

Marek Nekula

CONSTRUCTING SLAVIC PRAGUE:
THE “GREEN MOUNTAIN MANUSCRIPT”
AND PUBLIC SPACE IN DISCOURSE

Introduction

This study analyzes selected nineteenth-century narratives that aim to transform a nationally ambivalent Prague public space into a Slavic public space through commemorative activities. In particular, I analyze the funeral of Václav Hanka in 1861 and examine its link to the Svatobor Association that was founded after the funeral of Božena Němcová in 1862. This article follows on from my earlier research on the ways in which Czech national symbols came to dominate Prague public space.¹

My first thesis is that the Slavic or Czechoslovak reading of Prague was disseminated through the “Green Mountain Manuscript” (found in 1818 and first published in 1822), which – together with the “Queen’s Court Manuscript” (found in 1817 and published in 1819) – as the pre-eminent cultural text, functioned as *the* point of reference for other Czech nationalist texts throughout the nineteenth century.² In this manuscript, Vyšehrad is the core of the Slavic space and the foundation of Prague represents a logical extension of this core. This Slavic narrative of Prague can also be seen in the staging of Václav Hanka’s funeral and its reflection in contemporary newspapers and magazines.

My second thesis is that in moving from Prague’s city center to the periphery of Prague’s agglomeration, national funeral processions connected the legendary Vyšehrad as the core of the “Slavic” space with modern Prague as its extension and

¹ This paper is based on my presentations at the conference “Prague as Represented Space” (University of Regensburg, May 25-27, 2011) and at the workshop “Prag als Knotenpunkt europäischer Modernen” (University of Constance, July 15-17, 2011). – Cf. also *Nekula, Marek*: Prague Funerals: How Czech National Symbols Conquered and Defended Public Space. In: *Buckler, Julie/Johnson, Emily* (eds.): Rites of Place. Northwestern UP 2012, forthcoming. – *Nekula, Marek*: Die nationale Kodierung des öffentlichen Raums in Prag. In: *Becher, Peter/Knechtel, Anna* (eds.): Praha-Prag 1900-1945. Literaturstadt zweier Sprachen. Passau 2010, 63-88. – *Nekula, Marek*: Hankův pohřeb a idea českého Slavína: Přebírání a dominance veřejného prostoru českými národními symboly [Hanka’s Funeral: The Takeover and Domination of Public Space by Czech National Symbols]. In: *Pražský historický sborník* 37 (2009) 149-193.

² Here I refer to the new critical edition: *Dobiáš, Dalibor* (ed.): Rukopisy královédvorský a zelenohorský [Queen’s Court and Green Mountain Manuscript]. Brno 2010. This edition also includes a translation of both manuscripts into modern Czech and a commentary by the editor. The connection between Vyšehrad and Libuše, prophesying the future fame of Prague, had already been made before the “Green Mountain Manuscript” was published, but it was the authority of the “Green Mountain Manuscript” that was able to fix the specific place of Vyšehrad in the modern national mental map of the Czech territory.

continuation, thus helping to translate the nationally ambivalent urban space into the national one. The funerals in question took place in the early 1860s. At this time, national funeral processions for Václav Hanka, Božena Němcová, and others palpably introduced a specific image into Prague's public space – that of Vyšehrad and Prague as represented in the "Green Mountain Manuscript". The funerals also made this mental construct visible in the public space, albeit not permanently. To argue this point, I will provide a "thick description" of Václav Hanka's funeral based on the descriptions of this event by contemporary witnesses in newspapers and magazines. Significantly, the funerals I discuss established a tradition of national funeral proceedings that connected Prague's city center to the cemetery at Vyšehrad in an unprecedented way. Well-known examples of later national funerals that mediated a Slavic reading of Prague are the reburial of Karel Hynek Mácha in May 1939 and the burial of Alfons Mucha in the same year.

My third thesis is that the funerals of Hanka and Němcová led to the foundation of the Svatobor Association in 1862. This association subsequently played a crucial role in the later permanent symbolic transformation of Prague's public space. Just as Richard Wortman has shown in the case of St. Petersburg,³ in Prague, too, public space in the city center served to represent power in modern times. In the 1850s, before the funerals of Hanka and Němcová, Prague's city center was dominated by religious and nationally ambivalent pro-Habsburg Bohemian iconography, including the Maria Column in the Old Town Square linked to the dynasty, the monument to Charles IV (1848) near the Charles Bridge, the monument to students who fought in 1648 against the Swedes (initiated in the jubilee year of 1848) in the Klementinum, the monument to the Habsburg Emperor Francis I (1850) on the Vltava riverbank, and the monument to Marshal Radetzky (1858) on the Lesser Town Square. Czech national monuments came later. Erected in 1863, Hanka's tomb on Slavín (Vyšehrad) was not only the first monument to be built by the Svatobor Association, but also the first realization of a national monument project within Prague's broader agglomeration. The first Czech national monument in the city center of Prague was that in honor of Josef Jungmann in the 1870s, also sponsored by the Svatobor Association society. These changes in Prague's public space confirm Pierre Bourdieu's theses about the correlation between society and urban public space. Specifically, they marked the social and political transition from a Bohemian space to the respective spaces of Prague's Czech and German populations and the expansion of the Czech population, also visible in the gradual takeover of Prague's public space by its iconography.⁴ The ideal unity between Vyšehrad and Prague, permanently inscribed in Prague's public space through Hanka's tomb and Jungmann's

³ Cf. Wortman, Richard S.: *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy*. 2 vols, Oxford 2000.

