

ON THE RECEPTION OF VÁCLAV HANKA'S
CONTRIBUTION TO THE NINETEENTH-
CENTURY CZECH LANGUAGE REVIVAL*

Вот среди сей ночи темной,
Здесь, на пражских высотах,
Доблий муж рукою скромной
Засветил маяк впотьмах.

F. Tjutčev, *K. Ganke*, 1841.

conscia mens recti Hankaе mendacia ridet
Miklosich (1851: 318), freely after Ovid.

1. In his 1972 article "Sources and Methods of Lexical Enrichment in the Slavonic Language-Revivals of the Early Nineteenth Century", the late Robert Auty stressed, among other things, that *individual* influences played an important part in the codification of the Slavic literary languages of the Habsburg lands (cf. also idem 1958). Thus, the Croatian variant of standard Serbo-Croatian owes much to the personal activities and views of the politician Ljudevit Gaj (1809-1872) and his associates in the Illyrian movement. Likewise, the publicist L'udovít Štúr (1815-1856) played a leading role in the formation of standard Slovak based on its central dialects. As for Czech, the language to be discussed here, it was the great Enlightenment scholar Josef Dobrovský (1753-1829), who was instrumental in the formation of its literary variant, mainly by reestablishing the classical grammatical and lexical norms of the sixteenth century—the 'golden age'—as represented by the *Kralice Bible*.

The subject of this paper is one of Dobrovský's pupils whose wedding he attended as a witness on February 11, 1822 (cf. Gebauer 1887: 499, n. 2) — Václav Hanka (1791-1861). Hanka made a rather unorthodox contribution to the nineteenth-century revival of the Czech literary language. While Dobrovský "revealed the half-forgotten trea-

asures of the older Czech language to a younger generation eager to exploit them" (Auty 1958: 403), Hanka, who belonged to this very same younger generation, was not satisfied with simple revelations. For what was one to do if there were no sufficiently glorious treasures to be uncovered? Hanka's solution to this problem was simple and effective; he created the treasures himself.

2. Whereas Auty concentrated on outstanding scholars like Dobrovský, whose scholarly integrity is beyond dispute, I shall focus here on the rather disreputable figure of Hanka. At first sight it may seem odd to study a person who deliberately distorted the historical record. However, as Edmund K. Chambers noted in his 1891 essay entitled *The History and Motives of Literary Forgeries*: "the literary forger is emphatically the child of his time, and this not merely in the obvious sense that his art is conditioned by the existing limitations of literary science. He is always in touch with the main current of ideas; the chief interests of the epoch to which he belongs are his chief interests" (1891: 36). A similar view was expressed by Giles Constable: "Forgeries and plagiarisms [...] follow rather than create fashion and can without paradox be considered among the most authentic products of their time" (1983: 2). In this paper, I shall try to show that in the course of time Hanka's products have proven to be more influential than those of the most famous grand masters of literary deception in the age of Enlightenment and Romanticism: James Macpherson (1736-1796), composer of the Ossian-poems, and Thomas Chatterton (1752-1770), creator of the Rowley-poems. Unfortunately, the aftermath of Hanka's activities has not yet come to an end, as will be pointed out below (sections 5 and 6).

3. Hanka was born in 1791 in Hořineves in North Bohemia. When he died in 1861, he had been a librarian in the Czech National Museum in Prague for more than forty years — a convenient position for a would-be forger to occupy. Those were the days of the Czech national revival. Bohemia had been under the rule of the Habsburg dynasty since 1526. After the defeat of the Czech Protestant Estates in the Battle of the White Mountain in 1620, political and cultural life in Bohemia had come to a standstill. The loss of autonomy also implied that the status of Czech declined in favor of German. The national reawakening began toward the end of the eighteenth century under the influence of the political and ideological doctrines of the Enlightenment and the emergence of modern nationalism. As for Czech literature, especially the pre-Romantic time span of 1817-1835 within the national revival

* This is a revised version of a paper read on March 15, 1989, at the Slavic Department of the University of California, Los Angeles. Research for this paper was supported by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, N.W.O. I am grateful to Willem Vermeer for many helpful comments.

(cf. Harkins 1970), may be characterized as a forced attempt to fill the cultural gap of the preceding two centuries. There was a craving to rediscover and celebrate Bohemia's national past and to reveal the essence of the national soul in Czech literature. In particular, ancient folk songs, popular poetry, legends, and fairy tales were in high favor with the Czech patriots. They provided the tangible proof for romantic ideas about the unspoiled character, natural grandeur, and purity of the national soul. In this context, it is not surprising that enthusiastic patriots went in search of further evidence for a great cultural past. Obviously, Hanka had no scruples about helping fortune in this search.

