

Zdeněk V. David/Christina N. Wall

THE JOSEPHIST ENLIGHTENMENT TRADITION IN
BOHEMIA AND THE POETRY OF KAREL H. MÁCHA*

This article, which is a work of intellectual history, not of literary analysis, addresses the Bohemian aversion to Romanticism in belles lettres from the 1820s through the 1840s that exploded in the iconic adverse reaction to the writings of Karel Hynek Mácha (1810-1836) by the contemporary literary and intellectual establishment of Bohemia, consisting of Josef Kajetán Tyl, František L. Čelakovský, Josef K. Chmelenský, and Jan S. Tomíček, as well as many others.¹

Two Cultures

With this article we seek to shed new light on this cultural clash by establishing a connection which has not been noted previously, between the excoriation of Mácha, on the one hand, and the distinctive Bohemian *Weltanschauung* that emerged from the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment, on the other hand. The connection of the Realist outlook with the Josephist Enlightenment, however, was not merely accidental or trivial, but deeply rooted in the Bohemian as well as Austrian intellectual atmosphere. As a salient feature, the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment had been – at its start under Empress Maria Theresa (1740-1780) – philosophically grounded in a rejection of the essentialist Baroque scholasticism of the Counter-Reformation (represented by Francisco Suárez) in favour of the existentialism of Thomas Aquinas. The other side of the coin, as concerns the intellectual revolution initiated by Maria Theresa, was a deep aversion to Baroque emotionalism and mysticism, epitomized by “the second scholasticism” of Suárez.²

Moreover, the anti-essentialist standpoint and ontic pluralism of the Josephist Enlightenment, as well as the aversion to the emotionalism and ontic essentialism of the Counter-Reformation Baroque, persisted in the Czech intellectual ambiance into the first half of 19th century under the pervasive pedagogical influence of Bernard Bolzano (1781-1848) and Franz Exner (1802-1853).³ In addition, as far as Bohemia

* This article is an expanded version of an earlier work, published without the participation of Christina Wall, as *David, Zdeněk V.: Karel H. Mácha's Philosophical Challenge to the Catholic Enlightenment in Bohemia*. In: *Sborník Národního muzea v Praze, Řada C, Literární historie/Acta Musei nationalis Pragae, Series C, Historia litterarum* 56 (2011) no. 1-2, 3-14.

¹ *Lehár, Jan/Stich, Alexandr/Janáčková, Jaroslava/Holý, Jiří: Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku [Czech Literature from the Beginning till Today]*. Praha 1998, 209-210, 217.

² *David, Zdeněk V.: Hegel's Collision with the Catholic Enlightenment in Bohemia*. In: *Kosmas* 18 (2005) no. 2, 14-30, here 17-20.

³ *David, Zdeněk V.: Realism, Tolerance, and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening: Legacies of the Bohemian Reformation*. Washington/D.C., Baltimore 2010, chapter 11. –

was concerned, the philosophy of the Josephist Enlightenment harmonized with the Realism of the Golden Age of the 16th century, stemming from the Bohemian Reformation. As Zdeněk David explored elsewhere, this Czech historical legacy was recovered in the early stage of the National Awakening and its effect reinforced the impact of the Enlightenment.⁴

We argue that the Mácha phenomenon powerfully challenged the established Czech cultural outlook in two ways. Mainly, the resentment against Mácha's intellectual orientation revealed the contrast between philosophical Idealism and the monistic metaphysics of Romanticism, on the one hand, and the Realism, empiricism, and ontic individualism stemming from the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment, on the other hand. Secondly, the resentment against Mácha's literary style derived from its embracing elements of the Baroque mentality (visionary, passionate, and irrational), which clashed with the sobriety, calmness, and rationalism that also derived from the spirit of the Josephist Enlightenment.⁵

This assessment of Mácha's Romantic Idealism also helps to illuminate anew the intellectual differentiation within East Central Europe. This assessment highlights the significance of the well-known fact that, unlike in Bohemia, Mácha's work was favourably received and emulated in Slovakia and Poland. It can be argued that this positive reaction parallels the vogue of Herder's social philosophy and Hegel's Idealism in the Slovak and Polish intellectual ambiance, which had remained unaffected by the Austro-Bohemian Catholic Enlightenment, or its equivalent.⁶ In

On the issue of Catholic Enlightenment see *Sorkin, David: Reform Catholicism and Religious Enlightenment*. In: *Austrian History Yearbook* 30 (1999) 187-219. – *Blanning, Timothy C. W./Evans, Robert J. W.: Comments*. In: *Ibid.* 221-235. – *Blanning: The Enlightenment in Catholic Germany*. In *Porter, Roy/Teich, Mikuláš (eds.): The Enlightenment in National Context*. New York 1981, 118-126.

⁴ On the relationship between the 16th-century literature of the Bohemian Reformation era on one hand, and the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment on the other, see *David, Zdeněk V.: Národní obrození jako převtělení Zlatého věku [National Awakening as a Re-Incarnation of the Golden Age]*. In: *Český časopis historický (ČČH)* 99 (2001) 486-518. – On the contrast between the Josephist Enlightenment and Baroque culture see also *Pynsent, Robert B.: Doslov [Epilogue]* In: *Pynsent: Dáblové, ženy a národ: Výbor z úvah o české literatuře [Devils, Women, and the Nation. Selected Reflexions on Bohemian Literature]*. Praha 2008, 555-617, here 575, 577.

⁵ Paradoxically, the two tendencies followed opposite directions. One, which may be called “innovative”, aimed forward beyond the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment at the Lutheran-inspired German Romanticism and Idealism. The other, which might be called “retrospective”, aimed backwards at the Baroque culture of the Counter-Reformation, which the Catholic Josephist Enlightenment sought to supersede. *Putna, Martin: Čí je Mácha? [Whose Is Mácha?]*. In: *Souvislosti* 3 (1993) no. 4-5, 182-189. – See also *Kopáč, Radim: Kterak Ignác Mácha svou Lori pical a též onanii tropil a co z toho pro dnešního čtenáře vzešlo? [How Ignác Mácha Was Screwing His Lori and Also Practising Masturbation, and What Did Arise from This for Present-Day Reader?]* In: *Haman, Aleš/Kopáč, Radim (eds.): Mácha redivivus (1810-2010): Sborník ke dvoustému výročí narození Karla Hynka Máchy [Mácha redivivus (1810-2010): A Miscellany for the Bicentennial of the Birth of Karel Hynek Mácha]*. Praha 2010, 279-290, here 279.

⁶ The specific Catholic Enlightenment in Poland lacked the pronounced anti-Tridentine tenor. It seemed to involve more a social rather than ecclesiastical reform. See *Kloczowski,*

addition, the Poles were exposed to powerful intellectual influences in the Grand Duchy of Warsaw and in the Poznań area from Russia and from Prussia respectively, in both of which philosophical Idealism flourished.⁷

Slovak Lutheran intellectuals, who were the leaders of the Slovak National Awakening, imbibed Herderian Romanticism and Hegelian Idealism during their traditional *studies* at German Protestant universities.⁸ In this respect, it is significant that close parallels exist between the poetry of Mácha and Jan Kollár.⁹ Kollár, although writing in Czech, was affected by the Romanticism and Idealism stemming from German Lutheran universities, like his Slovak Protestant compatriots Ludevít Štúr, Michal M. Hodža, and Josef M. Hurban.¹⁰ Hegel's influence, in turn, facilitated the reception of Polish Romanticism by Slovak intellectuals.¹¹

German Monistic Romanticism and Idealism

If the Mácha phenomenon is viewed as a clash between two cultures, the external, essentialist one emanated largely from German Idealism and Romanticism. In the past, the focus was on exploring the sources stemming from Polish, and in part Russian, literature, as well as the poetry of Lord Byron. This search, however, overlooked the more obvious source in German literature. Robert Pynsent called for recognizing the relevance of popular German horror novels and the low-level mys-

Jerzy: A History of Polish Christianity. New York 2000, 173-190. – See also *Janowski, Maciej*: Polish Liberal Thought up to 1918. Budapest 2002.

⁷ *Walicki, Andrzej*: Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism: The Case of Poland. Oxford 1982, 142-145, 173-176. – *Kieniewicz, Stefan/Kula, Witold* (eds.): Historia Polski, vol. 2, part 3, 1831-1864. Warszawa 1959, 418-421. – For the Russians, German Idealism, especially that of Hegel, dovetailed with the philosophical maximalism of the Eastern Orthodox Church. *Masaryk, Tomáš G.*: Slovanské studie: Slavjanofilství Ivana Vasiljeviče Kirejevského [Slavic Studies: Slavophilism of Ivan Vasil'evich Kireevskii]. In *Masaryk: Slovanské studie a texty z let 1889-1891* [Slavic Studies and Texts from 1889-1891]. Praha 2007 (Spisy 20) 11-106, here 96. – Prussia was the largely unchallenged domain of Hegel's philosophy.

⁸ *Városová, Elena*: Hegelovské inšpirácie u Štúra a Hurbana [Hegelian Inspirations in Štúr and Hurban]. In: *Városová* (ed.): Filozofia vo svete: svet filozofie u nás [Philosophy in the World and the World of Philosophy at Us]. Bratislava 2005, 162. – *Kuzmány, Karol*: Ladislav. In: *Hronka* 3 (1838) 153-154. – *Đurovič, Ján*: Slovenský pietizmus [Slovak Pietism]. In: *Historica Slovaca* 3-4 (1945-1946) 165-201, here 197. – *Pynsent, Robert B.*: Questions of Identity: Czech and Slovak Ideas of Nationality and Personality. Budapest 1994, 73.

⁹ *Poborský, Miloš*: Mácha a český romantismus v evropských souvislostech [Mácha and Czech Romanticism in European Contexts]. In: *Poborský* (ed.): Karel Hynek Mácha. Dílo [Karel Hynek Mácha. Works]. vol. 2, 381, Praha 1986. – *Vodička, Felix*: Cesty a cíle obrozenecké literatury [The Ways and the Aims of the Awakeners' Literature]. Praha 1958, 155-163. – *Sak, Robert*: Josef Jungmann. Život obrozence [Josef Jungmann. The Life of an Awakener]. Praha 2007, 15, 104. – On Mácha's admiration for Kollár, see *Čapek, Jan B.*: Návrat básníkův [A Return of the Poet]. In: *Naše Doba* 46 (1939) 398.

¹⁰ *David*: Hegel's Collision with the Catholic Enlightenment in Bohemia 16-17 (cf. fn. 2). – *Kraus, Cyril*: Na tému Karel H. Mácha a Slováci [On the Theme of Karel H. Mácha and the Slovaks]. In: *Romboid* 22 (1987) 5, 68.

¹¹ *Kuzmány*: Ladislav 58-61 (cf. fn. 8).

tical piety of Baroque prayer books.¹² What has so far been neglected has been a direct exploration of German Romanticism, which actually appears to have been more basic and relevant to Mácha's literary and philosophical inspiration. It was the mental universe of the German Romanticists that his Bohemian critics – from their viewpoint of Austrian Realism – found particularly unpalatable, even more so than the intellectual horizons of Polish or Russian Romanticism.

