

Marie Škarpová

Czech Studies across the Iron Curtain: Dmitry Chyzhevsky's Collaboration with Czechoslovak Scholars, Based on Their Correspondence, 1956–1977

Abstract: The aim of the article is to highlight Dmitry Chyzhevsky's collaboration (during his "Heidelberg period" 1956–1977) with his colleagues on the other side of a politically divided Europe, namely in Czechoslovakia. Although Chyzhevsky was not able to meet in person with his colleagues in Czechoslovakia on a regular basis, the surviving correspondence between Chyzhevsky and Czechoslovak scholars documents the intensity of their collaboration despite all the political restrictions of the time. The letters provide unique information about the contemporary situation of Slavic and Czech studies on both sides of the Iron Curtain, including the limits faced by scholars at the time. Such correspondence managed to create an unofficial – "parallel" – distribution network for literature on Czech and Slavic studies across the Iron Curtain, one that worked in both directions and made it possible for scholars to obtain literature otherwise unavailable. Secondly, in some cases, the collaborations of Czechoslovak scholars with Chyzhevsky even evolved from commonplace scholarly discussions in the creation of specific cross-border editorial and publishing teams. This is an unrecognized part of both the parallel (humanities) discourse in Czechoslovakia independent or semi-dependent on the official research institutions and independent of publishing activities organized abroad by Czechs.

Keywords: Dmitry Chyzhevsky, Czech studies, correspondence, tamizdat, distribution of literature abroad

1.1. Collaboration despite the Iron Curtain

It is well known that Dmitry Chyzhevsky (1894–1977), the philosopher and literary comparatist of Russian-Ukrainian origin, was an important figure for Slavic studies in Germany, especially in the period 1956–1977, when he worked

at the Slavic Institute of the University of Heidelberg, first as its director and since 1968 as honorary professor (*Honorarprofessor*). This article aims to highlight Chyzhevsky's collaboration, during the scholar's "Heidelberg period", with his colleagues in Czechoslovakia – that is, on the other side of a politically divided Cold-War Europe. Although Chyzhevsky was not able to meet in person with his colleagues in Czechoslovakia on a regular basis (some he did not meet at all during the mentioned period), the surviving archival sources – primarily letters – document how intensive and multifaceted their collaboration was.

It is a paradox of history that Chyzhevsky spent a significant part of his life in Czechoslovakia. He taught at the exiled Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian Pedagogical Institute in Prague, from 1924 until 1933, when the institute was closed. This forced Chyzhevsky to find another job, which brought him to the University of Halle an der Saale in Germany. During his time in Prague, Chyzhevsky established contacts with some Czech humanities scholars and became a member of several local scholarly societies, including the Prague Linguistic Circle. However, after the Communist Party seized control of Czechoslovakia in its February 1948 coup d'état, it seems that Chyzhevsky visited Czechoslovakia only once: in August 1968, to attend the Sixth International Slavic Congress in Prague.¹ Similarly, for Czechoslovak humanities scholars to travel across the Iron Curtain to Heidelberg or elsewhere in the West was not entirely out of the question, at least for some of them (especially in the late 1960s), but this option was still very limited.

Moreover, during Chyzhevsky's Heidelberg period, the circumstances under which his academic contacts in Czechoslovakia were living differed significantly from his own. Unlike Chyzhevsky, who had already emigrated from Ukraine to Germany as a political refugee in 1921 (he had been sentenced to death by the Bolsheviks in his homeland), his Czechoslovak colleagues never left their native country. Starting in 1948, however, many of them lived in various forms of internal exile or dissent. Under the Communist regime, some of them were banned from university positions.

1 Chyzhevsky's participation is documented both in the Congress records and in Chyzhevsky's correspondence with Czechoslovak colleagues (see Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 21/12/1967 and 04/02/1968; Karel Horálek's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 23/07/1968; all the letters addressed to Chyzhevsky that we refer to in this article are deposited in Chyzhevsky's estate at the University Library in Heidelberg – see Archival sources).

Václav Černý (1905–1987), for example, a specialist in comparative literature at Charles University, had to leave his position in 1950. It was the same in 1953 for the classical philologist Bohumil Ryba (1900–1980) and even earlier, in 1948, for the historian Zdeněk Kalista (1900–1982). Kalista and Černý were allowed to resume their university work only briefly, during the period 1968–1970. Ryba was not allowed to resume his work at all. Moreover, Kalista and Ryba soon became political prisoners of the totalitarian regime, with Kalista sentenced to fifteen years in 1952, and Ryba to nineteen years in 1954, both of them remaining in prison until 1960, when an amnesty for political prisoners set the conditions for their release.² Another of Chyzhevsky's Czechoslovak colleagues, Josef Vašica (1884–1968), an expert on Old Church Slavonic and Baroque literature, was forced to retire after the Faculty of Theology at Charles University was abolished in 1950.

Some of Chyzhevsky's Czechoslovak colleagues could still work at the university after February 1948, but their work and life were made difficult, especially for those who were not members of the Communist Party, and they were able to maintain their position at the university only thanks to their professional reputation. This was the case, for example, with the literary historians Antonín Škarka (1906–1972) and Oldřich Králík (1907–1975), who worked at Charles University in Prague and Palacký University in Olomouc, respectively. However, some of Chyzhevsky's Czechoslovak colleagues did manage to gain prominent university positions, after February 1948, but only on condition of collaborating with the totalitarian regime. This was the case with the Slavist Karel Horálek (1908–1992), who served in 1951–1970 as director of the Department of Slavic Studies, Faculty of Arts, at Charles University (as well as faculty dean, 1955–1958), and in 1972–1978 as director of the Institute of the Czech Language at the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.³

2 In 1952, Václav Černý was also accused of anti-state activities, for which he was arrested and prosecuted but later acquitted for lack of evidence in 1953.

3 A more detailed examination of research by these Czechoslovak scholars is not within the scope of this study. Basic information on their methodological backgrounds and on the historical and intellectual contexts in which these scholars operated can be found in the relevant entries in the online *Slovník české literatury po roce 1945* (Dictionary of Czech Literature after 1945, <https://slovníkceskeliteratury.cz/>). On the fate of Bohumil Ryba, see Dvořáčková 2009. On the situation at the Faculty of Arts of Charles University, see Petráň/Petráňová 2015. About university life in general in the political satellites of the Soviet Union, see Connelly 2000.

Despite all the limits and political restrictions of the time, these Czechoslovak scholars managed to develop intensive collaborations with Chyzhevsky. The surviving correspondence shows that in spite of differences in methodological approaches between the corresponding parties (as they were interested in textual science, positivism, hermeneutics, structuralism, Marxist literary criticism, etc.), they all collaborated with Chyzhevsky along two particular lines. Firstly, they managed to create an unofficial “parallel” distribution network for literature on Czech and Slavic studies across the Iron Curtain, one that worked in both directions. Secondly, in some cases, their collaborations with Chyzhevsky during this period even evolved from commonplace scholarly discussions and occasional collegial assistance in the creation of specific editorial and publishing teams. They developed several remarkable editorial projects in Old Church Slavonic, medieval, and Baroque studies, though not all of the planned editions were ultimately completed. These editions were designed and prepared by Czechoslovak scholars as private research projects, without the support or setting of a contemporary Czechoslovak scientific institution (i.e. the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences or universities). Chyzhevsky, on the other hand, carried out these editorial projects under the auspices of his research work at the Slavic Institute at the University of Heidelberg (he also involved his students in them). Most importantly, he also managed to obtain an important partner who would play a crucial role in the comprehensive implementation of their editorial projects, namely a publisher.