The story begins in 1817-1818, when Hanka, probably with the help of the journalist and poet Josef Linda (1789-1834), came up with his two most successful literary deceptions — the texts known as the *Rukopisy Královédvorský* and *Zelenohorský*. The former, 28 pages long, purported to be a fragment from a large codex of the thirteenth century. It included six epic poems that celebrated glorious Czech battles against foreign enemies and that testified to an early and highly developed Christian civilization in Bohemia. In addition, it contained two lyrical compositions and six short love-songs. The *Rukopis Zelenohorský*, although only eight pages long, was of an even more ambitious scope. It was supposed to be a ninth-century work containing fragments of two epic poems, entitled *Sněm* ('The Gathering') and *Libušín soud* ('Libuše's Judgment'). The latter deals with a lawsuit between two brothers fighting over the rights of succession. The poem is blatantly anachronistic in the way it depicts allegedly ninth-century jurisdiction on the basis of nineteenth-century principles; moreover, it clearly displays the anti-German sentiments that were common among many Czech-speaking inhabitants of nineteenth-century Bohemia. For instance, at the end of *Libušín soud* we read: "nehualno nam u nemceh iscati p(ra)udu u nas p(ra)uda po zaconu suatu" ("It is inglorious for us to seek justice from (the) Germans; we have justice under the holy law").

A romantic falsification, of course, calls for a romantic discovery. Thus, Hanka chose an appropriate *mise-en-scène* to bring the *Rukopis Královédvorský* to light. Václav A. Svoboda (1791-1849), one of Hanka's greatest admirers, gives in the introduction to his German translation of the manuscript the following account of Hanka's conduct:

Am 16. September 1817 zum Besuche bei einem Jugendfreunde in [...] Königinhof [...], hört [Hanka], dass in einem niedrigen Mittelgewölbe des Kirchenturmes unter dem Musikchore eine Sammlung Pfeile liege aus den Zeiten jener unheilvollen Zerstörung der Stadt. Er wünscht sie zu sehen, und wie er darunter wühlt, stösst er auf einige Blättchen Pergament. Er sieht sie

beschrieben mit lateinischer Schrift, im helleren Raum der Kirche findet er, dass die Handschrift böhmisch sei, und bald hat er den Inhalt entziffert, der ihn mit Begeisterung erfüllt. Den Stadtbehörden und den Gebildeteren lies't er das erste Fragment vor. Die Versammlung theilt seine Begeisterung, und, ehrend den Wink des Schicksals, dass gerade dieser redliche Eiferer gefunden, was vielleicht Jahrhunderte hindurch unbeachtet da gelegen, weis't man ihm das Eigenthum des herrlichen Fundes zu. (Svoboda 1829: VIII)

The *Rukopis Zelenohorský* was sent to the Czech National Museum in 1818 by an anonymous donor from Zelená Hora. Hanka's indisputable talent for histrionics comes again to the fore in the letter that the donor enclosed with his gift:

In unserm Hausarchive lagen anliegende vier Blatt Pergament vielleicht Jahrhunderte lang im Staube verworfen. Da ich aber die erhabenen Gesinnungen meines Herrn (der ein eingefleischter deutscher Michel ist) in Rücksicht des Nationalmuseums kenne: denn er würde es lieber verbrannt o. verfault sehen als selbes dieser Anstalt zu schenken, so verfiel ich auf den Gedanken diese Blätter an Ew. Excellenz anonym zu senden, denn unter meinem Namen liefe ich Gefahr meines Dienstes verlustig zu werden. (Cited in Šafařík and Palacký 1840: 167)

The letter concludes with the statement: "Mit Bley geschrieben damit man meine Hand nicht erkenne" (quoted in idem 1840: 168).

The two manuscripts met exactly the Czechs' needs for tangible proof of a great and glorious national past. Their enthusiasm could not have been voiced better than by Svoboda who wrote in 1829:

[Man beklagte] überall den Mangel alter Volksdichtungen [...] eines so sinnigen Volkes, das seine Kraft bewährt und seine Treue, seinen Biedersinn in Tagen schwerer Prüfung, in stürmischen Zeiten. [...] Hanka's glücklicher Fund befriedigte die Sehnsucht, zeigte uns, was auch hierin die Kraft der Čechen gegoten. Daher die Begeisterung, mit der die seltsam herrliche Erscheinung, das glänzende Licht aus unserer Vorzeit, begrüsst wurde. (Svoboda 1829: X-XI)

After their 'discovery', the *Rukopisy Královédvorský* and *Zelenohorský* were quickly studied and discussed from all angles and translated into several modern languages. Goethe reworked Svoboda's German translation of the love-song *Kytice* ('The Bouquet') from the *Rukopis Královédvorský*, and Smetana composed the opera *Libuše* on the basis of *Libušín soud*.

