

acta

1/87

**Editorial • CSDC:
Purpose, Aims, Activity •
Jan Patočka's Collected
Works in Czech •**

**UNESCO Censors Czech
and Slovak poetry •
Questions of Terminology
in Independent
Literature •**

**The Samizdat Series
New Thought Trails •
New Books by Zdeněk
Rotrekl and Hana
Ponická**



**Quarterly of the Documentation
Centre for the Promotion of Independent
Czechoslovak Literature**

ACTA, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	1
Vilém Prečan: The Documentation Centre for the Promotion of Independent Czechoslovak Literature	2
Patočka's Collected Works The "Patočka Projekt"	7
Jiří Němec: A scheme for Patočka's Collected Works	8
Jan Vladislav: UNESCO censors Czech and Slovak poetry	16
Questions of Terminology in Independent Literature	19
– n: Some questions surrounding "inédit" literature	20
– pf: "Inédit" literature: the question they forgot	26
The Samizdat Series "New Thought Trails"	29
New Books – Pro Memoria (by Jan Vladislav) The hidden face of Czech literature	33
Lukavica notebooks 1977	34

Contributors:

Jiří Němec (1932),

psychologist and philosopher,
since 1983 in Vienna

Vilém Prečan (1933),

historian, Executive Director of the CSDC,
since 1976 in the Federal Republic Germany

Jan Vladislav (1923),

poet, essayist and translator; since 1981
in Paris

– n, – pf: authors living in Czechoslovakia

Documentation Centre for the Promotion of Independent Czechoslovak Literature:

Founding members: Jiří Gruša (Vice-chairman), František Janouch, Josef Jelfínek (Secretary), Ivan Medek, Jiří Pelikán, Vilém Prečan, Karl Johannes von Schwarzenberg, Pavel Tigríd, Jan Vladislav (Chairman) et al.

Chairman of the Academic Council: H. Gordon Skilling

ACTA. Quarterly of the Documentation Centre for the Promotion of Independent Czechoslovak Literature. The chief editor of ACTA is Jan Vladislav in collaboration with Jiří Gruša und Vilém Prečan; John Keane (member of the Academic Council) is responsible for editing the English version.

Address: Dokumentationszentrum, Schwarzenberg 6,
D-8533 Scheinfeld, Telephone: 09162/7761

© Dokumentationszentrum zur Förderung der unabhängigen tschechoslowakischen Literatur, e. V. 1987

Price: DM 11 per issue, DM 40 per annum.

ISBN: 3-89014-039-4

Production: Druck + Papier Meyer GmbH,
8533 Scheinfeld, Western Germany

EDITORIAL

Our intention in publishing ACTA, of which this is the first issue, is in no way to compete with any existing exile journal, but rather to supplement those that already appear. Its chief ambition is to pursue the specific aims of the CSDC by tackling those questions connected with independent Czechoslovak literature not being dealt with elsewhere, or those to which other publications are often unable to devote sufficient attention and space. Nonetheless, these can be matters of fundamental importance, because independent literature undoubtedly plays a crucial role in preserving and maintaining Czechoslovakia's threatened cultural continuity and asserting the spiritual identity of Czechs and Slovaks. Hence the need to deal in greater detail and more methodically not only with the history and present development of independent Czech and Slovak literature but also with matters related to archival treatment, scholarship and the dissemination of book and magazine output, either in the original language or translation.

Accordingly, our quarterly is intended not just for Czechoslovak readers at home and abroad but also for other interested parties throughout the world, from the general reading public to specialists working in universities, academic institutions, libraries, editorial boards and publishing houses. In an effort to make independent Czechoslovak writing accessible to the broadest readership, ACTA is published not only in Czech but also in an English version, and a German edition is also planned.

Apart from news of the CSDC's activities, services, library and archives, the ACTA will also

provide systematic information about independent publishing in Czechoslovakia. Its aim is gradually to publish comprehensive bibliographical surveys of the various series of samizdat books and journals, together, where possible, with brief descriptions of individual volumes or issues. An example of what we mean is the survey of the samizdat book series *New Thought Trails* in this present issue. Similar surveys will be published in subsequent issues.

In addition, these surveys will be supplemented with news of recent samizdat publications as information becomes available. It is also planned to publish brief reviews of new titles. Elsewhere in this issue you will find reviews of new books by Hana Ponická and by Zdeněk Rotrekl. The idea is to provide not only Czechoslovak readers, but also foreign subscribers who do not understand Czech or Slovak, with information about books or journals of possible interest, which are not otherwise available.

ACTA also plans to publish regular studies dealing with general problems of independent literature and publishing activity in Czechoslovakia. As a foretaste we are including in this issue two excerpts from articles seeking to define some of the terms and concepts used by Czechoslovak independent literature. Where possible, ACTA also aims to tell its readers about foreign reactions to this literature, in the form of news about published translations or even information about foreign-language studies of the phenomenon.

However, for ACTA and its publisher, the CSDC, this vital work of recording and information is not the be all and end all of its activity. We

will also seek to play an active role in promoting projects and assisting their implementation. One of the first and most urgent of these is the scheme to publish Jan Patočka's collected works, news of which is to be found elsewhere in this issue.

Even from this brief survey of its plans, it is clear that our quarterly cannot hope to fulfil its various tasks unaided. We therefore count on the assistance of all those at home and abroad

Vilém Prečan

THE DOCUMENTATION CENTRE FOR THE PROMOTION OF INDEPENDENT CZECHOSLOVAK LITERATURE: Purpose, Aims, Activity

The Documentation Centre for the Promotion of Independent Czechoslovak Literature (CSDC) was founded in the Federal Republic of Germany in early March 1986. The Centre is registered under German federal law as an "association pursuing publicly beneficial aims". Accordingly it has its own constitution and governing bodies: an AGM, a Board of Management and an Academic Council.

The association's chairman is the writer Jan Vladislav, its vice-chairman, writer Jiří Gruša. The CSDC Academic Council, with its much broader international membership, is chaired by the Canadian historian and political scientist Professor H. Gordon Skilling. The Centre's curator is the historian Vilém Prečan who admini-

who are truly concerned about the fate of independent culture in Czechoslovakia.

P.S. The easiest way to assist is by becoming a regular subscriber to ACTA which is published four times a year. The price of each issue is 11 DM for non-members. For an annual subscription of 40 DM, readers may receive all four issues numbering some 200 pages.

sters the CSDC on the basis of AGM resolutions and guidelines from the Board of Management. His tasks also include building up, allocating and managing the collection. A group of independent writers in Czechoslovakia, including Václav Havel and Ludvík Vaculík, are honorary CSDC members.

Since November 1986, the Centre has had suitable premises for its work, thanks to the assistance of Karel Jan Schwarzenberg, one of the founding members of the CSDC, who had rooms in his castle adapted for the Centre's purposes and rents them to the association. As a result, the CSDC now has space enough for the expert storage and systematic processing of the collection and can even offer scholars the opportunity – albeit limited – to study *in situ*.

THE AIMS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The aim of the CSDC is to support scholarship in the areas of Czechoslovak culture, history and politics, in particular through collecting materials that document independent Czech and Slovak thought since 1948.

Special attention will be given to Czechoslovak self-published (samizdat) materials, i.e. all writings, both fiction and non-fiction transcribed in Czechoslovakia by individuals or groups and distributed through their own devices, which, for reasons of censorship are banned from official publication or distribution. In the same way, literary works and non-fiction by exile writers are collected for study purposes.

Enshrined in the constitution of the CSDC is the principle that the collections form part of the cultural heritage of the Czech and Slovak nations, and other ethnic groups in Czechoslovakia. The holdings will be handed over to legitimate Czechoslovak institutions as soon as these come into existence and when political conditions allow the collections to be made accessible to all members of the Czechoslovak public.

MAIN LINES OF ACTIVITY

It is not the intention of the CSDC to duplicate or replace the activity of any existing exile organisation, institution, body or group. Instead it seeks to perform those tasks which have not been undertaken so far, as well as to offer a range of services which to date have been provided solely through individual initiative. It also seeks to facilitate or promote every activity of every kind that makes independent Czechoslo-

vak literature more accessible to the widest possible international public. The CSDC is ready to co-operate with all sections of the exile community and cultural institutions world-wide, and furthermore it is committed to assisting independent literature in Czechoslovakia as far as it is able and in terms of its specific mission.

The CSDC combines the functions of archive, library and study-cum-information body, within the framework of a wide range of activities, including:

- the systematic collection, preservation and archival processing of documents, photographs, audio-visual materials and documentation in the broadest sense;
- the planning, encouragement and, where required, actual organisation of research work on its own chosen topics, involving the academic treatment of source texts, as well as the publication of reference and information material and works of scholarship;
- the regular distribution to all interested libraries, research institutions, editors, publishers and individuals of updated lists of the Centre's holdings, and publication of the quarterly ACTA, of which this is the first issue;
- world-wide dissemination, for study purposes, of samizdat texts, as well as information and reports about academic work on samizdat materials, among association members, interested professional organisations, individual specialists and the general public;
- co-operation with universities, libraries and research institutions, as well as with other interested bodies and individuals, whom it supplies with information concerning its sphere of activity.

In furnishing its services, the CSDC takes care to safeguard the copyright of manuscripts of all authors, including those living in Czechoslovakia. Any copies of samizdat-published texts which it supplies are intended solely for study and information purposes. The Centre joins with international authors' associations and the various publishing and handling agencies in ensuring that the copyright of the writers mentioned is strictly respected in every case, including royalty entitlement. In this connection, it acts, where required, as an intermediary between authors in Czechoslovakia and various media in the rest of the world seeking to publish samizdat material.

PRESENT STATE OF HOLDINGS

The CSDC possesses the most extensive collection of Czechoslovak samizdat outside the home country and supplements it as new material becomes available. Most importantly its holdings include hundreds of titles issued by samizdat "publishers" i.e. different series of typewritten editions known variously as *Edice Petlice* (Padlock Editions), *Edice Expedice* (Dispatch Editions), *Kvart* (Quarto), *Česká Expedice* (Czech Dispatch), *Popelnice* (Dustbin), *Renega*, *Kde domov můj* ("Where is my homeland" – the Czech national anthem, trans.), *Nové cesty myšlení* (New thought trails), *Edice SE*, together with the samizdat edition of Jan Patočka's Writings, copies of the samizdat-distributed works of Egon Bondy, whole series of verse by Jaromír Hořec, and articles, essays and reportage by Jaromír Hořec and others.

Another important section of the collection comprises samizdat journals and magazines of

every kind, such as *Informace o Chartě 77* (News of Charter 77, otherwise known as *Infoch*), *Kritický sborník* (Critical Miscellany), *Paraf* (Parallel Acta of Philosophy), *Reflexe, Střední Evropa* (Central Europe), *Vokno* (Window), *Historické studie*, *Ekonomická revue*, *Ze zásuvky i z bloku* (From the desk-drawer and the notebook), *Komentáře*, *Prostor* (Space), *Pražské komunikace* (Prague communications), *Revolverová revue Jednou nohou* (Revolver Revue One leg in), *O divadle* (Theatre), *Informace o církvi* (Church News), *Náboženstvo a súčasnosť* (Religion Today) and many others including certain titles that have disappeared for the time being such as *Dialogy*, *Váhy* (Scale), *Čtverec* (Square) and *Spektrum*, as well as several lesser-known Slovak samizdat periodicals.

The CSDC maintains a complete set of Charter 77 materials and possibly all of the extant documentary evidence of the human rights and civil liberties movements in Czechoslovakia over the past ten or more years, not to mention other material from the post-1969 period, including hundreds of examples of samizdat journalism, many individual literary, historical, philosophical and theological manuscripts, and translations into Czech and Slovak made under samizdat auspices over the past fifteen years. The collections also englobe film and photographic material, musical recordings, recordings of conversations with leading Czechoslovak dissidents, video recordings, sets of newspaper cuttings and much biographical material. The CSDC can also boast a whole collection of source material related to Czechoslovak developments in the 1968 – 1969 period.