Otokar Fischer speaks of the many “German ingredients” that made up the Czech author's early and formative years.¹³ These “ingredients” not only left an indelible impression, but the language remained significant even at the end of his life. Just three days before his untimely passing, Mácha wrote one of his final, emotionally poignant letters in German.¹⁴ The German language played an important role in his personal life. He spoke with his fiancé only in German,¹⁵ and it was formative in his scholastic development as he attended German schools in Prague (Normalschule von St. Peter, Hauptschule zu den Piaristen, and Prag-Neustädter Gymnasium) to later become a student at the German-speaking University of Prague.¹⁶

Fischer also traces Mácha's first (and German) poetry to the tutelage of Alois Klar (1763-1833), a famed educator of his time.¹⁷ Beyond classes, Klar held public declamatory practices.¹⁸ Students and faculty gathered to discuss literature as well as to present original works. In January of 1830, Mácha began his studies in philosophy at the university, and it was during this period that he first put his hand to writing. He titled these early poems with the German term “Versuche”, meaning “attempts” or in this case “school exercises”.¹⁹ Although Mácha only attended these seminars for slightly less than two years (Klar went into retirement due to failing health in November of 1831), this brought him into contact with countless German, especially Romantic, writers.

Klar published two colloquia that he employed in his classes and at the declamatory practices. They contained excerpts from numerous German writers, including the Romanticists August Wilhelm Schlegel and Clemens Brentano.²⁰ Mácha's tutelage under Klar could have exposed him to other well-known works of German

¹² Pymont, Robert B.: Máchův Máj a umělotvorný třípokoj Petry Hůlové [Mácha's May and the Art-Forming Triple Room of Petra Hůlová]. In: *Haman/Kopáč* (eds.): *Mácha redivivus* 214-230, here 226 (cf. fn. 5).

¹³ Fischer, Otokar: K. H. Máchas deutsche Anfänge und der Kreis um Alois Klar. In: *Kraus, Ernesto* (ed.): *Xenia Pragensia*. Praha 1929, 233-259, here 234.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 235.

¹⁵ Bittner, Konrad: K. H. Mácha und das deutsche Geistesleben. In: *Slavische Rundschau* 8 (1936) 221-234, here 226.

¹⁶ Striedter, J.: K. H. Mácha als Dichter der europäischen Romantik. In: *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 31 (1963) 1, 42-90, here 43.

¹⁷ Fischer: K. H. Máchas deutsche Anfänge 237 (cf. fn. 13).

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 244.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 237.

²⁰ Klar, Alois: *Auswahl von Gedichten zu declamatorischen Uebungen*. 2 vols. Prag 1822-1829, cited in *Eisner, Pavel*: *Okusy Ignaze Máchy* [The Attempts of Ignatius Mácha]. Praha 1956, 24. – Text in German: *Zelený, Josef A.* (ed.): *Karel Hynek Mácha. Nové básně* [New Poems]. Chotěboř 1892.

Romanticism. For example, although his works were absent from the colloquia, Klar maintained contact with Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853), one of the most influential writers of Romantic movements. He was influential both during Romanticism's inception at the University of Jena in the early 19th century as well as in Dresden, the center of the late Romantic period (his name also appears in Mácha's notebooks).²¹

A cursory glance of the surviving notebooks from the years 1833 and 1834 reveals the preponderant influence of German writings. Its pages are filled with transcriptions from German sources. Among the excerpts appear the names of other German-language writers, including many associated with Romanticism, such as E. T. A. Hoffmann (1776-1822), Ernst von Houwald (1778-1845), Karl Adolf Suckow (1802-1847), Johann Ludwig Uhland (1787-1862), and Ernst Schulze (1789-1817), especially his work *Die bezauberte Rose* (1813). Large transcriptions of travelogues fill the German sections of the notebooks and the described places not only serve as inspiration for settings of Mácha's fictional works, but they also represent a window into the world far beyond his native Bohemia.²² These translations signified a "bridge" into foreign literatures.²³ Even Mácha's first exposure to Byron was through German translation.²⁴

A more concrete link to his exposure to German Romanticism is found in his poem *Kolumbus*, which is most likely a rewriting of the poem by Louise Brachmann (1777-1832), *Columbus* (1808). Although Mácha's version lacks the dialogue that drives Brachmann's poem, both stories chronicle the near mutiny against Columbus during his first voyage to the Americas.

These earliest works also establish a predilection for the brooding melancholia typical of the German Romantics. Repeating motives were cemeteries, graves, and sepulchres.²⁵ For instance, in a poem *Meine Freuden* (My Pleasures), the author is not enjoying the beauty of the sun or the shining stars, but rather the pale glow of the moon, noise of the storm, a violet on the grave, the last ray of sun, and the sorrowful swansong.²⁶ The German poems written by Mácha in his youth reveal the origins of his intellectual and literary outlook in German Romanticism.²⁷ This decisive and lasting impression equipped his mind with images of horrifying castles and dungeons, bloody crimes, and terrifying nocturnal scenes.

²¹ Vojtěch Jiráč, quoted in *Králík*, Oldřich: Zu den deutschen Gedichten Karel Hynek Máchas. In: *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 6 (1961) 387-414, here 391. – A more direct allusion to the German Romantics can be found in another German poem, *Es weht kein Lüftlein*, which is a direct quote from Clemens Brentano's *Die Gründung Prags* (1814), although some debate in the past has surrounded the authorship of this poem. *Ibid.*

²² Meyer, Holt: Nachwort. In: *Drubek-Meyer*, Natascha (ed.): Karel Hynek Mácha: "Die Liebe ging mit mir..." Prosa, Poesie, Tagebücher. 395-424, here 400.

²³ Bittner: K. H. Mácha und das deutsche Geistesleben 225 (cf. fn. 15).

²⁴ Striedter: K. H. Mácha als Dichter der europäischen Romantik 63 (cf. fn. 16).

²⁵ See *Krejčí*, František Václav: Karel Hynek Mácha. Praha 1916, 10.

²⁶ *Eisner*, Pavel: Pokusy Ignaze Máchy [Attempts of Ignatius Mácha]. Praha 1956, 75-77.

²⁷ See *Králík*, Oldřich: Zu den deutschen Gedichten Karel Hynek Máchas. In: *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 6 (1961) 387-414; 7 (1962) 60-102. – *Eisner*: Okusy Ignaze Máchy (cf. fn. 26). – *Fischer*: K. H. Máchas deutsche Anfänge 233 (cf. fn. 13).

The recurrent themes and motives of his later works reflect his early influences and reveal many traits of German Romanticism: pilgrims wandering through mountainscapes, cloister ruins, the beauty of melancholy, ghosts, and lost love – just to name a few. One is quickly reminded of the paintings of Caspar David Friedrich (1774-1840), the most influential painter of German Romanticism. In fact, Jiráť argues that the German paintings of the time impressed their themes on Mácha's imagination, especially the work of Friedrich.²⁸ Mácha certainly had the opportunity in Prague to view the works of Friedrich. The painter lived in nearby Dresden, and often travelled to Bohemia. Not only did the Bohemian landscape become the subject of his art, but Prague in particular served as an important city of exhibition for him.²⁹ He even unveiled one of his most well received works, *Das Eismeer*, there in 1824 under its original title *Ideale Scene eines arktischen Meeres, ein gescheitertes Schiff unter den aufgethürmten Eismassen*.³⁰ The painter's melancholy landscapes were kindred to Mácha's representation of life and nature.³¹ Parallels between Mácha's and Friedrich's vision of mountains and wild nature are striking.³² Although there is no direct evidence, it is almost certain that Mácha must have seen Friedrich's paintings.³³

Similarities between Mácha's works and German Romanticism are by no means limited to the domain of the visual arts. Mácha's penchant for settings on mountaintops, and among castles and ruins permeate the prose and poetry of Romanticism. In particular, Mácha's propensity towards wanderlust, his depiction of lone pilgrims and wanderers losing themselves in the surrounding nature – which often serve as a metaphor for the self – is a recurrent theme of German Romanticists such as in Tieck, Brentano, and Joseph von Eichendorff (all of whom are named in his notebooks).³⁴

Mácha's affinity towards nightscapes, death, and the grotesque aligns him with the Gothic novel, or the German equivalent, the *Schauerroman*, represented by authors Christian Heinrich Spieß (1755-1799) or Ann Radcliffe (1764-1823). As is apparent from the literal translation of the term, "shudder novel", these works showcased the "grotesque, ghastly, violent, and superhuman".³⁵ They featured the supernatural

²⁸ *Jiráť*, Vojtěch: Karel Hynek Mácha. Praha 1943, 12, 24. – *Jiráť*: Portréty a studie [Portraits and Studies]. Praha 1978, 67.

²⁹ *Updike*, John: Innerlichkeit und Eigentümlichkeit. In: *The New York Review of Books* 38 (March 7, 1991) no. 5, 10-11.

³⁰ *Börsch-Supan*, Helmut/*Jähmig*, Karl Wilhelm: Caspar David Friedrich. Gemälde, Druckgraphik und bildmäßige Zeichnungen. München 1973, 107.

³¹ *Ibid.* 99.

³² See *Vosedálek*, Ivo: Mácha Rýbrcoul a Krakonoš [Mácha *Rybrcoul* and *Krakonoš* (Czech mythical figures, Z.D.)]. In: *Haman/Kopáč* (eds.): Mácha redivivus 55-60, here 56-57 (cf. fn. 5).

³³ Meyer also posits the influence of Friedrich on Mácha, paralleling Mácha's fictive cloister ruins of "Die Pilgerfahrt ins Riesengebirge" to Friedrich's famous painting "Ruine Elenda". *Meyer*: Nachwort 409 (cf. fn. 22).

³⁴ *Tschizewskij*, Dmitrij [Dmytro Chyzhevskij]: Zu Máchas Weltanschauung. In: *Tschizewskij*, Dmitrij (ed.): *Kleinere Schriften*: Bohemica. München 1972, 269-270.

³⁵ *Wagenknecht*, Edward: *Cavalcade of the English Novel*. New York 1954, 111-112.

“with its romantic unrealities, its strange beauties, its very extravagances”.³⁶ Mácha was definitely familiar with the genre, naming both E. T. A. Hoffmann’s *Die Elixiere des Teufels* (1815) and Ann Radcliffe in his notebooks. Although the *Schauerroman* is not limited to the epoch of Romanticism, it is often understood as reaching its culmination during this period, both in expertise of form and in consumption by readers. Ann Radcliffe, for example, was incredibly popular in Germany during this time, and especially influential for German Romanticists. Her Gothic novel *A Sicilian Romance* (1790) was translated by Sophie Margaretha Dorothea Forkel just a year after its English publication, and this work, no less, was completed in the home of Caroline Böhmer, who later married August Wilhelm Schlegel, both of whom were prominent Romanticists who worked with Ludwig Tieck.³⁷

Despite the importance of the *Schauerroman* for Romantic literature, Romanticism and Gothicism should not be understood as synonymous. Rather, they “part company most conspicuously [...] in the former’s insistence that Beauty is most closely associated with pain, desire, sorrow.”³⁸ It is on this point that Mácha most clearly demonstrates his roots in German Romanticism.³⁹ For instance, Dmitrij Tschizewskij traces the sullenly beautiful landscape of the poem *Meine Freuden*, marked by its pale moon, fading stars, and singing owl, to Tieck’s *Melancholie* (1821).⁴⁰ The recurrent motif of fading stars also alludes to Brentano’s *Die Gründung Prags* (1812), from which Mácha noted down three short verses, one of which emphasized sparks fading away.⁴¹ Mácha also showed special interest in Schulze’s *Die bezauberte Rose*.⁴²

Parallels to Romanticism are also readily available in his Czech writing as well. Among the notable links to German Romanticism is the profound fascination with the figure of the monk, who was seen in a negative light by the Enlightenment thinkers. Mácha’s participation in this tradition of German Romanticism is evident in several of his works, such as *Pout’ krkonošská*, *Mnich*, *Máj*, and *Kat*.⁴³ The key figure of *Máj*, “The Terrible Lord of the Forests” (*Strašný lesů pán*), is derived from

³⁶ Summers, Montague: Gothic Question. A History of the Gothic Novel. New York 1961, 2.