1.2. Written correspondence as primary means of professional communication across the Iron Curtain

Given that the ability for scholars from Eastern Europe to meet in person with their counterparts from the West during the period 1956–1977 was severely limited, if not impossible, Chyzhevsky was forced to maintain contact with his Czechoslovak colleagues mainly in other ways. There were not many means of communication at that time, and all of them were limited in various ways. The telegram was primarily intended for urgent, preferably short messages. Those who had access to a private telephone – not a universal feature in the home at the time – could expect it to be bugged, which is why, according to the oral testimony of his colleagues, Antonín Škarka never wanted to own a private telephone. Written correspondence sent by post from socialist Czechoslova-

kia to the world behind the Iron Curtain was watched over by the state and could be censored or confiscated. Communication by unofficial means – that is, delivery of a letter or any other parcel or message by physical couriers – was probably used systematically only starting in 1965, when mention of this method begins to appear repeatedly in the surviving correspondence. Those who served as couriers were typically students of Czech studies from West Germany, who were given the opportunity to study at Czechoslovak universities.⁴ This role was also carried out by Czechoslovak scholars who went behind the Iron Curtain for conferences or as visiting professors for invited lectures, or who worked as lecturers in Czech for longer periods at universities in West Germany.

Following in the tradition of the epistolary genre and in the same basic means of intellectual communication and cultural exchange that has been around since the beginning of Humanist scholarship, it is not surprising then that written correspondence became Chyzhevsky's primary means of communication with his Czechoslovak colleagues living on the other side of the Iron Curtain.⁵ In the absence of other kinds of sources, it is this correspondence that serves as source material for this article. For this purpose, we have drawn on the Chyzhevsky estate held at the University Library in Heidelberg,⁶ as well as the estates of Czech scholars in the Literary Archive of the Museum of Czech Literature in Prague.⁷ Among the surviving correspondence, we leave aside the – innumerable – standard official correspondence in which

4 For example, from 1966 to 1968, a German student of Dmitry Chyzhevsky studied at the Prague University in Antonín Škarka's seminar, and she evidently functioned as a "courier" between Škarka and Chyzhevsky (see Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 15/11/1966; 08/11/1968; 17/12/1968).

5 Chyzhevsky's correspondence with Czechoslovak scholars living in exile is left aside. For example, his correspondence with the expert on Old Church Slavonic František Václav Mareš (1922–1994), who after his emigration worked as a professor of Slavic studies at the University of Vienna from 1968, is extensive.

6 The correspondence is deposited in the department "Historische Sammlungen" of the University Library in Heidelberg – see Archival sources; see also Sieveking 2008. The correspondence is mainly incoming, rarely also outgoing.

7 See the funds of Václav Černý, Karel Horálek, Zdeněk Kalista, Antonín Škarka, and Josef Vašica of the Literary Archive of the Museum of Czech Literature in Prague. It is almost exclusively incoming correspondence; it was published in the original and in translation into Ukrainian by Oksana Blašková (Blaškiv 2010: 219–355). Chyzhevsky's letters referred to in this article are deposited in the aforementioned funds (see Archival sources).

researchers contacted Chyzhevsky on behalf of a Czechoslovak university or other academic institution (asking him to deliver a paper or take part as an invited speaker at a conference, for example) or on behalf of a Czechoslovak professional periodical (requests for articles, or letters urging Chyzhevsky to submit a promised paper).

There is yet another type of correspondence – much more numerous in the archive collections – that we consider to be a more interesting source for understanding the situation of humanities scholars at that time: namely, the correspondence through which Czechoslovak scholars established, developed, and maintained professional collaborations with Chyzhevsky on an unofficial basis, independent of any Czechoslovak research institution. In particular, letters to Chyzhevsky by Václav Černý, Karel Horálek, Zdeněk Kalista, Milan Kopecký, Oldřich Králík, Antonín Škarka, and Josef Vašica⁸ represents this type of correspondence, which has several distinctive qualities. While Chyzhevsky's letters to Czechoslovak scholars, despite their spontaneity of formulation and peculiar language,⁹ retain some of the characteristics of official correspondence (e.g. the letters are typed on papers with a letterhead), the vast majority of his Czechoslovak colleagues' letters lack these features: with few exceptions, they did not use letterhead paper, and some letters are handwritten. However, despite this, the most prominent feature of all the correspondence is that it is almost exclusively professional, as it contains almost no information of a private nature. In fact, the surviving correspondence between Chyzhevsky and Czechoslovak scholars consists mostly of letters, with postcards being much rarer.

Given that in most cases envelopes were not preserved, it is not clear whether these letters were sent by post or other means, nor whether they were sent privately or through the institution where the sender was employed. However, in the correspondence between Chyzhevsky and Antonín Škarka, addresses of sender and recipient are included within the letters themselves,

8 The correspondence from the Heidelberg period of Chyzhevsky's life is preserved: with V. Černý from 1962 to 1967, with K. Horálek from 1957 to 1969, with Zdeněk Kalista from 1963 to 1976, with M. Kopecký from 1967 to 1972, with O. Králík from 1966 to 1967, with A. Škarka from 1956 to 1972, and with J. Vašica from 1964 to 1966.

9 Chyzhevsky's German, in which he usually corresponded with his Czechoslovak colleagues, is very "Slavic"; his letters – obviously – were not edited by native speakers.

showing that while Chyzhevsky sent his letters directly to Škarka's home, Škarka mailed his letters exclusively to Chyzhevsky's university address.

Unfortunately, only part of Chyzhevsky's correspondence with his Czechoslovak colleagues has survived.¹⁰ What remains, however, offers a unique source that documents their intensive collaboration in the fields named above during the period 1956–1977. Finally, this correspondence aptly highlights some of the limits faced by scholars in Slavic studies on both sides of the Iron Curtain, as well as their limited publishing opportunities.

2.1. The limits of the “Western” and “Eastern” scholar in Slavic studies during the period of the Iron Curtain

During the period 1956–1977, while Chyzhevsky was working at the University of Heidelberg,¹¹ he was faced with the same basic problem as all other Slavists in the Western world: a separation from all Slavic countries by the Iron Curtain, which prevented direct contact with the entire Slavic world and its literature. Chyzhevsky was also confronted with the problem that Slavic studies in the German context, and generally in the West, were commonly reduced to Russian studies. In a letter to Antonín Škarka dated 16/10/1956, he describes the beginnings of his work at University of Heidelberg as follows:

[...] z. Zt. bin ich Prof... an der Heidelberger Univ[ersität] und Direktor des Slavischen Institutes hier, das leider eher ein 'Russisches Institut' ist, d. h. es besitzt eine Bibliothek, die fast ausschließlich russische Bücher hat. Ich habe jetzt versucht die čechoslovakische Abteilung zu ergänzen, sowie die polnische usf.¹²

([...] currently, I am a professor at the University of Heidelberg, and director of its Slavic Institute, which unfortunately is rather a 'Russian Institute', that is, its library is stocked almost exclusively with Russian books. I have tried to add a Czechoslovak section, as well as a Polish section, etc.)¹³

10 The correspondence collection deposited in Heidelberg is probably more complete than the collection deposited in the Literary Archive of the Museum of Czech Literature.

11 Between 1964 and 1970, Chyzhevsky also worked at the University of Cologne.

12 See also Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letter to Václav Černý dated 24/02/1962.

13 Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are mine, M. Š.

We see then that Chyzhevsky was dedicated to the cause of broadening Slavic studies beyond the Russian context. This is also why contact with his Czechoslovak colleagues – experts on Czech literature – was so important to him, despite the difficulties that maintaining contact of any kind presented at the time.

2.1.1. Limited opportunities to travel behind the Iron Curtain prevented meetings in person

Unsurprisingly, a frequent theme of Chyzhevsky's correspondence with his colleagues in Czechoslovakia during his Heidelberg period is the impossibility of meeting in person.¹⁴ The correspondence also seems to suggest some of the factors that prevented face-to-face encounter, and points to some of the strategies that scholars used to overcome them.