It is astonishing that almost no one harbored the least suspicion, if only because the documents appeared out of the blue precisely at the

desired time. In the first decades after the 'discovery' of the manuscripts there were only few scholars who stood up against Hanka's blatant attempts to lead Czech historiography and philology astray. Especially Hanka's professor, Josef Dobrovský, repeatedly tried to put his pupil on the right track. In a letter of 1828 to Bartholomaeus Kopitar, Dobrovský, then seventy-five years old, relates:

als ich [Hanka] meinen Unwillen mündlich bezeugte, dass man durch solche Unterschiebung [viz. *Libuřin soud*] die Welt täusche, äusserte er sich mit diesen Worten: es wäre wohl zu wünschen, dass die Böhmen so was Altes aufweisen könnten. (Cited in Vasmer 1938: XXX, n. 1)

Needless to say, Dobrovský's numerous attempts to denounce Hanka's literary deceptions were not received favorably by the forger's numerous protectors. As Milada Součková puts it: "The stakes were too high, both for Czech literature and for the nation" (1958: 28). A venerable old man found himself opposed to a fanatic younger generation. Two scholars of the younger generation, Pavel J. Šafařík (1795-1861) and František Palacký (1798-1876), even tried to ascribe Dobrovský's attitude to his mental condition:

Im Sommer 1828 verfiel er [...] bekanntlich in seine periodische Gemüths-krankheit [...]. Auch scheint diese Krankheit von jeher nicht ohne Einfluss auf sein Benehmen in dieser Sache geblieben zu sein. Gewiss ist es, dass er in lichten Augenblicken oft (gegen uns selbst) das Bedauern äusserte, in dem Streite so weit gegangen zu sein. (Šafařík and Palacký 1840: 173; cf. also Auty 1958: 396, n. 2, Zacek 1984: 44)

The lexicographer Josef Jungmann (1773-1847), compiler of the influential *Slovník česko-německý* (1835-39), also considered Dobrovský's attitude blasphemous: "my obmanulis' v etom čelověkě, ja pravda vseгда polagal, čto on ne čex, a tol'ko slavizirujuščij němec" (quoted in Jagić 1910: 132; cf. also Hanuš et al. 1911²: 286, Auty 1970: 17). At the same time, Jungmann wrote to Hanka:

Mögen Sie nur ebenso wie bisher still und geräuschlos, wo und wie es nur möglich ist, daran arbeiten, dass unsere Nationalität nicht untergehe; der Dank und der Segen der kommenden Generationen wird Ihnen nicht ausbleiben. (Cited in Zeil 1967: 193)

In response to Dobrovský's dismissal of the *Rukopis Zelenohorský* as spurious, Hanka's most fanatic defender, Svoboda, reaches new heights by stating:

wenn Herr D. n i c h t geirrt, wenn die Handschrift wirklich das Werk eines glücklichen Genies in unserer Mitte wäre — wie es ganz gewiss nicht ist — so war er doch nicht berechtigt, den etwaigen Verfasser auf diese Weise öffentlich zu beschimpfen. Wir würden uns glücklich schätzen, einen zweiten Chatterton in unserer Mitte zu haben und würden, ohne auf die historische Echtheit seiner Werke ein besonderes Gewicht zu legen, ihn bitten, recht viel so Gelungenes wie dieses, gleich dem unglücklichen Briten, zu schaffen. [...] wir sind der innigen Überzeugung, dass ein genialer Chatterton die Kultur mehr fördert, als Männer, die durch allzuweit getriebene Kritik Jahrhunderte entvölkern. (Cited in Heřman 1974: 164; cf. also Jakobson 1931: 275)

However, Dobrovský was not alone; two other eminent Slavists attacked the authenticity of Hanka's literary products — Bartholomaeus Kopitar (1780-1844) and Franz Miklosich (1813-1891). Kopitar was among the first to dismiss the *Rukopis Královédvorský* as spurious (cf., e.g., 1840: 58-59, and also Šafařík and Palacký 1840: 207-208, n. 10, Vasmer 1938: XXVIII-XXXI, Pogačnik 1978: 81). As early as 1840, he wrote to Jacob Grimm:

die Königinhofer H-ft etc. p i a e f r a u d e s a d m a j. Boh. gloriam: Dobr. klagte mir oft über H**s fanatische I m m o r a l i t ä t in diesem Punkte" (Cited in Vasmer 1938: 187)