⁴ Cf. e. g. also Marek, Michaela: "Monumentalbauten" und Städtebau als Spiegel des gesellschaftlichen Wandels in der 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. In: Seibt, Ferdinand (ed.): *Böhmen im 19. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt/Main, Berlin 1995, 149-233, 390-411. – For the twentieth century cf. Paces, Cynthia: *Prague Panoramas: National Memory and Sacred Space in the Twentieth Century*. Pittsburgh 2009.

monument, was also documented by the “Svatobor” emblem on both monuments: three hands holding a circle.⁵

Methodology

In terms of methodology, my analysis is based on the semiotics of culture as defined by Yuri Lotman and Roland Posner.⁶ I rely especially on their broad definition of “text”, which refers not only to a verbal, but also to a non-verbal text, e. g. visual artifacts, which can refer to the same ideas, categories, and values as written or spoken texts. Using Kristeva’s terms, such “texts” not only quote each other (syntagmatic intertextuality), but also use the same narrative/s (paradigmatic intertextuality).⁷ Apart from relatively permanent signs such as literary texts, monuments and the like, the broad definition of the text also includes non-permanent (temporal) texts such as demonstrations, funeral proceedings, and other scripted performances. Furthermore, the concept of the “cultural text” as used in cultural semiotics is crucial for our understanding of how the Slavic narrative of Prague was able to spread not only to other verbal and visual texts relating to Prague, but also to non-permanent and permanent texts within Prague’s public space, thereby constituting Prague self-referentially as a Slavic city. In our case the important cultural text is the “Green Mountain Manuscript” which was edited and adapted many times in other prominent texts such as Bedřich Smetana’s opera “Libuše” (1872, premiered 1881) and which, together with the “Queen’s Court Manuscript”, was the most translated Czech-language work of the nineteenth century.⁸ It provided images and values, metaphors and ideas for other “texts” to dominate public discourse and its narratives even after the critique of Tomáš G. Masaryk and others who revealed the “Manuscripts” as forgeries in 1886.⁹

⁵ These monuments were mentioned and described e.g. in *Wittlich, Peter*: Plastik. In: Seibt (ed.): Böhmen im 19. Jahrhundert 273-294 (cf. fn. 4). – *Hojda, Zdeněk/Pokorný, Jiří*: Pomníky a zapomínky [Memorials and Forgetting]. Praha, Litomyšl 19972.

⁶ Cf. *Posner, Roland*: Kultur als Zeichensystem. Zur semiotischen Explikation kulturwissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe. In: *Assmann, Aleida/Harth, Dietrich* (eds.): Kultur als Lebenswelt und Monument. Frankfurt/Main 1991, 37-74. – *Posner, Roland*: Kultursemiotik. In: *Nünning, Ansgar/Nünning, Vera* (eds.): Einführung in die Kulturwissenschaften. Stuttgart, Weimar 2008, 19-38. – *Lotman, Yuri*: Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture. Translated by Ann Shukman, introduction by Umberto Eco. London, New York 2001 [1990]. – *Lotman, Juri*: Culture and Explosion. Translated by Wilma Clark, edited by Marina Grishakova. Berlin 2009. – *Lotman, Jurij M.*: Kultur und Explosion. Edited by Susi K. Frank, Cornelia Ruhe and Alexander Schmitz. Translated by Dorothea Trottenberg. Frankfurt/Main 2010.

⁷ Cf. e. g. *Homoláč, Jiří*: Intertextovost a utváření smyslu textu [Intertextuality and Forming of the Sense of a Text]. Praha 1996. – *Kristeva, Julia*: Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. New York 1980.

⁸ Cf. *Nezdařil, Ladislav*: Česká poezie v německých překladech [Czech Poetry in German Translations]. Praha 1985.

⁹ On the role of manuscripts cf. e.g. *Masaryk, Tomáš G.*: Z bojů o rukopisy 1886-1888 [Manuscript Struggles 1886-1888]. Praha 2004 (Spisy T.G.Masaryka 19). – *Dobiáš* (ed.): Rukopisy královédvorský a zelenohorský, commentary (cf. fn. 2). – *Marek, Michaela*: Kunst und Identitätspolitik. Architektur und Bildkünste im Prozess der tschechischen Nationsbildung. Köln 2004.

Michael Warner¹⁰ understands public discourse as a circulation of texts and claims that publics are constituted by such a circulation of text/s. I understand public discourse more broadly as a circulation of "texts", or narratives, metaphors, images, and the like, which are used and negotiated across contemporary texts (and other artifacts). This circulation of "texts" – as artifacts with specific codes – constitutes the "public" as the public, in this case not as the Bohemian, but as the Czech, or Czechoslovak, public.

As the New Historicism argues,¹¹ period narratives and images, categories and values manifest themselves not only in prestigious "high" texts with a canonical charge, but also in "low" verbal texts and non-verbal social practices. The latter texts, which are explicitly (syntagmatically) or implicitly (paradigmatically) related, often allow us to re-construct the material and mental context of a given period better than "high" texts, because they reflect everyday discursive reality. This "context" can be understood as "culture" that determines both verbal and non-verbal "texts" – social practices such as funeral proceedings organized by contemporary actors. My "thick description" of contemporary funeral practices, based on their representation in newspapers as manifestations of the aforementioned cultural texts, takes these assumptions of the New Historicism as its point of departure.