In particular, the correspondence with Antonín Škarka¹⁵ and Karel Horálek¹⁶ shows that Chyzhevsky, a renowned expert on J.A. Comenius' works since the 1930s (when he discovered *De rerum humanarum emendatione consultatio catholica*, Comenius' most important philosophical work), did not accept numerous invitations to come to Czechoslovakia for conferences or other events related to Comenius,¹⁷ although Czechoslovak scholars did their best to convince him. These included both official and private invitations (to deliver a paper or take part as an invited speaker at a conference, for instance), as we see, for example, in the case of Antonín Škarka's letter of 03/07/1967:

Všichni se mne zde dotazují na Vaši účast na této konferenci, na kterou Vás zjara jménem přípravného výboru pozvali jeho předseda prof. dr. Josef Poli-šenský a jeho sekretář doc. dr. Jiří Kyrášek a zároveň Vás požádali o referát. Opravdu se všichni domníváme a doufáme, že byste se jí měl osobně zúčastnit jako objevitel Konzultace. Budete u nás upřímně očekáván a vítán, v naší vědě není proti Vám zaujetí a nepřátelství. Jak jsem se informoval, nepochybu- jeme, že Vám bude československé vízum vydáno v nejkratší lhůtě buď na pas

14 See for example Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 15/11/1957; 21/04/1966; 16/12/1970.

15 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 03/07/1967; 07/10/1967; 23/07/1970.

16 See Karel Horálek's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 06/07/1967.

17 Surviving correspondence shows that Chyzhevsky was repeatedly invited to Comenius conferences held in Czechoslovakia in 1957, 1967, and 1970, and to the opening of the J. A. Comenius Memorial in Uherský Brod in 1956.

nebo jiný průkaz, který jej může zastoupit, z této strany nebudou žádné potíže, a rovněž celý pobyt u nás bude Vám hrazen. Myslím, že nemluví jenom za sebe, když prohlašují, že se na Vás těšíme. Jestliže nejsou opravdu nějaké nepřekonatelné zábrany, přijedte, neodmítejte naše upřímné pozvání.

(Everybody is asking me about your participation in the conference; in the spring, you were invited on behalf of the preparatory committee by its chairman, Prof. Dr. Josef Polišínský, and his secretary, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jiří Kyrášek, and they asked you for a conference paper at the same time. Indeed, we believe and hope that you shall attend the conference as the discoverer of *Consultatio*. You will be sincerely expected and welcomed by us; there is no bias or hostility against you in our humanities. As I have been informed, there is no doubt that a Czechoslovak visa will be issued to you at the earliest possible date, either to your passport or on any other document that may substitute it; there will be no difficulty on this side, and also your entire stay will be paid for. I think I do not speak for myself alone when I say that we look forward to seeing you. If there are no insurmountable obstacles, come, do not refuse our sincere invitation.)

Surviving correspondence also shows, moreover, that Chyzhevsky was invited to Czechoslovakia as a visiting professor for the summer of 1968, then for October 1968, and finally for the spring of 1969.¹⁸ However, none of these plans were realized, although, again, Czechoslovak scholars put considerable effort into preparing the matter carefully, as shown, for example, by Karel Horálek's letter of 18/04/1968:

Doufám, že jste již dostal od kolegy Škarky žádané formální pozvání. Nezávisle na něm teď usiluji o to, abyste byl pozván k nám do Československa také reálně. Domluvil jsem jeden návrh prostřednictvím kolegy Komárka na pozvání filozofické fakulty v Olomouci a pro jistotu ještě druhé pozvání prostřednictvím Literárněhistorické společnosti (slavistická sekce) v Praze. Doufám, že aspoň jeden z těchto návrhů projde...¹⁹

18 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 25/09/1968 and 08/05/1969; Karel Horálek's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 04/01/1969.

19 See also Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 01/05/1968; 15/05/1968; 23/06/1968.

(I hope you have already received the formal invitation from our colleague Škarka. Independently of him, I am making a considerable effort so that you may receive an official invitation to Czechoslovakia. I have arranged a proposal in collaboration with our colleague Komárek for an invitation from the Faculty of Arts in Olomouc and, just to be sure, a second invitation through the Literary-Historical Society (Slavic Section) in Prague. I hope that at least one of these proposals will be accepted...)

As mentioned above, it seems that Chyzhevsky came to Czechoslovakia only once, for the Sixth Slavic Congress held in Prague in August 1968. Does Chyzhevsky's refusal to travel to Czechoslovakia indicate his fear to enter a country under Soviet control? The death sentence passed on him in Ukraine in 1923 was still in force. Or was he simply constrained by schedule and workload, as he wrote to Václav Černý regarding the Comenius Conference in 1967 (Chyzhevsky, indeed, missed the conference)?²⁰ Or was it yet something else?

A similar topic in the correspondence between Chyzhevsky and his Czechoslovak colleagues was the impossibility or very limited possibility for Czechoslovak scholars to travel behind the Iron Curtain. The letters discuss only the possibility of travelling behind the Iron Curtain on business: either to attend a professional conference or as a visiting professor at a university. Czechoslovak scholars were interested in both options and hoped in both cases for Chyzhevsky's aid and support. Antonín Škarka indicates the whole problem and its possible solution in his letter to Chyzhevsky dated 08/10/1957:

Velmi jsem litoval, že jste nepřijel do Prahy na komeniologický sjezd, rád bych se s Vámi osobně seznámil. Ale stále k tomu není bohužel příležitost. To bych musel být leda pozván na nějakou vědeckou konferenci k Vám jako přítel Patočka, ovšem takovou, která by se nějak dotýkala mého vědního oboru (starší české literatury).

(I was very sorry that you did not come to Prague for the Comenius Congress, I would have liked to meet you in person. But unfortunately, there is still no opportunity to do so. I would have to be invited to a conference in Western

20 See Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letter to Václav Černý dated 05/11/1967.

Germany like our mutual friend Patočka, but one that would be somehow related to my research field (that is Czech literature of older times.)

In letters dated 18/06/1965 and 02/05/1966, Karel Horálek – whose position on the faculty gave him vastly greater opportunity to travel to Western Europe than Škarka – requests from Chyzhevsky an official invitation to come to the University of Heidelberg as a visiting professor and provides Chyzhevsky with a number of possible topics for lectures.²¹

It is not surprising that this form of written correspondence, which still represented the most basic and sometimes only possible connection between people, was all the more important in this situation. This is clearly illustrated by the correspondence between Chyzhevsky and Škarka, who wrote to each other from the late 1930s until Škarka's death in 1972. Although the two scholars had planned several meetings in person – Halle an der Saale in 1945, and Uherský Brod (thought to be Comenius' birth place) in 1956²² – their first chance to actually do so was in June 1967, when Škarka came to the University of Heidelberg as a visiting professor at Chyzhevsky's invitation.²³ In the years that followed, Chyzhevsky and Škarka probably met in person on only two more occasions: at the aforementioned Sixth Slavic Congress in August 1968 in Prague and at a conference on Comenius in Arnoldsheim, West Germany, in 1970.²⁴

21 However, some proscribed Czech scholars also had problems with business trips within the Eastern political bloc, as we read in a letter by A. Škarka dated 01/05/1968, in which he explains to Chyzhevsky why he has not attended any Slavic congresses, although they were held in pro-Soviet countries: “[...] mne aspoň dosud při každém slavistickém kongresu naši “soudruzi” vynechali, sami jeli tam zadarmo, na státní útraty, mně pak ponechávali jenom na vůli, zdali se přihlásím, ovšem bez nějakého pozvání, za drahé zlodějské peníze s Čedokem. Proto jsem nebyl ani v Moskvě, ani v Sofii. Předražené cestování s Čedokem jsem si se svým platem nemohl dovolit.” (“[...] so far, our “comrades” haven't let me participate at either of the Slavic congresses, even though they went there for free themselves, at state expense, and left it up to me whether I would sign up, but without any invitation, forced to pay exaggerated sums to travel with the travel agency Čedok. That is why I was neither in Moscow nor in Sofia. With my salary, I couldn't afford the overpriced travel with Čedok.”)

