistic fortunes – often blends with his history of Prague as a "Slavic" city in seemingly contradictory ways. The "German colonists" who immigrated to Prague during Otakar II's rule might have weakened the city's Slavic element, but they also accompanied a new era of prosperity that resulted, in part, from the importation of German trade, skills, and municipal laws.[65] Just as the "cosmopolitan" character of Charles IV's reign threatened the Slavic city, it also represented the height of Prague's economic, political, and artistic achievements. The Hussite Wars might have Slavicized the city again, but they also left it empty and in ruins. "Buildings and places of worship, as well as other invalu-

---

[57] *Ibid.* 25.
[58] *Ibid.* 48.
[59] *Ibid.* 44.
[60] *Ibid.* 47.
[61] *Ibid.* ii.
[62] *Ibid.* 230.
[63] *Ibid.* 246.
[64] *Ibid.* 124-128.
[65] *Ibid.* 13.

able treasures from the preceeding periods of glory were destroyed in the rages of battle" and are now lost forever, Zap lamented.[66] The Counter-Reformation era might have subsumed Czech language and literature, and empowered a foreign nobility, but that same nobility built palaces in Malá strana in "proud Roman style, richly ornamented."[67] Thus, "art awoke once again in Prague," he concluded. The fate of Prague's architecture was intertwined with the fate of the city's Slavic element. And, significantly, Zap apparently had no qualms about allowing his friend, Ludwig Ritter, to provide a German translation of the "Guide", which softened Zap's anti-German statements and reworked references to Czech nationalism. The translation also excluded Zap's original preface in which he declared Prague to be the Czechs' Rome and demanded that Czechs remember and protect the structural reminders of the nation's history.[68]

Where Zap and Klutschak diverged most prominently, however, was in the ways in which they concluded their respective histories, which in turn points to a debate within Prague about industrialization and technology that cut across linguistic divides. Klutschak ends his history section with the arrival of the railway in Prague on August 20, 1845, which, in addition to connecting Prague with Vienna, promised to "mark a new epoch in the history of our capital."[69] Not surprisingly, "Bohemia" led with long articles on the arrival of the first train as well. Klutschak included the railroad station on his rigorous one-day walk. His description of the station emphasized its grandiose character. One of the largest of its kind in Europe, its construction required a "host of workers […] and an unbelievable amount of necessary materials."[70] Plans for a line to Dresden, he commented approvingly, were well under way. Zap was much more circumspect about the arrival of the railway in Prague. He too ended his history section with the arrival of the trainline, but minus any predictions about Prague entering a period of renewed glory. Indeed, the German-language translation of Zap's works included a footnote apologizing for not including more information about the events of August 1845 with the excuse that such current events were much better known than Prague's more distant past.[71] The railway appeared only on the second of Zap's two-day walks when he recommended that the reader ascend the city walls to observe the station, its surroundings, and the massive gates built into the city wall to allow for the passage of trains and train personnel.[72] His description of the station in the body of the book is more subdued than Klutschak's and includes a brief description of the celebrations of August 1845, various opportunities to purchase goods, and the station's coffee house, replete with orientalist decorative features, that ranked as one of the most luxurious cafes in this part of Europe.[73]

---

[66] *Ibid.* 26.
[67] *Ibid.* 43.
[68] *Zap:* Wegweiser passim (cf. fn. 6).
[69] *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 13 (cf. fn. 7).
[70] *Ibid.* 49.
[71] *Zap:* Wegweiser 58 (cf. fn. 6).
[72] *Zap:* Průwodce 332 (cf. fn. 6).
[73] *Ibid.* 132.

This difference might well be explained by the two books' publication date. Klutschak completed his guide just a month before the railway's arrival in Prague, when anticipation was at a high point.[74] Klutschak and his publisher no doubt also hoped that the railway would bring more visitors and, hence, more customers. The back page of Klutschak's 1845 guide advertised two books: a collection of lithographs by Morstadt entitled "Views of Prague" and Moriz Rühlmann's "Easily Understandable Instructions Regarding All Matters Concerning the Railroad".[75] Zap, who had been in Galicia during this momentous event, was writing many months later, when the railway and train travel had become more mundane. Zap's fears about the fate of his Slavic city were no doubt in play as well. Just as Prague's citizens had forged trade links between Prague and cities such as Nuremberg, Regensburg, Augsburg, Cracow, Vienna, and Venice during the reign of Charles IV, railroad lines to Vienna and Dresden promised to link Prague to the North Sea and the Adriatic, thus placing Prague "in the heart of Europe […] between North and South, between the Orient and the Occident." Recalling how the "cosmopolitan character" of Charles IV's Prague had threatened the city's Slavic character, Zap warned that the "spiritual and moral strength of the nation must now march forward in step" so as to counter the cosmopolitan influences that the railway brought to the city.[76]