The CSDC reference library contains the bulk of titles from the Czechoslovak exile publishing

houses which have come into existence since the early seventies, as well as some of the exile publications from the 1948-68 period, and entire sets of all the main exile journals. An important section of the Centre's book and magazine holdings is made up of foreign-language literature and journals related to Czechoslovakia and those issues of prime interest to the CSDC, such as the history of the Czechoslovak Republic and questions of human rights and civil liberties in the Soviet bloc.

One section of the library comprises translations of the independent output of Czech and Slovak writers, including those living in Czechoslovakia and authors domiciled abroad, and secondary literature dealing with independent writing in Czechoslovakia.

The CSDC also has a collection of books and journals published in Czechoslovakia in earlier periods which are either rare or virtually unobtainable, such as Václav Černý's *Kritický měsíčník* (Critical Monthly), or certain magazines from the 1968-69 period and books that were printed between the years 1969 and 1970 but were either withdrawn from sale or were immediately pulped.

Naturally there are still many gaps in the CSDC's collections, particularly as regards samizdat literature and materials from the fifties and sixties. Moreover, that section of the library containing foreign-language editions of works by authors of independent Czech and Slovak literature (particularly those living abroad) leaves much to be desired.

In its efforts to overcome these deficiencies, as well as in its "archaeological delvings" into independent thought and writing, the CSDC is helped by all those who furnish the Centre with such materials. Acquisitions come from donations or bequests, or are supplied in return for payment or for services rendered. Some of them take the form of permanent loans or are loaned for copying. During its first year of existence the Centre received valuable gifts from many friends and supporters from the home country and elsewhere. (A list of donors living outside Czechoslovakia is published in this issue of the news letter.)

Thanks to the support of the Central and East European Publishing Project (CEEPP) based in Oxford, England, work has now started on the unified systematic cataloguing and data processing of the collections and library stocks. The aim is to produce a catalogue which will also be available in published form. However, even in the present provisional state of processing and cataloguing, the Centre's holdings are able to serve the needs of a whole number of publishing houses and journals (e.g. *Index on Censorship*, *Kosmas*, *Proměny*, *Svědectví*, *Studie*, *Rozmluvy*, *Obrys*, *Listy*, etc.), as well as leading libraries in several countries (e.g. Harvard College Library, the British Library, the University of Toronto Library, *Bibliothek des Herder-Instituts* in Marburg, etc.), academic and research institutions (e.g. *Forschungstelle Osteuropa an der Universität Bremen*, Keston College, *Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen* in Vienna) and individual scholars and researchers in many countries who are in contact with the CSDS.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The CSDC receives financial support in the form of donations from private foundations and individuals, as well as from membership subscriptions. These sources of income are always fixed for a given calendar year, or are strictly limited to a particular project. The Centre is run on a non-profit-making basis and is not primarily involved in financial activity on its own behalf. The charges it makes for its services (e.g. copying materials, research, etc.) merely cover the overhead expenses involved.

In these circumstances, the development of the Centre's activity depends on building up an adequate financial base. It is aimed to do this through: a) contributions from European and American foundations, organisations and institutions that pursue similar or consonant aims to the CSDC and are able to give financial support to the Centre or its individual projects, and b) support from individuals who consider the work of the Centre to be important enough to warrant their financial support for the Centre or one of its projects. Since it enjoys charity status as a "publicly beneficial organisation" (*Gemeinnützigkeit*), donations to the Centre are tax-deductible. (More detailed information about this elsewhere in this issue.)

CONDITIONS FOR USING THE CENTRE

The CSDC library and archives are not open to the public. All its services are rendered on the basis of individual arrangements with the institutions or researchers involved. The Centre's minimal level of staffing is the main limiting factor on how fast or fully it can deal with requests outside

the regular framework of services performed on the basis of long-term agreements or subscriptions (e.g. the distribution of the quarterly newsletter ACTA and of updated lists, and the copying of samizdat periodicals, etc.) Requests for in situ study need to be sent at least one month in advance to enable research visits to be co-ordinated.

URGENT TASKS IN THE 1987-88 PERIOD

Apart from the regular activity of augmenting the collections and the library stocks, and rendering services to those institutions and individuals having long-term co-operation agreements with the Centre – including the publication of the quarterly newsletter, ACTA, the Centre has set itself a number of specific tasks for the immediate future.

Among these tasks is the cataloguing and data processing of the Centre's entire holding of materials and books. The intention is to produce a catalogue to be available in published form, as well as a series of lists of samizdat production which will be gradually published in ACTA.

With the support of the above mentioned Central and East European Publishing Project in Oxford and in co-operation with highly-qualified translators, the CSDC is also preparing a collection of samizdat texts in English translation: *The Annual Survey of Independent Literature in Czechoslovakia*. It chiefly comprises shorter texts (an exception being Milan Uhde's new play *The Annunciation or Freddy, You're an Angel*) that appeared in samizdat journals during 1986. The Survey, numbering some 300 pages of typescript will be reproduced in several dozen copies and

sent out to publishing houses and the editorial boards of leading magazines in different countries around the world as a sample of the texts that are available and which interested parties may publish in the press in translated form on the basis of agreement either directly with the authors or with the copyright-holders. The CSDC fully expects that this experiment, which could mark the start of an ongoing annual series, will ensure wider publicity for independent Czechoslovak writing in translation.

This issue of ACTA also contains news about the Centre's current major publishing project: the publication of *Jan Patočka's Collected Writings*.

THE PATOČKA PROJECT

Nowadays, the name of Jan Patočka is chiefly associated in the minds of Czechs and Slovaks with his civic stand in connection with Charter 77. Having been one of the first trio of spokesmen and a leading exponent of the movement, he has virtually become its symbol over the ten years since his death. None the less, the respect and gratitude felt towards him must not obscure the fact that the main and fundamental reason for Patočka's importance in the history of Czechoslovak culture was his achievement as a thinker, most of whose output remains inaccessible for a whole number of reasons, and therefore largely unknown. It is therefore a matter of supreme importance to Czechs and Slovaks to ensure that these works are finally published, particularly since work on editing his legacy has been proceeding over the past years and a number of volu-

The Centre's AGM in March this year decided to mark the forthcoming twentieth anniversary of the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia by reprinting at its own cost the original version of *Seven Days in Prague: 21st-27th August 1968*, the documentary account known as the *Czech Black Book*. It was also decided to co-operate with the Charter 77 Foundation in bringing out a book on the developments in Czechoslovakia from January 1968 to May 1969 based on documentary literature. In addition, ACTA will publish in good time a list of items in the Centre's collections which come under the general heading of what is popularly known as the 'Prague Spring'.

mes are virtually ready for printing, not to mention the fact that several of his works have even been published in French in the meantime and a German translation of his selected writings in several volumes is shortly to be published, to be followed by an English-language collection.

In view of all this, the task of ensuring the earliest possible publication of Patočka's legacy in a worthy form is not just a challenge but a duty.

It hardly needs stressing that in view of the complexity and extent of Patočka's philosophical bequest, its publication is an extremely demanding task not only in terms of editing, but also from the point of view of organisation and financing. For these reasons and in line with its particular mission, the CSDC has decided to

promote a discussion about all these aspects as a first step towards getting this urgent project finally under way. The discussion is intended to serve two purposes: firstly, to finalise the ground-plan both of the entire collection and the individual volumes, and secondly, to ensure optimal long-term material and technical conditions for their publication. This means alerting Czechoslovak cultural circles, but not them alone: we also need support in the form of subscribers, sponsors and publishers throughout the world. Only the widest support and co-operation can ensure the publication of Patočka's legacy in the foreseeable future and in the language in which they were written.

As a basis for discussion of the different aspects of the project, we are publishing Dr. Jiří Němec's various proposals for the collected edition. We trust that we will be able to publish further expert suggestions of a theoretical and practical kind, so that the project may be finalised

and under way in the autumn, and we may inaugurate the subscription. Meanwhile, we issue a specific appeal to our exile publishers to consider assuming responsibility for practical aspects of the actual publication – i.e. printing, distribution, etc. – either alone or in co-operation with others. The CSDC will gradually be able to make available expertly edited manuscripts of the individual volumes, page-set and ready for printing.

Regarding the question of subscriptions to the *Collected Works*, we are considering a two-tier approach. Thus it would be possible for specialists, libraries and institutions to subscribe to the entire set, while individual members of the wider reading-public would be able to commit themselves to buying only certain volumes of their choice. This would prove advantageous both to those subscribing to the entire edition and also to those readers ready to buy at least four volumes in line with their specific interests.

The Editors

Jiří Němec

A SCHEME FOR PATOČKA'S COLLECTED WORKS

Introduction

The linguist and literary scholar Roman Jakobson, one of the world's most distinguished 20th century academics and a man with deep philosophical roots, once wrote: "There were three Czech philosophers of world importance and outstanding moral power and integrity: Jan Amos Komenský (Comenius) (1592–1670), Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1850–1937) and Jan Pa-

točka (1907–1977)." The writings of the first two have been published in entirety, albeit inadequately in some cases. Yet we have no edition of Jan Patočka's complete works. During his lifetime, only two (!) volumes of his extremely extensive output were published, as well as a couple of booklets and some very sporadic journal articles. Nevertheless, Patočka's works constitute a coherent entity to which every Czech and Slovak intellectual and student should have access.

Another argument in favour of the publication of Patočka's complete output in unexpurgated form and free from any subjective interpretive editing is the fact that the personalities and work of Comenius and Masaryk figured prominently and even centrally in Patočka's work.

In today's Czechoslovakia it is inconceivable that even one single line of objective information about Patočka should be published, let alone any of his writings. And even if we were to be wildly optimistic it would be hard to imagine any change for the better in this respect over the next three years. Meanwhile, time flies and new generations are coming of age: young people in need of a trustworthy guide through the entire broad spectrum of Czech and world culture. The only Czech in our times to fit the bill is Jan Patočka. And his works can be truly said to radiate deep erudition and a moral challenge.

The complete edition of Patočka's works is conceived in such a way as to include all his texts, published and unpublished alike. Their entire publication could take three or four years. They would be divided into eleven volumes solely for ease of orientation, on the basis of the already existing bibliography of his output. The bibliography would be included in one of the first volumes to be published.

All we can do is appeal to everyone who has not given up all hope for spiritual life in that small central European country to contribute to the success of this project in one way or another. It is paradoxical that with the publication of many of his works in French translation, not to mention the five large volumes of German trans-

lation and the extensive English version which are shortly to appear, Patočka either is, or shortly will be better known to foreigners than he is to Czechoslovaks at home or in exile. Hence our determination to publish as soon as possible Patočka's complete writings, which should also include translations of works he wrote in foreign languages.

The scheme itself

The following scheme for Patočka's collected writings (henceforth PCW) is based on already published works, both books and magazine articles, material published in Prague in samizdat and the virtually exhaustive Patočka archive in the Vienna *Institut für die Wissenschaft vom Menschen*. Unlike samizdat practice, it does not draw a strict line between published and unpublished works (these details are included in the editorial notes). The underlying criterion is thematic and to a certain extent chronological (particularly within the individual volumes), as this best reflects the evolution of Patočka's views. Specialists have been aware for some time that the changes in Patočka's attitudes had chiefly philosophical causes. I will cite three by way of illustration: 1) His shift from Husserlian subjectivism to non-subjective phenomenology (not to be identified with Heidegger's position however); 2) The changes in his attitude towards Masaryk, while always remaining loyal to him and retaining the greatest esteem for his basic positions. 3) The post-1969 evolution of Patočka's attitude to Czech history (the previous phase having culminated in the lecture *A philosophy of Czech history* and the subsequent discussion, *Sociologický časopis*, Vol.5, No.5, pp. 457-472), in favour of a ruthless national (self)criticism.

Jan Patočka, Complete Works

- Vol. I: *Art and philosophy*
Vol. II: *The natural world as a philosophical problem*
Vol. III: *The movement of human existence*
Vol. IV: *Pure phenomenology*
Vol. V: *The philosophy of history*
Vol. VI: *Comenius*
Vol. VII: *Masaryk*
Vol. VIII: *The Czech existence*
Vol. IX: *History of ancient philosophy*
Vol. X: *Aristotle, his predecessors and successors*
Vol. XI: *The history of philosophy*

Volume I.: *Art and philosophy*

1. *The idea of culture (= Bildung)*

Myšlenka vzdělanosti a její dnešní aktuálnost (The idea of "Bildung" and its present relevance), 1938.