³⁷ Kleßmann, Eckart: Universitätsmamsellen. Fünf aufgeklärte Frauen zwischen Rokoko, Revolution und Romantik. Frankfurt am Main 2008, 179. – Tieck would later allude to the “good and bad novels of Miss Radcliffe” in his novella *Das Zauberschloß* (1829), quoted in Trainer, James: The Incest-Theme in the Works of Tieck. In: *Modern Language Notes* 76 (December 1961) 8, 819-824, here 822.

³⁸ Hemmessy, Brendan: The Gothic Novel (Writers & Their Work). Essex 1978, 34.

³⁹ See Černý, Václav: Baroko a romantismus [The Baroque and Romanticism]. In: *Kritický měsíčník* 1 (1938) 1, 105-115, here 107.

⁴⁰ By analyzing Mácha’s semantic field more broadly, Tschizewskij reveals distinctive similarities to other German Romanticists such as Novalis (1772-1801), Joseph von Eichendorff (1788-1857), and Karoline von Günderode (1780-1806), and connects him to the movement as a whole. See *Tschizewskij: Zu Máchas Weltanschauung* 243-44 (cf. fn. 34).

⁴¹ Striedter: K. H. Mácha als Dichter der europäischen Romantik 80 (cf. fn. 16).

⁴² Prokop, Dušan: *Kniha o Máchově Máji* [A Book about Mácha’s May]. Praha 2010, 86.

⁴³ Meyer, Holt: Máchova narativní díla a fantastický žánr v literatuře gotického románu a romantismu [Mácha’s Narrative Works and the Phantastic Genre in the Literature of the Gothic Novel and Romanticism]. In: *Česká literatura* 43 (1995) 167-191, here 187.

German – not Polish or English – sources.⁴⁴ Ilse Seehaseová traces the metaphor *aetas aurea* in Mácha's *Máj* to an inspiration from other German writers and artists.⁴⁵ Holt Meyer notes similarities between Mácha's *Pouť krkonošská* and Hoffmann's *Die Elexiere des Teufels* such as the motif of falling down from great heights.⁴⁶ Novák also traces the source of *Pouť krkonošská* to the outlines of the second section of Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* (1802) as they were published by Tieck,⁴⁷ and Tschizewskij sees further influence of Novalis in the work's conflation of past and present.⁴⁸

These parallels allude to deeper impressions of German Romanticism, propensities beyond mere thematic similarities. Bittner describes Mácha's Romanticism as

the deep and agonizing rumination and reflection on the ultimate questions of existence and nonexistence [...] the painfully sweet and youthfully sad dream of love and death and destruction [...] the homesick yearning abroad that never finds peace anywhere and incessantly wounds and exhausts itself within itself.⁴⁹

These ironically complimentary contradictions bring Mácha distinctly into the realm of the German Romantics. It is the German Romantics' fondness of being unclear, of blurring the boundaries between earnestness and humor, happiness and melancholy, as well as dream and reality that so deeply left an impression on Mácha. This is very aptly expressed in a quote from Mácha stating, "Either one dreams because it is, or it is because one dreams".⁵⁰ This is the very question that readers are left with at the end of Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann* (1817), in which it is unclear if the protagonist's insanity is the result of a traumatic childhood experience, or if traumatic memories that plagued him through adulthood and into death were rather the product of his insanity.

Mukařovský highlights two other typical customs of German Romanticism found in Mácha's work: the proclivity towards fragmentary texts and self-referential authorship.⁵¹ The "Dosloví ke Křivokladu" (afterword to *Křivoklad*) and the

⁴⁴ Čolaková, Žoržeta: 'Strašný lesů pán' versus rex nemorensis. In: *Haman/Kopáč* (eds.): Mácha redivivus 441-453, here 450-453 (cf. fn. 5). – A similarity can be likewise discerned between Mácha and Clemens Brentano in the treatment of the *Cikáni* (Gypsies) figures, see Všetická, František: Die künstlerische Gestalt von Máchas Cikáni (im Vergleich mit Clemens Brentanos Werken). In: *Schmid*, Herta (ed.): Kapitel zur Poetik Karel Hynek Máchas: Die tschechische Romantik im europäischen Kontext. Beiträge zum Internationalen Bohemistischen Mácha-Symposium an der Universität Potsdam vom 21. bis 22. Januar 1995. München 2000, 100-107, especially 106-107.

⁴⁵ See Seehaseová, Ilse: Metafora aetas aurea – zlatý věk – v Máchově Máji [The Metaphor aetas aurea – Golden Age – in Mácha's *May*]. In: *Česká literatura* 35 (1987) 102-105.

⁴⁶ Meyer: Máchova narativní díla a fantastický žánr 174-175 (cf. fn. 43).

⁴⁷ Arne Novák quoted in *Striedter*: K. H. Mácha als Dichter der europäischen Romantik 50 (cf. fn. 16).

⁴⁸ Tschizewskij: Zu Máchas Weltanschauung 259 (cf. fn. 34).

⁴⁹ Bittner: K. H. Mácha und das deutsche Geistesleben 221 (cf. fn. 15).

⁵⁰ Quoted as a German translation of the Czech in *Mukařovský*, Jan: K. H. Máchas Werk als Torso und Geheimnis. In: *Slavische Rundschau* 8 (1936) 213-220, here 219. German quote: "Entweder man träumt, weil es ist, oder es ist, weil man träumt."

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 215.

following “Epilog” demonstrate this quite aptly. The afterword is written as a play, the dialogue mainly focusing on two students and a third character called “Me”.⁵² The students discuss their disapproval of the recent publication of the story *Křivoklad* in a journal due to its lack of completion. The “Me” (assumedly the author himself) then interjects, claiming he knows the author well, and explains that the incompleteness was due to its intended continuation as a serial work. This entire exchange, however, is then completely challenged by the proceeding “Epilog”, in which he states, “I am pleased if my readers await something more – I am finished.”⁵³

The sentiments of these epilogues seem to follow the dictums of Romantic literature as outlined in Friedrich Schlegel’s (1772-1829, brother of A. W. Schlegel) seminal *116. Athenäums-Fragment*. In this work, published in the renowned Romantic journal *Athenäum*, F. Schlegel defines Romantic writing for the first time, christening it *Universalpoesie* (Universal Poetry).⁵⁴ A full description of this form of writing is too complex for this article to expatiate, but a summary suffices to draw striking parallels between Mácha’s work and the foundational work of German Romantic philosophy. There are no direct references to F. Schlegel in Mácha’s notebooks; however, such salient correlations establish, if nothing else, an analogous *Weltanschauung* between Mácha and Romantic thinking. Moreover, the assumption of a spilling over of F. Schlegel’s ideas into Mácha is by no means presumptuous. Schlegel’s works, particularly *Fragment-116*, greatly impacted on countless Romantic authors, specifically those named in the notebooks (Tieck and Brentano, among others). In this fragment, he outlines three main characteristics of *Universalpoesie*: it combines all genres of poetry (such as the change from prose to drama in the afterword of *Křivoklad*), it embodies the author so much that it often became a self-portrait, and finally – and most crucially – it should never be complete, but always be in the process of becoming.

A lack of textual cohesion often cultivates Romantic irony as well. Stemming from F. Schlegel’s second attribute of *Universalpoesie* – namely, that the work and the author become so intertwined that it becomes difficult to determine where the author ends and the text begins – Romantic irony is characterized by a recognition of a text’s own textuality. Drubek-Meyer sees this irony throughout Mácha’s works, most notably in *Marinka*. The similarities shared between the narrator and Marinka’s father resemble that of doppelgangers, in which the narrator embodies a monochromatic image of Marinka’s father, who wears a red coat, white stockings, and blue vest. Drubek-Meyer argues, however, the similarities of these characters are found in a third doppelganger, that of the author himself. The descriptions of these two men are virtually identical to a description of Mácha by his friend V. Mach, who describes the sartorial replacement of Mácha’s youthful and patriotic blue, red, and white with a more subdued black and white. That Marinka’s father is described

⁵² *Mácha*, K. H.: *Křivoklad* [modern name of the castle is *Křivoklát*, Z.D.]. In: *Dílo Karla Hynka Máchy*, vol. 2, *Próza* [Prose]. Praha 1949, 63.

⁵³ “Teší mne velice, jestli čtenáři moji ještě něco očekávají, – já jsem hotov.” *Ibid.* 65.

⁵⁴ *Schlegel*, Friedrich: *Lucinde and the Fragments*. Minneapolis 1971.

rather disparagingly is further indication that the author seems to be mocking his younger, more zealous self – a likely example of Romantic irony.⁵⁵

The doppelgänger is a frequently used subject of German Romanticism. Doppelgängers can enact the villainous treachery that devastates the hero, as in Hoffmann's *Die Elexiere des Teufels*. Or, as in Tieck's *Der Blonde Eckbert* (1797), one character could also manifest in multiple figures. Mácha's works are rife with various forms of doppelgängers, usually employed in a subtle manner. Meyer argues that the wanderer, and narrator of *Pout' krkonošská*, represents a doppelgänger to its protagonist, the pilgrim,⁵⁶ and Drubek-Meyer views the narrator of *Máj* as the doppelgänger to Vilém.⁵⁷ The narrator's name in *Máj*, Hynek, infers yet another allusion to the author, lending to the text an ironic tone.⁵⁸

From overarching themes to technical particularities, Mácha's Romanticism clearly aligns itself more with the German prototype than with the Russian or Polish variants. His use of the fantastic – with its stress on horror, darkness, and death – is closer to that of German authors like Hoffmann than to their Russian or Polish counterparts.⁵⁹ Mácha's approach lacks the openly playful, satirical, rhetorical, or ironic elements that are employed by the Russian Romanticists such as Pushkin, Pogorelskii, Polevoi, or Odoevskii. Even the secret diaries of Mácha and Pushkin about their sexual exploits were found contradictory in tone and approach.⁶⁰ Moreover, Mácha lacks the inspirational tone of the Polish poets, such as Mickiewicz and Slowacki, who pursued the creation of new nationalist legends to serve axiological purposes.⁶¹

Echoes of the Baroque

While the sources of Mácha's German-style Romanticism are clear, it is essential for the central thesis of this article to call attention to Mácha's more subtle links with the Baroque mentality that are evident in his writings. There is a definite sense that the dark emotionalism and pessimism of his Romanticism reflect the Baroque gloominess and irrationality of the Counter-Reformation, which the sunny optimism and rational tenor of the Josephist Enlightenment had sought to exorcise.⁶² For Mácha, there was an insuperable contrast between the spiritual and the physical.⁶³ The ele-

⁵⁵ *Drubek-Meyer*, Natascha: Allegorische Spuren der Melancholie in Máchas *Máj* und *Marinka*. Versuch einer intermedialen Rekonstruktion. In: *Schmid* (ed.): Kapitel zur Poetik Karel Hynek Máchas 260-307, here 296-297 (cf. fn. 44).

⁵⁶ "Nikdy víc mně neporozumíte". *Ibid.* 38.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 281.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 266.

