

SUMMARY

The meeting between Austrian writer and critic Hermann Bahr and Czech poet and polemicist J. S. Machar in Vienna in 1892 and their subsequent work together at *Die Zeit* was a significant event both for Czech modernism and Czech-Viennese literary relations. An exposition of Bahr's work and his aesthetic opinions formed in Berlin, Paris and Vienna, as well as facets of Machar's Viennese experience, indicates the non-obvious nature of these meetings, which came about due to the conjunction of a number of personal, artistic and cultural-political circumstances. The search for a common level of understanding was made difficult by their different nationalities, differences in their personalities, their differing artistic orientations (Bahr focused on criticism, prose and drama, Machar on poetry and later the feuilleton) and their conceptions of modernism (in Machar's case, despite his proclaimed internationalism, a nationally-oriented conception of modernism based on a critical and skeptical approach, a desire for order and the volitional formation of an integrated personality; Bahr's conception is based on the constant variability of

SUMMARY

the individual and on the multiplicity, fusion and integration of Austrian national literatures). Both authors were, however, identical in their focus on the present.

Machar's apparently favourable stay in Vienna made these contacts in many respects more rather than less problematic, his autostylization of the "Watch on the Danube" polarized the speaker against the Viennese cultural and political environment, and his self-detachment was manifested in his poetic descriptions of Vienna as the national enemy and symbol of the decadence of modern times. In his poetry Vienna is depicted as an assimilating mechanism and nationality at this time of danger is manifested and construed as a positive value. In these representations, in his changing autostylization and conception of modernism, we can follow Machar's struggle with Vienna as with an imaginary (ideologically formed) and real urban space, and the national, social, cultural and political barriers and cultural stereotypes are confirmed here rather than brought down or overcome.

Bahr's initial interest in Bohemia and its literature was based on the framework of polyphonous Austrian modernism and motivated by the success of Czech theatre and music in Vienna in 1892, his interest in Czech modernists and their interpretation of Czech culture (but not in contact with older authors) being characteristic. Because of his lack of knowledge of Czech, Bahr was dependent upon intermediaries and translations, so Machar was an important source of information for him, while a series by Eduard Albert entitled *Poesie aus Böhmen*, whose aim was to balance German ideas of a merely popular Czech culture with an image of sophisticated Czech art, aspiring to universal values of benefit to all regardless of nationality, was essential reading for him to find his bearings in 19th century Czech literature. Die Zeit published articles, essays, reviews, comments and translations of and on Czech prose. Albert's anthologies familiarized the Viennese public with the broad range of Czech poetry. In terms of distribution, both projects were complementary, although they

differed substantially in their interpretation of Czech literature. Contacts with *Die Zeit* and Hermann Bahr gave Machar some support in the polemic disputes. The Viennese weekly provided him the opportunity to meet the general requirement for internationalism which the young generation set out in their programmatic texts; Bahr's programmatic essays also influenced Machar's formulation of Czech modernism. *Die Zeit's* openness towards Czech output brought with it practical problems, and the urgent need for translators also led to an interest in Prague German authors as potential intermediaries between Czech and German culture. Systematic collaboration between F. V. Krejčí and *Die Zeit* led to a unique view of relations between the Czech and Viennese literary modernist movements, reflecting the influence of political and social factors. With his reviews, information and translations in *Rozhledy*, Krejčí then attempted to open up further opportunities for literary exchange between Prague and Vienna, although he maintained that it was not possible to completely ignore or overcome the tensions and differences in view of the political status of the Czech lands within the empire. Development of journal networks between Vienna and Prague in the mid-1890s (*Die Zeit – Rozhledy – Čas – Naše doba*) is an important phenomenon, but it has to be said that the reception of work by Viennese authors in the Czech context took place more at the nominal level, and the difference in the two artistic contexts and the aforementioned cultural stereotypes were reflected in this evaluation (the reception of German modernism was much broader and more positive). From 1896/1897, Czech critics such as F. V. Krejčí, A. Procházka, F. X. Šalda and J. Kamper were joined as intermediaries between Prague and Vienna, and thus between young Czech and German literature, by such young German-language authors from Bohemia and Moravia as O. Wiener, P. Leppin, A. Donath, C. Hoffmann and E. Trager, whose original work was published and reviewed in parallel in German and Austrian modernist journals. At the same time Prague started to be thematized as