In 1851 Miklosich published a masterly lampoon entitled "Entgegnung auf herrn Wenzel Hanka's albernheiten und lügen", in which he poses two questions: "Ist herr Wenzel Hanka in Prag ein Slavist?" and "Ist herr Wenzel Hanka in Prag ein mann von ehre?" (Miklosich 1851: 269, 317). His answer to both questions is a wholehearted no! In the same article we find an example of Hanka's practice of taking unfair advantage of those to whom he had rendered a service (cf. also Karásek 1904: 151). Hanka reproaches Miklosich for disapproving of his literary writings. For was he not the one who had provided Miklosich with a copy of the recently published edition of the *Ostromir Gospel*? Miklosich's reply is devastating:

Liebe freunde! Lasst euch ja nie von Hanka eine gefälligkeit erweisen, ihr müsst dann zu allem unsinn, den er in die welt schickt, schweigen, oder ihm gar glauben, ihr müsst am ende Hanka für einen gelehrten halten. (Miklosich 1851: 311)

The turning point came in 1886-87, more than twenty-five years after Hanka's death, when several lengthy articles were published that mercilessly exposed the fraud. In a sociological analysis of the manuscripts, Tomáš G. Masaryk (1850-1937) laid bare the numerous ana-

chronisms and the many historical conceptions and events which were depicted in a vague and contradictory way (cf., e.g., Masaryk 1887). The texts could be completely explained on the basis of the literature available to Hanka in 1817. Jan Gebauer (1838-1907) undertook a linguistic analysis and concluded that the language of the manuscripts differed from genuine Old Czech in many instances (cf., e.g., Gebauer 1887). Their orthography, phonology, and morphology were all inconsistent in major respects. The forger used Old Czech and Old Church Slavonic forms indiscriminately in ways that were unparalleled elsewhere. The language of both manuscripts fully reflected the linguistic and philological knowledge of the time of their 'discovery'.

To give an impression of the tremendous impact that Hanka's two major literary deceptions had even on later Czech philology, it may suffice to present some details and figures taken from a bibliography compiled by Miroslav Laiske in 1969. His select bibliography on the *Rukopisy Královédvorský* and *Zelenohorský* contains more than a thousand titles. According to Laiske (1969: 323), the total amount of literature runs into ten thousands of items. Both manuscripts are available in approximately sixty editions and forty translations into languages such as Russian, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Hungarian, German, French, English, Italian, and Swedish. Masaryk dedicated some twenty-five articles and Gebauer even some forty-five to the manuscript controversy. The documents were submitted to chemical analysis on three separate occasions (cf. also Kašpar 1969: 276). Special attention was paid to the subject in 1867, 1917, and 1967 to commemorate the fiftieth, hundredth, and hundred-fiftieth anniversaries of the 'discovery' of the spurious documents. The *Rukopisy Královédvorský* and *Zelenohorský* were so widely known that one could simply refer to them by using the single word *Rukopisy*.

4. In his extravagant passion to enrich the Czech cultural legacy, Hanka did not restrict himself to the *Rukopisy*. His actions conformed to the basic principle of free enterprise: where there is a sudden demand, the supply instantly follows. In addition to the *Rukopisy*, I shall now briefly sum up the principal products of Hanka's imagination (cf. Truhlář 1887, and also Hanuš et al. 1911²: 843-844, 866-871, Souček 1924, Václavěk 1939, Mann 1957-58: 492, Kočí 1969: 25-26):

— The Old Czech Vyšehrad Song Nr. 1 (created by Hanka in collaboration with Linda); allegedly discovered by Hanka's roommate Linda in 1816 and published by Hanka in the following year.

— The Old German version of the Vyšehrad Song Nr. 1; purportedly bestowed on the Czech National Museum in the 1850s.

— The Old Czech Vyšehrad Song Nr. 2; a later version of Nr. 1 that was probably prepared after the original had vanished.

— The Old Czech love-song of King Václav; allegedly sent to the Czech National Museum in 1819 and published by Hanka in 1823.

— The Old Czech interlinear translation of Psalm 109 and the beginning of Psalm 145 in a Latin Psalter with genuine Old Czech glosses from the thirteenth century; published for the first time by Hanka in 1827.

— Some eight hundred Old Czech glosses inserted in a genuine Old Czech vocabulary (known as the *Mater Verborum*); allegedly discovered by Hanka in 1827 (see below).

— The Old Czech interlinear translation of a Latin fragment of St. John's Gospel; allegedly found by Hanka in 1828 inside the covers of an old book (see below).