⁵⁹ *Grebeníčková*, Růžena: Mácha a Novalis [Mácha and Novalis]. In: *Slavia* 46 (1977) 128-147.

⁶⁰ *Meyer*: Máchova narativní díla a fantastický žánr 64-65 (cf. fn. 43).

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 179.

⁶² It is safe to assume that Mácha drew on elements of the Baroque mentality of the Counter-Reformation that had survived the intervention of the Bohemian Enlightenment. See *Gran-jard*, Henri: Mácha et la renaissance nationale en Bohême. Paris 1957, 36, 38. – *Lehár/Stich/Janáčková/Holý*: Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku 214 (cf. fn. 1). – See also *Černý*: Baroko a romantismus 105 (cf. fn. 39).

⁶³ See *Janský*, Karel/*Jiráč*, Vojtěch: Tajemství Křivokladu a jiné máchovské studie [The Mystery of Křivoklát and Other Studies Concerning Mácha]. Praha 1941, 34.

ment of *Schwärmerei* (dreaminess) as a source of human motivation, noted to be strongly present in Mácha's *Weltanschauung*,⁶⁴ has also been interpreted as a reiteration of the Baroque dreaminess that the Enlightenment had earlier challenged. Mácha's Romantic version of the *Schwärmerei* was for Tyl, Mácha's main critic, a way to escape from the real and objective questions of life into an isolationist and debilitating preoccupation with the self.⁶⁵ The interest in the topic is also evident in scholarship of the early 20th century, although initially the connections that were drawn were rather vague, such as Albert Vyskočil's chapters "Barokní citění" and "Barokní poesie" in his book *Básník. Studie máchovské otázky*.⁶⁶

Among later commentators, Šalda concludes that Mácha, particularly in his prose, transformed the residual Baroque elements into full-fledged Romanticism.⁶⁷ Wellek estimates Mácha's pedigree as follows: "Though it is not possible to establish a real historical connection, Mácha's spiritual ancestors are rather among the Baroque poets than among the Romanticists of his own time."⁶⁸ Zdeněk Rotrekl claims Mácha's work reflects the spirit of the irrational, characteristic of the Baroque, and a willingness to leap into an abyss of the unknown.⁶⁹ Milada Součková speaks of "a pattern of Baroque morbidity" in Mácha's poetry.⁷⁰ Jan Mukařovský sees in Mácha's Romanticism echoes of a secularized Baroque mysticism as well as Baroque imagination and emotionalism. He maintains that Mácha's relation to the Baroque was important for two reasons: first, for understanding him as a part of a tradition, not just an aberration; second, for understanding his poetic images and the main ideas behind his work that operated through symbols with multiple meanings.⁷¹ The

⁶⁴ Macura, Vladimír: Český sen [Czech Dream]. Praha 1999, 41.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 36.

⁶⁶ Vyskočil, Albert: Básník. Studie máchovské otázky [The Poet. A Study of the Mácha Question]. Praha 1936, 20-26, 61-77. – See the critique in Černý: Baroko a romantismus 106-107 (cf. fn. 39). – For another study of Baroque influences, see Bitnar, Vilém: Máchova katolicita. Příspěvek k řešení otázky Máchova baroku [Mácha's Catholicity. A Contribution to a Solution of the Question of Mácha's Baroque]. Olomouc 1936.

⁶⁷ "Přehodnotit toto barokní residuum v expresionismus nebo v zenitismus romanticky, byl, historicky vyvojně mluveno, vlastní stylový čin Máchův" [To romantically transvalue this Baroque residuum into expressionism or zenitism was – speaking in terms of historical development – Mácha's own stylistic achievement]. See Šalda, František X.: O krásné próze Máchově [On Mácha's Mácha's Belles-Lettres]. In: Mukařovský, Jan: Torso a tajemství Máchova díla [Torso and Secret of Mácha's Œuvre]. Sborník pojednání Pražského lingvistického kroužku [A Miscellany of Prague Linguistic Circle]. Praha 1938, 181-200, here 183. – Šalda, František X.: K. H. Mácha a jeho dědictví [K. H. Mácha and His Inheritance]. In: Šalda: Duše a dílo: podobizny a medailony. Soubor díla [The Soul and the Œuvre: Portraits and Medallions. Collected Works], vol. 2. Praha 1950, 30-40, here 36. – On traces of the Counter-Reformation in Mácha's work, see also Masaryk, Tomáš G.: Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918 [The World Revolution During the War and After, 1914-1918]. Praha 2005 (Spisy 15) 438.

⁶⁸ Wellek, René: The Two Traditions of Czech Literature. In: *Wellek: Essays on Czech Literature*. Ithaca/N. Y. 1943, 213-228, 17-31, here 27.

⁶⁹ Rotrekl, Zdeněk: Barokní fenomén v současnosti [The Baroque Phenomenon at Present]. Praha 1995, 116-125, see also 102-103.

⁷⁰ Součková, Milada: Czech Romanticism. Den Haag 1958, 55.

⁷¹ Mukařovský, Jan: Příklad poezie: K otázce trvalé platnosti Máchova díla [An Example of

authoritative *fin-de-siècle* compendium on Czech literary history, *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku* (Czech Literature from the Beginnings to the Present, 1998), states that Mácha “received a powerful inspiration from the Baroque culture (although earlier rejected by the Enlighteners, nevertheless still alive in the common subconscious).”⁷²

Other literary historians uncovered more specific traces of the Baroque in Mácha’s poetry and prose. Jiráť notes the effect of Baroque paintings on the contrast of light and darkness appearing in Mácha’s *Máj*, “in which light, springing from one source either natural or artificial, casts blinding illumination on some objects, while submerging others into correspondingly deep darkness.”⁷³ More recent scholarship has built on Jiráť’s work, highlighting the importance of Baroque visual art on Mácha. Residing in Prague, the author was surrounded by Baroque structures, which saturated the city, from architecture to the sepulchral art adorning the many cemeteries he frequented. Drubek-Meyer interprets the description of Vilém’s jail cell, with its emphasis on a gaze escaping the dark dungeon for the light and the implied freedom of the outside, as being influenced by the Baroque, notably St. Teresa and Pascal.⁷⁴ Grygar posits that Mácha’s concept of corporeal beauty was largely informed by the painters of the Baroque. For Mácha, beauty only existed on account of its transitoriness, a major theme of Baroque painting, which emphasized the fugacity of the physical being and depicted its physical decay and death.⁷⁵ Drubek-Meyer compares the description of Vilém’s execution in the fourth stanza of *Máj* to Baroque still life or memento mori.⁷⁶

Josef Vařica, in addition to observing the formal similarity between the penchant for paradoxical expression in Mácha and the Bohemian Baroque poets, calls attention to the similarity between Mácha’s treatment of the figure of St. Ivan in his early poetical experimentation and the legend of the same saint written by the leading Baroque poet of Bohemia, Fridrich Bridel (1619-1680).⁷⁷ Parallels between Mácha’s *Máj* and Bridel’s *Co Bůh, co člověk* are noticeably conspicuous in juxtaposing images of beauty and ugliness.⁷⁸ Chyzhevskiy cites parallels in Mácha’s poetry from German, Czech, Polish, and Spanish Baroque literature⁷⁹ and notes that the symbo-

Poetry: To the Question of the Permanent Validity of Macha’s Work]. Praha 1991, 40, 43. Moreover, Mukařovský suggests that, although Mácha had early lost his fervent religious faith, he retained echoes of its penchant for symbolism. *Ibid.* 45.

⁷² *Lehár/Stich/Janáčková/Holý: Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku* 214 (cf. fn. 1). – See also Černý: Baroko a romantismus 106-107 (cf. fn. 39).

⁷³ *Jiráť: Karel Hynek Mácha* 18 (cf. fn. 28).

⁷⁴ *Drubek-Meyer: Allegorische Spuren* 274-278 (cf. fn. 55).

⁷⁵ Grygar, Mojmír: Zur semiotischen Deutung des Körperlichen bei Mácha. In: *Schmid* (ed.): Kapitel zur Poetik Karel Hynek Máchas 223-247, here 226 (cf. fn. 44).

⁷⁶ *Drubek-Meyer: Allegorische Spuren* 269-273 (cf. fn. 55).

⁷⁷ Vařica, Josef: České literární baroko [Czech Literary Baroque]. Praha 1938, 3, 66.

⁷⁸ *Mácha, Karel Hynek: Básně a dramatické zlomky* [Poems and Poetical Fragments], vol. 1. Ed. Karel Jáněský. Praha 1959, 45. – *Bridel, Fridrich: Básnické dílo* [Poetical Work]. Ed. Milan Kopecký Praha 1994, 7.

⁷⁹ *Chyzhevskiy, Dmytro: K Máchovu světovému názoru* [On Mácha’s Weltanschauung] In: *Mukařovský* (ed.): Torso a tajemství Machova díla 125-134 (cf. fn. 67).

lism of occult philosophies (such as Boehme and the Rosicrucians, which he detects in Máchá) dovetails with that of the Baroque. He further suggests that Máchá became acquainted with Baroque poetry and “mysticism” thanks to the revival of these genres in Romantic literature, with which he was familiar.⁸⁰ Máchá, in fact, referred to Boehme by name in his notebook.⁸¹ Subsequently, Antonín Měšťan emphasizes that Máchá had a background not only in current, but also older literature, particularly the literature from the Baroque period.⁸² Hrdlička focuses on three of Máchá’s “mystical poems, in which man fuses with light” as being more Baroque than Romantic.⁸³

Recently, the question of Máchá’s dependence on the Baroque has been addressed more systematically by Libor Pavera and Robert B. Pynsent. According to Pavera, heroes of Máchá’s poetry and prose did not indulge in wallowing in the *Weltschmerz* of contemporary Romanticism. Instead, like the pilgrims of Baroque literature, they sought an answer to the vanity of this life in another higher world.⁸⁴ Like Baroque poets such as Bridel, Máchá pictured the transient character of the world with epithets: “appearance”, “dream”, “vapour”, and “foam.”⁸⁵ Máchá parted company with the Baroque writers, according to Pavera, due to his disbelief in the existence of a real permanent world. For Pavera, as we saw, Máchá’s idea of nothingness at the start and at the end of worldly existence reflects a likely influence of Hegel.⁸⁶ Finally, Pavera calls attention to Máchá’s frequent use of stark contrasts and mystical symbols, reminiscent of Counter-Reformation authors of the so-called Silesian school such as Johannes Scheffler (also known as Angelus Silesius, 1624-1677) and Christian Hoffmann von Hoffmannswaldau (1616-1679).⁸⁷

Robert B. Pynsent sees the Baroque tradition reflected in Máchá’s linking of sexual contact and death. He underlines that Jarmila, the heroine of *Máj*, is presen-

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 170. – See also *Mel’nychenko*, Ihor: ‘Daleka put’ moia, ta marnyi poklyk ...’ Tvorchist’ Karla Hinka Makhy v konteksti ches’koho i evropeis’koho romantyzmu 20-40-kh rr. XIX st. [‘My Journey is Long, Calling is in vain...’ The Creativity of Karel Hynek Mácha in the Context of Czech and European Romanticism from the 1820s to the 1840s]. Kiev 2003, 140.

⁸¹ *Macha*, Karel Hynek: Literární zápisníky. Deníky. Dopisy [Literary Notebooks. Diaries. Letters]. In: Spisy 3 [Writings 3]. Eds. Karel Jánský et. al. Praha 1972, 217.