The Slavic reading of Prague in the "Green Mountain Manuscript"

Before I reconstruct the Slavic narration of Prague within Prague's public space, I will try to show the paradigmatic narration of the Slavic core space in literature. To employ a metaphor used by Stephen Greenblatt, I seek to reconstruct "text threads"¹² that lead from "inside" the "Green Mountain Manuscript" not to a so-called reality, but to a discursive reality in which Prague is constructed as a Slavic city. At first, this may seem surprising, since the "Green Mountain Manuscript" has – at least superficially – nothing to do with "Prague." The part in question deals only with Libuša's Vyšehrad, where a trial is held to decide an argument between Chrudoš from the Otava River and Št'áhlav from the Radbuza River, both sons of Popel Tetva, who once came with Čech, the legendary ancestor of all Czechs, into the area where Czechs live even to the present day.¹³ However, the "Green Mountain Manuscript" represents Vyšehrad as the political center of the Slavic or Czechoslovak world, in some respects similar to Prague. Thus it is Vyšehrad to which Libuše invites the elders, nobles, and local leaders ("kmety, lechy i vládyky")¹⁴ to attend the supreme

¹⁰ Cf. Warner, Michael: Publics and counterpublics. In: *Public Culture* 14 (2002) 49-90.

¹¹ See Montrose, Louis: New Historicisms. In: Greenblatt, Stephen/Gunn, Giles (eds.): *Re-drawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. New York 1992, 392-418. – Baßler, Moritz (ed.): *New Historicism: Literaturgeschichte als Poetik der Kultur*, Tübingen 2001. – In the Czech context, Bolton, Jonathan (ed.): *Nový historismus [New Historicism]*. Brno 2007.

¹² For more on this metaphor, see Baßler, Moritz: *New Historicism, Cultural Materialism und Cultural Studies*. In: *Nünning/Nünning: Einführung in die Kulturwissenschaften* 132-155, here 134 (cf. fn. 6).

¹³ Dobiáš (ed.): *Rukopisy královédvorský a zelenohorský 178-179* (cf. fn. 2).

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 180.

court from all corners of her “empire,” described explicitly in references to the rivers and mountains where local Slavic leaders – their Slavic names are in brackets – live and reign: the River Libice (Svatoslav and Zutoslav), Dobroslav’s mountain, where the Orlice and Labe Rivers come together (Lutobor), the Krkonoše mountains (Ratibor), the Stone Bridge (Radovan), the Brdy mountains (Jarožir), and the Sázava (Strezibor), Mže (Samorod), Otava (Chrudoš), and Radbuza (Štáhlav) rivers.¹⁵ By coming to Vyšehrad, they accept and in this way constitute Vyšehrad on the Vltava River as their center, i.e. the existence of a political center, where the supreme courts are held, constitutes the Slavic “lebensraum” as a political territory.

Of course, for the contemporary reader in the nineteenth century, these toponyms also describe the territory of Bohemia. Furthermore, the “Green Mountain Manuscript” reader of the period can identify the functional parallel between Vyšehrad and Prague: both were political centers of the surrounding territory, where the ruler and the supreme institutions such as the court reside. The difference is that the Vyšehrad of the “Green Mountain Manuscript” is the center of a homogenous Slavic “lebensraum” and the seat of the supreme “folk” court. In reality, nineteenth-century Bohemia is by no means ethnically homogenous, it speaks Czech and – especially in the border regions – German, and it is only a part of the Habsburg Empire. But the “Green Mountain Manuscript” fragment emphasizes the autonomy and the cultural and political boundaries of the Slavic “lebensraum.” The “Manuscript” ends with a call by Ratibor, at home in the Krkonoše Mountains, which nineteenth century readers can identify as the territorial border between the later Bohemian Kingdom and the “German Empire.” This border is imagined by Ratibor with respect to the law and its values and with respect to the space in which that law has come to be used:

We don’t need to search for the German law;
Our law is oriented to the holy law,
Brought here by our fathers,
Here in this fruitful land around three rivers.¹⁶

These lines show that the fragment does not just deal with a specific trial and a particular ruling over a local dispute. It is also about the self-organization of an ethnic collective and it projects this collective and its law – “pravda” (truth) also means “law” in old Czech – into a space constituted as a political territory that is inhabited by a folk constituted as a national collective (*Němci Germans* vs. *Češi Czechs*). In the constitution of an homogenous ethnic space as a political “lebensraum”, the border and the center play a key role: the border to mark the inside and outside of this space, the center to constitute the homogenous and organized political whole.

In this sense, the movement of this center from the unknown Libušín, where Libuše resided in Cosmas’s chronicle,¹⁷ to Vyšehrad in the “Green Mountain Manuscript” was highly significant:

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 180-181.

¹⁶ In the Czech original: “Nechvalno nám v Němcích jskáti pravdu; u nás pravda po zákonu svatu, juže přinesechu otci naši, v sěže [žirné vlasti pres tri reky]”. *Ibid.* 184.

¹⁷ Here I refer to the new revised Czech translation of the chronicle: *Kosmas: Kronika Čechů*.

[...] in Libuřín in the golden seat of her fathers,
in the seat of her fathers, in the holy Vyšehrad.¹⁸

Thus, the "Green Mountain Manuscript" depicts the Czech mental map¹⁹ of Bohemia in the nineteenth century: Bohemia is Czech and is to be conceptualized as "Czechia," the "holy" political center of the Slavic space is on the Vltava River (Vltava is mentioned several times in the manuscript).²⁰ In this way it is connected with the contemporary political center on the Vltava, which is also evoked in the manuscript as "golden," an attribute used to describe Prague in the nineteenth century. The imagined unit of Libuše's seat (Vyšehrad in the manuscript) and Prague, which Libuše foresaw as a glorious future capital,²¹ became a single unit for the nineteenth-century reader, with respect both to Prague's foundational legend, and to the function and topography of both centers. In this way, the topographic semantic unit of Vyšehrad as a "holy" core of Czech space and Prague as an original Czech city were created. The Czechoslovak reading of Prague was based precisely on this union between Vyšehrad and Prague. Note that Prague was an ethnically ambivalent space for a long time; even in the census of 1857, Germans made up a majority of the city's population.²²