Česká vzdělanost v Evropě (Czech "Bildung" in Europe), 1939.

Mládí a filosofie (Youth and Philosophy), 1941.

Duchovní základy života v naší době (The spiritual bases of life in our times), 1970.

K problému filosofických překladů (The problems of philosophical translations), 1968.

2. *Time, myth and aesthetics*

Zrod evropského uvažování o kráse v antickém Řecku (Origins of the European concept of beauty in ancient Greece), 1971.

Platon o vědění a umění, nadšení a kráse (Plato on knowledge and art, enthusiasm and beauty), 1969.

Čas, mýtus, víra (Time, Myth and Belief), 1952 and post 1954.

Umění a čas (Art and Time), 1966.

Učení o minulém rázu umění (Doctrine about the former nature of art), 1965.

K vývoji Hegelových estetických názorů (The development of Hegel's aesthetic views), 1965.

Filosofie dějin v Palackého Krásovědě (The philosophy of history in Palacký's "Aesthetics"), 1956.

Idea božnosti v Palackého Krásovědě (The idea of divinity in Palacký's "Aesthetics"), 1965.

O Burckhardtově pojetí francouzské renesance (Burckhardt's conception of the French renaissance), 1965.

Romantismus, romantika, romantický a příbuzné pojmy (Romanticism, romance, romantic and related concepts), 1969.

3. *Drama*

Epičnost a dramatičnost, epos a drama (The epic and the dramatic, epos and drama), 1966.

Exkurs o attické tragédii (A digression on Attic tragedy), 1946.

Pravda mýtu v Sofoklových dramatech o Labdakovcích (The truth of myth in Sophocles' Theban plays), 1971

Ještě jedna Antigona a Antigone ještě jednou (Another Antigona and Antigone once more), 1967.

K "ideji národního divadla" (On "the national theatre idea"), 1969.

Svět Ivana Vyskočila (The world of Ivan Vyskočil), 1963.

Čechovův Ivanov (Chekhov's Ivanov), 1970.

4. *Fiction and criticism*

Fragmenty o jazyce (Fragments re language), 1942.

Spisovatel a jeho věc (The writer's cause), 1969.

Komenský a otevřená duše. (Comenius and the Open Soul), 1970.

Symbol země u K. H. Máchy (Mácha's Earth symbol), 1944.

Čas, věčnost a časovost v Máchově díle (Time, eternity and temporality in Mácha's work), 1967.

Ladislav Klíma (1967).

Šalda mezi věcerejškem a dneškem (Šalda between Titanism od Černého (V. Černý's "Titanism"), 1936.

Osobnost a tvorba od V. Černého (Černý's "Personality and Creation"), 1947.

Kulhavý poutník Josef Čapek (JČ the limping pilgrim), 1950's.

Předmluva k Boží duze od Jaroslava Durycha (Preface to Durych's "Boží duha" (God's Rainbow), 1965.

Smysl mýtu o paktu s ďáblem. Čtenářovy úvahy nad knihou Thomase Manna (The meaning of the myth about pacts with the Devil. A reader's reflections on Thomas Mann's book), 1973.

Faulknerův zpěv výsostnosti (Faulkner's song of sovereignty), 1968.

Co je existence? Zpřítomnění existence v literárním díle a systematický výklad. (What is existence? Portraying existence in literary works and a systematic interpretation), 1969.

5. *Space and art*

Co je vidění? (What does seeing mean?), 1935.

Prostor a jeho problematika. (The problems of space), 1965.

A. Gehlen o moderním výtvarnictví (Gehlen on modern art), 1965.

Gehlenovy názory o úloze umění v antropogenezi. (Gehlen's views of the role of art in anthropogenesis), 1965.

Úvahy nad Readovou knihou o sochařství (Reflections on Read's book about sculpture), 1969.

K Ingardenově ontologii malířského díla (Ingarden's "Ontology of painting"), 1972.

K Ingardenově filosofii malířského díla (Ingarden's "Philosophy of painting"), 1972.

Studie z dějin a teorie umění od V. Richtera (Richter's "Studies in the history and theory of art"), 1971.

Památková péče (Conservation), 1968.

6. *Music*

Německá duchovnost Beethovenovy doby (German spirituality in Beethoven's time), 1971.

K záležitostem Plastic People of the Universe a DG 307 (The affair of the Plastic People and DG 307), 1976.

Appendices

K Umění a času (Art and time)

Metafyzická kvalita a její intencionalita (The metaphysical quality and its intentionality)

Směšně (Ludicrous)

K teorii kritiky u V. Černého (Černý's theory of criticism)

Ladislav Klíma

Březinova "Návštěva" (Březina's "Návštěva" /Visit/)

Holan

Vaculík a Kundera (Vaculík and Kundera)

Poezie a filosofie (Poetry and philosophy)

Durrenmattův Meteor (Durrenmatt's Meteor)

Beethovenova Devátá (Beethoven's Ninth)

Editorial notes

Volume II.: *The Natural World as a Philosophical Problem*

Přirozený svět jako filosofický problém (The natural world as a philosophical problem), 1936

"Přirozený svět" v meditaci svého autora po třiatřiceti letech ("The Natural World" in the meditations of its author thirtythree years on), 1969.

Volume III.: *The Movement of Human Existence*

1. Studies

"Subjektivní východisko" a objektivní biologie člověka ("The subjective solution" and objective human biology), 1950s.

K prehistorii vědy o pohybu (The prehistory of the science of movement), 1965.

Přirozený svět a fenomenologie (The natural world and phenomenology), 1967.

Pokus o přepracování studie "Přirozený svět a fenomenologie" (A draft re-working of the study "The natural world and phenomenology"), 1967.

Fenomenologie vlastního těla (The phenomenology of one's own body), 1967-68.

Koncept přednášky o tělesnosti (Outline for a lecture on corporeality), 1968-69.

Fenomenologie "posmrtného" života (The phenomenology of "life after death"), post 1967.

Fenomenologie a metafyzika pohybu (Phenomenology and the metaphysics of movement), 1968.

Celek světa a svět člověka (The world as a whole and the human world), 1972

Filosofie krize věd podle Edmunda Husserla a jeho koncepce fenomenologie "světa našeho života" (Husserl's philosophy of the crisis of science and his concept of a phenomenology of "Lebenswelt"), 1972.

Recenze knihy K. Ulmera "Filosofie moderního světa našeho života" (Review of "Die Philosophie der modernen Lebenswelt" by K. Ulmer), 1972.

Křesťanství a přirozený svět (Christianity and the Natural World), 1975

Autorův doslov k francouzskému vydání díla Přirozený svět jako filosofický problém (The author's postscript to the French edition of "The natural world as a philosophical problem"), 1976.

2. *Transcripts of lectures*

Tělo, společenství, jazyk, svět (Body, community, language, world), 1968-69.

Problém přirozeného světa (Problem of the natural world), 1968.

3. *Appendices*

Přeskočení přirozeného světa (Transcending the natural world)

Hermeneutický problém (The problem of hermeneutics)

Mach

K fenomenologii a ontologii pohybu (The phenomenology and ontology of movement)

Lidský život – pohyb ukazování (Human life – the movement of showing)

Existence jako pohyb (Existence as movement)

Pohyb (Movement)

Rozvrh, příprava a koncept doslovu k francouzskému vydání díla Přirozený svět jako filosofický problém (Outline, preparation and draft of the postscript to the French edition of "The natural world as a philosophical problem")

Tělo, možnosti, svět, pole zjevování (The body, possibilities, the World, fields of revelation)

K článku Celek světa a svět člověka (Re the article "The World as a whole and the human world")

Láska jako pohyb (Love as movement)

Filosofie, problém posvátného a božského (Philosophy, the problem of the sacred and the divine)

Římská rodina, akceptace, pieta (The Roman family, acceptance and piety)

Každodennost – vyjimečnost (Ordinariness and singularity)

Porozumění pro bytí a porozumění pro vlastní (lidské) jsoucno (Understanding for being and understanding for one's own /human/ existence)

Editorial notes

Volume IV.: *Pure phenomenology* *

1. *Introduction to phenomenology*

Pojem evidence a jeho význam pro noetiku (The concept of "Evidenz" and its significance for epistemology), 1931.

Der Geist und die zwei Grundschichten der Intentionalität (The spirit and the two basic levels of intentionality), 1936.

Úvod do Husserlovy fenomenologie (Introduction to Husserl's phenomenology), 1966.

Husserlova fenomenologie, fenomenologická filosofie a "Kartézské meditace" (Husserl's phenomenology, phenomenological philosophy and the "Cartesian meditation"), 1968.

Husserlův pojem názoru a prafenomén jazyka (Husserl's conception of opinion and the ur-phenomenon of language), 1968.

Die Kritik des psychologischen Objektivismus und das Problem der phänomenologischen Psychologie bei Sartre und Merleau-Ponty

(A critique of psychological objectivism and the phenomenological psychology of Sartre and Merleau-Ponty), 1968.

Der Subjektivismus der Husserl'schen und die Möglichkeit einer "asubjektiven" Phänomenologie (The subjectivism of Husserl's phenomenology and the possibility of an "asubjective" phenomenology), 1970.

Subjektivismus Husserlovy fenomenologie a požadavek asubjektivní fenomenologie (The subjectivism of Husserl's phenomenology and the demand for an "asubjective" phenomenology), orig. German, 1971.

Epoché und Reduktion (Epokhe and reduction), 1975.

Was ist Phänomenologie (What is phenomenology?), 1976.

2. *Shorter studies*

Několik poznámek o mimosvětské a světské pozici filosofie (Some comments about the position of philosophy outside the world and within it), 1934.

Otázka solipsismu a argument souvislého snu (Solipsism and the continuous dream argument), 1942.

Poznámky o rozporu (Comments about contradiction), 1943.

Pochybnosti o existencialismu (Misgivings about existentialism), 1947.

La doctrine husserlienne de l'intuition eidétique et ses critiques récents (The Husserlian doctrine of eidetic intuition and its recent critics), 1965.

Heidegger vom anderen Ufer (Heidegger from the other shore), 1970.

Roman Jakobsons phänomenologischer Strukturalismus (The phenomenological structuralism of Roman Jakobson), 1977.

Appendices

Husserlova transcendentální filosofie po revizi (Revised version of "Husserl's transcendental philosophy"), 1976.

Fenomenologie a strukturalismus (Phenomenology and structuralism), 1975-76.

Editorial notes

Volume V.: *The philosophy of history*

1. *Basic studies*

Platon a Evropa (Plato and Europe), 1973.

Kacířské eseje k filosofii dějin (Heretical essays about the philosophy of history), 1975.

Vlastní glosy ke Kacířským esejům (Author's commentary on the Heretical Essays), 1975.

2. *Shorter studies*

Několik poznámek k pojmům dějin a dějepisu (Some comments about the concepts of history and historiography), 1934.

Několik poznámek o pojmu "světových dějin" (Some comments about the concept of "world history"), 1935.

O filosofii dějin (About the philosophy of history), 1940.

Evropský rozum (European reason), 1941.

Ideologie a život v ideji (Ideology and life in the Idea), 1946.

Nadcivilizace a její vnitřní konflikt (Supercivilisation and its inner conflict), early nineteen-fifties.

Negativní platonismus (Negative Platonism), 1953.

Nebezpečí technizace ve vědě u Edmunda Husserla a bytostné jádro techniky jako nebezpečí u Martina Heideggera (Edmund Husserl on the danger of technicalisation and Martin Heidegger on the intrinsic danger of technology), 1973.

3. *Commentary*

Re Heidegger's interview in Der Spiegel (1976)

4. *Appendices*

Editorial notes

Volume VI.: *Comenius*

1. *Shorter studies about Comeniological research*

2. *Shorter Comeniological writings from P's posthumous works*

(Both sections, prepared and published by Dr Radim Palouš and Professor Klaus Schaller, contain a number of articles written in German and French.)

3. *Fragments*

4. Didaktika a pansofie. Studie k filosofii výchovy J. A. Komenského (Didactics and pansophy. Studies of Comenius' philosophy of education), second half of 1950s, unprinted. Prepared for publication by Dr Radim Palouš.