22 See Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letter to Antonín Škarka dated 16/10/1956; see Antonín Škarka's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 26/10/1956.

23 See Antonín Škarka's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 02/06/1967.

24 See Antonín Škarka's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 16/12/1970.

2.1.2. Renewing or establishing new correspondence

As Chyzhevsky's correspondence with Antonín Škarka shows, Chyzhevsky had already corresponded with some of his Czechoslovak colleagues before and during the Second World War. However, their correspondence was interrupted during Chyzhevsky's stay in the United States in 1949–1956, while he was a visiting professor of Slavic studies at Harvard University. After his return to Europe as director of the Slavic Institute at the University of Heidelberg, almost all of his correspondence with Czechoslovak colleagues was renewed, either immediately, as in the case of Škarka,²⁵ or after some period of time, as with Zdeněk Kalista. The latter contacted Chyzhevsky only after his release from a communist prison, as evidenced by his letter of 22/07/1963:

Im März 1960 bin ich nach fast neunjährigem Gefängnis (aus politischen Gründen) nach Hause zurückgekehrt. Verschiedene Krankheiten, die ich heilen musste, und ein schwerer Unfall [...] im vorigen Jahre machten mir jedoch das Leben so schwierig, dass ich erst jetzt wage meine früheren Korrespondenzen anzuknüpfen. Ich möchte auch mit Ihnen die Korrespondenz, die wir in den Vorkriegszeiten geführt haben, erneuern.

(In March 1960, after almost nine years in prison (for political reasons), I have returned home. Various illnesses, which I had to have treated, and a serious accident [...] in the previous year, however, made my life so difficult that I only now dare to renew my previous correspondence. I would also like to renew the correspondence I had in the pre-war times with you.)

As Kalista's letter indicates, it was primarily Czech scholars who sought to initiate correspondence with Chyzhevsky by being the first to write. This is also true of those contacts with Czechoslovak colleagues that Chyzhevsky made only during his time in Heidelberg, as in the case of Václav Černý, who approached Chyzhevsky in 1962 with a letter asking for consultation on a research problem,²⁶ or of Karel Horálek, who contacted Chyzhevsky as early as 1957. We see yet another motivation in Horálek's letter of 16/03/1957, which, due to its conciseness, I quote here in full:

25 See Antonín Škarka's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 05/09/1956.

26 See Václav Černý's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 06/01/1962.

Slovutný pane profesore!

Promiňte mi, že se na Vás obracím, osobně Vás neznám, s žádostí o výměnu publikací, jednak svých vlastních, jednak běžných československých. V tomto případě mám na mysli potřeby Vaší seminární knihovny, popřípadě i knihovny jiných institucí. Usiluji o získání německých publikací touto cestou proto, že normální způsob nákupu je ztěžován valutovými obtížemi. Ze svých vlastních publikací Vám posílám nejdříve několik separátů. Knihy pošlu, jakmile se dovím, že máte o ně zájem. Příkládám seznam části našich duplikátů, z nichž snad něco bude potřebovat Váš seminář. Počítáme s výměnou 100 stran našich věcí za 30–50 stran německých, u důležitějších knih jsme ochotni přijat jakékoli podmínky. Můžeme Vám opatřovat i publikace nové (také polské). Prosim o laskavou odpověď i v případě, že bude negativní. Předem za ochotu srdečně děkuji.

V hluboké úctě
Dr. K. Horálek.

P.S. Při vyměňování s ústavem zastupuji katedru slavistiky na filologické fakultě Karlovy univerzity.

Esteemed Professor!

Forgive me for turning to you, although I do not know you in person, with a request to exchange publications, both my own and other Czechoslovak ones. In this case, I am referring to the needs of your departmental library, and possibly the libraries of other departments. I seek to obtain German publications in this way, because the usual method of purchase is complicated by foreign currency difficulties. Concerning my own publications, I am sending several offprints first. I will send the books as soon as I know that you are interested in them. I enclose a list of our duplicates, of which perhaps some will be needed by your seminar. We expect to exchange 100 pages for every 30–50 pages of German materials, and in the case of the more important books, we are willing to accept any conditions. We can also supply you with new publications (also Polish ones). Please kindly reply, even if your answer is negative. Thank you in advance for your willingness.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. K. Horálek

P.S. When exchanging with the institute, I represent the Department of Slavic Studies, Faculty of Arts, at Charles University.)

2.1.3. Limited access to literature published on the other side of the Iron Curtain

The letter from Horálek quoted above aptly conveys the urgent demand on the part of Czechoslovak scholars, constrained by financial and other factors, for books and periodicals published on the other side of the Iron Curtain. Yet this demand for literature from the “other side” was mutual. Chyzhevsky describes the situation in West Germany and the United States in a letter to Antonín Škarka dated 16/10/1956, which he wrote almost immediately after arriving in Heidelberg:

Leider sind die čechoslovakischen Bücher hier am teuersten – und zwar nur deshalb, weil ein paar Buchhändler sich Monopolstellung verschafft haben und ungeheureres Geld verdienen. [...] Ihre Veröffentlichungen kenne ich, doch werden wir sie sicherlich gerne auch besitzen. Ich kann Ihnen dafür meine Veröffentlichungen zusenden, sowie die beiden Buchreihen, die ich jetzt herausgebe (*Musagetes* – kleinere Arbeiten zur slav<ischen> Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte, und Heidelberger slavischen [sic] Texte) [...]. In USA hat man čechische Bücher freilich erhalten können, aber meist erst nach Monaten, ja nach Jahren und z.B. hatten wir selbst in Harvard *Slavia* nicht vollständig! und *Veškeré spisy Komenskýs* wollte die Bibliothek nicht kaufen, weil die Ausgabe ‘unvollständig’ sei. Usf. Man weiß nicht, ob man das eher als komisch oder als tragisch bezeichnen soll.²⁷

(Unfortunately, Czechoslovak books are the most expensive here – and this is only because a few booksellers have gained a monopoly position and are making an outrageous amount of money. [...] I know your publications, but we would certainly like to own them as well. I can send you my publications in return, as well as both book series that I have been publishing (*Musagetes* – smaller works on Slavic literary and intellectual history, and Heidelberger slavischen Texte) [...]. It has been possible to obtain Czech books in the USA, but mostly only after months, even after years, and for example, even at Har-

²⁷ This was the main subject of Chyzhevsky’s first letter in his renewed correspondence with Antonín Škarka.

ward we did not have Slavia in its entirety! And the library did not want to buy Comenius' *Veškeré spisy*, because the edition was 'incomplete.' Etc. One does not know whether to call it comic or tragic.)

Similarly, in a letter of 24/02/1962 responding to Václav Černý's request to establish correspondence, Chyzhevsky thanks Černý for the offprints he sent and promises to send him offprints of his articles in return, suggesting that "it would also be possible to make up for the lack of literature, which is probably mutual, by exchanging used and new books."²⁸ As evidenced by the letter from Horálek, the situation in Czechoslovakia at the time was no better. For example, Antonín Škarka laments in his letters to Chyzhevsky of 08/10/1957 and 14/12/1971 about the unavailability of foreign books in Czechoslovakia at the time, "because they do not reach our book market due to the high price of Western books."²⁹

Chyzhevsky's correspondence with his colleagues living in Czechoslovakia tended to touch not only on professional issues, including updates on research work and plans for future projects, but also on sending offprints of their articles or entire issues of journals as well as copies of their books. Nearly every letter mentions sending a book, periodical, or offprint, and/or gratitude for books and articles already sent, or else an apology for not sending anything, explaining that the publication of a book has been delayed or that the offprints have yet to arrive, etc. Škarka sends apologies to Chyzhevsky in his letter of 21/12/1967,³⁰ explaining that he is still unable to send offprints of articles he published earlier that year, because "there is a terrible problem with the printing houses in our country even in the respect that they sometimes deliver them nearly a whole year later."³¹

It seems to have been an unstated rule that a researcher who was establishing or renewing contact with the addressee would attach one of his publi-

28 "[...] by bylo též možné odpomáhati nedostatku literatury, který je asi oboustranný, výměnou antikvárních a nových knih."