This Slavic reading of Prague was propagated in successive editions of the "Green Mountain Manuscript" published under Hanka's editorship together with the "Queen's Court Manuscript" from 1829 onwards. Hanka played an important role in the transmission of old Czech texts in contemporary discourse. His translation of the "Green Mountain Manuscript" was published in numerous editions, first in 1824 and revised in 1853. The spread of the Slavic narrative of Prague was also supported by an adaptation of Libuše's trial by Š. Hněvkovský, J. V. Frič and others, anthologies of Czech literature such as "Výbor z literatury české" (A selection from Czech literature) edited by Pavel Josef Šafařík in 1845, and histories of literature starting with "Historie literatury české" (History of Czech Literature) by Josef Jungmann in 1825. The popular edition of the Manuscripts with illustrations by Josef Mánes published in 1861 by Carl Bellmann played no small role in the spread of this narrative.²³ This edition was initiated in the context of the overwhelming echo of Václav Hanka's funeral during which the Manuscripts were prominently placed both in public dis-

Translated by Karel Hrdina, Marie Bláhová, and Magdalena Moravová with a commentary by Maria Bláhová, Magdalena Moravová, and Martin Wihoda. Praha 2011, 34. The quoted part can be found in the older editions under 1/IV.

¹⁸ In the Czech original: "v Libuříně otně zlatě sídle, sídle otně, světě Vyšehradě". *Dobiáš* (ed.): *Rukopisy královédvorský a zelenohorský* (cf. fn. 2) 178.

¹⁹ Cf. e.g. *Downs, Roger/Stein, David: Maps in Minds: Reflections on Cognitive Mapping*. New York 1977. – *Jaworski, Adam/Thurlow, Crispin: Introducing semiotic landscapes*. In: *Jaworski, Adam/Thurlow, Crispin* (eds.): *Semiotic Landscapes: Language, Image, Space*. London 2010, 1-40.

²⁰ *Dobiáš* (ed.): *Rukopisy královédvorský a zelenohorský* 178-179, 180-181 (cf. fn. 2).

²¹ *Kosmas: Kronika Čechů* 40 (cf. fn. 17), cf. also 1/IX.

²² Cf. for example *Cohen, Gary B.: The Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague 1861-1914*. Second revised edition. West Lafayette 2006.

²³ More in *Dobiáš* (ed.): *Rukopisy královédvorský a zelenohorský* 191-192 (cf. fn. 2).

course and in Prague's public space. I will analyze the staging of Prague's public space during this funeral in greater detail in section 4. The impact of this edition and its illustrations on the National Theater has been analyzed by Michaela Marek.²⁴

The Manuscripts-based Slavic narrative of Prague also spread rapidly through the print media and political speeches, the inaugural address of the Prague mayor JUDr. Tomáš Černý in 1882 being particularly noteworthy.²⁵ This reading of Prague became ubiquitous in literature and the arts. It was buttressed by Czech textbooks and public commissions such as the aforementioned enthronement opera "Libuše", the decoration of the National Theater, the Museum, and other representational buildings, and the monuments on the Palacký Bridge by Josef Václav Myslbek.²⁶ As late as 1893, the switch from bilingual street names to Czech ones and the introduction of the Slavic tricolor on street signs²⁷ echo the once passionate public discourse about the "Czech character" of the city. These monuments and representational buildings with their iconographies and Czech street signs in national colors are artifacts associated with similar "mentefacts" according to which Prague is self-referentially coded as a Slavic city from its origins to the present and claimed by the Czech public, which thereby imagines and constitutes itself as a nation, as the center of its mental "lebensraum."

Within Prague's public space, the Slavic reading of the city was introduced in the context of Václav Hanka's funeral in 1861 – at first temporarily and later more permanently. There is also a permanent inscription of the Slavic reading of Prague in the urban space through monuments. As I mentioned above, the first Slavic monument was erected at Vyšehrad in 1863 with the monumental gravestone for Václav Hanka. The first Slavic monument in the city was the monument to Josef Jungmann. For both, the semantic unity of Vyšehrad and Prague was constitutive. The "referential" urban space in literature and the arts became – as Jurij Lotman or Michail Bakhtin would formulate it²⁸ – self-referential within the urban space "narrated" as Slavic "lebensraum." The mental maps designed by the "Green Mountain Manuscript" became visible in evanescent events and in more permanent monuments. Vyšehrad "was" and became "again" the "holy" Slavic place; in national funeral ceremonies, the translation of Prague into a Slavic city started here. That is why I will try to reconstruct Václav Hanka's funeral in the next section.

²⁴ Cf. Marek: Kunst und Identitätspolitik (cf. footnote 9).

²⁵ Cf. Ledvinka, Václav/Pešek, Jiří: Praha [Prague]. Praha 2000, 495-496.

²⁶ Nekula, Marek: Die deutsche Walhalla und der tschechische Slavín. In: brücken N. F. 9-10 (2003) 87-106. – Nekula, Marek: Prager Brücken und der nationale Diskurs in Böhmen. In: brücken N. F. 11 (2004) 163-186.

²⁷ Laštovka, Marek/Ledvinka, Václav: Pražský uličník. Encyklopedie názvů pražských veřejných prostranství [Nomenclature of Prague streets and public spaces]. Praha 19972. – Nekula, Marek: Hus – Husova, Žižka – Žižkov ... Toponyma a ideologie [Hus – Husova, Žižka – Žižkov ... Toponyms and Ideology]. In: Čornejová, Michaela/Kosek, Pavel (eds.): Jazyk a jeho proměny. Prof. Janě Pleskalové k životnímu jubileu [Language and its change: In honor of Prof. Jana Pleskalová on her jubilee]. Brno 2008, 178-194.

²⁸ Lotman, Jurij M.: Die Struktur literarischer Texte. München 1972. – Bakhtin, Michail Michailovich: The Dialogic Imagination. Austin 1981.