— The Old Czech prophecies of Libuše Nr. 1; allegedly discovered by Hanka in 1849.

— The Old Czech prophecies of Libuše Nr. 2; a duplicate of Nr. 1 that was found in the legacy of a functionary of the Czech National Museum.

This brief survey of Hanka's most successful literary deceptions shows clearly his predilection for adding so-called Old Czech glosses to Latin manuscripts. His greatest achievement in this particular field is without doubt the Old Czech interlinear version of a part of St. John's Gospel, which is listed in Jungmann's *Historie literatury české* (1849²: 16) as a genuine work from the tenth century (for an edition and facsimile see Šafařík and Palacký 1840: 103-166). Since Hanka had many authentic early Czech versions of the Gospel at his disposal, it was nearly impossible to detect the fraud on the basis of its contents. When the fragment was first shown to Dobrovský, he is reported to have cried out: "Ah, das ist etwas Anderes!" (quoted in Šafařík and Palacký 1840: 172), meaning that it was not a spurious work as in the case of the *Rukopis Zelenohorský*. However, after analyzing the language and handwriting of the *St. John Fragment*, Dobrovský changed his mind. Šafařík and Palacký relate:

Gegen [Hanka], den er nun direct als den grossen Falsarius bezeichnete, sprach er kategorisch: "schweigen Sie davon, ich werde auch schweigen." Herr Hanka, der sich stets als Dobrowsky's dankbarer Schüler schrieb und bewies, verschloss dem zu folge das unglückselige Fragment, und wollte es seitdem auch uns nicht mehr sehen lassen. Er suchte jede Kränkung des alten hochverdienten Mannes zu vermeiden, und tröstete sich über die Unbill, die ihm widerfuhr, mit dem richtigeren und billigeren Urtheile der Nachwelt. (Šafařík and Palacký 1840: 172)

5. The life and works of Hanka have received renewed attention since 1979, when Josef Hamm published a book in which he argued that the *Kiev Leaflets*, generally attributed to the late ninth or the tenth century and as such regarded as the oldest extant continuous text in Slavic, were in fact a nineteenth-century mystification of Hanka. Although Hanka's conscience is burdened with an extensive corpus of fraudulent texts, it is inconceivable that either he or any of his contemporaries would have been capable of fabricating a manuscript like the *Kiev Leaflets* (cf. further Schaeken 1987: 175-200).

In contrast with the *Kiev Leaflets*, it is far more difficult to prove or disprove the authenticity of some Old Czech glosses that can be connected with Hanka in one way or another. It will come as no surprise that the collection of Old Czech glosses and glossaries composed by Hanka in 1833 is absolutely unreliable. To give an example, Hanka claims in the introduction to his edition of a genuine fourteenth-century Latin-Czech glossary (1833: 155-174) that the edition consists merely of a selection of words. However, as Bohumil Ryba has pointed out (1981-82), the list of cited words is not only completely exhaustive but also contains over sixty additional glosses taken by Hanka from an entirely different manuscript.

In the case of the thirteenth-century *Mater Verborum*, it is often hard to determine whether a gloss is genuine or not (cf. Šafařík and Palacký 1840: 205-233, Patera and Baum 1877, Jagić 1879). Soon after his 'discovery' of the glosses, Hanka wrote to A.S. Šiškov in 1827:

Kakaja radost' dlja menja obrěsti Slovar' s češkimi vyrazami [...], v kotom ne tokmo mnogija iz upotreblenija vyšedšija slova, no i imena raznyx slovenskix bogov po nyně neizvěstnyx. (Cited in Ml.[?] 1912: 147-148)

There is no doubt that the numerous mythological names in the *Mater Verborum* are the products of Hanka's fertile imagination. The same applies to the consistent translation of nineteen different Latin pejoratives such as *barbarus* 'barbarian', *tardus* 'sluggish', *imperitus* 'ignorant', *stolidus* 'stolid' or *truculentus* 'truculent' by the single word *němec* 'German' (cf. Šafařík and Palacký 1840: 191, 218, Jagić 1879: 115-116).

Another example of the aftermath of Hanka's activities as a glossator is the still unresolved question of whether the so-called *Patera Glosses*, which date to the beginning of the twelfth century, contain spurious glosses. Here and there, the language of the glosses seems to resemble that of the St. John *Fragment*, which is known to be forged (cf. Patera

1878, Gebauer 1894: 117, Jagić 1903: 32-35, 38-41, 1910: 11-12, Weingart 1949: 76-83, Mareš 1979: 213-216). However, from a linguistic point of view there is, in my opinion, no reason to suspect Hanka of any misdemeanour in this case, although only a future chemical analysis can bring us absolute certainty concerning the authenticity of the *Patera Glosses* (cf. Schaeken 1989: 165-166).