Volume VII.: *Masaryk*

1. *Studies*

Masarykovo a Husserlovo pojetí duševní krize evropského lidstva (Masaryk's and Husserl's concept of the spiritual crisis of European humanity), 1936.

Masaryk a naše dnešní otázky (Masaryk and our present questions), 1946.

Masaryk včera a dnes (Masaryk yesterday and today), 1947.

Kolem Konkrétní logiky (Around "Concrete Logic"), 1950.

Masaryk proti antisemitismu (Masaryk versus anti-semitism), 1950-54).

Dvě studie o Masarykovi (Two studies about Masaryk), 1976.

2. *Polemics and papers*

Výbor ze spisů T. G. Masaryka (Selection of Masaryk's writings), 1930.

Masaryk od J. L. Hromádky (Review of "Masaryk" by J.L.Hromádka), 1930.

Německý historik o Masarykově a Pekařově pojetí českých dějin a české kulturní orientaci (A German historian on Masaryk's and Pekař's concepts of Czech history and the Czech cultural orientation), 1936.

Ještě k Masarykově filosofii náboženství (More about Masaryk's philosophy of religion), 1937.

Před rokem zemřel... (He died a year ago...), 1938.

3. *Appendices*

Masarykovy dopisy Husserlovi, 1877-1930 (Masaryk's letters to Husserl)

4. *Commentaries, variants and comments*

K studii Kolem Konkrétní logiky (Re the study "Around Concrete Logic")

Masarykova filosofie dějin a současná filosofická situace (Masaryk's philosophy of history and the present philosophical situation)

Heidegger a Masaryk (H. and M.)

Editorial notes

Volume VIII.: *The Czech existence*

Studies taken from the whole of Patočka's output, dealing, for instance, with such figures as Emanuel Rádl or J. L. Hromádka, as well as other studies not included in the other volumes from the book: O smysl dneška (The meaning of today), Prague 1969, which was almost entirely pulped, as well as related studies from other periods which were partly included in a number of samizdat publications issued in Prague, not to mention, of course, the study Co jsou Češi (What are the Czechs?) from 1976 which was printed in the exile review 150 000 words Vol.IV, No.12, 1985.

Volume IX.: *The history of ancient philosophy*

Přehledné dějiny filosofie. Presokratikové (Comprehensive history of philosophy. Socrates' predecessors), 1945.

Presokratovská filosofie (Presocratic philosophy), 1969.

Sokrates (1946-47)

Platon (1948-49)

Aristoteles (1948-49)

Editorial notes

Volume X.: *Aristoteles, his predecessors and successors*

Aristoteles, jeho předchůdci a dědicové (Aristoteles, his predecessors and successors), 1964.

Volume XI.: *The history of philosophy*

All those studies not included elsewhere concerning individual philosophical figures and problems not directly related to Czech history, such as Dvojitý rozum a příroda v německém osvícenství (Double reason and nature in the German Enlightenment), 1942, or Formy pohybu v dialektickém materialismu (The form of movement in dialectical materialism). unprinted 1966. etc.

Commentary

Volume I.

Edited ready for printing. Length: cca 600 pp. typescript. The volume still requires retyping in fair copy according to the latest orthographical practice and to eliminate minor errors of previous samizdat editions.

Volume II.

First published 1936. Reprinted by *Československý spisovatel*, Prague 1970, together with the study “‘The Natural World’ in the meditations of its author, thirty-three years on”. Printed in 2200 copies, the new edition did not reach the bookshops, however, and only 300 copies were retained for the use of certain institutions. A number of printing errors crept into the second edition. 232 pp.

Volume III.

Edited ready for printing. Length: cca 500 pp. typescript. Same situation as for Volume I.

Volume IV.

Foreign-language texts to be translated, whole text to be edited. Length: cca 450 pp. typescript.

Volume V.

In course of editing, practically ready for printing. Length: cca 500 pp. typescript. An appendix will include doublets and variants, mostly in foreign languages, particularly “Europa und Nach-Europa” (1972), which is 80 pp. long and not yet available in Prague, the only copy being in the Vienna archive.

Volume VI.

In both the volumes published so far, the foreign-language texts still need translating for inclusion in PCW. Otherwise, Study No. 4 (cca 231 pp. typescript) is edited ready for printing, all that remains is to unify the system of notes.

Volume VII.

Edited ready for printing. Volume: cca 300 pp. typescript. Same situation as for Volume I.

Volume VIII.

Selection and editing still to be done. Charter 77 texts logically belong in this volume. The volume’s structure would be similar to the above i.e. thematico-chronological.

Volume IX.

Edited ready for printing except for the paper “Aristotle” which is currently being prepared. Volume: cca 900 pp. typescript. Although the main editorial work is complete it is necessary to clarify the system of academic references which is rather cursory in the constituent papers.

Volume X.

Originally published in Prague under the imprint of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in a print-run of 1400 copies. That edition contains several printing errors. 415 pp.

Volume XI.

Selection and editing still to be done. It will be a more lengthy task since it is necessary to decide the order of texts and the criteria for the inclusion of Patočka’s encyclopaedia entries and his almost endless number of reviews.

General Guide-Lines for Printing PCW

A single format is recommended for all the volumes, namely, 21 cm high. (This was the height of the reprint of *The Natural World* – our Vol. II, Aristotle, his predecessors and successors – our Vol. X, and the paper *A synoptical history of philosophy*. of course. Even with its 400+ printed pages, the Aristotle volume is only 2.5 cm. thick. Another possibility, naturally, would be to divide certain of the volumes (e.g. Vol. IX) into several parts. The external aspect of the publication (i.e. typography, paper-quality and binding) should be scrupulously uniform, in order that *Patočka's Collected Works* should bear all the hallmarks of a definitive edition.

UNESCO CENSORS CZECH AND SLOVAK POETRY

French readers had to wait over fifty years for a new anthology of Czech and Slovak poetry. The first of its kind appeared in a series of admirable anthologies of modern French, American and other prose and poetry published by the Parisian publishing house Kra in 1930. The works had been selected, translated and compiled by the indefatigable translator and champion of Franco-Czech relations Hanuš Jelínek (*Anthologie de la poésie tchèque*, par H. Jelínek, Editions Kra, Paris 1930). For its time it was a fine collection and ranged from the early 19th century (i.e. Kollár, the *Manuscripts*, etc.) to what was then the younger generation: Wolker, Nezval, Seifert, Biebl, Halas and Závada. And although the title only mentioned Czech poetry, Jelínek also included several examples of Slovak verse by Hviezdoslav, Hurban-Vajanský and Ivan Krasko.

In my view, each of the volumes should be printed in at least 2000 copies. At all stages of editing it is necessary to consult with the Prague editors of the still unfinished samizdat version. The Patočka archive in the Viennese *Institut für die Wissenschaft vom Menschen* is virtually in a position to supply all the basic texts. We are working on the assumption that a large part of Patočka's foreign language texts would be translated in Prague.

Patočka's Collected Works are primarily intended for Czech and Slovak scholars both at home and abroad. Nevertheless, it is assumed that subscriptions will also be taken out by philosophical institutions and libraries, not to mention the majority of the the world's centres of Bohemian and Slavonic studies.

During the nineteen sixties repeated attempts were made to put together a collection of Czech and Slovak poetry as part of a new series of anthologies of world poetry then being prepared by another Parisian publishing house. As I learnt from the poet Pierre Emmanuel who initiated them, these attempts came to naught, however, because of continual objections on the part of the Czechoslovak authorities, who apparently objected to the selection on the grounds that it ran counter to Czechoslovakia's cultural policy at the time, though in fact it was chiefly because it did not suit the personal interests of some of its representatives. For these reasons the anthology did not get published in the end.

An attempt to fill the gap at least partially was made by Petr Král with his anthology of one of

the currents of modern Czech and Slovak poetry – surrealism (*Le surréalisme en Tchécoslovaquie, choix de textes 1934–1968*. Traduit du tchèque et présenté par Petr Král. Gallimard, Paris 1983). Although Král was far from restrictive in his selection, he could not make up for the lack of a wide-ranging anthology of modern Czech and Slovak poetry, and nor was it his intention to do so.

It was not until this year that such a collection was available to French readers. It was brought out by the Parisian publishing house Messidor in co-operation with UNESCO as part of a series of representative works of European literature, under the title *Anthologie de la poésie tchèque et slovaque*. The earliest selections in this 420-page volume are from the nineteenth century, the latest are examples of verse by the youngest generation of Czech and Slovak poets. The collection introduces French readers to almost sixty Czech and just over thirty Slovak poets by means of brief profiles and some samples of their work.

So far so good. However, a quick look at the contents page is enough to discover that it is not the representative picture of Czech and Slovak poetry which the title and the publicity on the back cover leads us to expect. Instead, it is a graphic illustration of Czechoslovak censorship and its notions of how Czech and Slovak poetry ought to appear. It is not merely a question of a few missing names (every anthology leaves someone out), but the omission of entire groups of poets, i.e. those banned from official publication in Czechoslovakia, as well, of course, as all those poets living in exile. In addition, the anthology passes over whole areas of Czech and Slovak

verse, not only by contemporary poets, but also by those of the recent past. Among those systematically excluded in this way are catholic poets from Jakub Deml and Jaroslav Durych down to Ladislav Dvořák and Zdeněk Rotrekl, and including Bohuslav Reynek, Jan Zahradníček and Václav Renč, Klement Bochořák, Josef Kostohryz, Jan Dokulil, F. Lazecký and Vladimír Vokolek among others. Also omitted are members of Group 42, including Jiří Kolář, Ivan Blatný, Jan Hanč and Jiřina Hauková, not to mention their latter-day continuator Emil Juliš. The same fate is shared by all the poets belonging to the post-war wave of Czech surrealism, particularly Vratislav Effenberger, Karel Hynek, Zbyněk Havlíček, Stanislav Dvorský, Petr Král, etc. However, this does not by any means conclude the list of groups of writers and individual poets completely neglected by the new anthology. Without being exhaustive in any way, mention should at least be made of Jaroslav Kolman Cassius, Josef Palivec, the late and much underrated Josef Lederer, Ladislav Fikar, Josef Hiršal, Ivan Wernisch and Ivan Diviš. Missing from the groups, both large and small, which the anthology decimates without mercy are not only the writers associated with Mladá fronta in the post-1945 period, such as František Listopad, Jaromír Hořec, Ivo Fleischmann, Oldřich Kryštofek, or, in later years, Karel Šiktanc, etc. but also those young poets who made their debut in the sixties, such as Jiří Pištora, Pavel Janský, Zbyněk Hejda, Petr Kabeš, Josef Brukner, Pavel Šrut, Jiří Gruša, Antonín Brousek and others.

In line with official Czechoslovak attitudes to literature the collection also ignored singer-poets like Karel Kryl, Jaroslav Hutka or Vlastimil Třešňák, among others; and of course no place

was found for the most recent underground poetry of Egon Bondy, Ivan Jirous, etc. It is necessary also to point out the anthology's blatant misogyny: the only woman writer in the Czech section, for instance, is J. Urbánková, even though many are worthy of inclusion such as Ludmila Macešková, who published under the name of Jan Kameník, Jana Štroblová, Olga Neveršilová and Vladimíra Čerepková. Women did not fare any better in the Slovak section, which, moreover neglects a whole lot of men writers as well, but it would take an expert in Slovak literature to identify them all properly.

This list of writers systematically excluded from the French anthology has no pretensions at being exhaustive: that was not my aim. I merely wished to indicate the ground-rules the compilers of the volume clearly observed in making their choice, or rather, in deciding whom to exclude. The disinformation conveyed by this anthology does not end there, though. On the contrary, it is evident in all the biographical profiles, as well as in the choice of poetry and the size of the samples, of course. A poet's importance is not to be measured in numbers of poems and pages, naturally, but it is none the less puzzling that a representative collection of Czech poetry should devote only three pages to Otakar Březina, four to Josef Hora, six to František Halas, seven to Jaroslav Seifert and eight pages to Jan Pilař, a poet who accommodated all regimes.