Hanka's Funeral

After the fall of the Bach regime, the spirits of "true Czech patriots" were revived by the October Diploma of 1860, which promised the end of absolutism and a more democratic political system. The transformation of the representative public sphere into the bourgeois public sphere, as theorized by Jürgen Habermas,²⁹ could now continue in the Bohemian lands. Nevertheless, sad news soon followed. On January 12 1861 Hanka died, and was mourned – according to the magazine "Lumír" – by the "entire nation."³⁰ This "nation" was of course understood as Czech or Slavic, not as Bohemian. We can see this in the poem "To Hanka!" by the poet, journalist, and later politician František Schwarz (1840-1906), which appeared on the front page of "Lumír" on January 17. The poem envisioned grief over Hanka's death spreading across the whole Slavic world, of which patriotic Czechs believed themselves to be part – from the "Bohemian Forest" in the Šumava mountains, located on the Czech-German border, across "to the Tatras" in Slovakia, and all the way "to the chilly Baltic" and to the Volga.³¹

It was only to be expected that Hanka's funeral procession would have a Slavic character. Hanka had sympathized with Panslavic ideals and his obituary reports that he died with Russian words on his lips.³² The obituary for Hanka published in "Lumír" was far longer than other obituaries for other important Czech personalities, and Hanka's funeral on January 15 became a highly public event. It was organized by the authorities of the Patriotic Museum, an institution that played an important role in the Czech national movement. Hanka had worked as a librarian at the Museum before he died. The procession included representatives of the Museum and other educational institutions as well as representatives of the Prague and Bohemian political elites, including the Bohemian governor Antal Forgács (1819-1885), later to become the Hungarian chancellor in Vienna. However, Forgács did not play a prominent role in the funeral procession for Hanka, although his presence marked the funeral as an important event for all of Bohemia. The main body of the procession was made up of other entities:

The Riflemen's brigade. – Schools of applied sciences. – Grammar schools. – Choirs. – The reverend clergy. – The coffin with the corpse. – Three representatives of the academic association [...]. – Committee, staff and clerks of the Museum. – Heads of k. & k. offices, rector magnificus of the University, Royal Czech Academic Society and the professors. – Board and council of the capital city of Prague. – Deputation of the Royal Dowry Town of Dvůr Králové. – Deputation of the Royal Estates Theater. – [...]. – Writers, artists. – Academic and technical students. – Riflemen.³³

²⁹ Habermas, Jürgen: *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge 1989 [1962]. – Cf. also the discussion in Calhoun, Craig (ed.): *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge 1993.

³⁰ *Lumír* 11 (17.1.1861) no. 3., 61.

³¹ *Ibid.* 49.

³² *Lumír* 11 (2.2.1861) no. 6., 136.

³³ In the Czech original: "Sbor střelcův. – Reální škola. – Gymnasia. – Sborny zpěváků. – Velebné duchovenstvo. – Rakev s mrtvolou. – Tři reprezentanti akademického spolku [...]. – Výbor, sborové a úřednictvo musejní. – Hlavy c.k. úřadů, rektor magnificus s universitou,

This body, which included young and old and all relevant segments of society, was led by “Master František Palacký, Professor Tomek, school councilor Wenzig, Prince Rudolf of Thurn and Taxis, Doctor Rieger and Mr. Frič,” who “carried the tips of the bier cover. Mr. Palacký was [...] deputized by Dr. Brauner.” And “Czech songs, conducted by Master Lukes, were sung at the coffin” and in the procession. [...] The large hearse was decorated with laurels [...].”³⁴ The semantics of the laurel are very subtle here. It is a symbol of “glorious victory” or “vítězosláva” in Czech, which could also be understood in Czech as “Slavic victory.” The hearse was also decorated with painted funeral emblems bearing Hanka’s name and the coat of arms of the Knights of St. Vladimír with a Russian motto in the Cyrillic alphabet: “Pol’za [merit], Honor, Glory.”³⁵ The young Count Václav of Kounice and the student Emanuel Horáček³⁶ “carried the Queen’s Court Manuscript, placed on a splendid cushion wreathed in laurels.”³⁷ The procession became – according to the report in “Lumír” published in Czech for Czechs – “proof of our multitude and zeal,”³⁸ where “our” refers to “Czech.” The newspaper “Národní listy” also mentioned the “infinite, immense crowds.”³⁹ “Bohemia” noted that they were disciplined and that Hanka’s funeral was more monumental than the earlier funerals of Jungmann (1847) and Čelakovský (1852).⁴⁰

But this “Czech” procession was only “pars pro toto” of the “multitude and zeal” of the anonymous, but disciplined, Czech public that deliberately assembled on Prague balconies and roofs and in the streets along the route of the procession to extend the body of the Czech funeral procession. Most of the spectators would themselves become a part of the procession and accompanied Hanka to Vyšehrad. In one respect, the Czech newspaper “Národní listy” and the German “Bohemia” differ profoundly: “Národní listy” estimates that about 40,000 people took part in the funeral, while “Bohemia” claims that only 10,000 to 12,000 people were present. The readers of “Národní listy” and “Lumír”, which both described the Czech funeral ceremonies, formed the next circle of the Czech public assembled around the corpse of Václav Hanka. His body then circulated in the newspapers and it also circulated as a cultural text in the procession – represented by the “Queen’s Court Manuscript”, the “holy” script of Czech nationalists.

In subsequent days and weeks, readers in other towns and cities of the Bohemian Kingdom followed suit with their own commemorations. “Lumír” magazine

kr. Česká učená společnost a profesorové. – Představenstvo a rada kr. hlavního města Prahy. – Deputace kr. věnného města Králové Dvora. – Deputace kr. stav. divadla. – [...]. – Spisovatelé, umělci. – Akademické a technické studentstvo. – Ostrostřelci.” Lumír 11 (17. 1. 1861) no. 3, 65.