6. In the beginning of this paper, I mentioned Robert Auty's 1972 article on lexical enrichment during the early nineteenth-century Slavic language revival. Hanka's contribution to this process should not be underestimated. According to Bohuslav Havránek (1936: 92), the *Rukopisy Královédvorský* and *Zelenohorský* provided modern Czech with around hundred words (cf. also Frinta 1918, Šimek 1926). Hanka was especially keen on reviving Old Czech words that had gone out of use, as e.g., *jary* 'brisk, lively', *ladný* 'nice', *pěvec* 'singer', *věhlasný* 'famous', and *zračiti se* 'be reflected'. He also frequently borrowed words from other Slavic languages, especially from Russian, as for instance *dálný* 'distant', *družný* 'sociable', *hovor* 'talk', and *chrabry* 'brave'. All these words are used in the modern Czech literary language.

Since Hanka was a far from talented linguist, he sometimes failed to convert his borrowings into their historically correct Czech forms. This, for example, is the case with the Russian loanwords *bodry*, *bodrost* 'jovial, joviality' and *plzný, plzně* 'useful, usefulness' which are attested either in the *Rukopisy Královédvorský* and *Zelenohorský* or in the *Mater Verborum*. Hanka was obviously unaware of the fact that *-o-* in Russian *bodryj* corresponds to the vowel *e* in Czech. For this reason, the expected form is **bedrý* instead of Hanka's *bodry* (cf. Gebauer 1887: 505, 1896b: 315-316, Komárek 1969: 211). As for Russian *poleznyj, pol' za*, which is a compound of the prefix *po* and the root **lbg-*, Hanka apparently misinterpreted the cluster *-ol-* as being of the same nature as for instance in Russian *polnyj* 'full' and its Czech equivalent *plný*. Possibly misled by the sound of the Czech place-name *Plzeň*, he thus created the etymologically incorrect words *plzný* and *plzně* (cf. Gebauer 1887: 506, 1896b: 316-317).

As far as I know, Hanka's *corpus dclicti* contains only one word that has led scholars astray up to the present day. It is the alleged Old Czech word for 'niece', *neti*. Some scholars consider it to be an isolated remnant of a Proto-Slavic *r*-stem, while others prefer to explain it as a secondary Old Czech formation (cf., e.g., Isačenko 1953: 70-71, 75-77, Trubačev 1959: 76-79, Bräuer 1969: 79, Arumaa 1985: 37-38). I agree that *neti* is indeed a secondary formation; however, it originated

not in the Old Czech period but in the nineteenth century and happens to be exclusively attested in the *Mater Verborum* with its numerous falsified glosses. As Vatroslav Jagić pointed out as early as 1879, the gloss *neti* is as spurious as the etymologically incorrect form *sesti* 'sister', which occurs in the same document (1879: 121-122; cf. also idem 1880: 155, Gebauer 1896a: 428, Fraenkel 1950: 63, n. 1, Vaillant 1958: 258). Nevertheless, the word *neti* has entered modern Czech, where it is now attested as *net*.

7. Hanka's literary deceptions demonstrate his inability or unwillingness to handle fact and fiction in an ethical way. Apart from his literary activities, other examples of this dubious attitude toward truth and decency can easily be found. Let me cite two examples. First, Hanka misinformed his biographer, Legis-Glückselig, about his youth. He stated that he received no schooling until the age of sixteen, because he had to take care of his father's cattle. As a matter of fact, Hanka was sent to high school ('Gymnasium') as early as 1804, at the age of thirteen (cf. Gebauer 1887: 496 and n. 1, Jagić 1910: 248). Second, Hanka once sent Šafařík a visiting card printed in Glagolitic. This must have come as a shock to Šafařík, who had himself designed this very Glagolitic type for the printing firm Haase a short time before and who had obtained the right to be the first to use it in print. Hanka, however, had somehow managed to prevail on Haase so that he could claim to have the first prints of this type (cf. Karásek 1904: 151-152).