In the same passage, Zap also warned against the negative consequences of rapid material and technological advances, thus tapping into a larger debate among educated inhabitants of Prague about the significance of the railroad and other technological advances. As Vladimír Macura writes, the train's movement suggested liberal ideas about progress, movement from the past to the future, forward to something better. The train, he continues, suggested freedom of movement, but also individual freedom and the freedom of nations.[77] For Klutschak and others the train was a potent symbol of bourgeois values, free trade, science, and progress. "Bohemia", which devoted three issues to the events of August 20, 1845, called the arrival of the railway in Prague a "triumph […] in the field of science and industry, a triumph not won on the battlefield but by human reason."[78] As Jan Evangelista Purkyně wrote in an 1839 volume of "Časopis českého Musea", the railroad promised to bring "wealth, industriousness, peace, learning and culture, freedom and might."[79] Many of these same authors commented on the train's incredible speed and how its speed and power would increase trade. As "Bohemia" commented, with just "one magical stroke" the journey from Vienna to Prague had been reduced by fif-

---

[74] *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 49 (cf. fn. 7).

[75] *Morstadt,* Vincenc: Ansichten von Prag. Prag [date unknown]. – *Rühlmann,* Moriz: Leichtfaßliche Belehrung über das gesammte Eisenbahnwesen. Prag 1842.

[76] *Zap:* Průwodce 47 (cf. fn. 6).

[77] *Macura,* Vladimír: Vlak jako symbol 19. století [The Train as a Symbol of the nineteenth Century]. In: *Pohl* (ed.): Osudový vlak 59-62, 60 (cf. fn. 19).

[78] Die Prag-Olmützer k. k. Staatseisenbahn und deren feierliche Eröffnung. In: Bohemia, ein Unterhaltungsblatt, 23. Aug. 1845, 1.

[79] *Purkyně,* Jan: O železnodrahách, o gich newyhnutelné potřebnosti w Ewropě [About the Railroad, about Its Inevitable Suitability in Europe]. In: Časopis českého museum 30 (1839) vol. 2, 84-106; and continued in 30 (1839) vol. 3, 192-214. Quotation from p. 214.

teen hours.[80] Or, as Purkyně had calculated, the train "reduced space and reduced time" for trade, the train going "six times as fast as the horse [thus leading to] a six-fold decrease in costs and virtually immense increases in opportunities to multiply the output of transportable products."[81]

And yet the train, as well as the very ideas of progress and science that it embodied, also had its doubters. Shortly after the arrival of the railway in Prague, "Kwěty" warned that "people – not only our people, but all across the world – inveigh against everything new." They are not, the author continued, "looking toward the great, mysterious movement of the spirit of time […]."[82] Indeed, inhabitants of Prague who had already experienced a number of jarring, oftentimes disturbing transformations questioned the notion that the city was entering a new, glorious period in its history. Urbanization and industrialization were well under way by the late 1840s. The city's first census in 1770 had counted more than 77,000 people. By 1846 Prague's population had expanded to well beyond 100,000 inhabitants, thanks in large part to the growth of the Habsburg bureaucracy and the establishment of factories just outside the city's walls.[83] By 1843 four in every ten people living within the city's walls had not been born in the city.[84] Prague's factories within the city walls, and in newly constructed suburbs adjacent to the city such as Karlín, produced sugar, porcelain, paper, beer, textiles and, after 1843, railroad cars. The 1844 workers' uprising, led by railroad workers, shook the city's middle classes as well as the government authorities. "Fear and terror lurk in every corner" in a city where people eye each other with suspicion, one anonymous pamphleteer wrote. The sight of a cabbage knife caused the police to draw their bayonets.[85]