The explanation for all these effronteries is quite simple. A glance at the introduction tells us

that the choice of authors and verse was the work of Messrs. V. Ržounek and S. Wollman and that the introduction was the joint achievement of Messrs. M. Pohorský, M. Zeman and M. Tomčík, and Prof. Rosenbaum, not to mention that the volume was "authorised by the Czechoslovak National Committee for UNESCO". Thus, by courtesy of UNESCO and its willing collaborator, the publishing firm Messidor which has close ties with the French Communist Party, the Czechoslovak censor has widened his field of activity to include France. And the French readers, with their traditional aversion to all censorship, have not the faintest idea.

So French readers will have to wait a while longer for a genuine anthology of Czech -- and maybe Slovak -- poetry. At least they can already see an outline of it in issue No. 149 of *Liberté*, a French-language journal published in Montreal. That issue, which came out in October 1983, was devoted to Czech poetry and presented readers with a total of twenty nine Czech poets and one Slovak author of this century. Most of them belong precisely to the large contingent neglected by the Paris anthology. It was a remarkable collection which, albeit small, may justly be described as truly representative. The selection and translation were once more the work of Petr Král, who, though this was not his intention at the time, effectively prevented the Prague censor scoring a total victory over the French public.

J.V.

QUESTIONS OF TERMINOLOGY IN INDEPENDENT LITERATURE

New phenomena and new realities logically give rise to new terminology. However the nature of such terminology does not seem to follow quite such a logical pattern. This is because new terms often come into existence haphazardly, frequently without any real linguistic sensitivity and sometimes without regard for the natural logic of the language into which the new terms are introduced and in which they take root. It would take a linguist to provide a detailed explanation of this phenomenon, but even an expert would have difficulty in explaining how it is that in Czech the term “rádio” is being increasingly superseded by the expression “rozhlas”, and why, in the case of television, Czechs have remained faithful to the word “televize” and almost no one recalls the – admittedly rather awkward – term “rozvid” which was once proposed. Meanwhile, German, for instance, successfully employs entirely home-grown expressions in both these cases.

It is clearly not purely a matter of the origin of a particular newcomer or the circumstances of its creation or importation, but also of the overall potential of a particular language and the linguistic sensitivity of those who introduce a new term in the first place, not to mention its first users and the mass media. Moreover, there would seem to be a whole number of contingency factors involved. Take the very expression “samizdat” for instance. Quite clearly, it was originally a parody of the stereotyped abbreviations which serve as titles for the official Soviet publis-

hing houses, and there is something of the same irony detectable in the title “Edice Petlice”. The very nature of such expressions tells us something about the linguistic environment at the time the phenomena described came into being.

Independent literature in Czechoslovakia undoubtedly has its roots in the nineteen fifties, even though at that time it consisted of timid experiments and the phenomenon itself still lacked a name. The advent of “normalisation” at the turn of the seventies served to swell the ranks of silenced writers and represented a watershed in this sphere, sparking off the unexpected growth of all kinds of defence mechanisms. One of the most widespread, and apparently most effective, of these has been the publication, in typewritten form, of manuscripts which are banned by the official state-controlled publishing houses.

The development of such “unofficially published” literature has naturally given rise to discussions about how best to describe it. The concern has not been narrowly linguistic, however. The discussion about the terminology used by unofficial literature has also considered its nature, meaning, intention, and also the practical aspects of its creation and dissemination. For this reason, we are publishing the following two contributions to the debate which deal with these questions in greater detail. We intend, where possible and appropriate, to publish further contributions in future issues.

SOME QUESTIONS SURROUNDING “INÉDIT” LITERATURE

[...] We wish to address ourselves to the sociological aspect of the emergence and existence of literature described as “inédit” which readers originally came to know as “samizdat”.

The term “inédit” has not taken root either and in fact even many educated people are unaware of what it actually means. In the countries of “existing socialism” in which this sort of literature originated, the more commonly used expressions are either “unofficial” or “illegal” literature (and the same expressions are used to refer to culture in general). Both these terms are unsuitable, however. (Regarding the first of them, I agree with the position maintained by P. Fidelius in *Kritický sborník*, Vol. 1, 1981, No. 3.) The term “illegal” is fundamentally unsound and directly conflicts with the law-abiding attitude adopted by inédit authors. In fact the latter regard their activity as entirely legal, since, in our country, no law exists banning anyone from making several typewritten copies of their writings and lending them to others. Thus no illegal activity is involved. (The police make a further distinction: for them “illegal” literature is the sort whose content is unobjectionable, but which, for one reason or another – e.g. the politics of the author – cannot be published here, whereas “unlawful” literature is objectionable from the point of view of content.)

Admittedly the term “‘inédit’ literature” is also not entirely satisfactory. Firstly, “inédit”

manuscripts are only “inédit” here; they can still be published abroad (and some of them occasionally are); further, in common with the term “unofficial”, it draws a sharp distinction between published and unpublished literature; and lastly, it can only be appropriately applied to literary production of the so-called “parallel culture” (itself an imprecise term), and fails to cover home theatrical productions, exhibitions, musical performances, etc., which are clearly not “published”.

Apart from that, though, it is quite a precise and clear description since it applies to all literary works that cannot be published here for various reasons. It can apply to all fields of art or learning, to authors living here, to translations of foreign works, and to living and dead authors alike, whether or not they have the opportunity of being published. The fact is that there are certain authors who are able to have some works published, but not others (e.g. Seifert and Hrabal), and one could also mention those writers who could publish but prefer not to. There are also cases where a book exists in two separate versions – “édit” and “inédit” – which can be quite different from each other.

It would seem, therefore, that, from the point of view of terminology, literature may include textual alterations they are obliged to make, publication delays, drastic cuts in print runs, difficulties over distributing a book once it

is published, the hushing up of its publication, etc.

Inédit literature was not dreamt up by somebody. It is not a strange whim of some individual writer or literary grouping. Nor is it a foretaste of the exclusiveness of the literature to come, as V. Rozanov had in mind when he stated that future literary works would be distributed entirely in manuscript form among a narrow circle of experts. By coincidence, "samizdat" (i.e. literature published by authors themselves, without the assistance of intermediaries – in other words, without editing or censorship) may well have originated in Russia too, but it certainly did not come into being out of any doubt the authors might have had of the mass interest in their works on the part of readers. In a certain sense it was the regime itself that gave rise to inédit literature, by having, through its network of control over printing and publishing prevented (both as regards content and authors, wherein it differs from classic censorship which was interested solely in texts not their authors) a large section of intellectual creation from being published. Strict Stalinism, of course, did not countenance the creation of any non-conformist literature, not even in manuscript form. It is not so long ago that Soviet poets kept their unpublished poems fixed in their memories and only recited them to particularly intimate friends, and out of earshot of any witnesses: in the woods, for instance. This should not surprise us if one considers the severe penalties paid by authors of various leaflets and home-produced magazines, or even of rashly formulated sentences in private correspondence.

This is why it was only after Stalin's death, in the Khrushchev era, that samizdat could come

into being and even experience a period of expansion (though it would seem to be on the wane nowadays and restricted mostly to political science, or to sociological and historical texts, with samizdat fiction becoming more of a rarity).

People in democratic countries must find the inédit literature phenomenon hard to comprehend. After all, the typewriter is a typically American invention originally intended to speed up commercial and business communication and for many decades it did not occur to anyone that it might compete with Guttenberg's machine – particularly now that there exist, in addition to classic typography, a whole number of other reproduction techniques permitting the rapid and fairly inexpensive duplication of any kind of text or illustration, and in any quantity. Except where it is linked to some other reproduction technique, the typewriter is now used solely for letters, short texts or originals for printing (in this respect almost all "pen-pushers" use a typewriter nowadays).

The fact is that samizdat literature is extremely impractical: it is expensive to produce, mostly of poor legibility and not very durable. In these respects, it compares unfavourably not only with printed literature, but also with old manuscripts, which were certainly expensive to produce, but otherwise very legible and, by and large, of aesthetic value. (Inédit literature admittedly does have its bibliophile "impressions", particularly in this country, but so far they are extremely restricted since they involve phenomenal costs and the consumers of inédit books tend not to belong to the better off sections of the reading public.)

Owing to these factors, inédit books have a specific feature that distinguishes them from published literature: in their case the economic aspect of literary production is fundamentally altered. In fact it completely reverses the practice of the entire 19th century and of the first half of the twentieth century. Although, from the very beginning, printing was a cultural undertaking it was mostly an activity conducted for reasons of financial gain. It was not long though before authors started, quite rightly, doing what they could to obtain a share of the profits, on the grounds that "the labouring man is worthy of his hire" During the nineteenth century, most countries introduced legislation governing printing and publishing and also instituted protection of copyright, first on a national scale and subsequently on a world-wide basis. To a certain extent, writers were freed from existential worries, which was positive, but at the same time, literature came under enormous commercial pressure which increasingly forced authors to be successful rather than good: factors which seldom go hand in hand and often diverge. Socialists made a sport of attacking the publishers' exploitation of writers and promised that things would change after the revolution. As things have turned out, in the countries of "existing socialism" writers admittedly do not endure the pressures of the capitalist market, but they do suffer the pitiless pressure of an exclusive ideology and repression in respect of their career prospects. Under capitalism, writers in search of success must frequently bow to the demands of a conservative readership. Under socialism, authors have to bow to the demands of the regime and the pressure of editors who can be notoriously conservative. Neither group is free, but whereas, when

the worst comes to the worst, principled authors in capitalist society can bring out unpopular works at their own expense, in socialism, such writers lack that possibility. But in all Western countries there are plenty of publishers willing to publish an unpopular book, at least from time to time: on the one hand, to enhance their reputations, and on the other, because of the existence of competition, and on the grounds that "you never know". In socialist countries, competition does not exist, because of collusion between the small number of similarly endowed central publishing houses. Moreover, no editorial board will even talk to writers who are not positively vetted, let alone with those who have actually been rejected by the screening process.

Naturally, even in the West there are writers who, for want of a publisher, cannot get their books published, and cannot afford to publish them themselves. But in those cases, it all depends on their degree of determination. I cannot believe that there are writers too poor to get their works copied out -- or copy them out themselves -- and then get at least a hundred further copies run off by means of some reproduction technique or other. That is why the phenomenon of "inédit" literature" does not exist in the West. (One critic in our country actually believes that the western countries, such as France and West Germany, should study samizdat here, on the grounds that the time is coming when, there too, real literature will be "published" solely in inédit editions.)

Inédit literature negates the entire commercial basis of contemporary book publishing. Not only has no one ever made a fortune out of sa-

mizdat literature, but neither could anyone even earn their living at it. Writers have come to take it for granted that they will receive no fee for their works -- regardless of whether they are two-page articles, thousand-page novels or philosophical treatises requiring years of research. Clearly they have lost much as a result; but they have also gained something as well: namely, a degree of creative freedom never before available to literature, either here or anywhere else. Not only are they free of any censorship and hence are able gradually to rid themselves of any remaining self-censorship, but they are also free of all the sort of economic restraint that an editor can place on them. (Should writers fail to satisfy the requirements of an editor, the latter can threaten them not to recommend the work for publication, and hence deprive them of their fee. How many people are there strong-willed enough to resist pressure of that kind?!)

Inédit literature is, I grant, also subject to editing, but only of an overall kind; the decision is made whether the manuscript is worth reproducing or not. In this sense, "editors" may let authors know their comments, but the latter are not obliged to take account of their critics' remarks in subsequent editions of their works.

If, in addition to outlay on materials, typing and binding, the production costs of inédit books had to include an author's fees, however small, the price of the finished edition would be so high as to place it beyond the means of mere mortals.

Thus, owing to its attitude towards banned authors the régime has found itself faced with two unexpected and inconvenient consequences: on the one hand it has enabled writers to create

freely and on the other it has lost the control that it is normally able to wield even over those authors who, albeit non-conformist, have to bargain with editors and censors in order to get their manuscripts published.

All this serves to display inédit literature in a very favourable light as a free and unmercenary activity carried on by writers of principle with honourable motives.

It is free in so far as individual writers have rid themselves of inner self-censorship. It is also unmercenary, however much some writers may be accused of writing for their own glory -- i.e. out of vanity -- or because they are incurable scribblers whose obsessive writings no one would publish anyway. Of course such cases exist, but they are few and far between.