29 "[...] poněvadž se na náš knižní trh pro drahotu západních knih nedostanou."

30 See also Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letters to Antonín Škarka dated 30/01/1957 and to Václav Černý dated 24/02/1962 and 02/10/1963.

31 "[...]s tiskárnami je u nás hrozná potíž i po této stránce: dodávají je někdy až skoro po roce." For the causes of the problems in cooperation between publishers and printing houses in Czechoslovakia in the 1960s, see Janoušek et al. 2008a: 54–60.

cations to the letter, as we find with Karel Horálek's first letter to Chyzhevsky, dated 16/03/1957 (quoted above), and Václav Černý's first letter to Chyzhevsky, dated 06/01/1962. Similarly, Antonín Škarka's first letter, dated 05/09/1956, in which he renews his correspondence with Chyzhevsky after returning to Europe, includes some of Škarka's works and offers to send Chyzhevsky more books.

The shipments between Chyzhevsky and his colleagues living in Czechoslovakia frequently included offprints,³² books (sometimes sent directly by publishers),³³ publishers' editorial programmes, and other texts, as well as photographs or microfilms of old prints. The surviving correspondence is fragmentary, not least because these literary materials were originally an integral part of it. The researchers seem to have sent each other practically anything they had at their disposal, as evidenced by Černý's letter to Chyzhevsky dated 10/06/1966, in which Černý writes: "[...] dávám Vám poslat malou studii o Rilkevi a Čechách [...]. Nevím ovšem, zda Vás Rilke zajímá; pakliže nikoli, věnujte knížku prostě nějakému rilkevi."³⁴

2.1.4. "Parallel" distribution of literature abroad and creation of a delivery network

In particular, the correspondence between Karel Horálek and Dmitry Chyzhevsky shows that these scholars not only sent their own publications but also created a way of acquiring literature from the other side of the Iron Curtain independently of the official distribution network. This "parallel" distribution network did not only involve new book production; Horálek also informs Chyzhevsky about older books available in Czechoslovak antiquarian bookshops, where he also bought books for Chyzhevsky. For example, in a letter dated 02/05/1966, Horálek writes:

32 See for example Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 05/09/1956; 15/11/1957; 01/05/1968; Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letter to Antonín Škarka dated 30/01/1957.

33 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 23/03/1965; 14/03/1968; 30/12/1970; 06/07/1971.

34 "[...] I am sending you a small study on Rilke and Bohemia [...]. However, I do not know whether you are interested in Rilke; if not, simply give the book to anybody who is interested in him." See also Karel Horálek's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 12/07/1965; Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letter to Antonín Škarka dated 03/09/1964.

Die erwünschten Bücher habe ich schon fast alle geschickt. Brauchen Sie nicht J. Pekař: *Kniha o Kosti* (sehr selten)? Auch Novák, *Přehledné dějiny české literatury* [...] sind zufällig kaufbar. Ich habe geschickt auch *Česká literární bibliografie II* (wichtiges Nachschlagewerk), auch den ersten Teil kann ich schicken lassen.

(I have already sent almost all the books you requested. Do you care to have J. Pekař's *Kniha o Kosti* (very rare)? Novák's *Přehledné dějiny české literatury* also [...] happen to be available for purchase. I also sent *Česká literární bibliografie II* (important reference work). I can also send the first volume.)

Surviving correspondence shows that Antonín Škarka also bought books for Chyzhevsky in Prague antiquarian bookshops,³⁵ and that Chyzhevsky responded to the scarcity of literature from Slavic countries by systematically buying books, including old prints, from antiquarian bookshops in other countries of the Eastern Bloc.³⁶

The correspondence between Chyzhevsky and his colleagues in Czechoslovakia further reveals that the post office did not always work reliably as it was subject to censorship in Czechoslovakia. Some parcels arrived late,³⁷ and others were damaged or lost in the mail.³⁸ As Chyzhevsky explains to Antonín Škarka in a letter dated 07/03/1965, it would be better not to send the manuscript of his edition of Adam Michna's poetry to Heidelberg by ordinary post service, since it worked "slowly, and I have received books and manuscripts that got wet on the way or even soaked in kerosene."³⁹

For these reasons, scholars looked for alternative ways of delivering letters and parcels. Their correspondence, especially from the mid-1960s onwards, reveals that both oral messages and parcels (especially books) were delivered by colleagues and students on both sides allowed to travel behind the Iron Curtain. This was Chyzhevsky's preferred method for delivering parcels that

35 See for example Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 05/01/1965 and 25/09/1968.

36 See for example Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letter to Antonín Škarka dated 27/03/1965.

37 See for example Zdeněk Kalista's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 07/03/1966.

38 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 30/06/1958; 16/12/1970; 14/03/1967.

39 "[...] mäßig und ich erhielt bereits Bücher und Handschriften, die unterwegs nass geworden sind oder sogar mit Petroleum durchtränkt."

particularly mattered to him, and he proposes to Škarka that the manuscript of his edition of Michna's poetry should be transported to Heidelberg this way.⁴⁰ Finally, the manuscript of Škarka's edition – as we also know from the correspondence – was delivered to Heidelberg through a variety of means: Adolf Kamiš took the manuscript from Prague to Göttingen, where he was then working as a Czech language lecturer, and sent it from there by registered mail to Chyzhevsky in Heidelberg by a “more secure route”.⁴¹

2.2. Tamizdat

Škarka's edition of Adam Michna's poetry from Otradovice brings us to the phenomenon of “tamizdat”.⁴² Scholarship on Czech tamizdat literature has primarily focused on dating these activities to after the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet army in August 1968 (see Janoušek et al. 2008b: 142–151). However, the correspondence between Chyzhevsky and his Czechoslovak colleagues documents that the tamizdat of Czech literature was practiced even earlier.

2.2.1. Publishing problems faced by scholars of medieval and early modern literature in Czechoslovakia after February 1948

After the political upheaval of February 1948, humanities scholars in Czechoslovakia who wished to publish their work faced a number of problems related to the strict, ideologically-motivated practices of state censorship (lifted only for a short period in the summer of 1968) and state restrictions for editorial plans at publishing houses, all of which were also run and managed by the state.⁴³ Although scholars of medieval and early modern literature seem to have had greater publishing freedom than their counterparts in other literary

40 See Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letters to Antonín Škarka dated 16/02/1965; 26/02/1965; 08/02/1966.

41 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 24/02/1966; 21/04/1966; 08/11/1968; 17/12/1968; 05/02/1969.

42 Tamizdat is the process by which manuscripts rejected or never submitted for publication in the country in which they were written were brought out to the opposite side of the Iron Curtain and published there (in the original language or in translation) to be read not only abroad but also sent back in printed form. Unfortunately, research on tamizdat has mainly focused on Russian literature. For a recent study of this phenomenon, see Klots 2023; on tamizdat literature written in Soviet political satellite states, see Kind-Kovács 2014.

43 For press censorship and publishing practice in Czechoslovakia in 1948–1989, see Janoušek et al. 2007: 61–80; Janoušek et al. 2008a: 50–63; Janoušek et al. 2008b: 57–66.

fields during the period 1948–1989 (cf. Janoušek et al. 2008a: 161–166; Janoušek et al. 2008b: 214–220), the surviving correspondence between Chyzhevsky and his Czechoslovak colleagues highlights that several editions of Czech medieval and early modern literature, as well as scholarly treatises in medieval and early modern studies, faced considerable problems in this regard.