It would be simplistic to explain Hanka's fraudulent practices as something that more or less could be expected in a romantic and hyperpatriotic milieu and age. While his forgeries were certainly a product of their time, they were above all the product of a man whose behavior in this respect can be characterized as mythomania. In his own way, Hanka tried to achieve fame both for his country and for himself. As I have tried to illustrate here, from 1817-1818 to the present his literary activities have provoked a continuous and overwhelming stream of differing reactions, ranging from naive enthusiasm, common sense, partial vindication (cf., e.g., Jakobson 1931), and even uncalled-for suspicion (cf. Hamm 1979). In the nineteenth century, the reception of Hanka's creations involved much more than an argument over their authenticity. For patriots, the *Rukopisy Královédvorský* and *Zelenohorský*, in particular, were a metaphor of Bohemia's right to independence, whereas for unbiased critics they provided an additional stimulus to gain a better insight into the history of Czech language and culture. Nowadays, the study of Hanka's legacy should no longer be obscured by sentimental and nationalistic feelings. However, because of the difficult task of de-

termining the complete corpus of falsified glosses, the case of Václav Hanka will probably remain open to debate for a long time to come.

References

- Arumaa, P., 1985: *Urslavische Grammatik. Einführung in das vergleichende Studium der slavischen Sprachen. III: Formenlehre*, Heidelberg.
- Auty, R., 1958: "The Linguistic Revival Among the Slavs of the Austrian Empire, 1780-1850: The Role of Individuals in the Codification and Acceptance of New Literary Languages", *MLR* 53, 392-404.
- 1970: "Changing Views on the Role of Dobrovský in the Czech National Revival", *The Czech Renaissance of the Nineteenth Century. Essays Presented to Otakar Odložilík in Honour of His Seventieth Birthday* (eds. P. Brock and H.G. Skilling), Toronto, 14-25.
- 1972: "Sources and Methods of Lexical Enrichment in the Slavonic Language-Revivals of the Early Nineteenth Century", *The Slavic Word. Proceedings of the International Slavistic Colloquium at UCLA, September 11-16, 1970* (ed. D.S. Worth), The Hague-Paris, 41-52, 54-56.
- Bräuer, H., 1969: *Slavische Sprachwissenschaft. III: Formenlehre 2*, Berlin.
- Chambers, E.K., 1891: *The History and Motives of Literary Forgeries*, Oxford-London.
- Constable, G., 1983: "Forgery and Plagiarism in the Middle Ages", *Archiv für Diplomatik* 29, 1-41.
- Fraenkel, E., 1950: "Slavisch *gospodь*, lit. *viešpats*, preuss. *waispattin* und Zubehör", *ZfslPh* 20, 51-89.
- Frinta, A., 1918: "Rukopisné podvrhy a naše spisovná řeč", *Naše řeč* 2, 1-4.
- Gebauer, J., 1887: "Unechtheit der Königinhofer und Grüneberger Handschrift", *AfslPh* 10, 496-569.
- 1894: *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. I: Hláskosloví*, Praha-Vídeň.
- 1896a: *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. III: Tvarosloví. 1: Skloňování*, Praha-Vídeň.
- 1896b: "O nové obraně padělaného Rukopisu Královédvorského", *LF* 23, 275-379.
- Hamm, J., 1979: *Das Glagolitische Missale von Kiew*, Wien.
- Hanka, V., 1833: *Zbírka neydávnějšich slownjků latinsko-českých*, Praha.
- Hanuš, J., J. Jakubec, J. Máchal and J. Vlček, 1911²: *Literatura česká devatenáctého století. I: Od Dobrovského k Jungmannově škole básnické*, Praha.
- Harkins, W.E., 1970: "The Periodization of Czech Literary History, 1774-1879", *The Czech Renaissance of the Nineteenth Century. Essays Presented to Otakar*