⁸² *Měšťan*, Antonín: Geschichte der tschechischen Literatur im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Köln 1984, 83.

⁸³ The three poems are *Těžkomyslnost* (Melancholia), *Měsíc stojí* (The Moon Stands), and *V svět jsem vstoupil* (I Entered the World), see *Hrdlička*, Josef: *Obrazy světa v české literatuře: studie o způsobech celku* [Images of the World in Czech Literature: Studies about the Kinds of Totality. Praha 2008, 53.

⁸⁴ *Pavera*, Libor: *Romantismus a předchozí literární tradice zvláště barokní* [Romantism and the Preceding Literary Tradition, especially the Baroque One]. In: *Pavera: Od středověku k romantismu: úvahy o starší literatuře* [From the Middle Ages to Romanticism: Reflections on Older Literature]. Opava 2000, 189.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* 190.

⁸⁶ *Wagenknecht*: *Cavalcade of the English Novel* 111-112 (cf. fn. 35). – See also *Hrdlička*, Josef: *Obrazy světa v české literatuře. Studie o způsobech celku* (Komenský, Máchá, Šlejhar, Weiner) [Pictures of the World in Czech Literature. Study on the Methods of the Whole (Komenský, Máchá, Šlejhar, Weiner)]. Praha 2007, 126.

⁸⁷ *Pavera: Romantismus a předchozí literární tradice zvláště barokní* 192 (cf. fn. 84).

ted as a symbol of both love and suicide.⁸⁸ Concerning the sex-death relationship in *Máj*, Pynsent notes: “one of the characters is murdered, another commits suicide and a third one is executed – and all this because of love”.⁸⁹ Moreover, in his discussion of the Baroque character of Mácha’s poetry, Pynsent draws on the vocabulary and imagery of Bohemian Jesuit prayer books, disseminated under the title of *Nebeklíč* (Key to Heaven) since the onset of the Counter-Reformation. This devotional literature was still commonly used in Czech households in the beginning of the 19th century during Mácha’s childhood and early youth.⁹⁰ In his analysis, Pynsent highlights the frequent presence of Baroque literary topoi in Mácha’s *Máj*, such as the reiterated contrast between “the temporal” and “the eternal”; the theme of incest (fatal to the three main heroes of *Máj*); various themes of femininity attributed to the Virgin (white tower, morning star, gate of heaven); the image of fatherland (*vlast* and *patria*) as the ultimate aim of life; and the linking of the concepts of “goal and end”.⁹¹ Besides *Nebeklíč*, another example of belated incursion of Baroque poetry was the hymnal of Heřman A. Gallaš, *Múza moravská* (1813).⁹² Pynsent also points out the connection between love and death that Mácha derived from the Baroque mentality as well as the more earthy connection between “pleasure of birth” and “the sneer of death”.⁹³

⁸⁸ Pynsent, Robert B.: Charakterizace v Máchově Máji. In: *Pynsent: Ďáblové, ženy a národ* 118 (cf. fn. 4). – See also *Mácha: Literární zápisky* 309 (cf. fn. 81).

⁸⁹ Pynsent, Robert B.: Touha, frustrace a trocha uspokojení: komentář k Hlaváčkově Mstivé kantiléně [Yearning, Frustration, and a Bit of Satisfaction: A Commentary to Hlaváček’s Vengeful Cantilena]. In: *Pynsent: Ďáblové, ženy a národ* 263-294, here 266 (cf. fn. 4). – For parallels between love and death in *Máj*, see *Mácha: Básně a dramatické zlomky* 49 (cf. fn. 78). – For Mácha, sexual love was a barrier to the attainment of spirituality; see *Janský/Jirát: Tajemství Křivokladu* 34 (cf. fn. 63).

⁹⁰ According to Josef Vašica, the prototype was composed by Martin of Kochem in German and translated into Czech by Edilbert Petr Nymburský (d. 1705). See *Vašica: České literární baroko* 162, 309-310 (cf. fn. 77). – Pynsent relies on *Poloviční Nebe-Klíč* (N. p., n. d. [c. 1800]), having used three other editions. See *Pynsent: Doslov* 575, 577 (cf. fn. 4). – Mácha was also familiar with *Kronika česká* of Václav Hájek of Libočany, a favourite literary source during the Counter-Reformation. *Mácha: Literární zápisky* 9, 390 (cf. fn. 81). – On the religious piety of Mácha’s parents, see *Janský, Karel: Karel Hynek Mácha. Život uchvatitele krásy* [Karel Hynek Mácha. Life of the Captor of Beauty]. Praha 1953, 24.

⁹¹ *Pynsent: Doslov* 577-579 (cf. fn. 4). Pynsent suggests that Czech literary historians in the late 19th and 20th centuries tended to confuse this mystical fatherland of the Baroque with earthly Bohemia in order to portray Mácha as a nationalist patriot.

⁹² Urválková cites an illustrative passage: “Skal vysokých pahrbkové/ vzhůru strmějí,/ na nichž strašní hrbolové/ semtam visejí,/ jichžto hřbet kryjou křoviny/ neb svalené roztržiny.” *Urválková, Zuzanna: Mezi barokem a biedermeierem. K povaze biedermeieru v Múze moravské (1813) Heřmana Agapita Gallaše* [Between Baroque and Biedermeier. On the Character of Biedermeier in Heřman Agapit Gallaš’s *Moravian Muse* (1813)]. In: *Lorenzová, Helena/Petrasová, Tatána: Biedermeier v českých zemích* [Biedermeier in the Bohemian Lands]. Praha 2004, 285-286, citing *Gallaš, Heřman Agapit: Múza moravská* [The *Moravian Muse*]. Ed. Jiří Skalička. Olomouc 2000, 176. – For another discussion of the genre, see *Bočková, Hana: Knihy nábožné a prosté. K nábožensky vzdělávací slovenské tvorbě doby barokní* [Pious and Simple Books. On the Religiously-Educational Literary Products of the Baroque Period]. Brno 2009.

⁹³ Pynsent, Robert B.: Ironie v Máji [Irony in May]. In: *Česká literatura* 35 (1987) 105-110,

More recently, Dušan Prokop highlights the Baroque character of Mácha's Czech language,⁹⁴ and Milan Exner sees specific similarities to the language of the premier poet of the Bohemian Baroque, Fridrich Bridel.⁹⁵ Further, Prokop traces the influence of the Baroque on Mácha to the late Baroque character of German poets Tieck and Lenau and his upbringing in the Roman Catholic Church, where Baroque elements lingered in prayers and rituals well into the opening years of the 19th century.⁹⁶

Mácha's affinity for the Baroque also functions as a further link to his German Romantic roots. Both Striedter and Bittner emphasize the significance of 18th-century motif of "Nacht- und Grabesdichtung" – characterized by its reverence for crepuscular and sepulchral imagery – on this author's melancholy *Weltanschauung*.⁹⁷ This notably beloved genre of the Early Romantics reached its apex in Novalis' *Hymns to the Night* (1800). The topos of the *wanderer*, a frequent player and hero of the German Romantic tradition (also in the works of Mácha) leads us back, as Tschizewskij illustrates, to the Early Romantics and then to the Baroque.⁹⁸

Biedermeier and the Catholic Enlightenment

The literary trend, prevalent in Bohemia as well as Austria, which Mácha's orientation – based on German Idealist tradition – challenged, was the genre of the Biedermeier style deriving from the Austrian Realist philosophical outlook. This Realist, anti-Romanticist tenor of literature persisted in Bohemia from 1820 to 1845. It was then epitomized in literature by the writings of Tyl, Havlíček, Rubeš, Němcová, and Erben. The term Biedermeier was adopted by Czech scholarship to designate the literature of that period and to authenticate the non-Romantic nature of its production. A crucial piece of evidence for the thesis of this article is the concept of Biedermeier that relates the general tenor of Czech literary culture to the philosophical character of the Enlightenment and the detestation of Baroque *Schwärmerei*, thus illuminating the stark contrast between the Mácha phenomenon and the entrenched Czech mentality.

The concept of Biedermeier was first applied by Jiráč by analogizing the visual arts to characterize Czech literature in the period from the 1820s to the 1840s.⁹⁹ In

here 108-109. – *Pysent*: Liturgické otvory: k poetice Máchova Máje [Liturgical Openings: On the Poetics of Mácha's May]. In: Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty Brněnské university 7 (2004) 5-43.

⁹⁴ Prokop: Kniha o Máchově Máji 123 (cf. fn. 42).

⁹⁵ See Exner, Milan: Mácha mezi sentimentalismem a biedermeierem. In: *Haman/Kopáč* (eds.): Mácha redivivus 398-400 (cf. fn. 5).

⁹⁶ Prokop: Kniha o Máchově Máji 85-86 (cf. fn. 42).

⁹⁷ Striedter: K. H. Mácha als Dichter der europäischen Romantik 229 (cf. fn. 16).

⁹⁸ Tschizewskij: Zu Máchas Weltanschauung 244 (cf. fn. 34). – Schwarz even goes so far as to characterize Mácha as a conduit of the Baroque into the 20th century, accentuating the mark Mácha's Baroque character left on the Czech Nobel Prize winner, Jaroslav Seifert; see Schwarz, Wolfgang F.: Zur Entwicklung der Ästhetik des Widersprüchlichen: Mácha – Barock – Seifert und die moderne tschechische Dichtung. In: *Schmid*: Kapitel zur Poetik Karel Hynek Máchas 18-25 (cf. fn. 44).

⁹⁹ Jiráč, Vojtěch: Úloha biedermeieru v českém národním obrození [The Role of Biedermeier

advancing his concept of Biedermeier, Jirát contrasts Mácha, a singular representative of Romantic subjectivism yearning for turbulent freedom and unbound emotion, with his Realist contemporaries, exemplified notably by Erben, who embraced literary Biedermeier and its non-revolutionary classicist values of order, lawfulness, and harmony.¹⁰⁰ Jirát further defines the Weltanschauung of Czech Biedermeier as “Christian Epicureanism”, which finds supreme happiness in peace and tranquility based on civic order and immaculate morality.¹⁰¹ Jirát maintains that it was only Mácha who transcended the Bohemian Biedermeier and realized its antithesis. His Romanticism, unique in Bohemia, allied him with the literary movement of Young Germany.¹⁰² About the same time that Jirát pioneered the term for Czech literature, Arne Novák made a passing reference to Biedermeier as “timid burgher Romanticism” without applying the term either to an era or a group in Czech literature in his *Přehledné dějiny literatury české* (A Survey History of Czech Literature, 1936-1939).¹⁰³ More recently, the American scholar of comparative literature Virgil Nemoianu states: “The literary atmosphere of the 1830s and 1840s in Bohemia could not be thoroughly understood without the concept of Biedermeier. The main figures of the period certainly displayed Biedermeier features.”¹⁰⁴ Biedermeier has been viewed as a continuation of Enlightenment rationalism and moderation,¹⁰⁵ and also an early form of literary Realism.¹⁰⁶

in Czech National Awakening]. In: *Jirát: Portréty a studie* [Portraits and Studies]. Praha 1978, 548-555, here 548-549.

¹⁰⁰ *Jirát: Erben čili majestát zákona* [Erben or the Majesty of Law]. Praha 1944, 17-20.

¹⁰¹ *Jirát: Úloha biedermeieru v českém národním obrození* 548-549 (cf. fn. 99).