Specialists in early modern literature also faced significant delays when publishing their books, in some cases more than two decades. We see this, for example, in the case of Škarka's monograph on the Czech Baroque poet Fridrich Bridel, completed in 1946. Shortages of paper at the time delayed the plans to publish the work until 1949. As Škarka describes the matter to Chyzhevsky in a letter dated 01/02/1965: "[...] byla už vysázena a zlomena, ale nevyšla, zabránila tomu situace z doby 'kultu osobnosti'".⁴⁴ He also asks him whether it would be possible to publish the book in West Germany. Škarka finally managed to get it published in 1968 by Charles University Press in connection with the Sixth International Slavic Congress in Prague (because its theme was Baroque literature, the book was found suitable for the presentation of Czech Baroque studies at the congress).⁴⁵ In some cases, however, these books in limbo were never published, as we see, for example, in the case of Škarka's edition of *Časoměrné básně českého literárního baroka* (Metrical Poetry of the Czech Literary Baroque), which the Academia Publishing House commissioned from Škarka for the *Památky staré literatury české* (Monuments of Old Czech Literature) series and had in its possession for at least three years. In the end, the book was left unpublished, and the manuscript is now missing.⁴⁶

Czechoslovak scholars who found themselves on the list of banned authors after February 1948 were in an even more hopeless situation. In his letter of 21/11/1965, for example, Zdeněk Kalista, who was not allowed to publish in Czechoslovakia until his political rehabilitation in 1966, asks Chyzhevsky if he could recommend a Slavic periodical in Germany that might be interested in publishing his study on the Czech Baroque writer Matěj Vierijs. Kalista also describes the peripeties of its creation:

44 "[...] it had already been typeset and the layout was ready, but it was not published, prevented by the situation of the 'cult of personality'."

45 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 17/07/1966; 15/10/1966; 15/11/1966. See also Sládek 2010.

46 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 30/12/1970; 06/07/1971; 14/12/1971; 08/05/1972.

Ich habe kurz vor meiner Verhaftung im Jahre 1951 die Herausgabe des ersten neuzeitlichen Romans (und eigentlich des ersten tschechischen Romans überhaupt) *Christoslaus* von M. Vierius vorbereitet. Jetzt ist es aber leider nicht möglich hier an die Herausgabe dieses Werkes [...] zu denken. Doch möchte ich wenigstens die Einleitung, die dem Verfasser dieses Romans gewidmet ist, gedruckt sehen, denn es handelt sich hier um eine Persönlichkeit, die bis heute fast völlig unbekannt bleibt. Und so wende ich mich an Sie mit der Frage, ob man nicht irgendwo in den deutschen slawistischen Zeitschriften für dieses [...] Portrait (nicht allzu umfangreich – 10–12 Seiten) Interesse hätte. Sie sind über die Situation in der deutschen Slawistik gut informiert und ich habe von ihr keine Ahnung – können Sie mir in dieser Sache mit Ihrem Rat helfen?

(Shortly before my arrest in 1951, I prepared the publication of the first Czech novel *Christoslaus* by M. Vierius. Now, unfortunately, it is not possible to think about the publication of the work here [...]. However, I would at least like to manage the publication of my introduction, which is dedicated to the author of the novel, because it is about a figure almost completely unknown until today. And so, I turn to you with the question whether some of the Slavic journals in Germany might be interested in the article [...]. You are well informed about the situation in Slavic studies in Germany, and I have no idea about it – can you give me any advice in this matter?)

In a subsequent letter dated 14/03/1966, Chyzhevsky invites Kalista to send him the study and promises to publish it; as far as we know, however, Kalista's text was never published.

2.2.2. The “time of reprints” for Slavic studies in Germany

Chyzhevsky too faced publishing problems, of a kind generally faced by all publisher-scholars dealing with Slavic studies in the West. Although his publishing opportunities were incomparably greater than those of his counterparts in Czechoslovakia, it was still the case that literature from Slavic countries was very difficult to access even for him (for the reasons mentioned above). Chyzhevsky responded to the situation through intensive publishing activities, notably collaborating with Wilhelm Fink, who – at Chyzhevsky's

instigation – founded his own publishing house in Munich.⁴⁷ In 1963, Fink and Chyzhevsky launched the *Slavische Propyläen* series, which was intended for the publication of Slavic literature works in their original languages or in German translation (Korthaase 2019: 85–86, 161–162).

For the publication of essential literary works, especially those found unacceptable for publication by totalitarian regimes in the Slavic countries for various reasons, Chyzhevsky chose the format of a reprint of the original or older edition (facsimile), to which he attached an introduction authored either by himself or one of his students or collaborators. He chose this format both because he was not a trained philologist nor editor and for financial reasons: reprints, as he points out, were simply cheaper.⁴⁸ Even in this case, however, he often had to contend with the limited availability of literature, especially in the case of older works for which there were no modern editions. Primarily in the case of older prints, he was dependent on the international interlibrary loan service;⁴⁹ this explains why Chyzhevsky's correspondence with his colleagues living in Czechoslovakia, mainly Antonín Škarka, includes requests to arrange loans of older prints from Czechoslovak libraries through the interlibrary loan service⁵⁰ or to help him order photocopies or microfilms (unique copies of older prints were often not circulated abroad).⁵¹ Czechoslovak researchers knew the situation well and repeatedly offered their help to Chyzhevsky in this matter.⁵²

However, the *Slavische Propyläen* series published not only editions prepared by Chyzhevsky and his students and collaborators but also those prepared by Chyzhevsky's colleagues from Czechoslovakia. In 1965, the eighth book in the series was published: a reissue of the Old Church Slavonic *Korsuner Legende*, edited by Josef Vašica (Vašica 1965) – a work originally published in 1948 by the obscure press of the Faculty of Theology at the University in Olomouc, in *Acta Academiae Velehradensis* (Vašica 1948). Their collabo-

47 Originally called Eidos, the publishing house had to change its name to Wilhelm Fink in 1965 for legal reasons.

48 See Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letter to Antonín Škarka dated March 1966.

49 See Antonín Škarka's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 05/01/1967.

50 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 05/01/1965 and 12/10/1967.

51 See for example Antonín Škarka's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 05/01/1965.

52 See for example Antonín Škarka's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 14/04/1965; Zdeněk Kalista's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 10/01/1966.

ration was apparently cut short by Vašica's declining health, a condition that became serious in 1966⁵³ and led to his death two years later. It was, however, Chyzhevsky's collaboration with Antonín Škarka that was the most interesting.

2.2.3. A cross-border editorial and publishing team: Škarka – Chyzhevsky – Fink

The correspondence between Škarka and Chyzhevsky gives unique testimony to the establishment of the editorial and publishing team comprising these two scholars and Fink's publishing house (for more on this topic, see Škarpová 2022). However, their original plans were very different, as Škarka attempted to get Chyzhevsky to collaborate on an edition of the treatise *De rerum humanarum emendatione consultatio catholica* by J. A. Comenius, which was being prepared under the aegis of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. Although Chyzhevsky, who had discovered this work by Comenius in Halle an der Saale during the 1930s, agreed to collaborate,⁵⁴ the edition (Comenius 1966) would eventually be published in Czechoslovakia not only without Chyzhevsky's participation but without even mentioning Chyzhevsky as the discoverer of *Consultatio*.⁵⁵ It was Škarka who understood that the situation – difficult for editors on both sides of the Iron Curtain – could be solved by collaborations that benefited both sides: while Škarka undeniably had easier access to sources, Chyzhevsky had far better publishing options. It is on these terms that, in a letter dated 01/02/1965 responding to Chyzhevsky's request for microfilms from Prague libraries (of hymnbooks composed by the Czech Baroque hymnographer Adam Michna of Otradovice), Škarka does not hesitate to propose taking their collaboration in a new direction:

[...] nevím, jak má ta barokní knihovna vypadat. Chcete v ní vydávat jenom přetisky (faksimilia?) dřívějších vydání anebo dokonce původních starých textů (např. ten Michna), anebo také zcela nové edice? [...] Jestliže pomýšlíte však na edice nové, na texty dosud nepublikované, mohl bych Vám např.