- Odložilík in Honour of His Seventieth Birthday (eds. P. Brock and H.G. Skilling), Toronto, 3-13.
- Havránek, B., 1936: "Vývoj spisovného jazyka českého", Československá vlastivěda. II: Spisovný jazyk český a slovenský, Praha, 1-144.
- Heřman, M., 1974: Josef Dobrovský. Literární a prozodická bohemika, Praha.
- Isačenko, A.V., 1953: "Indoevropskaja i slavjanskaja terminologija rodstva v svete marksistskogo jazykoznanija", Slavia 22, 43-80 (= Opera Selecta 1976: 62-97).
- Jagić, V., 1879: "Die Fälschungen in der Mater Verborum des Prager Codex", AfslPh 3, 112-123.
- 1880: Review of I.I. Sreznevskij, 1878: Češskija glossy v Mater Verborum. Razbor A.O. Patery i dopolnitel'nyja zaměčanija, Sanktpeterburg, AfslPh 4, 155-157.
- 1903: Kirchenslavisch-böhmische Glossen saec. XI-XII (= Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Klasse 50/2), Wien.
- 1910: Istorija slavjanskoj filologii (= Ěnciklopedija slavjanskoj filologii 1), Sanktpeterburg.
- Jakobson, R., 1931: "Pamjati Vjačeslava Vjačeslavoviča Ganki", Central'naja Evropa 1931/5, 268-275 (= Selected Writings VI/2, 1985: 696-703).
- Jungmann, J., 1835-39: Slownjk česko-německý, Praha.
- 1849²: Historie literatury české, Praha.
- Karásek, J., 1904: Review of V.A. Francev, 1902: Očerki po istorii češskago vozroždenija. Russko-češskija učenyja svjazi konca XVIII i pervoj poloviny XIX st., Varšava, AfslPh 26, 145-156.
- Kašpar, J. 1969: "Rukopisy královédvorský a zelenohorský — paleografický přepis", in: Otruba 1969, 275-322.
- Kočí, J., 1969: "Spory o Rukopisy v české společnosti", in: Otruba 1969, 25-48.
- Komárek, M., 1969: "Jazykovědná problematika RKZ", in: Otruba 1969, 197-274.
- Kopitar, B., 1840: Hesychii glossographi discipulus et epiglössistēs russu in ipsa Constantinopoli sec. XII-XIII, Vindobonae.
- Laiske, M., 1969: "Bibliografie RKZ" in: Otruba 1969, 323-408.
- Mann, S.E., 1957-58: "Václav Hanka's Forgeries", SEER 36, 491-496.
- Mareš, F.W., 1979: An Anthology of Church Slavonic Texts of Western (Czech) Origin, München.
- Masaryk, T.G., 1887: "Skizze einer sociologischen Analyse der sogenannten Grüneberger und Königihofers Handschrift", AfslPh 10, 54-101.
- Miklosich, F., 1851: "Entgegnung auf herrn Wenzel Hanka's albernheiten und lügen", Slavische bibliothek 1, 267-321.
- MI. [?], 1912: "Koncept listu Hankova z r. 1827", ČMF 2, 147-148.
- Otruba, M., ed., 1969: Rukopisy královédvorský a zelenohorský. Dnešní stav poznání, Praha.
- Patera, A., 1878: "České a starobulharské glossy XII století v latinském rukopise kapitulní knihovny v Praze", ČMKČ 52, 536-557.

- and A. Baum, 1877: "Česke glossy a miniatury v Mater Verborum", ČMKČ 51, 120-149, 372-390, 488-513.
- Pogačnik, J., 1978: Bartholomäus Kopitar. Leben und Werk, München.
- Ryba, B., 1981-82: "Hankův klam při edici staročeského Nomenklátoru", Sborník Památníku národního písemnictví 16-17, 173-180.
- Šafařík, P.J. and F. Palacký, 1840: Die ältesten Denkmäler der böhmischen Sprache: Libuša's Gericht, Evangelium Johannis, der Leitmeritzer Stiftungsbrief, Glossen der Mater Verborum, Prag.
- Schaeken, J., 1987: Die Kiever Blätter, Amsterdam.
- 1989: "Die tschechisch-kirchenslavischen Patera-Glossen (St. Gregor-Glossen, Prager Glossen)", WSJb 35, 159-191.
- Šimek, F., 1926: "O vzájemném vlivu jazyka Antonína Marka a jazyka podvrhů družiny Hankovy", MNHMA. Sborník vydaný na paměť čtyřicátiletého učitelského působení Prof. Josefa Zubatého, Praha, 229-234.
- Souček, S., 1924: Dvě pozdní mystifikace Hankovy, Praha.
- Součková, M., 1958: The Czech Romantics, 's-Gravenhage.
- Svoboda, V.A., 1829: Königihofers Handschrift, Prag.
- Trubačev, O.N., 1959: Istorija slavjanskix terminov rodstva i nekotoryx drevnejšix terminov obščestvennogo stroja, Moskva.
- Truhlář, J., 1887: "Anerkannte Falsa der böhmischen Literatur aus der ersten Hälfte unseres Jahrhunderts", AfslPh 10, 101-105.
- Václavek, B., 1939: "Nové 'falsum' Hankovo", ČMF 25, 157-160.
- Vaillant, A., 1958: Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. II: Morphologie. 1: Flexion nominale, Paris.
- Vasmer, M., 1938: B. Kopitars Briefwechsel mit Jakob Grimm (= Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Klasse 1937/7), Berlin.
- Weingart, M., 1949: Československý typ církevní slovančiny. Jeho pamiatky a význam, Bratislava.
- Zacek, J.F., 1984: "František Palacký and 'The Battle of the Manuscripts'", Nationalities Papers 12, 39-48.
- Zeil, W., 1967: Bolzano und die Sorben. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des "Wendischen Seminars" in Prag zur Zeit der josefinischen Aufklärung und der Romantik, Bautzen.