Much is often said about the high standard of inédit literature, particularly in this country. And the fact is that the best works of Czech literature of the seventies were first published by *Pellice*, *Expedice* and *Kvart*. It was not entirely to the credit of inédit literature per se, but simply because the post-1969 "normalised" régime had banned from publication the majority of the best writers, philosophers, historians, journalists we then had. At the same time, it put too much pressure on budding writers with any gumption and forced them to join the ranks of the inédit.

However it cannot be said that everything in the realm of inédit literature is of a high standard or, conversely, that all published books are necessarily bad. Far fewer inédit titles are "published", and it is easier to keep track of them, and

the fact is that they include a much higher percentage of truly fine works than is to be found among the inflated figures of recent publications which the regime loves to parade, particularly for foreign eyes, as evidence of the rich development of contemporary Czech literature. Otherwise, there are good or even excellent published books, in the same way that there are bad or below-average “*inédit*” editions. What is far less represented among *inédit* titles is the average sort of mediocre writing which makes up a large proportion of published literature. In fact the average sort of book that gets published is a typical product of commercial pressure, whether from an undemanding readership, or from the official ideology. Its author usually lacks any great talent, but has learnt the writer’s trade and decided to reap all due profit from it. Of course such an approach is only viable in the realm of published literature for which royalties are paid.

Nevertheless, *inédit* literature also has its drawbacks and grave problems. For one thing, it lacks that phase when a manuscript undergoes a final check, which is only really possible at the page-proof stage. However much writers hone down their manuscripts, they still remain manuscripts i.e. fairly open texts which, by virtue of the very fact that they permit a number of subsequent amendments and additions, can display a lack of finish or finality. Moreover, a printed text looks different from a typewritten one. It is a sort of psychological enigma that manuscripts are capable of containing errors that authors just never see until they are type set.

Then there is the question of limited publicity in the sense of a greatly restricted readership. Of

course there is the odd exception where *inédit* texts are read by as many people as they would have been, had they been published in mass editions (e.g. Seifert’s *Plague Column*). Furthermore, the usage made of manuscript copies is much higher than of published books: a book I have just bought I might merely add to the other books on my bookshelf with the intention of reading it “when I find the time” – which might be five years later, or never for that matter, whereas a manuscript borrowed for a week has to be read straight away. But that only partly compensates for the shortage of copies available to potential readers, most of whom can never lay their hands on *inédit* editions.

Still graver is the matter of critical responses. Occasionally writers will learn the opinion of their friends by word of mouth, which is obviously not much of a guideline, since it is always difficult to comment on someone’s work to their face, particularly when one’s criticism is negative. Apart from rare exceptions (e.g. Václav Černý, J.Rak and L.Dobrovský) written criticism virtually did not exist in the seventies, not within the country, anyway. Inevitably this meant that the other face of the *inédit* authors’ unlimited freedom started to emerge: i.e. they never really had any way of knowing what their readers’ thought of their works. Admittedly this also has its advantages, but they are extremely conditional. But the effect is mostly negative: Authors are left to their own devices. Their texts are not analysed or discussed and they themselves are restricted solely to self-assessment, which is deceptive. Sometimes it keeps them buoyant on a wave of belief in their own genius (and it helps nicely to compensate for lack of re-

cognition to be an unrecognised genius!): on other occasions, they fall prey to nihilistic moods and the conviction grows that their creations are worthless. Of course it is possible to write for no one in particular. But there is no guarantee that this will give rise to a truly viable literature.

Another effect is that inédit writers can lose their sense of belonging to one particular national literature -- or rather, they may retain it only nominally. Some writers live in total isolation, virtually without any contact with other authors. There are exceptions to this, of course, but even the other inédit authors associate solely in narrow circles, their relations based more on friendship than on a common creative programme, as used to be the case among artistic and creative people. It is very rare for published writers to maintain relations with inédit authors, for understandable reasons, since the latter are frequently the object of surveillance on the part of the security forces, and such promiscuity could cost the published authors -- at the very least -- their right to have their books published.

Whether we like it or not, two quite separate social phenomena have come into being in this country: published literature and inédit literature. Of course there are those inédit authors who believe that the situation is no more than a passing anomaly, and count on their manuscripts being published somewhere some day; they therefore regard the present situation as somehow temporary, even though it has lasted for more than ten years already. If only that were the case! But what if inédit literature is actually a new phenomenon in the history of literature, which bases

itself on the assumption, as Rozanov believes, of a permanently restricted readership on the one hand and a constant rise in the cost of printing on the other?

In America, they are already predicting that book culture as we know it will die out by the nineties to be replaced by microfiches, for reasons of utility and low cost, if no other (e.g. the microfiche of a thousand-page novel will fit into something the size of a matchbox and cost a few cents instead of tens of dollars). Anything that still remains of inédit literature by that time, or is still extant, will just need photographing on to microfiche. What will be the point of setting it in print and laboriously turning it into a book first? (Of course there will always be bibliophiles ready to make sacrifices in order to pay the highest prices for a classically printed book to place on their bookshelves. But they will be fewer and fewer in number, and in common with the bibliophiles of today they will concentrate on classic texts that have stood the test of time, as well as on curios and shorter works.

But let us set aside futurological forecasts. For the time being inédit literature continues to fulfil an important role in our country: that of ensuring that our literature and thinking goes on developing as a continuation of the nation's cultural heritage and, where possible, within a global context. And this role is such an important and honourable one, that it merits the effort and the risk involved in the creation and propagation of inédit literature.

Kritický sborník, Vol. 2, 1982, No. 4, pp. 29–36

“INÉDIT” LITERATURE: THE QUESTION THEY FORGOT

The odd habit of describing any literature published in samizdat as “inédit literature” has tended to become widespread of late. Maybe it is only a passing fashion. However, if in fact it is the expression of a serious attempt to solve at last the long-standing difficulties of finding the right terminology to describe the free and independent literature evolving outside the realm of official control in a late-totalitarian communist-style regime, then it has to be pointed out that the use of the epithet “inédit” in this particular case is not merely inappropriate, but is actually a contradiction in terms. When the article: *Some questions surrounding 'inédit' literature* appeared in *Kritický sborník* 4/82, I thought the author was going to point out this anomaly. Unfortunately, it was not to be the case. Even though the article specifically deals, among other things, with the suitability of the new term, oddly enough its author ignores the main point at issue: having carefully weighed the pros and cons, he concludes that “otherwise it is quite a precise and clear description”. Well yes, one could agree with that statement, on the proviso that the term were understood to express precisely and clearly the exact opposite of what the author intended. Nonetheless it has become quite a widely accepted term, which would seem to suggest that the author (unwittingly) hit the nail right on the head when he expressed the view that “in fact even many educated people are unaware what it actually means”.

So if we are bent on enriching our mother tongue with this foreign expression regardless, at least let us be clear about how it may be used. Translated into Czech “inédit” quite simply means “unpublished”. “Inédit” therefore describes a manuscript that still lies in a desk drawer. But as soon as a manuscript is published it ceases to be “inédit”, of course, and becomes “édit” (why not bless the Czech language with that expression while we are at it?) At the very most, the word “inédit” may appear on the title page of a first edition, to indicate to readers that the text they have in their hands has not been published before. (But it is a practice that editors tend only to adopt in the case of posthumous publication). And with this we have exhausted the possibilities of the term’s legitimate use. All else is just thoughtless over-use, and fundamentally no less absurd than if we went on calling meat “raw” even after it was cooked.

At this point, many will undoubtedly object that they are already well aware of this, and assert that the copying out of a text on a typewriter as a means of samizdat publication clearly differs from the situation where it is printed in normal fashion by a publishing house, or that it is even incomparable with it. Of course it is different; but is it really incomparable? What, may I ask then, are we doing with those texts in samizdat, if not publishing them? Why is it that we refer to various “editions” (e.g. *Petlice* and *Expedice*)?

Isn't it the case that were we consistently to pursue such a line it would be inadmissible even to use the expression "sam-izdat" (Russian: self-publishing, trans.)? But it doesn't look as if the champions of the epithet "inédit" trouble themselves with such considerations. This can be seen, for instance, in the fact that they have no trouble in uttering – like the author in *Kritický sborník* in question – expressions like "inédit editions". As a poetical oxymoron there is nothing wrong with it, of course, but, if I'm not wrong, our particular concern here is how, practically, to describe a specific reality.

It might help us a bit to clarify the meaning of the very concept of "publishing" (or "editing") a manuscript: the question is to what extent this concept covers our samizdat activity also.

If we take "publishing" in its broadest sense we may distinguish two main aspects: let us call them the technical and the creative. As far as the technical aspect goes, I see no reason why the concept of "publishing" should necessarily imply the use of printing of a certain number of copies. Of course the number of copies published does have a bearing on a text's "publicity" (in the sense of its public distribution). And in this respect it is indeed true, as the author of the article points out, that what is typical for samizdat literature is its "limited publicity in the sense of a greatly restricted readership". That is no reason for us to describe it as "inédit", though. We are all aware of the fact that in periods of freedom in our country a whole number of impressions were produced for bibliophile or private purposes in very small print runs, but I am sure that we have

no hesitation in regarding them as regular "publishing" activity. Besides, "publicity" understood as "size of readership" is by no means directly proportional to the size of the print-run. In this respect, certain titles published in truly massive print runs, such as the Marxist-Leninist classics that our publishing houses continue untiringly to churn out (conceivably for the sole purpose of maintaining the metabolism between the pulper and the printing press) have extremely negligible "publicity". Even though it is clearly a futile and superfluous activity it would seem to be "publishing" for all that. On the other hand, it is obvious that, in technical terms, there is no fundamental reason why samizdat should be permanently restricted to typewritten copies: the present restriction is dictated by the present status quo. Where the situation permits, samizdat is even known to make use of printing techniques, as was once the case in Poland and continues to be (for the time being) in Hungary.

What is decisive as far as the concept of "publishing" is concerned, is the *creative* aspect. I am thinking specifically of the irreplaceable role played (or that ought to be played) in this process by a publisher or editor. Even considered solely from the point of view of the writer and the development of his or her talent, good editors are as important as good literary critics. In one respect, perhaps, they are even more important. After all, it is precisely in the process of co-operation between author and editor that a work finally assumes its definitive form: the form in which it will then reach the critic. And I do not have to recall the not inconsiderable responsibility that the editor bears towards the reading public.

Well then, how does samizdat match up to this criterion at the present time? I believe that if one takes a dispassionate or even sceptical look, one cannot but acknowledge that, after an initial period of rather more extensive growth, samizdat in this country has displayed a growing concern about the standards of editorial preparation of published texts. Let us recall – to choose some random examples – the publication of Patočka's *Opera omnia*, the translation of *Sein und Zeit* in instalments, the reappearance of the *Kvart* imprint and of course, last but not least, our own dear *Kritický sborník*. Can there really be the least doubt that such achievements demand conscientious editorial activity? I believe that it is no more than a just appraisal of reality to declare that – all in all – over these past years, slowly but surely the awareness has been growing within samizdat in our country of the editor's vital creative role. I detect in it a welcome sign of progress from more or less haphazard amateurism to responsible systematic activity. I believe the time is not far off when it will be universally taken for granted that a samizdat typescript should be edited in such a way as to be "ready for printing" should the need arise.

If contention still exists about how to describe this "unofficial" publishing activity (and the literature published in this way), I really fail to see why we should not stick to the term that is already accepted i.e. "samizdat". Out of all current descriptions it is the only one about which no objections can be raised either in terms of accuracy or suitability, and one which is entirely untrammelled by misleading connotations. The word, I believe, best describes the fundamental reality: that in samizdat we quite simply publish

by our own means what cannot be published in institutions subject to state control. At the same time there are two different ways of considering this self-help activity. In material terms, it can be regarded as an emergency solution: an exceptional and abnormal procedure imposed on us by exceptional and abnormal circumstances. It is a method of publishing appropriate to a state of emergency: a costly and inefficient process that must, compared with normal conditions, appear to be fantastically wasteful in terms of physical and mental effort. On the other hand, in spiritual terms, this phenomenon may be regarded as a promising spark of normality, in that it provides us with a real chance (albeit very limited) to preserve for future generations – not only in theory but also in practice – an idea of what is meant by free and independent cultural institutions.