SUMMARY

a centre of German literature, not only by German critics associated with Prague (Alfred Klaar) or German population centres (Hanz Benzmann), but also by Czech critics (F. V. Krejčí). These intermediary relationship networks were substantially expanded by *Moderní revue* through its association with Przybyszewski, by means of whom writers and artists living in Berlin entered the Czech context and relationships were developed between Czech and Polish modernism. Thanks to Adolf Donath, the Viennese authors (Altenberg) were also reflected in *Moderní revue*. The network of relationships was further enhanced by Procházka's numerous acquaintanceships with German literati in Prague (e.g. E. Trager, R. M. Rilke, A. Guth and E. A. Bondy), who translated poems by *Moderní revue* authors into German, and who themselves published original or translated work and were reviewed in *Moderní revue*.

The view of Viennese modernism, and by extension all Vienna, at the turn of the century was thematized as aesthetic, hedonistic and apolitical from the 1950s standpoint of E. C. Schorske; this critical view of the Viennese environment was symptomatic and formative for a number of modernists (from Karl Kraus to Hermann Broch), a large number of whom were members of the Jewish intellectual (and artistic) elite – however, this critical view was also typical of the Czechs and Czech modernists (as shown by the interpretation of Machar's collection *Tristium Vindobona*). The formation of mutual relations was supposedly associated with the creation of a different Vienna: the demarcation of a "road to Vienna" by the Czech modernist movement of the 1890s also meant the creation of a different image of Vienna, similar to the image of Prague, and the inclusion of both metropolises in the network of European modernism.¹ However, collaboration with *Die Zeit* also brought with it or exacerbated numerous frustrati-

¹ Katherine David-Fox, Prague–Vienna, Prague–Berlin, s. 735–760.

ons caused by the necessity to present still crystallizing Czech modernism not only in all its internationalism, but also in all its Czechness. *Die Zeit* appealed to national identifications, but also to mutual exchange and openness, bringing a different type of confrontations and questions than the domestic literary situation, and authors had to again come to terms with the issue of German influence on Czech culture in the 19th century or with the idea of a single Austrian modernism, whose texts were close to those of prominent European modernist authors and the like. Hence the analyses in previous chapters also describe their mutual utilization, failures to connect with and understand each other and projections of their own desires (see Krejčí's idea of the balance in Bahr's work between cosmopolitanism and nationality and Bahr's similar interpretation of Czech culture in the first decade, while *Die Zeit* was used both ways by the Czechs, both for their own presentation abroad and for domestic struggles and the like).

Machar's collaboration with *Die Zeit* was most intensive in the mid-1890s. At the turn of the century Bahr and Machar turned away from the idea of a new federalist Austria – Machar in favour of an independent Czech state, while Bahr inclined towards the Habsburg tradition and the dynastic principle. Although their relations had cooled and despite Machar's aloof statement on Bahr and the Vienna authors in *Čas* in 1903, Bahr supported Czech art with increasing intensity and even though Jaroslav Kvapil replaced Machar as an intermediary and information provider, in the first decade Bahr would refer to Machar in the Austrian German-language press. This new wave of pro-Czech engagement was no longer motivated aesthetically, but politically, in the interests of preserving Austria.

The vantage point offered by the relations between Czech and Viennese literary modernism in the 1890s opens up a new context for the study of both modernist movements and turn-of-the-century modernism in general, raises new questions and topics, draws attention to the previously neglected activities of Czech and German-language Viennese authors and

SUMMARY

invites further research into the contacts between Prague Czech and German authors at the turn of the century and the older generation.