³⁴ *Ibid.* 65. – The Czech newspaper “Národní listy” also mentioned the “Slavic tricolor” around the large hearse; cf. Národní listy 1 (16. 1. 1861) no. 16, 3. The German newspaper “Bohemia” mentioned that the laurels were “colossal”; cf. Bohemia 34 (16. 1. 1861) 124.

³⁵ Lumír 11 (17. 1. 1861) no. 3, 65

³⁶ Both names are specified in the newspaper Národní listy 1 (16. 1. 1861) no. 16, 3.

³⁷ Lumír 11 (17. 1. 1861) no. 3, 65.

³⁸ *Ibid.* 61.

³⁹ Cf. Národní listy 1 (16. 1. 1861) no. 16, 3.

⁴⁰ Cf. Bohemia 34 (16. 1. 1861) 124.

mentions or describes ceremonies and requiem masses in many cities throughout Bohemia, thereby offering proof of national multitudes and zeal not only in Prague, but also in the rest of Bohemia. In the commentaries of contributors to "Lumír" and other newspapers, all these "commemorative ceremonies" and requiem masses pointed to the fact that the entire country and its population acknowledged the Czech national program as represented by Hanka. Following the model described in "Lumír", they quoted the funeral proceedings in Prague, with the same representation of the national body by municipal representatives and the younger generation, the same Czech songs, the red-white-and-blue tricolor, the Slavic alphabet, the "Queen's Court Manuscript", and so on. Through this uniform reference to Prague, a "homogenous" Czech national territory was constituted, and Prague was affirmed as a center of Czech or Czechoslovak "lebensraum."⁴¹ Cities on the inner linguistic border or outside of it were also described in "Lumír" and other print media and played a crucial role in the national cartography of the mental "we-space." The ceremonies for Hanka in these cities were cited as evidence of their Czech identity and they were declared as "Czech" and claimed for the Czechs, even though they had respectable German minorities or, in some cases, majorities. This synecdochic strategy was also employed with respect to the Bohemian territory: Czech or Slavic Prague stood for the whole of Bohemia, "translated" into the indivisible Czechia. The cities on the Czech-German language border and in the predominantly German-speaking parts of Bohemia, where ceremonies for Hanka were organized by the local Czech population, were also "translated" in this way as Czech. They represented a *pars pro toto* of the rest of the predominantly German-speaking part of Bohemia and claimed it as a part of the indivisible Czech territory.

I use Pardubice as an example of the synecdochic strategy employed to present cities and the rest of the Bohemian territory as Czech, although a significant portion of the population was German. As part of the campaign leading up to local and state elections, Czech patriots in Pardubice organized a magnificent requiem for Hanka, a plan that was regarded as being vindicated by their success in the later election and their redefinition of the nationally ambivalent Pardubice as a Czech city. An anonymous author wrote about Pardubice in "Lumír":

The [Czech] National Party won a complete victory and by that token dominance. Now the heartless voices that proclaimed Pardubice to be a half-Czech, half-German city will finally be silenced; it has been demonstrated that the town is Czech, and God willing, it will soon prove itself as such through ample deeds.⁴²

Through the funeral proceedings in other cities, which quoted Hanka's Prague funeral, Prague was constructed twofold: as the capital of Bohemia up to a geographic border and as the center of the Czech or Slavic national space. Thus the construction of Czech territory followed the same synecdochic model we described in connection with the "Green Mountain Manuscript": on the one hand, Czech space

⁴¹ In detail cf. *Nekula*: Hankův pohřeb (cf. footnote 1).

⁴² In the Czech original: "Národní strana nabyla u nás úplného vítězství a jím převahy. Nyní utichnou ony krkavčí hlasy, které Pardubice mermomocí za město poločeské poloněmecké prohlášovaly: dokázáno nyní, že jest české, a co takové bohda brzy skutky vydatnými se osvědčí." *Lumír* 11, no. 10, March 7, 1861, 235-236.

was constituted as a political “lebensraum” by the (Slavic) reference to the center, and on the other hand, Prague became the center through the uniform reference to it. At the same time, Bohemia was conceived as Czech up to the geographic border. The same representation was also used later in the Czech National Theater.⁴³

Prague was also constructed and narrated as a Slavic space by the route of Hanka’s funeral procession. The trajectory began in the Museum courtyard and proceeded through Příkopy (later Jungmann Street), continuing quite logically towards Charles Square and thence towards the “Slovany,” the fourteenth-century Slavic monastery founded by Charles IV for Croatian Benedictine monks who practised the Slavic liturgy. The route ended in the cathedral on “ancient Vyšehrad.” The newspaper “Bohemia” stated that the procession was so long that it connected Charles Square, the Emmaus monastery, and Vyšehrad with a living chain of people. While the Czech journal “Lumír” and other Czech newspapers used the toponym “Slovany” intentionally and put it in quotation marks,⁴⁴ the German “Bohemia” avoided this terminology. The Slavic reading of Prague through the prism of Vyšehrad, which started with the “Green Mountain Manuscript”, can also be seen in the chain of human bodies that connected Prague with the “ancient” and original Vyšehrad where dead bodies had to be put into the holy ground to find their ancestors.

At Vyšehrad, Hanka was buried as if he were a king, close to the remains of the supposed royal crypt of the first Přemyslid (Slavic) King Vratislav and his successors. Hanka was given a royal funeral in all respects. On its journey to the place where the coronation procession of Charles IV had once begun, his coffin was accompanied by riflemen, supplementing knights, and the army in the middle-class context, and several hundred people bearing ceremonial torches. Most importantly, all this was staged at a place that was associated with the mythical princess Libuše, the central figure of the “Green Mountain Manuscript”. The Manuscripts not only replaced the corpse, but also played the role of the route-planner for the burial. The “Green Mountain Manuscript” was the inspiration for Václav Hanka’s burial on Vyšehrad. Its Slavic semantics were transferred onto Prague through the living chain between Vyšehrad and Prague.