If there is a reservation to be voiced about the term "samizdat", then it is solely on grounds of linguistic aesthetics: like every Russian abbreviation it has shades of "kolkhoz", "politruk" and suchlike words which admittedly do not look particularly nice in Czech. But if, after all, we have come to terms with such a monstrosity as "khozrashchot" (the Soviet method of management and accountancy, trans.) an expression that most resembles a pig's grunt, aesthetically speaking, on what grounds are we to refuse a residence permit in our mother tongue to the irrefutably nicer-sounding expression "samizdat"? Anyway, it is only polite and just that the word itself should continue to remind us of the primacy which the Russians deservedly enjoy in this particular field.

Kritický sborník, Vol.3, 1983, No.2, pp. 94–97

THE SAMIZDAT SERIES *NEW THOUGHT TRAILS*

As was pointed out in the editorial, ACTA intends to include regular reports on various series of Czechoslovak samizdat books and periodicals. Apart from listing all titles, these reports will, where possible, include brief descriptions of individual books, or in the case of periodicals, details of annual collections and/or individual issues. With the growing volume and variety of samizdat production, our aim will be not only to provide a comprehensive picture of this phenomenon from its origins until now, but also to act as a guide for readers and provide information on lesser-known or unknown series of books or

journals. Since this is demanding work, particularly in the case of book series, which often number hundreds of titles, ACTA will adopt a pragmatic approach and make use of that material which has already been processed either in the home country or abroad. The list we are publishing in the present issue belongs in this category. It is the samizdat series *Nové cesty myšlení* (New Thought Trails) in which twenty seven titles have been published over the past ten years. The list and descriptions were prepared in Czechoslovakia.

The Editors

NEW THOUGHT TRAILS

The series concentrates on original Czech philosophical writings, mainly of a theoretical kind, but occasionally including some works in a lighter vein. The series' philosophical framework is provided essentially by Patočka's legacy of ideas, and it concentrates in the main on Christian aspects. The series evolved gradually. Its likely antecedent was a collection of philosophical writings listed here as No.0 which exceptionally included works by foreign authors.

0) *Filosofický sborník* (Philosophical miscellany). No indication of date or place of publication. Appeared in Prague in 1977. Mimeographed A5; limp covers, 130 pp. Contents: Martin Heidegger, *Věc* (The Thing) – a new Czech translation; M.Heidegger, *Dopis mladému studentovi* (Letter to a young student; M.Heidegger,

Přípitek (A toast); Jan Patočka, *Křesťanská víra a myšlení* (Christian faith and thought), transcript of a lecture and discussion of 27.1.75; M.Heidegger, *Rozhovor s R. Augsteinem a G.Wolffem* (Conversation with R.Augstein and G.Wolff), 23.9.66; Jan Patočka, *Výňatky z diskuse o Heideggerově rozhovoru* (Excerpts of a discussion about Heidegger's conversation), summer 1976; H.Rombach, *Víra v Boha a vědecké myšlení* (Belief in God and Scientific Thought).

1) Radim Palouš, *Škola stáří* (The School of Old Age). Prague, 1978. Typescript A5, bound in stiff cardboard with picture of Comenius on cover, 167 pp. The volume is in two parts; Part I interprets Comenius' concept of education as a school of life in the light of the absolute sum-

mons that human beings are called upon to answer; meanwhile stress is laid on the "school of old age" i.e. that which is relatively least open to abuse for purely temporary ends. Part II is a critique of the contemporary concept of age concern and an attempt to lay the bases of gerontology.

2) Radim Palouš, *Konverze* (Conversion). Prague, nineteen-seventies. Mimeographed A4, bound in soft or stiff cardboard with picture of an open book on front cover, 94 pp. Study of the phenomenon of a fundamental change of life, including relevant testimony from the Eleusinian mysteries and Plato's PERIAGOGÉ, to the Christian experience and contemporary examples from the world of artists.

3) Radim Palouš, *Kmotřenci* (To my God-son). Prague, nineteen-seventies. Mimeographed A5, bound in stiff or soft cardboard, 131 pp. The author addresses his god-son and tries to initiate him into the spiritual climate of the present day, frequently making use of fairy-tale themes in talking about concealment and modesty, modernity, courage, finality, faith, love and hope.

4) *Cesty myšlení* (Thought trails). Miscellany. Prague 1979. Mimeographed A5, bound in soft or stiff cardboard, 175 pp. Six studies and meditations taking a critical attitude towards anthropocentrism. Contents: D.Kroupa, *Život filosofa* (Life of a philosopher): a philosophical biography of Jan Patočka; Martin Palouš, *Domácí přítel a směšný člověk* (Friend of the family and a ludicrous man); Zdeněk Neubauer, *Filosofie jako svědectví o zjevení bytí v symbolu* (Philosophy as a witness to the revelation of being in sym-

bols; Radim Palouš, *Světelná metafora* (A luminous metaphor); V.Illa, *Cesta teologie a teologie jako cesta* (The path of theology and theology as a path); Kalypton, *Zapři sám sebe* (Grin and bear it).

5) Zdeněk Neubauer, *Deus et natura*. Prague 1980. Mimeographed A5, bound in soft or stiff cardboard, 127 pp. Reflection on "religio" in the light of the author's philosophical attitude which he calls the "ontology of subjectivity". In chap.I, the author explains this philosophical belief as experience of the natural world. Chap.II is a meditation on the theme of faith and miracles. Chap. III is a Mariological study concerning a pilgrimage to Turzovka, Chap.IV deals with the problem of inherited sin. Related to chapter IV is an appendix taking issue with the position of K.Rahmer.

6) *Smysl smyslu* (The Meaning of Meaning). Miscellany. Prague 1980. Typescript B5, stiff cloth binding, 192 pp. An investigation of the theme of meaning as suggested by Patočka in one of his last philosophical studies. Contents: Martin Palouš, *Filosofie, řeč a smysl* (Philosophy, language and meaning); Zdeněk Neubauer, *Co je to smysl* (What is meaning?); Radim Palouš, *Smysl a dějiny* (Meaning and history); Jiří Němec, Zdeněk Neubauer et al: *Záznam diskuse o smyslu* (Transcript of a home philosophical seminar on meaning), 8.1.1979.

7) Radim Palouš, *K Bolzanovu významu v duchovním vývoji a národním povědomí* (The significance of Bolzano in spiritual development and the national consciousness). Prague 1981. Mimeographed A5, binding soft card or stiff

cloth, 48 pp. Some copies are illustrated with 12 photos by O.Němec and a portrait of Bernard Bolzano. Issued to mark the 200th anniversary of Bolzano's birth, this study is also part of the samizdat debate about that philosopher.

8) *Polis a religio (Polis and religio)*. A collection to mark Josef Zvěřina's seventieth birthday. Typescript A5, stiff cloth, 220 pp. Contents: Marie Rút Křížková, *Milostivé léto* (Merciful summer), poem, frontispiece; Zdeněk Neubauer, *Duch v křesťanské tradici* (The spirit in Christian tradition); Pavel Bratinka, *Politická obec a křesťanské perspektivy* (The political community and Christian perspectives); Martin Palouš, *Věčnost a nesmrtelnost* (Eternity and immortality); Václav Benda, *Poznámky k poznámkám často slyšeným* (Comments on some frequently heard comments); Radim Palouš, *K Zvěřinovu malému rozhovoru o TGM* (Concerning Zvěřina's short conversation about Masaryk); D.Kroupa, *K pramenům Masarykovy filosofie praxe* (The origins of Masaryk's philosophy of praxis); Miloš Rejchrt, *Aby všichni jedno byli* (Let all be one).

9) Radim Palouš, *Dvě vánoční povídky* (Two Christmas tales). Prague 1983. Typescript, folding pages A5, stiff cloth binding, 56 pp. Variations on *Cinderella* and *Babes in the Wood* for the use of teachers. Includes suggested interpretations.

10) Radim Palouš, *Čas výchovy* (Time for education). Prague 1983. Typescript, B5, stiff cloth, 371 pp. A study explaining the author's theory that the metaphysical and ontologico-epistemological eras will be succeeded by an era of educa-

tion i.e. the question of what is and how we know it, will be superseded by the question of what is people's responsibility.

11) Milan Balabán, *Stručné dějiny izraelské noetiky* (A short history of Israelite epistemology). Prague 1984. Typescript B5, stiff cloth, 232 pp. Chronological account of the Israelite concept of "knowing" about the Lord, with special reference to the prophetic tradition, from the earliest times to the New Testament period.

12) T.R.Korder, *Hledání aktuálního pojetí dějin* (In search of a modern concept of history). Prague 1984. Typescript B5, stiff cloth, 278 pp. Transcript of a home seminar with papers on Patočka's Heretical Essays, and on the books: *A New Science of Politics* by E.Voegelin and *The Voegelinian Revolution* by Ernest Sandoz. The discussion centred on the concept of history.

13) Martin Palouš, *Paralelní úvahy* (Parallel reflections). Prague 1984. Typescript B5, stiff cloth, 140 pp. Collection of philosophical essays on the spiritual crisis of the present day and the fate of citizenship in this period of tension; on the difficulties of objective perception; on the geocentric meaning of "conquering the Moon". The author also contrasts Patočka's Heretical Essays with Hanna Arendt's views, and discusses the relationship between the Hellenic and Christian views of eternity and immortality.

14) Václav Havel, *Šestnáct dopisů* (Sixteen Letters). Prague 1985. Typescript B5, stiff cloth, 140 pp. Selection of Havel's prison letters. The ninety-one pages of selected text dealing with exi-

stential questions are prefaced by thirty-three pages by Sidonius on the ontological significance of Havel's reflections.

15) Sidonius and Sakateka, *Dialog o páté cestě a dialog o mínění* (Dialogue on the Fifth Way and a dialogue on meaning). Prague 1985. Typescript B5, stiff cloth binding, 115 pp. A discursive conversation between two friends about the relationship between activity and inactivity, the plurality of thought paths, problems of modern cybernetics, the theological arguments of mediaeval scholars, etc,

16) I.M.Havel, M.Palouš, Z.Neubauer, *Svatojánský výlet* (A Midsummer Day's Outing). Prague 1985. Typescript B5, stiff cloth binding, 225 pp. Three friends give separate accounts of the same trip made together, each describing the course of events and considering its deeper meaning.

17) Radim Palouš, *1969*. Prague 1985. Typescript A4, stitched card binding, 100 pp. Hypothesis about the end of modern times, or rather the end of the entire Euro-age and the birth of a new age. The origins of existing classifications, discussion of periodization and arguments about the succession of ages in the twentieth century.

18) *T. G. Masaryk a naše současnost* (T.G.Masaryk and our times). Anthology. Prague 1986. Typescript B5, stiff cloth binding, 118pp. Selection from the four-volume miscellany of some 800 pp. published under the same title in samizdat in 1980. Includes condensed versions or details of all the articles from the sections "Reminiscences" and "Articles".

19) *Hostina* (The banquet). Philosophical miscellany. Prague 1986. Typescript, stiff cloth binding, 329 single-spaced pages. Compiled by Václav Havel from contributions by 21 authors living in Czechoslovakia and abroad. The volume has five parts. Parts I & II are largely philosophical and ontological, part III: epistemological, part IV: politico-philosophical; part V: varia.

20) Sidonius and Sakateka, *Dialog o mudrování a dialog o otázkách* (A dialogue about philosophizing, and a dialogue about questions). Prague 1986. Typescript B5, stiff cloth binding, 110 pp. Further conversations between two friends, this time about wisdom, love, popularity, contemplation and philosophy, about plays and dialogue, asking questions and expecting answers, existence and inquisitiveness, identity as participation, secrecy, etc.

21) Zdeněk Neubauer, *Bytí a subjektivita* (Being and subjectivity). Prague 1986. Typescript B5, stiff cloth binding, 151 pp. The opening paper: *Krise subjektu v západní filosofii* (The crisis of the subject in Western philosophy) is by Paul Ricoeur. The four subsequent studies by Neubauer, a) about Ricoeur's "crisis of the subject", b) about "the subject" understood hermeneutically, c) about metaphor, and d) about the philosophy of faith. The last part of the volume is the record of a conversation with Paul Ricoeur during his trip to Prague in 1980.