53 See Josef Vašica's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 03/01/1966. In the letter, Vašica thanks Chyzhevsky for the publication of *Korsuner Legende*, and the letter has the character of a testament.

54 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 28/09/1964 and 17/12/1964; Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letter to Antonín Škarka dated 02/10/1964.

55 See also Antonín Škarka's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 15/10/1966.

nabídnout celého Michnu [...]. Poněvadž u nás se sotva objeví zájem o takové texty, byl bych ochoten nabídnout Vám tuto edici. Bylo by to vůbec první vydání celého Michny básníka.

([...] I still do not know what your Baroque library should look like. Do you want to publish only reprints (facsimiles?) of previous editions or even original old texts (e.g. Michna), or do you also plan completely new editions? [...] However, if you are thinking of new editions of texts not yet published, I would, for example, propose to publish Michna's complete works [...]. Since there is hardly any interest in such texts here, I would be willing to give you this edition. It would be the first-ever complete edition of Michna's poetry.)

Chyzhevsky enthusiastically agrees to Škarka's proposal, and their subsequent correspondence documents the formation of a cross-border editorial and publishing team that united Škarka's Prague, Chyzhevsky's Heidelberg, and Fink's Munich. The specific aim of their collaboration was formulated by Škarka, though on Chyzhevsky's initiative: a critical edition of the complete works of Adam Michna of Otradovice.

Škarka proposed a different model than what Chyzhevsky to that point had implemented in his editorial activity: it would not be a facsimile of an older print, nor a reprint of a previously published edition, but a new, original critical edition. This edition, including the editorial apparatus, was eventually left in Czech; only Škarka's introduction was translated into German. It would be the first – and only – edition completed by the Škarka–Chyzhevsky–Fink team as originally intended: published as the twenty-second volume of the editorial series *Slavische Propyläen* in 1968 (Škarka 1968). The correspondence between Škarka and Chyzhevsky, nonetheless, documents all stages of this project in detail, including the formulation of the concept of the edition, actual preparation of the edition, translation of Škarka's introduction into German in Heidelberg by Chyzhevsky's student, typesetting of the book, several proofreadings, delivery of author's and review copies, as well as problems with its distribution to Czechoslovakia and modest sales in the West.

What we learn from the correspondence between Škarka and Chyzhevsky, however, is that the plans for their collaboration were much greater than this, covering the poetry of the Czech Baroque poet Fridrich Bridel as well. Although Chyzhevsky originally wanted to publish reprints of editions of Josef

Vašica⁵⁶ in the *Slavische Propyläen* series, he later changed his mind. In their correspondence, Chyzhevsky agrees that Škarka should continue preparing a new edition that he has already started working on,⁵⁷ but his untimely death prevented its completion. Other planned editorial projects mentioned in the correspondence were an edition of Comenius' *Přemyslování o dokonalosti křesťanské* (Reflections on Christian Perfection) and a series called "česká barokní knihovna ve faksimilích" (Czech Baroque Library in Facsimiles), for which Škarka prepared an editorial proposal for the first twenty-five volumes.⁵⁸ There was also a plan to publish Škarka's manuscripts on the history of medieval and early modern literature in the Bohemian lands at Fink's publishing house, but it is not clear from the correspondence whether this was to be in the Czech original or German translation.⁵⁹

Soon after publication of Vašica's edition of *Korsuner Legende*, other Czech scholars began to contact Chyzhevsky to propose the publication of their editions of Czech literature. In December 1966, Oldřich Králík, on the recommendation of Karel Horálek, approached Chyzhevsky with a proposal, together with Bohumil Ryba, to prepare an edition of early medieval hagiography that Králík attributed to St. Adalbert's brother, Radim-Gaudentius. Chyzhevsky accepted the proposal,⁶⁰ but the project was never realized.

Chyzhevsky did not accept all editorial proposals sent by his Czechoslovak colleagues, however. Many factors came into play, as illustrated by the case of *Zdoroslaviček*, a collection of sacred songs by the Czech Baroque poet Felix Kadlinský. Suggested by Škarka, who had prepared an edition of *Zdoroslaviček* during the Second World War,⁶¹ Chyzhevsky responded to this proposal (in a letter dated 08/02/1966) as follows:

56 See Dmitry Chyzhevsky's letter to Antonín Škarka dated March 1966.

57 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 03/07/1967 and 23/06/1968.

58 See Antonín Škarka's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 07/10/1967 and 21/12/1967. Škarka's proposal for a *Czech Baroque library in facsimiles*, which was evidently part of his letter of 07/10/1967, was discovered in another part of Chyzhevsky's estate at the University Library in Heidelberg in November 2023.

59 See Vincent Sieveking's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 05/12/1972.

60 See Oldřich Králík's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 05/12/1966 and 03/02/1967.

61 See Antonín Škarka's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 19/12/1965.

Über Zdoroslaviček werden wir noch uns verabreden müssen. Ich würde lieber zunächst noch irgendein Originalwerk der čech<ischen> Barockliteratur herausgeben. Kadlinský's Nachdichtung wird – vor allem bei den Germanisten – nur die alte und noch nicht ganz verschwundene Ansicht unterstützen, dass die čech<ischen> Literatur sich vorwiegend von den Übersetzungen aus dem Deutschen nährte.

(We will have to make an agreement about *Zdoroslaviček*. I would rather first publish an original work of Czech Baroque literature. Kadlinský's paraphrase will only support – especially among Germanists – the old and not yet completely discarded view that Czech literature was fed mainly on translations from German.)

Similarly, the Czech literary historian Milan Kopecký⁶² repeatedly proposed his monograph *České drama v období renesance: Příspěvek k literárním vztahům německo-českým* (Czech Drama in the Renaissance Period: A Contribution to German-Czech Literary Relations) to Chyzhevsky in the period 1967–1972 for publication in Fink's publishing house, but it is clear from the surviving correspondence that Chyzhevsky did not respond to the proposal.⁶³

2.2.4. Czech books published in the West were not available in Czechoslovakia

The story of the publication of Škarka's edition of Michna's poetry in Munich by the Wilhelm Fink publishing house points to another problem of the time: Czech books published in the West were unavailable at that time in Czechoslovakia. Škarka aptly described the whole matter in a letter to Chyzhevsky dated 08/05/1972:

Jenom lituji, že ta nádherná kniha <i.e., Chyzhevsky's *Kleinere Schriften – Bohemica*> zůstane pro nás nedostupná. Pro svou cenu! 68 DM, to je pro nás, kde knihy [...] jsou stále velmi levné, částka příliš velká. Proto také nepřestávám

62 Milan Kopecký (1925–2006) was vice-dean of the Faculty of Arts at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Brno from 1969 to 1972, then its dean from 1972 to 1976, and director of the Department of Czech and Slovak Literature from 1976 to 1990.

63 See Milan Kopecký's letters to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 21/08/1967; 09/09/1968; 06/05/1972.

litovat, že pro cenu 64 DM nemůže k nám proniknout můj Michna. Kdyby byl vyšel u nás, stál by nanejvýš 50 Kčs, a byl by už dávno i v mnohem větším nákladu rozebrán. A nějakou dodatečnou kooperaci, jak se domníval p. Fink, není možno sjednat.⁶⁴

(I only regret that this wonderful book <i.e. Chyzhevsky's *Kleinere Schriften* – *Bohemica*> will remain unavailable to us. For its price! 68 DM is a sum too large for us, where books [...] are still very cheap. That is why I do not cease to regret that for the price of 64 DM my Michna cannot reach us. If it had been published here, it would have cost 50 CZK at most and would have been sold out long ago, even in a much larger print run. And some additional cooperation, as Mr. Fink thought, cannot be arranged.)