¹⁰² *Ibid.* 551. – See also *Sabánek, Stanislav: Biedermeier v německém písemnictví* [Biedermeier in German Literature]. Bratislava 1938, 26.

¹⁰³ *Novák, Arne: Přehledné dějiny literatury české* [A Historical Survey of Czech Literature]. Olomouc 1936-1939. 4th edition, 217. – *Jirát: Úloha ‘biedermeieru’ v českém národním obrození* 548-549 (cf. fn. 99). – See also *Jirát: Erben čili majestát zákona* 17 (cf. fn. 100). – This literary term is not found in either of the two earlier standard surveys of Czech literature by Vlček and Jan Jakubec. *Vlček, Jaroslav: Dějiny české literatury* [A History of Czech Literature]. 2 vols. Praha 1951. – *Jakubec, Jan: Dějiny literatury české* [A History of Czech Literature]. 2 vols. Praha 1929-1934. 2nd edition.

¹⁰⁴ *Nemoianu, Virgil: The Taming of Romanticism. European Literature and the Age of Biedermeier*. Cambridge/Mass. 1984, 130. – See also *Tureček, Dalibor: Biedermeier a současná literárněvědná bohemistika* [Biedermeier and Contemporary Scholarship in Czech Literature]. In: *Lorenzová, Helena/Petrasová, Tatána: Biedermeier v českých zemích. Sborník příspěvků z 23. ročníku symposia k problematice 19. století, Plzeň, 6.-8. března 2003* [Biedermeier in the Bohemian Lands. A Miscellany to the 23rd Annual Symposium on the Problems of the Nineteenth Century, Pilsen, March 6-8, 2003]. Praha 2004, 390-392. – *Tureček: Biedermeier a současná literárněvědná bohemistika* [Biedermeier and the Contemporary Czech Literary Scholarship]. In: *Česká literatura* 51 (2003) 289-301. – *Tureček: Biedermeier a české národní obrození* [Biedermeier and the Czech National Awakening]. In: *Estetika* 30 (1993) 2, 15-24. – *Exner, Milan: Biedermeier a syndrom rozpadu* [Biedermeier and the Syndrome of Disintegration]. In: *Estetika* 32 (1995) 2, 15-23.

¹⁰⁵ On Biedermeier as a continuation of the Enlightenment rationalism and moderation, see *Jirát: Erben čili majestát zákona* 20 (cf. fn. 100). – See also *Havelka, Miloš: Byl Herbart filosofem biedermeieru? Herbartův pokus o realistickou akceptaci rozdvojenosti člověka a světa*. In: *Lorenzová/Petrasová: Biedermeier v českých zemích* 25-37 (cf. fn. 92).

¹⁰⁶ *Exner: Biedermeier a syndrom rozpadu* 17 (cf. fn. 104).

The current survey, *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku* (1998), makes clear that “Biedermeier was fundamentally different from Romanticism in its conception of the author and the reader.”¹⁰⁷ The volume assigns Tyl and Rubeš unequivocally to the Biedermeier, along with Němcová and Erben with some qualification.¹⁰⁸ Jungmann is characterized as a representative of “Enlightenment classicism”, and Havlíček as a perpetuator of the same tradition in his literary Realism.¹⁰⁹ According to Tamás Berkes, the concept of Biedermeier can cover most of Czech belles lettres from the 1820s through the 1850s with the notable and conspicuous exception of Mácha’s works.¹¹⁰

As the ascendancy of Realism and Empiricism, inherited from the Austro-Bohemian Catholic Enlightenment, provides an explanation for the rejection of Romanticism in Czech belles lettres, so it also supplies the reason for the prevalence of the Realist Biedermeier. It contrasts the dominance of Romanticism in the neighbouring countries such as Lutheran Germany, Slovakia, Poland, and Russia, where metaphysical Idealism persisted, rooted in an amalgam of German and Iberian mysticism.¹¹¹ Characteristically, Austria, which with Bohemia has contributed to in relation to the heritage of the Catholic Enlightenment, resembled the Biedermeier period of the Czech belles lettres.¹¹²

German Praise with Polish and Slovak Concurrence

According to the thesis of this article, it is hardly surprising – in contrast to the negative reaction in Bohemia – that Mácha received an enthusiastic reception in those countries that lay in the sphere of the metaphysical and idealistic tradition.¹¹³ It was primarily in Germany proper and secondarily in Poland and Slovakia. Never-

¹⁰⁷ *Lehár/Stich/Janáčková/Holý: Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku* 209 (cf. fn. 1).

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 208, 237, 246. – Němcová is also assigned to Biedermeier by *Exner: Biedermeier a syndrom rozpadu 16-17* (cf. fn. 104).

¹⁰⁹ *Lehár/Stich/Janáčková/Holý: Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku* 211 (cf. fn. 1). – The somewhat older work by *Michala, Lubomír/Petrů, Eduard: Panorama české literatury: Literární dějiny od počátků do současnosti* [Panorama of Czech Literature. A Literary History from the Beginning to the Present]. Olomouc 1994, applied the quaint term of “Pre-Romanticism” to Jungmann, Čelakovský, Tyl, and Erben 99-107. – Havlíček and Němcová are unequivocally assigned to “Literary Realism”, *ibid.* 114-116. – The designation of “Romanticism” was reserved for Mácha, *ibid.* 110-112.

¹¹⁰ František Sušil, Josef V. Kamarýt, Vacek Kamenický, Jan z Hvězdy, and others. See *Berkes, Tamás: České obrození jako literární kánon*. In: *Česká literatura na konci tisíciletí. Příspěvky z 2. kongresu světové literárněvědné bohemistiky*, Praha 3.-8. července 2000 [Czech Literature at the End of the Millennium. Contributions to the Second World Congress of Scholarship in Czech Literature, Prague, July 3-8, 2000]. 2 vols. Praha 2001, vol. 1, 120-122. – For identification of Božena Němcová as a Biedermeier writer, see also *Schamschula, Walter: Aspekte des Biedermeier in der tschechischen Literatur*. In: *Zeman, Herbert: Die österreichische Literatur: Ihr Profil im 19. Jahrhundert (1830-1880)*. Graz 1982, 107-124, here 116-119.

¹¹¹ *David: Hegel’s Collision with the Catholic Enlightenment in Bohemia* 17-20 (cf. fn. 2).

¹¹² *Jirát: Úloha ‘biedermeieru’ v českém národním obrození* 548-549 (cf. fn. 99). – See also *Sahánek: Biedermeier v německém písemnictví* 26 (cf. fn. 102).

¹¹³ *David: Realism, Tolerance, and Liberalism*, chapter 10 (cf. fn. 3).

theless, the positive reception of Mácha came much earlier from the German side than from Poland and Slovakia. While the enthusiasm for Mácha in the latter two countries has frequently been noted, the resonance of Mácha's poetry in the cultural ambiance of the Brandenburg and Saxony, and especially in Leipzig (which was the locus of subjective Romanticism) has been hitherto understated, if not neglected. Writers oriented to Berlin and Leipzig, who greeted Mácha's writings with enthusiasm, included W. A. Gerle, Julius Seidlitz, Isidor Haller, Uffo Horn, and Friedrich Bach.¹¹⁴ According to Mojmir Otruba, contemporary German writers feel a kinship with Mácha for his *Zerrissenheit* (inner strife, *rozervanost*).¹¹⁵

Soon after its first appearance, *Máj* received very favourable reviews in the journals *Unser Planet*, published in Leipzig on 20 June 1836, and *Österreichisches Morgenblatt*, published in Vienna on 22 June 1836.¹¹⁶ The review in *Unser Planet*, under the title "Übersicht der neuesten böhmischen belletristischen Literatur", favourably compares Mácha's poetry with that of his pedestrian compatriot Matouš Klácel. Klácel struggles against adversity with ideas of reason, Mácha with dark ideas of emotion. While Klácel's ideas are expressed clearly through words, Mácha's ideas appear in his works in terrifying twilight, powerfully affecting fantasy and feelings. They emanate not from words, but from the work's totality, from the very plot of the poem. Only critics deficient in emotion and imagination might erroneously conclude that Mácha's *Máj* lacks ideas. Klácel's poems can be compared to a violent storm that frightens those who are evil and gives hope to the righteous ones. Mácha's poem is best compared to a simple cross, which stands in a beautiful landscape and conveys the idea that there is a gloomy cemetery. The reviewer characterizes Mácha's approach as a delight in the most vividly imagined horrors of death and extinction and claims Mácha clings to the principle that thereby a man can get to know a genuine unhappiness and that – while the evil one may become unhappy – "the really unhappy one could never become evil". The intention of *Máj* is to contrast a quiet noble love, which is present in nature, with the wild sensory love of man and to show that the former leads to a new life, the latter to destruction. A deep and painful irony permeates the entire poem. Its greatest beauty rests in the poetically truthful depiction of emotions and nature, as well as in the vividness of contrasts, often evoking horror.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ For instance, *Krčma*, František: Starší německé studie o K. H. Máchovi [Older German Studies about K. H. Mácha]. In: *Listy filologické* 59 (1932) 404-413, here 409. – *Otruba*, Mojmir: Souvislosti a smysl předbřeznového zápasu o Máchu a jeho dílo [The Context and the Meaning of the Pre-March Struggle Around Mácha and His Writings]. In: *Česká literatura* 5 (1957) 255-279, here 266. – *Loužil*, Jaromír: Motiv spánku u K. H. Máchy [The Motive of Sleep in K. H. Mácha]. In: *Česká literatura* 35 (1987) 2, 159-185. – See also *Polák*, Karel: Překlady z K. H. Máchy do cizích jazyků [Translations from K. H. Mácha into Foreign Languages] In: *Hartl*, Antonín et al.: Věčný Mácha. Památník českého básníka [Eternal Mácha. Memorial of a Czech Poet]. Praha 1940, 215-238, here 217-219.

¹¹⁵ *Otruba*: Souvislosti a smysl předbřeznového zápasu o Máchu a jeho dílo 23 (cf. fn. 114).

¹¹⁶ *Komárek*, Stanislav: Mácha německý [The German Mácha]. In: *Haman/Kopáč* (eds.): *Mácha redivivus* 291-297, here 296 (cf. fn. 5).

¹¹⁷ *Übersicht der neuesten böhmischen belletristischen Literatur*. In: *Unser Planet*, June 20, 1836, cited by *Vašák*, Pavel: Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy: Ohlas Máchova díla

The review in *Österreichisches Morgenblatt*, titled “Einige Worte über Böhmens neueste Nationalliteratur”, presents Mácha’s poem as a romantic flower that spreads its scent far and wide. The review continues:

A soft wind of a lovelorn weeping hovers over flowers, widely scattered by the fiery fantasy, and the author’s lively feeling is manifest particularly in those passages, where he addresses the romantic beauty of nature and suffering. The first intermezzo is most successful, where the romantic tone of the poem reaches its acme and attests to the author’s competence in this poetical genre.