As Peter Fritzsche writes, many early nineteenth-century Europeans longed for a simple, more comprehensible yet bygone past that existed before the wrenching changes of the Napoleonic Wars and an industrializing, modern world.[86] One senses a similar longing for the past throughout Zap's text. In the course of just one summer, he notes sadly, four thousand workers ripped down ten houses, a garden, a courtyard, and an army barracks to make room for the railroad station.[87] Nearby, the massive customs house had been a Franciscan monastery until Joseph II had appropriated the property.[88] The House of the Black Rose, an inn that would later host important gatherings during the March 1848 revolution, had in the fourteenth cen-

---

[80] Die Prag-Olmützer k. k. Staatseisenbahn und deren feierliche Eröffnung (cf. fn. 778).

[81] *Purkyně:* O železnodrahách 84 (cf. fn. 79).

[82] J. K.: Otewření c.k. státní železné dráhy [The Opening of the C. K. State Railroad]. In: Kwěty 12 (23 Aug. 1845) no. 101, 403.

[83] *Vlk,* Jan / *Bělina,* Jan (eds.): Dějiny Prahy [The History of Prague]. Vol. II. Praha 1997-1998, 24 (cf. fn. 14).

[84] *Kárníková,* Ludmila: Vývoj obyvatelstva v českých zemích 1754-1914 [Population Growth in the Bohemian Lands, 1754-1914]. Praha 1965, 105, 107.

[85] *Anon:* Prag und die Prager: Aus den Papieren eines Lebendig-Todten. Leipzig 1845, 69

[86] *Fritzsche,* Peter: Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History. Cambridge/Mass. 2010.

[87] *Zap:* Průwodce 130-131 (cf. fn. 6).

[88] *Ibid.* 132-134.

tury been the property of the Czech "nation" within the university. Similarly, the working-class suburb of Karlín had, until recently, included three pubs and a military hospital. Fields and vegetable gardens filled the remaining space. Now, Zap wrote, it was impossible to find "a clean cobblestone pavement" in a neighborhood whose slipshod architecture was "piled up in a chaotic mess."[89] Just as disturbing was the fact that Karlín had not a single church, making it, he claimed, the only community in Bohemia with more than ten thousand people or more to lack a place of worship.[90] He compared the rapid change and energy of Karlín unfavorably with Hradčany's "sad, still life."[91] Klutschak, by contrast, ignored Karlín. Readers on his walks are expected to traverse the district on the way to see the military hospital, but neither the hospital nor a single structure in Karlín receives any mention in the body of his topography.

Thus, the choice about whether to embrace the future, technological progress, and the many changes brought about by industrialization informs each author's summations about Prague's significance, both in the past and present. For Klutschak, Prague embodied, in one city, a romantic past and a vibrant, progressive future:

Affluence, elegance, splendor, and industry are on the increase, and thus contemporary Prague combines the romantic aura of the heroic deeds of antiquity and the medieval voices of its countless towers with the real, energetic strivings of today and will, as a result, be doubly intriguing for locals and foreigners.[92]

Zap, however, disparaged the wealth and industrialization of other cities. Prague's greatest attribute, and the highest attribute of any city, was its ability to retain memories of the past within its structures:

There are of course larger, more gorgeous, wealthier, and noisier cities where splendor and plenty are at hand, where grandiose royal courts, trade, and lively industry and a luxuriant life blend together; but few of these cities come close to the noble and distinguished ideal of the city realized in Prague.[93]

In this respect, both authors represent the hopes and fears brought on by the transformations of their day. They represent both an appreciation of the past and earnest efforts to make sense of a rapidly changing present and future. They shared a common understanding of Prague's past and a sense that the past resided in the physical environment around them. Yet the radical transformations of the present provoked different interpretations, one full of optimism and a belief that better times were ahead, the other more pessimistic, full of nostalgia.