During the funeral ceremony, Hanka already began to turn not only into a text, but also into a permanent representation in public space: copies of a poem about Hanka were distributed during the funeral, copies of statuettes of Hanka created by Tomáš Seidan were bought for bourgeois salons and living rooms, and Hanka’s poems were set to music and published in a book entitled “Funeral March” together with the popular song “Where is My Home”. The illustration of the booklet depicted

[...] the grieving bard Lumír standing in front of the time-honored Vyšehrad, which is soaring to the skies. Three Cyrillic words are inscribed onto three wreaths of laurel, oak and roses: “Glory, Pol’za [merit], Honor.”⁴⁵

⁴³ *Nekula, Marek*: The Divided City: Prague’s Public Space and Franz Kafka’s Readings of Prague. In: *Nekula, Marek/Fleischmann, Ingrid/Greule, Albrecht* (eds.): Franz Kafka im sprachnationalen Kontext seiner Zeit. Sprache und nationale Identität in öffentlichen Institutionen der böhmischen Länder. Weimar, Köln 2007, 85-106.

⁴⁴ Cf. *Bohemia* 34 (16.1.1861) 124. – *Národní listy* 1 (16.1.1861) no. 16, 3.

⁴⁵ In the Czech original: “[...] truchlícího pěvce Lumíra, za nímž v pozadí staroslavný

The proceeds from sales of the booklet with motifs of Václav Hanka's funeral were to be used to pay for his monumental gravestone. The "Matice" Foundation also launched a fundraising campaign to build a memorial for Hanka immediately at the time of his funeral. The first collections "towards Hanka's memorial" took place as early as the requiem masses: the public interest in the establishment of Hanka's memorial had been attested in the "Czech and Slovak lands" by voluntary collections and sponsorship balls, gatherings, theater performances, and other social events, whose net proceeds had been dedicated to this noble purpose.⁴⁶ People also sent money to "Národní listy" and other newspapers. These fundraising campaigns for dead national heroes and for the Czech National Theater were then ritualized in the 1860s and 1870s – another way of constructing the national collective. The ritualistic function of these campaigns was probably more important than their limited financial success, as Michaela Marek has shown with regard to collections for the Czech National Theater.⁴⁷ In Hanka's case, Czech patriots wished to construct an adequate monument to Hanka on Vyšehrad – ideally, they wanted nothing less than his internment in a national pantheon to be called "Slavín." But their willingness to donate their own money towards Hanka's monument did not match the zeal evident in the numbers of people who attended the funeral spectacle. Indeed, it was Hanka's funeral in Vyšehrad Cemetery that gave rise to the idea that Vyšehrad, which at the time was rather desolate and dilapidated,⁴⁸ was the best place to build a national pantheon. At that time, Vyšehrad was the imagined core of the national space and nineteenth-century Czech culture was refined from here. The transformation of Prague into Slavic Prague also started here in the nineteenth century.

*Božena Němcová's Funeral, Svatobor,
and the Institutionalization of National Commemoration*

The next famous personality to follow Hanka to Vyšehrad cemetery was the writer Božena Němcová (1820-1862), who, as a "mere woman," received much more modest and unpretentious funeral honors. Nevertheless, her funeral copied that of Hanka. And it was Božena Němcová's funeral at Vyšehrad in 1867 that breathed new life into plans to build an adequate monument to Hanka. No more than one week after Němcová's funeral (and almost precisely a year after Hanka's), plans were publicly announced to found "Svatobor", an association whose objectives were, as we know, to erect a memorial to Hanka, to establish the Czech pantheon Slavín, and to support commemorations of Czech writers and playwrights (incidentally,

Vyšehrad k oblakům se vypíná. Do tří věnců, z ratolestí vavřínových, dubových a z růží uvitých, vepsány jsou azbukou psaná slova, sláva, polza, čest." Lumír 11 (14.2.1861) no. 7, 161.

⁴⁶ Lumír 11 (24.1.1861) no. 4, 90. – Lumír 11 (31.1.1861) no. 5, 117. – Lumír 11 (14.2.1861) no. 7, 161.

⁴⁷ Cf. Marek: Kunst und Identitätspolitik (cf. fn. 9).

⁴⁸ Cf. Saar, Ferdinand von: Innocens. Critical edition with commentary by Jens Stüben. Bonn 1986 [1866].

Němcová's monument was only erected in 1869 by the Society of American Women).⁴⁹

At a Svatobor meeting in July 1862, various speakers discussed the possibility of a "common national tomb, [...] a monumental building with passageways whose walls are filled with compartments in the style of honeycomb cells, where the deceased are buried. Our national tomb for writers and poets might perchance be constructed in a similar manner."⁵⁰ Nevertheless, Svatobor also supported the building of national monuments in other locations in Prague, especially in the city center. As mentioned above, at that time the center of Prague was dominated by bronze monuments to Charles IV (1848), Franz I (1850), Marshal Radetzky (1858), and others. Czech national symbols were present only as temporary installations in the 1850s. National symbols that were perceived as "Czech" were used only to decorate halls for parties, balls, and other occasions. But these symbols – for example, busts or allegorical figures – were constructed of plaster and were portable, lightweight, and cheap:

Many years have passed since such a splendid national celebration was last seen in Prague as this year's grand party at Žofín. [...] Between the Great and Small Halls, the busts of Josef Jungmann and Karel Havlíček Borovský stood side by side. [...] In the middle of some allegorical figures, the statue of Czechia ("Čechie") was prominent along with her faithful lion, and several reliefs in the form of medallions stood out on the walls [...] next to the life-sized bust of King Jiří, very successfully rendered.⁵¹

The Svatobor Association intended to give such images a permanent presence in the public space. It was founded to honor Václav Hanka with a tomb within the Slavic pantheon Slavín. Thus Hanka's tomb was not only the first Czech national memorial at Vyšehrad and in Prague in 1863, but also marked the starting point for the gradual transformation and domination of Prague's urban space by Czech national symbols. Subsequently, Svatobor went on to finance the monument to Josef Jungmann in the center of Prague on Ferdinand (later National) Boulevard, a Czech promenade. Incidentally, the location of the monument to Josef Jungmann had already been discussed in the newspapers in 1861 and confirmed by the Svatobor Association in the early 1860s (foundation stone 1873, monument erected 1878). This decision can be understood in the context of "national city planning."⁵²

⁴⁹ *Pokorná, Magdalena: Josef Němec. Neobyčejný muž neobyčejné ženy* [Josef Němec. Extraordinary Man of an Extraordinary Woman]. Praha 2009, 205-206.

⁵⁰ Lumír 12 (17.7.1862) no. 29, 695.

⁵¹ In the Czech original: "Mnoho let uplynulo, co jsme neviděli v Praze tak skvělou národní slavnost, jako byla letošní velká beseda na Žofíně. [...] Mezi velkým a malým sálem byla podle sebe poprsí Josefa Jungmanna a Karla Havlíčka Borovského. [...] Uprostřed některých allegorických postav stála na hlavním místě socha Čechie s věrným svým lvem a na stěnách vynikalo několik reliéfů ve formě medailonů s poprsím [...] krále Jiřího v životní velikosti a vyvedení velmi zdařilého." Lumír 11 (31.1.1861) no. 5, 114.

⁵² The realization of this and other monuments initiated by the Svatobor Association was supported by the city of Prague with financial funds, building sites, site preparation, etc. The city also took over the care of the monuments when they were finished and unveiled; cf. for example, the correspondence and other documents relating to the monument to Josef Jungmann in the Archiv Akademie věd (Archive of the Academy of Science), Fond 62,

Furthermore, there was some overlap in the membership of the Svatobor Association and the Society for the Building of the National Theater. František Palacký, for example, was a member of both. Both associations placed their representational projects on opposite sides of the Ferdinand (later National) Boulevard. One end of the Czech promenade was dominated by the monument to Josef Jungmann, while the other was dominated by the Provisional Theater (1862), replaced in the 1880s by the monumental National Theater.

Conclusion

This Slavic transformation of Prague started on the periphery of the Prague agglomeration at the former "holy" Slavic place, and only later came to the center of Prague, made into a Slavic city from and through Vyšehrad not only in the mental imagination of the past in the "Green Mountain Manuscript", but also in the visible world of public events as well as monuments and representational buildings. Both Hanka's tomb at Vyšehrad and the monument to Jungmann in the center of Prague were decorated with the "Svatobor" emblem, which became a visible marker of their semantic interconnection. This syntagmatic intertextual link joined the monuments and Vyšehrad to Prague, repeating the specific semantic unit of Vyšehrad and Prague already imagined in the "Green Mountain Manuscript", the funeral procession for Václav Hanka, and subsequent funerals of Czech public figures.

Later the transformation of Prague's public space received funding from the municipal authorities and from private patrons such as Josef Hlávka. In the end, only a few monuments in Prague were marked with the "Svatobor" emblem ("Svatobor" supported monuments to K. Havlíček Borovský, F. Palacký, K. H. Mácha, and so on). However, other monuments can still be seen to have been paradigmatically interlinked even without the "Svatobor" emblem, through the use of specific symbols that referred to the language-based national categories (mentefacts) that dominated the public discourse of that period. Representational buildings, monuments, and other permanent installations in the center of Prague followed this example and transformed Prague into a Czech or Czechoslovak city. After Czechoslovakia gained independence in 1918, many "German" monuments were removed or destroyed, including the Maria Column, the monument to Johann Joseph Wenzel Graf Radezky, and the monument to Emperor Franz I.⁵³ Of course, the transformation of Prague's public space was not purely symbolic. Nevertheless, without the iconographic transformation of Prague from an ambivalent and partially "German" city into a "Czech" or "Slavic" one, Prague would hardly have become – even for Czechs – the Czech (Slavic) Prague. The Svatobor Association started this process and remained an important actor in institutionalized national commemorations in the following decades.

Svatobor, Karton 80, invent. č. [inventory number] 548 and 549. – Cf. also *Hojda/Pokorný: Pomníky a zapomníky 54-64* (cf. fn. 5).

⁵³ On the broader context of the disappearance of German monuments from the public space in Czechoslovakia cf. *Wingfield, Nancy M.: Flag Wars and Stone Saints. How the Bohemian Lands became Czech.* Cambridge, London 2007.

Moreover, Bohemian cities looked to Prague as an example. Thus Prague assumed the role of a center of a linguistically homogenous, or at least Czech-dominated, "Czechia." Prague is thus not only a prominent example of the transformation of the nationally ambivalent Bohemian into the Czech (or German) public space, but also a model of iconographic and linguistic transformation across the board. The transformation of the urban public space seems to illustrate Pierre Bourdieu's thesis that modern society is represented in urban space. Thus the transformation of urban public space in the capital city of Bohemia by Czech national iconography shows the social and political transition from Bohemian to Czech society in Prague. The Czech or Slavic narration of Prague in literature, newspapers, and national funerals manifested itself a long time before it became permanently visible in monuments, representational buildings, and other artifacts.