The plot is considered simple, but arranged in an outstanding way. The reviewer concludes with a wish that Mácha’s genius may spawn many more poetical flowers.¹¹⁸

In 1840, the article “Die czechoslawischen Dichter” in the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* singles Mácha out as the most significant Czech poet of unusual originality and poetic power. While his Czech predecessors had mostly local significance, Mácha represented a poetical personality of world format, comparable to Byron and Pushkin.¹¹⁹ Subsequently, Friedrich Bach published a eulogistic poem *Am Grabe Karl Máchas* in 1841.¹²⁰ A year later, a highly laudatory article, “Karel Hynek Mácha und die neuböhmische Literatur” by Siegfried Kapper, celebrating Mácha’s genius, appeared in the journal *Sonntagsblätter für heimatliche Interessen* in Vienna. Kapper refers to Mácha’s poems as “the genius’s divine flowers, which he kept scattering from the riches of the cornucopia of plentitude in his heart”. In a note, Frankl, the editor of the *Sonntagsblätter*, urges readers to subscribe to a planned edition of Mácha’s works, and became an exponent in perpetuating Mácha’s literary legacy.¹²¹

Kapper’s German translation of Mácha’s *Máj* appeared in the almanac *Libussa* in 1844 in Prague.¹²² The German poet Theodor Wander Ritter von Grünwald wrote an introduction to the translation, expressing enthusiastic admiration for the Czech poet. He emphasizes Mácha’s noble sympathies for human suffering and his fondness of nature. Grünwald feels that his verses exuded something peculiarly mystical

v letech 1836-1858 [The Literary Pilgrimage of Karel Hynek Mácha: The Response to Macha’s Œvre in 1836-1858]. Praha 2004, 106. – See also *Vašák: Realita a symboly máchovské recepcce* [The Reality and the Symbols Mácha’s Reception]. In: *Vašák* (ed.): *Prostor Máchova díla* [The Space of Mácha’s Oeuvre]. Praha 1986, 9-48, here 43.

¹¹⁸ Einige Worte über Böhmens neueste Nationalliteratur. In: *Österreichisches Morgenblatt*, June 22, 1836, cited by *Vašák: Literární poutí Karla Hynka Máchy* 45-46 (cf. fn. 117).

¹¹⁹ Die czechoslawischen Dichter. In: *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, April 30, 1840, cited in *Vašák: Literární poutí Karla Hynka Máchy* 128 (cf. fn. 117).

¹²⁰ *Bach, Friedrich: Am Grabe Karl Máchas*. In: *Ost und West*, November 26, 1841, 381, cited in *Vašák: Literární poutí Karla Hynka Máchy* 144-145 (cf. fn. 117). – See also *Krčma: Starší německé studie o K. H. Máchovi* 407 (cf. fn. 114).

¹²¹ *Kapper, Siegfried: Karel Hynek Mácha und die neuböhmische Literatur*. In: *Sonntagsblätter für heimatliche Interessen*, May 1, 1842, 313-314, cited in *Vašák: Literární poutí Karla Hynka Máchy* 152-153 (cf. fn. 117). – See also *Otruba: Souvislosti a smysl předbřeznového zápasu o Máchu a jeho dílo* 259 (cf. fn. 114). – And *Krčma: Starší německé studie o K. H. Máchovi* 407-408 (cf. fn. 114).

¹²² The translation appeared in *Libussa Jahrbuch* 1844 (1844) 3, 100-124. – For a discussion of Kapper’s translation, see *Polák: Překlady z K. H. Máchy do cizích jazyků* 217-219 (cf. fn. 114).

and melancholic, as well as a grandiosity of horror and gloom. He attributes Mácha's tendency toward mysticism to his philosophy teacher, Johann P. Lichtenfels.¹²³ Also commenting on the German translation of *Máj* in 1844 in his journal *Der Komet*, Georg K. Herloszson notes that in Mácha one can find as much profound gentleness as fiery thoughts. Mácha's anticipation of an early death did not cause a spiritual weakness to invade his poems, but "it flew through them as the glow of a heavenly metamorphosis, as a dreamy bitter-sweet ecstasy, as a sudden sparkle in beautiful eyes".¹²⁴ In Leipzig in 1845, Ferdinand L. Schirnding published a brief survey of Czech literature, *Zwei Fragen aus Böhmen*, in which he singles out Mácha's *Máj* for its rich, brilliant Romantic diction that arouses a deep regret for the premature death of the poet.¹²⁵ In 1846, the Prague journal *Ost und West* published a German translation of Mácha's *Křivoklad* (Burg Bürglitz) by B. Dörfel, as well as a highly positive assessment of Mácha's novel, *Cikáni* (Gypsies).¹²⁶

The favourable view of Mácha's poetry found expressions elsewhere in central Europe, in which Romanticism and Idealism were embedded in the intellectual life. Above all, the Polish intellectual ambiance was deeply affected by German Romanticism in the post-Napoleonic era.¹²⁷ Thus, Mácha's poetry also resonated favourably with the Polish philosophical scene. *Máj* was greeted with an enthusiastic review by Bielowski in *L'viv*.¹²⁸ Other Polish critics, such as Edmund Chojecki, may have been less effusive, but even he placed Mácha above other Czech poets.¹²⁹

¹²³ Grünwald also regretted that Mácha's grave in Litoměřice had not yet been marked by an appropriate monument. The introduction appeared in: Libussa, Jahrbuch für 1844 (1844) 3, 97-100. – see also *Vašák: Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy 171-172* (cf. fn. 117). – See also *Krčma: Starší německé studie o K. H. Máchovi* 408 (cf. fn. 114).

¹²⁴ Cited by *Krčma: Starší německé studie o K. H. Máchovi* 409 (cf. fn. 114). – Kapper's translation of *Máj* is also briefly noted in an anonymous review "Deutsche Literatur in Böhmen". In: *Die Grenzboten* 3 (1844) 26-31, 96-103, cited in *Vašák: Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy 172-173* (cf. fn. 117).

¹²⁵ *Schirnding*, Ferdinand Leopold: *Zwei Fragen aus Böhmen*. Leipzig 1845, 51-52, cited in *Vašák: Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy* 178 (cf. fn. 117). – In the same year, Kapper, reviewing Czech lyrical poetry in the Viennese *Sonntagsblätter*, once more singles out Mácha, whom he defends from insinuations that he was a mere imitator of Byron. *Kapper*, Siegfried: *Aufzeichnungen zur Geschichte der neuschtschischen Poesie*. Die Lyrik. In: *Sonntagsblätter für heimatlichen Interessen* 4 (1845) 1086-1088, cited in *Vašák: Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy* 229-230 (cf. fn. 117).

¹²⁶ *Ost und West* 10 (1846), 125-126, 129-131, 133-134, 137-139, 141-143, 145-147, 149-150, 153-155, 157; The note on the novel *Cikáni* is on p. 125. – See also *Krčma: Starší německé studie o K. H. Máchovi* 409 (cf. fn. 114).

¹²⁷ *Wellek*, René: *Mácha and English Literature*. In: *Wellek: Essays on Czech Literature* 148-178, here 149 (cf. fn. 68). – See also *Heidenreich Dolanský*, Julius: *Vliv Mickiewiczův na českou literaturu předbřeznovou* [Mickiewicz's Influence on Czech Pre-March Literature]. Praha 1930, 81-127. – *Menšík*, Jan: *Malczewského 'Marie' a Máchův 'Máj'* [Malczewski's 'Marie' and Mácha's 'May']. In: *Horák, Jiří/Hýšek*, Miloslav: *Sborník prací věnovaných Janu Máchalovi k sedmdesátým narozeninám* [A Miscellany Dedicated to Václav Máchal for His Seventieth Birthday]. Praha 1925, 75-101. – *Menšík*: *Mickiewicz a Mácha* [Mickiewicz and Mácha]. In: *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 13 (1927-28) 29; 14 (1928-29) 29.

¹²⁸ In *Gazeta lwowska*, December 24, 1836, no. 52, cited in *Vašák: Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy* 79-80 (cf. fn. 117).

The reception of Máchy was even more favourable in Slovakia, where the leading national intellectuals were likewise followers of Romanticism and Idealism (especially the teachings of Herder and Hegel), and unsympathetic to the typical Bohemian Realism and empiricism.¹³⁰ As noted earlier, it is significant that Máchy's work found its closest parallel not in the work of another Czech poet, but in the poetry of the Slovak Jan Kollár. In his poetical collection *Bázně* (1821), Kollár also transmits German Romantic ideals from the Lutheran intellectual milieu at the University of Jena, where he had studied from 1817 to 1819.¹³¹ Within the Slovak review media, Máchy's poetry received the highest praise in the journal *Hronka*, which favoured Romantic literature, including translations by Aleksandr Pushkin and Adam Mickiewicz.¹³² The editor of *Hronka*, Karol Kuzmány, acknowledges as early as 1836 to the publication of Máchy's *Máj* as an outstanding work in the Romantic spirit and one of the best poems in the Czech language.¹³³ Subsequently, he denounces Chmelenský's critique of *Máj*.¹³⁴ He also stresses the appeal of Máchy's mentality to the Slovak intellectuals.¹³⁵ The poetry of Kuzmány, Ludovít

¹²⁹ Writing in 1847, cited by *Vašák*: Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy 244 (cf. fn. 117). – On Chojeck's attitude see also *Horák*, Jiří: K. H. Máchy v literaturách slovanských [Máchy in Slavonic Literatures]. In: Sborník prací věnovaných Janu Máchalovi k sedmdesátým narozeninám [A Miscellany Dedicated to Václav Máchal for His Seventieth Birthday]. Praha 1925, 320-324. – On Máchy's influence on Polish literature, see *Pilař*, Jan: Máchy polské vlivy [Máchy's Polish Influences]. In: Česká literatura 35 (1987) 136-138. – For a delayed Russian reaction to Máchy as one "of the most gifted Czech poets", see *Gerbel*, Nikolai V.: Poeziiia slavian: Sbornik luchshikh poeticheskikh proizvedenii slavianskikh narodov [Poetry of the Slavs: A Miscellany of the Best Poetical Works of the Slavic Nations]. St. Petersburg 1871, 367. – Among the South Slavs, an early translator of Máchy (1836-1837) was the Croatian poet Petar Preradović. *Vašák*, Pavel: První překlad Máchova díla [The First Translation of Máchy's *Āvre*]. In: Časopis Česká literatura 28 (1980) 6, 596-600, here 598.

¹³⁰ *Gombala*, Eduard: Recepčia diela Karla H. Máchy a jeho romantická iniciatíva na Slovensku [Reception of the Work of Karel Hynek Máchy and His Romantic Initiative in Slovakia]. In: Slovenská literatur[a] 34 (1987) 13-29. – *Kraus*: Na tému Karel H. Máchy a Slováci 63-70 (cf. fn. 10). – *Kraus*, Cyril: K. H. Máchy v kontexte slovenskej literatúry v 30. a 40. rokoch 19. storočia [K. H. Máchy in the Context of the Slovak Literature in the 1830s and 1840s]. In: Česká literatura 35 (1987) 119-124. – *Brtáň*, Rudo: Ohlas Máchova Mája na Slovensku [The Echo of Máchy's *May* in Slovakia]. In: Panoráma 14 (1936) 88. – *Pišút*, Milan: Karel Hynek Máchy a Slovensko [Karel Hynek Máchy and Slovakia]. In: Elán 6 (1935-1936) no. 8, 1-3.

¹³¹ *Pohorský*: Máchy a český romantismus v evropských souvislostech 2:381 (cf. fn. 9). – *Vodíčka*: Cesty a cíle obrozenecké literatury 155-163 (cf. fn. 9).

¹³² *Káša*, Peter: Český 'romantismus' očami J. M. Hurbana a L. Štúra. [Czech Romanticism Through the Eyes of J. M. Hurban and L. Štúr]. In: Česká literatura na konci tisíciletí, vol. 1, 153-154 (cf. fn. 110).