It is tempting to look back at these two men's lives through the lens of the latter half the nineteenth century. Klutschak, who remained editor of "Bohemia" until shortly before his death in 1886, came to embody the declining German liberals within Prague who became isolated from lower-class German speakers and helpless

---

[89] *Ibid.* 285-286. Quotation from 286.
[90] *Ibid.* 59.
[91] *Ibid.* 55.
[92] *Klutschak:* Der Führer durch Prag 13 (cf. fn. 7).
[93] *Zap:* Průwodce 2 (cf. fn. 6).

in the face of a powerful, expanding Czech middle class. "Bohemia", and Klutschak, eventually accepted national difference while preaching cooperation among nationalitie. To many, Klutschak seemed out of touch with the times.[94] In 1859 Zap helped found a society dedicated to renovating St. Vitus Cathedral. Renovations would begin in 1873 and continue throughout the interwar period. He continued to publish works about Prague's monuments and history in general, and his career in many ways culminated with the 1862 publication of his popular history, "The Czech Moravian Chronicle".[95] Meanwhile, his younger counterparts in the national movement focused on building new monuments to their national past and present. Over the course of the nineteenth century patriotic Czechs raised funds to dot Prague with numerous structures – the Municipal House, the National Theater, the Czech Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the Land Bank – that suggested a glorious national past and a confident future. Their representatives in the municipal government renamed streets after leading Czech historical figures and events, and in 1892 the city's aldermen removed the German-language names from street signs.[96] One is tempted to say that Klutschak was correct in predicting that Prague had entered a new, glorious phase in its history. He might have been surprised to see that, à la Zap, the city's "Slavic elements" were once again ascendant.

Yet to see these men solely through the lens of nineteenth-century nationalism masks more than it reveals. Later topographers of Prague clearly followed in Klutschak and Zap's footsteps.[97] One might also ask to what extent turn-of-the-century preservationist organizations, appalled by city hall's Hausmannization plans for the Jewish Town and much of the Old Town, drew inspiration from thoughts expressed by Zap and Klutschak decades earlier.[98] Yet the real significance of these two men's topographies relates to the first half of the nineteenth century, when local elites and travelers sparked a new interest in Prague and its structures. Klutschak and Zap suggest a time in which Czech- and German-speaking elites shared a common, but not identical, sense of their city's history. The tragedies and triumphs of their

---

[94] Ehrenpreis, Petronilla: Die "Reichsweite!" Presse in der Habsburgermonarchie. In: *Rumpler,* Helmut/*Urbanitsch,* Peter (eds.): Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918. Politische Öffentlichkeit und Zivilgesellschaft. Die Presse als Faktor der politischen Mobilisierung. Bd. 7.2 Wien 2006, 1791-1799

[95] *Sayer:* The Coasts 357-358, fn. 111, 180-182 (cf. fn. 2).

[96] *Marek:* Kunst und Identitätspolitik (cf. fn. 14). – *Paces,* Cynthia: Prague Panoramas: National Memory and Sacred Place in the Twentieth Century. Pittsburgh 2009, 59-62. – *Nekula,* Marek: "Institutions of Memory: Prague Pantheons since 1848" paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, November 2009. – *Cohen,* Gary: The Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague, 1861-1914. West Lafayette, 2006, 145-148. – *Sayer:* The Coasts 100-103 (cf. fn. 2). – *Wingfield,* Nancy M.: Flag Wars and Stone Saints: How the Bohemian Lands Became Czech. Cambridge/Mass. 2007, esp. 48-78.

[97] See, for example, *Ruth,* František: Kronika královské Prahy a obcí sousedních [A Chronicle of Royal Prague and Its Neighboring Districts]. 3 vols. Praha 1995-1996 [1903-1904]. – *Poche,* Emanuel: Prahou krok za krokem. Uměleckohistorický průvodce městem [Through Prague Step by Step: An Art-Historical Guide through the City]. Praha 1958.

[98] *Guistino,* Cathleen M.: Tearing Down Prague's Jewish Town: Ghetto Clearance and the Legacy of Middle-Class Ethnic Politics around 1900. Boulder, New York 2003, 267-306.

shared past remained embedded in the city's landscape. Visions of the present, often sanitized, comingled with visions of this glorious past. In Morstadt's lithographs, Palacký wrote, "nature and art, present and past, appear to vie with one another so as to give the city a beautiful sense of diversity within the whole, as well as a magnificent grandness."[99] And yet the jarring transformations of the modern day could not be completely ignored, as Zap had ruefully noted. Past and present mixed in a city filled with memories that headed toward a glorious, or disconcerting, future.

---

[99] *Schottky:* Prag I, 77 (cf. fn. 16).