Indeed, starting with the publication of Fink's edition of Michna's poetry, there is evidence that two Czechoslovak publishing houses – Růže (1967) and Lidová demokracie (1968) – intended to buy a part of the book's print run and publish the edition in a fully Czech version (Sládek 2010: 282). However, neither of these plans came to fruition. When preparing his next book (an edition of Bridel's poetry), Škarka thus thought of publishing it in cooperation with a Czechoslovak publishing house, so that – as he wrote to Chyzhevsky in a letter dated 08/11/1968 – “the book would also reach a Czech reader and have a greater sale and be more affordable”.⁶⁵

3. Conclusions

The surviving correspondence between Chyzhevsky and his colleagues in Czechoslovakia during his Heidelberg period, 1956–1977, shows how intensive and fruitful Chyzhevsky's contact with the Slavic world was at that time, despite the East-West divide in Europe. The correspondence also provides unique information about the contemporary situation of Slavic studies on both sides of the Iron Curtain, including the limits faced by scholars at the time. It documents the creation of a literature distribution network that made it possible for scholars to obtain literature otherwise unavailable on their side

64 See also Antonín Škarka's letter to Dmitry Chyzhevsky dated 29/06/1968.

65 “[...] kniha se dostala také k českému čtenáři a měla větší odbyt a byla i cenově dostupnější.”

of the Iron Curtain. The letters written by Chyzhevsky's Czechoslovak correspondents also offers unique testimony to the creation of "parallel" research in the fields of medieval and Baroque Czech literature which did not belong to research "on political orders". This is an unrecognized part of both the parallel (humanities) discourse in Czechoslovakia independent of or semi-dependent on the official research institutions and independent of publishing activities organized abroad by Czechs.⁶⁶

The most interesting period in the collaboration between Chyzhevsky and his Czechoslovak colleagues seems to be 1965–1972. During this period, the scholars not only carried on with their standard format of collaboration – discussing their research topics, giving updates on their research projects, sending their published works, etc. – but also sought new ways to collaborate. Perhaps the most remarkable initiative was that of Antonín Škarka, who, despite all obstacles, managed to transform his collaboration with Chyzhevsky into a cross-border editorial and publishing team with tangible results. It is certainly noteworthy that this was achieved primarily in and through written correspondence.

66 For example, the handbook *Dějiny české literatury 1945–1989* (History of Czech Literature 1945–1989) deals with dissident ('parallel') culture in Czechoslovakia only during the period of 'normalization' in the 1970s and 1980s (see Janoušek et al. 2008b: 66–72, 84–88, 107–109, 184–187) and briefly mentions dissident literary and research activities in the 1950s (see Janoušek et al. 2007: 152–154). The 1960s are presented as a relatively open period of research and publishing activities in Czechoslovak literary criticism, including in the fields of medieval and early modern literature (Janoušek et al. 2008a: 161–166). Passages on the publication of Czech literature abroad in the original Czech language focus exclusively on Czech exile publishing houses and periodicals. The publication of Škarka's edition of Michna's work by Wilhelm Fink in Munich is mentioned, but it is treated like a completely isolated event, without mentioning Chyzhevsky's contribution to this publishing venture (see Janoušek et al. 2008a: 166).

Archival sources:

Historische Sammlungen Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, Sign. Heid. Hs. 3881C – Dmitrij Ivanovič Tschizewskij, Heidelberger Korrespondenznachlass: Buchstaben C und Č, Mappe 3 (Černý, V.); Buchstabe H, Mappe 8 (Horálek, K.); Buchstabe K, 1. Kasten, Mappe 2 (Kalista, Z.); Buchstabe K, 2. Kasten, Mappe 1 (Kopecký, M.); Mappe 8 (Králík, O.); Buchstaben Q/R, Mappe 17 (Ryba, B.); Buchstaben S und Š, 4. Kasten, Mappe 11–13 (Škarka, A.); Buchstabe V, Mappe 2 (Vašica, J.).

Literární archiv Památníku národního písemnictví v Praze (Literary Archive, Museum of Czech Literature, Prague), fonds Václav Černý (LA/PNP/59/89/00796–00800), Karel Horálek (LA/PNP/113/71/114), Zdeněk Kalista (LA/PNP/95/75/8208–8213, 10186), Antonín Škarka (LA/PNP/26/83/0073–0092), Josef Vašica (LA/PNP/40/65/0213).

Printed sources:

Červenka, Jaromír / Miškovská-Kozáková, Vlasta, et al. (Ed.) (1966): *Ioannes Amos Comenius: De rerum humanarum emendatione consultatio catholica. Editio princeps I–II*. Pragae: Academia.

Škarka, Antonín (Ed.) (1968): *Adam Michna z Otradovic: Básnické dílo*. München: Wilhelm Fink. (*Slavische Propyläen* 22)

Vašica, Josef (Ed.) (1948): *Slovo na prenesenie moštem preslavnago Klimenta neboli legenda Chersonská I. K výkladu některých míst v legendě Chersonské*. Olomouc: Bohoslovecká fakulta. (*Acta Academiae Velehradensis* 19, 38–80)

Vašica, Josef (Ed.) (1965): *Die Korsuner Legende von der Überführung der Reliquien des heiligen Clemens*. München: Wilhelm Fink. (*Slavische Propyläen* 8)

References:

Blaškiv, Oksana (2010): *Чеська і словацька культура в житті та науковій спадщині Дмитра Чижевського*. Siedlce: Instytut Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Przyrodniczo-Humanistycznego w Siedlcach.

Connelly, John (2000): *Captive University. The Sovietization of East German, Czech, and Polish Higher Education 1945–1956*. Chapel Hill.

- Dvořáčková, Věra (2009): “Profesor Bohumil Ryba mezi vědou a vězením”, in: *Sborník Archivu bezpečnostních složek* 7, 227–274.
- Janoušek, Pavel, et al (2007): *Dějiny české literatury 1945–1989. II. 1948–1958*. Praha: Academia.
- Janoušek, Pavel, et al (2008a): *Dějiny české literatury 1945–1989. III. 1958–1969*. Praha: Academia.
- Janoušek, Pavel, et al (2008b): *Dějiny české literatury 1945–1989. IV. 1969–1989*. Praha: Academia.
- Kind-Kovács, Friederike (2014): *Written Here, Published There. How Underground Literature Crossed the Iron Curtain*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Klots, Yasha (2023): *Tamizdat: Contraband Russian Literature in the Cold War Era*. Ithaca: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Korthaase, Werner (2019): *Dmitrij Tschizewskij als Wissenschaftler und Comeniusforscher*. Siedlce: Instytut Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Przyrodniczo-Humanistycznego w Siedlcach.
- Petráň, Josef / Petráňová, Lydie (2015): *Filozofové dělají revoluci. Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy během komunistického experimentu (1948–1968–1989)*. Prague: Karolinum.
- Sieveking, Vincent (2008): *Dmitrij Ivanovič Tschizewskij (23.03/04.04.1894 – 18.04.1977). Heidelberger Korrespondenznachlass (1945–1977). Inventar*. Stuttgart: s. t.
- Sládek, Miloš (2010): “Antonín Škarka nový a neznámý aneb Dobové okolnosti vydání souboru studií o Fridrichu Bridelovi”, in: *Omnibus fiebat omnia. Kontexty života a díla Fridricha Bridelia SJ (1619–1680)*. *Antiqua Cuthna* 4, 278–284.
- Škarpová, Marie (2022): “Budou Vám toho Michnu u nás závidět aneb Vznik české barokní knihnice v korespondenci Antonína Škarky a Dmitrije Čyževského. Kapitola z dějin vědecké týmové práce realizované přes železnou oponu”, in: *Slovo a smysl* 19 (41), 121–129.