¹³³ *Kuzmány*, Karol: Literární Zprávy [Literary News]. In: *Hronka* 1 (1836) pt. 3, 93. – See also Kuzmány's elegy on Máchy: *Kuzmány*: "Pláč nad smrtí Karla Hynka Máchy". In: *Květy*, Příloha 16, December 29, 1836.

¹³⁴ *Kuzmány*, Karol: Slovo k panu Dr. Jos. Chmelenskému. [A Word for Dr. Jos. Chmelenský]. In: *Hronka* 2 (1837) pt. 1, 88-90.

¹³⁵ *Kuzmány*: Ladislav 57-58 (cf. fn. 8). – On the Czech side, Čelakovský, in turn, called Kuzmány a *slovácký balama* (a Slovak oaf) and a *hrubý pacholek* (an insolent miscreant) for his attacks on Chmelenský. *Vašák*: Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy 92-93, 96 (cf. fn. 117).

Štúr, Jozef M. Hurban, Viliam Pauliny-Tóth, and Samo B. Hroboň was strongly influenced by Máchá's work.¹³⁶ Ľudovít Štúr himself declares in his magnum opus, *Das Slawenthum und die Welt der Zukunft*, that "in Bohemia in the arts, as well as in poetry, they cannot offer a single uniquely creative spirit – except for Máchá".¹³⁷

In 1842, as a sign of his devotion, Hurban, a leading Slovak intellectual and Štúr's associate, published a ballad of Máchá in his almanac *Nitra* with highly laudatory comments.¹³⁸ Writing ten years after Máchá's death, Hurban recalls the strong resentment among his Slovak contemporaries against Máchá's Czech critics in 1836/37. The Slovak students targeted Chmelenský, Tyl, and especially Tomíček, whom they intended to confront in Prague for a disrespectful attitude toward Máchá and his work. In addition, Hurban excoriates Tyl for the portrait of Máchá in his article "Rozervanec" as unreal and entirely false in its suggestion that the Czech poet lacked any moral principles and hence was thoroughly decadent. According to Hurban, if Máchá had lived longer he might have become the first world-class poet of the Czechs.¹³⁹ The Slovak Romantic writers in the 1840s continued to be attracted to Máchá's poetry, which this younger generation, as Samuel Šipko notes in 1847, considered as the highest achievement in Czech literature.¹⁴⁰ Pavol Dobšinský reminisces in 1875 that in the period from 1846 to 1849 the young Slovak students of the Levoča region viewed Máchá as the sole authentically poetic spirit among the Czech

¹³⁶ *Procházka*, Antonín: Máchův Máj a Bottova Smrt Janošíkova [Máchá's *May* and Botto's *Death of Janošík*] In: Slovenská miscellanea [Slovak Miscellany]. Bratislava 1931, 94. – *Frydecký*, F.: O vlivu Máchova Máje na Bottovu Smrt Janošíkovu [On the Influence of Máchá's *May* on Botto's *Death of Janošík*]. In: Česká revue 9 (1915-16) 541-551, here 541. – *Vlček*: Dějiny české literatury, vol. 2, 520 (cf. fn. 103). – *Macura*, Vladimír: Znamení zrodu: české národní obrození jako kulturní typ [Sign of Birth. Czech National Awakening as a Cultural Type]. Praha 1995, 202. – Karol Štúr, the lesser known brother of the famous Ľudovít, wrote his poetry in Máchá's spirit, and dedicated to his model an elegiac poem in 1837. *Štúr*, Karol D.: Pout' mladého pěvce: žalozpěv památce Karla Hynka Máchy [The Pilgrimage of a Young Singer: Elegy to the Memory of Karel Hynek Mácha]. In: Květy (September 7, 1837) Příloha 18, 69-70. – *Gombala*, Eduard: Karol Štúr a Karol Hynek Mácha [Karol Štúr and Karel Hynek Mácha]. In: Slovenská literatur[a] 24 (1977) 585-595.

¹³⁷ *Štúr*, Ľudovít: Das Slawenthum und die Welt der Zukunft. Bratislava 1931, 203.

¹³⁸ *Hurban*, Jozef Miloslav: Píseň od K. H. Máchy [Song from K. H. Máchá]. In: *Nitra* 1 (1842) 153-154. – See also *Káša*: Český 'romantizmus' očami J. M. Hurbana a Ľ. Štúra, vol. 1, 157 (cf. fn. 132).

¹³⁹ Hurban acknowledges his devotion to Máchá, claiming that he had worn out two copies of *Máj* from constant use, having spent innumerable exciting hours immersed in the poet's thoughts. *Hurban*, Jozef Miloslav: Prehľad časopisou a novín [An Overview of Journals and Newspapers]. In: Slovenskje pohľadi na vedi, umeňja a literaturu 1 (1847) 2, 74-75. – See also *Káša*: Český 'romantizmus' očami J. M. Hurbana a Ľ. Štúra, vol. 1, 162 (cf. fn. 132).

¹⁴⁰ In: *Považie* 10 (1847), cited by *Kraus*: Na tému Karel H. Mácha a Slováci 70 (cf. fn. 10). – Pauliny dedicated a poem to Máchá's memory in 1845. *Vašák*: Literární pout' Karla Hynka Máchy 178-179 (cf. fn. 117). – Jan Botto's poem *Smrt Janošíkova*, written by 1848 and published in 1862, was, according to Jaroslav Vlček, a virtual paraphrase of Máchá's *Máj*. See *Procházka*, Antonín: Máchův Máj a Bottova Smrt Janošíkova 94 (cf. fn. 136). – *Frydecký*: O vlivu Máchova Máje na Bottovu Smrt Janošíkovu 541-551 (cf. fn. 136).

authors, and sought to imitate his style.¹⁴¹ Palacký observes the link between the Romanticism of Máchá and that of the Slovak followers of Kollár and Štúr when, in 1838, he criticizes Kuzmány's *Lučatínská Víla* as a work with "the same pretensions of poetic style [...] which we viewed with distaste in Máchá".¹⁴²

A Prism Distinguishing Two Philosophical Cultures

The lavish praise from the German, Polish, and Slovak sides served to underscore Máchá's estrangement from Bohemia's intellectual ambiance. As underlined in the introduction, his poetry managed to combine two strands that were contrary to the mainstream of Bohemia's literary culture that derived from the Realism of the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment and, more remotely, echoed the Realism of the 16th-century Utraquists.¹⁴³ The rejection of Máchá's Romanticism in Bohemia represented a parallel in literature to the almost concurrent rejection of Hegelian Idealism of Augustin Smetana, Matouš Klácel, and Ignác J. Hanuš in philosophy.¹⁴⁴ The reaction against both literary Romanticism and philosophical Idealism simultaneously

¹⁴¹ Pavol E. Dobšínský in *Čajak*, Janko: Básne [Poems]. Martin 1875, 114. – The Slovak intellectuals' interest in Máchá's poetry matched their sympathy for the rare Czech Hegelians, evident particularly in Štúr's relationship with Matouš Klácel. Štúr, Ludovít: Listy [Letters]. Ed. Jozef Ambruš and Vladimír Matula. 4 vols. Bratislava 1954-1999, vol. 2, 185-188, 449-450.

¹⁴² In his article on *Vesna* in *Časopis českého musea* (1838), cited by *Souček*, Stanislav: Příspěvek k poznání Erbená básníka [Contribution to the Understanding of the Poet Erben]. In: *Časopis Matice moravské* 39 (1915) 95-260, here 258. – *Vašák*, Pavel: Literární pouť Karla Hynka Máchy 106 (cf. fn. 117).

¹⁴³ One was the Herderian and Hegelian Idealist strand that emanated chiefly from the German Romanticism; the other was the Baroque pathos reminiscent of the literature of the Counter-Reformation. *David*: Realism, Tolerance, and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening (cf. fn. 3). – *Sorkin*: Reform Catholicism and Religious Enlightenment (cf. fn. 3). – *Blanning/Evans*: Comments (cf. fn. 3). – *Blanning*: The Enlightenment in Catholic Germany (cf. fn. 3). – Moreover, Máchá's case illustrates the great paradox of Czech literature, namely that some of its highest esthetic attainments were atypical of Bohemia's intellectual ambiance, whether it was the poetry of Máchá with his sentimental Romanticism, or that of Březina with his symbolist mysticism. On Máchá's relationship to Březina, see *Novák*, Arne: O tradici v české literatuře [On Tradition in Czech Literature]. In: *Novák*: Nosiči pochodní; kniha české tradice [The Bearers of Torches; a Book on Czech Tradition]. Praha 1928, 26. – *Šalda*, František X.: Vývoj a integrace v poesii Otakara Březiny [Development and Integration in the Poetry of Otakar Březina]. In: *Šalda*: Duše a dílo: podobizny a medailony 131-132 (cf. fn. 67).

¹⁴⁴ For this parallel in a somewhat different context, see also *Zába*, Gustav: Filosofie [Philosophy]. In: Památník na oslavu padesátiletého panovníckého jubilea Františka Josefa I: vědecký a umělecký rozvoj v národě českém [A Memorial to Celebrate the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Reign of Francis Joseph I: Scientific and Artistic Development in the Czech Nation]. Praha 1898, separate pagination 3. – See also *David*: Hegel's Collision with the Catholic Enlightenment in Bohemia 14-30 (cf. fn. 2). – It is significant that while Máchá imbibed his ideas from Polish Romanticism, Hanuš, for instance, developed his penchant for Hegelianism in the Polish philosophical milieu of Galician L'viv. *Gabriel*, Jiří (ed.): Slovník českých filozofů [Dictionary of Czech Philosophers]. Brno 1998, 158.

expresses the strength of the ontic and epistemological Realism in the Bohemian intellectual milieu.¹⁴⁵

The Catholic Enlightenment, originating in the latter part of the 18th century, persisted in impacting on the intellectual life of Bohemia into the following century. First, it was mainly through the champions of Josephist Reform Catholicism – Bolzano, Fesl, and František Příhonský – and then by kindred Realist philosophies, especially that of Johann Herbart. The latter, which the magisterial authority of Franz Exner established in Bohemia, dovetailed with the tenor of Bolzano's logical Realism. Another such extension was the prevalence of the Biedermeier style in Czech literature of the first half of the 19th century.¹⁴⁶

Thus, Mácha's devotion to German-style Romanticism and Idealism, as well as his harkening back to the mystique of the Counter-Reformation, clashed with the Czech sobriety and Realism of the Catholic Enlightenment, a legacy reinforced by the earlier tradition of the Utraquist mainstream of the Bohemian Reformation, which was rediscovered in the Enlightenment.¹⁴⁷ What caused resentment in Bohemia assured Mácha a favourable reception in areas under the influence of German Romanticism and philosophical Idealism in Poland, Slovakia, and – above all – in Germany itself, and attests to the presence of two philosophical traditions in East Central Europe.

¹⁴⁵ The 16th-century legacy was rediscovered and transmitted by the Enlightenment. *David*: Realism, Tolerance, and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening (cf. fn. 3). – *Sorkin*: Reform Catholicism and Religious Enlightenment (cf. fn. 3). – *Blanning/Evans*: Comments (cf. fn. 3). – *Blanning*: The Enlightenment in Catholic Germany (cf. fn. 3).

¹⁴⁶ *Sabánek*: Biedermeier v německém písemnictví 19-20 (cf. fn. 102). – *Havelka*: Byl Herbart filosofem biedermeieru? 36-37 (cf. fn. 105).

¹⁴⁷ *David*: Realism, Tolerance, and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening 18-46 (cf. fn. 3).