22) *Faustování s Havlem* (Havel's Faustiana). Miscellany to mark Václav Havel's fiftieth birthday. Typescript B5, binding stiff cloth -- one copy part-leather, 151 pp. Essays by Ivan Havel, Martin Palouš, H.Weberová, Radim Palouš, Pa-

vel Bratinka, D.Kroupa and Zdeněk Neubauer on the common theme of Havel's play *Pokoušení* (Temptation). Appendix: transcript of a conversation with Václav Havel about the play.

Editorial note: All lists of samizdat book series and, where appropriate, details about individual

volumes, will be gradually supplemented. The appearance of the same title in the lists of more than one samizdat series is either due to deliberate co-operation between "publishers" or a case of borrowing a particular title from another samizdat workshop.

NEW BOOKS – PRO MEMORIA

THE HIDDEN FACE OF CZECH LITERATURE

Zdeněk Rotrekl, *Skrytá tvář české literatury nejenom krásné* (The hidden face of Czech literature). Selected biographical chapters. Samizdat, 364 pp. + photographs. Brno, Easter 1985.

Contents: Foreword; Otto František Babler; Ivan Blatný; Klement Bochořák; Josef Silvestr Maria Braitó; Jan Čep; Rudolf Černý; Reginald Dacík; Miloš Dvořák; Ivan Jelínek; Zdeněk Kalista; Josef Knap; Josef Kostohryz; Antonín Kratochvíl; František Křelina; František Lazický; Dominik Pecka; Suzanne Renaud; Václav Renč; Bohuslav Reynek; Zdeněk Řezníček; Nina Svobodová; Růžena Vacková; Timoteus Vodička; Marie Rosa Junová-Vodičková; Jan Zahradníček; František Halas; Jan Trefulka; Afterword.

As the title indicates and the author explains in the foreword, the idea of assembling this set of "encyclopaedic biographical chapters" was inspired not only by the death of "many members of the older generation of writers and scholars", but also by the realisation that the names and works of many of them, as well as those of many

other, younger authors have been systematically erased from Czech cultural history, thereby (deliberately, it would seem) aggravating the already perilous discontinuity of Czech culture. Zdeněk Rotrekl is not the only one to realise this danger and write about it. He would seem to have been the first, however, to tackle the problem in a practical fashion by editing these biographical chapters devoted to authors whose names we would look for in vain in today's encyclopaedias or text-books. And on the rare occasions in the past when some of them actually were acknowledged, such as in the Dictionary of Czech Writers (*Slovník českých spisovatelů*) of 1964, the entries were incomplete, to say the least. This was because certain important biographical details, particularly concerning political persecution, imprisonment and (where applicable) rehabilitation, were taboo and have remained so. At best, sharp-eyed readers of that dictionary could deduce these details from the conspicuous silence about lengthy periods of writer's lives, as well as from gaps in their bibliographies. The situation has been remedied to a great extent by the *Slovník českých spisovatelů* published by Sixty-Eight Publishers, Toronto, in 1982. But even that collection fails to include some the wri-

ters Rotrekl recalls, partly, of course, because his book presents not only writers of fiction but also several scholars, specialist writers and publishers, as is also evident from the contents.

Most of the subjects were known personally to Zdeněk Rotrekl. His affinity with many of them derived from sharing the same or similar opinions, and like more than one of them, he too spent many years in prison for political reasons. In that sense, it is a book about Rotrekl himself, or more precisely about what has been the most typical fate of Czech scholars over the past fifty years. This is another of the book's strengths: that it is not only inspirational reading but also a testimony. On the other hand, the author himself realised that it was beyond the means of any individual to complete such a task, of course; the individual chapters are of an uneven standard in terms of their exhaustiveness, the collation of data and Rotrekl's own comments. This is why the author sought to supplement some of the entries in the afterword, and why, in the foreword itself, he describes his texts as a "basis for future research". And in that respect, his book will certainly prove useful.

LUKAVICA NOTEBOOKS

Hana Ponická, *Lukavické zápisky 1977* (Lukavica Notebooks 1977). I-III. Samizdat, 332 + 226 + 262 pp. Lukavica 1985.

Contents: I. Return from escape (Návrat z úniku) 1. The green butterfly (Zelený motýl); 2. The blocked spring (Zastavený prameň); 3. "Le Monde"; II. Summer in Lukavica (Leto v Lukavici) (1. The appeal (Odvolanie); A mill for guests (Mlyn hostí); The bitter-apple tree

(Horká jabloň); III. The stone guest (Kamenný host') 1. The trial (Proces); 2. No prosecutor's warrant (Bez príkazu prokurátora); Christmas card (Vianočná pohľadnica).

Although relatively few Slovaks signed Charter 77, its impact on Slovakia would seem to have been greater than we once supposed. Further evidence of this is provided by Hana Ponická in her *Lukavica Notebooks 1977*, the minutely documented story of how her conscience was quickened and her determined stand for the truth. The essentials of the story are in fact well known and it even attracted world-wide attention ten years ago; we have had to wait for these three volumes of the *Lukavica Notebooks*, however, to discover the details of what actually happened.

Basically there is nothing very complex about the story, and unhappily it is one that is all too common. In February 1977, the Slovak Writer's Union called on Hana Ponická to sign a resolution condemning Charter 77, without giving her the opportunity to read the Charter's original text. Hana Ponická withstood the pressure on her and refused to sign the resolution. And she did not leave it at that. She also wrote a discussion paper for the 3rd Congress of the Slovak Writers' Union in March 1977, in which she set out the facts about Slovak literature, including that section of it which had been silenced, naming a score of authors who had been prevented from publishing for almost ten years by that time. She summed up the intention of her paper by quoting one of the speeches of the memorable 2nd Congress of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union in 1956. Recalling the fate of the then silenced writers and those in prison, the poet František Hrubín had declared from the rostrum of

that congress: “Those of us who happily go about our business, who go on writing and getting paid for it, who go to bed at night and sleep untroubled as if unaware of what is going on – those of us who fail to say out loud: ‘an injustice is being done here!’ are selfish crypto-bourgeois, no less, and those of us who are content merely to hide their shame are arrant cowards!” Hana Ponická was not content to go on hiding her shame.

Even though she had given the prescribed notice, she was not allocated an opportunity to speak at the congress. She therefore submitted her paper in writing and insisted that it should form part of the congress documentation according to the union’s rulebook. This resulted in renewed pressure and when she refused to climb down, reprisals began in earnest, including the removal of her manuscripts from the plans of publishing houses, a ban on her writings, a campaign of silence about her works, etc., in other words, exactly the sort of methods her discussion paper criticised. When her text subsequently appeared in the Parisian daily *Le Monde*, unbridled repression was unleashed against her, including police harassment, tailing, threats, interrogations: in short, the usual treatment meted out

to anyone in Czechoslovakia who has the courage to think otherwise and stick to their guns. The reader will find all the details in the three volumes of the *Lukavica Notebooks*. To those readers who feel they have read plenty of similar things already, I would only make the point that the constant recurrence of such realities proves that we can never have too many testimonies of this kind.

But it would be to underrate *Lukavica Notebooks 1977*, were we to read it solely as a testimony, though even as such it is no mean achievement. It is above all a riveting story, and I’d almost say a novel about one single – albeit fateful – year in the life of an individual human being who decided to be true to themselves always from that moment on. The individual discovers that that dearly-bought, though liberating decision suddenly endows everything with new meaning. So apart from being an exceptional testimony, as I have already indicated, *Lukavica Notebooks 1977* are a noteworthy literary achievement, a book about love, marriage, friendship and the solidarity of ordinary people, in other words the good, though arduous, fortune of being a human being among other people.

Acknowledgements

The Board of Management wishes to express its gratitude to those whose contributions have permitted the enlargement of the Centre and its collections.

† Dr. Johann Wolfgang Brügel, London
Dr. Oldřich Dubina, Paris
Milan Horáček, Frankfurt am Main
Dr. Antonín Kratochvíl, Munich
Erich Kulka, Jerusalem
Dr. Alexej Kusák, Cologne
Milan Nápravník, Cologne
Susanne Roth, Paris
Dr. Jiří Sláma, Munich
Dr. Ota Šik, St. Gallen
Ludvík Veselý, Munich

Financial contributions are administered by „Kulturamt der Landeshauptstadt Hannover“. Cheques may be sent directly to the Centre or funds may be transferred to following account: Kreissparkasse Peine (BLZ 25250001), Acc.-No. 35000595, „Dokumentationszentrum – Spendenkonto“. Contributors may stipulate specific projects which they would like to further (e. g. Patočka's Collected Works, Catalogue, Annual Survey).

THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN CHARTER 77 AND K. J. VON SCHWARZENBERG

Message of thanks to Karl Johannes von Schwarzenberg

(Charter 77 Document No.6/87)

Prague, 15 January 1987

Dear Sir,

We have learnt the glad news of the founding of the Czechoslovak documentation centre whose aim is to record and preserve the works of our independent literature, and are gratified to hear that you have made available premises within your castle as a fitting home for the centre.

We believe that this act of yours demonstrates the profound attachment you have to our national cause and your unflagging interest in the development of independent Czech and Slovak culture.

We are sending a small gift to mark this occasion.
With warm thanks and greetings,

Jan Litomiský	Dr. Libuše Šilhánová	Josef Vohryzek
Charter 77	Charter 77	Charter 77
spokesman	spokeswoman	spokesman

Letter from K. J. von Schwarzenberg

27 February 1987

A 1030 Rennweg 2
Vienna 3

Dear Madam,
Dear Sirs,

To tell you the truth, I am rather embarrassed by your letter and the fine tribute to Zahradníček by J.Jirásek which you sent me.

The reason is that when I compare your work and the conditions in which you and your friends perform the tasks you have set yourselves with the opportunities that I happen to enjoy here, the fact that I was able to supply a few rooms for the establishment of an archive is not worthy of mention.

If my forebears were able to preserve Czech historical documents of earlier centuries in their archives at Třeboň and Krumlov, then I can only hope that the new archive will serve a similar purpose today.

In short, I would beg you in future to take such things for granted and hope that the archive in question may soon find a home where it belongs, i.e. in Prague.

It is my conviction above all that each work of art that helps maintain the continuity and tradition of our cultural life is of greater importance in our particular situation than in the case of larger nations or of those countries that do not happen to be situated at historical crossroads.

It occurs to me that it is almost impossible to understand Czech history or our nation's leaders, let alone our failures* at fatal moments of our history without a knowledge of how our passage to freedom and self-reliance was repeatedly disrupted by truly unwonted reverses and losses, such as mark our endeavours to this very day.

The wearisome negation, time after time, of everything that went before and the proclamation of new times to last for ever have restricted our view of history and caused us to lose our instinctive awareness that realism, courage and truthfulness are a nation's essential foundation. It is for this very reason, that every endeavour to maintain continuity and prevent further losses is so important.

But if we manage to preserve and develop everything that has come into being in recent years, then we stand at least some chance of achieving a breakthrough to new consciousness.

I thank you with all my heart; you have made me very happy. Yours sincerely,

Schwarzenberg

* It's fascinating how in Czech the word for "failing" is derived from the word for "lying".

I realise that we do not view the world from any prominent vantage point, but even so I get the impression that a miracle has happened: the miraculous birth of a free culture which started with ordinary carbon-paper, old typewriters and the belief – regarded so sceptically nowadays – that it is worth while, that it makes sense as an effective defence against lies, oppression and stupidity.

Milan Šimečka (Bratislava)

What exactly is a 'parallel culture'? Nothing more and nothing less than a culture which, for various reasons will not, cannot or may not reach out to the public through the media which fall under state control. In a totalitarian state, this includes all publishing houses, presses, exhibition halls, theatres and concert halls, scholarly institutes and so on. Such a culture, therefore, can make use only of what is left -- typewriters, private studios, apartments, barns, etc. Evidently the 'parallel' nature of this culture is defined wholly externally and implies nothing directly about its quality, aesthetics or eventual ideology.

Václav Havel (Praha)

