A romance and a tragedy: Antonín Salač and the French School at Athens

Thea De Armond

Defined, in culture-historical fashion, as the regions occupied by the ancient Greeks and Romans, the ‘Classical world’ once spanned much of Europe and parts of Asia and Africa.¹ The study of the Classical world – in particular, its archaeology – has been somewhat more limited in geographical scope, or rather, its most prominent forebears tend to hail from only a few places, namely Germany, Great Britain, France and, perhaps, the United States of America (see Dyson, 2006). It is not surprising that the history of Classical archaeology maps onto geopolitics. After all, with their shared claims to universality, Classics and empire have much in common (Porter, 2006; Bradley, 2010); Classical materials – like so many other desirable goods – gravitate toward power.

Of course, Classics has never been the sole provenance of the powerful. Even the geopolitically ‘marginal’ have sought their share of Classical culture (see Stephens and Vasunia, 2010), to say nothing of so-called ‘source’ nations such as Greece and Italy (see Hamilakis, 2007; Ceserani, 2012). However, outside the geopolitical centre, Classical archaeology often traces unfamiliar pathways, unfamiliar to those for whom Classical archaeology comprises Winckelmann, Delphi and the Vienna School.

In this chapter, I follow the career of one geopolitically marginal scholar, the Czech Classicist Antonín Salač (1885–1960), focusing particularly on Salač’s waxing and waning relationships with French scholars and French institutions. Czechoslovakia had little leverage in the traditional centres of Classical antiquity. But thanks to his relationship with France – a relationship rooted in French-Czechoslovak diplomatic relations – Salač, a scholar from a ‘small nation’, managed to insinuate

himself into what was, for the most part, a conversation between Great Powers. Unfortunately, the French-Czechoslovak relationship did not withstand the Czechoslovak Communist Party's takeover; thus, the geographies of Classical archaeology in Czechoslovakia shifted.

It merits emphasising that Salač's abortive love affair with France was not solely his own; nor is his story simply a one-off attempt by the geopolitical margins to secure a piece of the Classical archaeological pie. Rather, it hints at myriad, lesser known but no less important histories of Classical archaeology. After all, Great Powers are hardly the only states that seek power.

Introducing Antonín Salač

Antonín Salač spent most of his scholarly career at Charles(-Ferdinand) University in Prague, first as a student, later as a professor of Greek and Roman antiquities. He published hundreds of monographs, articles, reviews and 'brief notes'² – especially these last two – on a wide range of topics, particularly epigraphy, ancient Greek and Roman religion and numismatics; later in his career, he turned toward Byzantology (see Avenarius et al., 1992; Havlíková, 1999). Salač conducted archaeological excavations in Greece, Turkey and Bulgaria, among the first excavations under the Czechoslovak flag. However, his most significant legacy may be as an 'organiser of scholarly life',³ as founder of the still-extant Centre for Greek, Roman and Latin Studies⁴ (now, the Centre for Classical Studies)⁵ at the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences,⁶ and of Eirene, a society for Classical studies in the socialist countries.⁷

Salač was a distinguished scholar by any metric, but this is not why I chose to write about him. Rather, I have chosen Salač because his career is an apt venue for the exploration of geopolitics' entanglement with scholarly practice. His biography intersects with a host of geopolitical shifts: two World Wars, the establishment of an independent Czechoslovakia and the Communist Party takeover. Moreover, Salač is one of only a few Czech Classical archaeologists to have excavated abroad, a testament to his international scholarly networks.

Salač's personal archive at the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic⁸ also makes him an apt object of study, mostly because of its compendiousness. It covers more than forty (shelf) metres of unprocessed materials. According to Jan Bouzek (personal communication, 24 March 2014) and Pavel Spunar (personal communication, 8 August 2014), these materials essentially consist of the contents of Salač's apartment. An extensive archive is a *sine qua non* for this chapter, given its preoccupation with the basic infrastructure of scholarly production

– that is, with scholarly networks beyond those attested in published scholarship.

At issue here is an idea central to the overlapping bodies of scholarship known as science and technology studies, science studies and histories of science – namely, that scholarship cannot be walled off from ‘real life’ (see e.g. Shapin, 1998; Livingstone, 2003, 2005). Despite scholars’ pretensions to objectivity, to ‘a view from nowhere’ (see Nagel, 1986), knowledge production always takes place within historical, political, sociological, economic, material, etc. contexts. David N. Livingstone writes: ‘Given that bodies are resolutely located in space, there are grounds for suspecting that scientific knowledge is always positioned knowledge, rationality always situated rationality, inquiry always local inquiry’ (2003: 80).

Without directly engaging with science studies, for the most part, archaeologists have already begun to ‘put knowledge in its place’ (see Livingstone, 2003: 1–16). Since the 1990s, studies of nationalism and archaeology – essentially, ‘geographies of knowledge’ at the scale of the nation-state – have flourished (see e.g. Kohl and Fawcett, 1995; Díaz-Andreu and Champion, 1996; Meskell, 1998). If archaeology builds nation-states at home, so, too, might it negotiate for nation-states abroad; hence, the study of the entanglement of archaeology with cultural diplomacy (see Luke and Kersel, 2012). This chapter is a contribution to the latter area of enquiry. As we shall see, the scholarly networks Salač cultivated with the French and the French School at Athens were shaped by Czechoslovak foreign relations, both inasmuch as geopolitics governed access (particularly, under Czechoslovakia’s Communist government), but also – and more significantly – because Salač was regarded by France as a cultural envoy.

Introducing Czechoslovakia

Czechoslovakia was established as an independent state on 28 October 1918, in the aftermath of the First World War. Although Czechoslovakia was meant to embody the principle of ethnic self-determination (‘one nation, one state’), ‘Czechoslovak’ was an ethnicity to which few self-ascribed. Rather, ‘Czechoslovakism’ unified Czechs and Slovaks, in part, toward the aim of gerrymandering the new state’s borders, so that the demographic impact of its sizeable German and Magyar minorities would be reduced. In 1921, ‘Czechoslovaks’ comprised 65.51 per cent of Czechoslovakia’s overall population; Germans were 23.36 per cent and Magyars 5.6 per cent (Státní úřad statistický, 1924: 60).⁹ Considered together, then, Czechs and Slovaks were less than two-thirds of Czechoslovakia’s population; should the two groups be

divided, the German minority in particular might prove a real demographic threat.

Anti-German sentiment had a prominent place in Czech nationalism.¹⁰ The development of a Czech literary language – and its concomitant, a Czech literary culture – had occurred in opposition to the official German language of the Habsburg Empire (Agnew, 1993).¹¹ So, too, the emergence of Czech-language education (see Zahra, 2004), which lay at the centre of Czech nationalist struggles (Havránek, 2009: 50). And many Czech nationalist historians – most prominently, the ‘Father of the Nation’ František Palacký (1798–1876) – represented Czech history as one of conflict with Germans, with the Thirty Years’ War as a crucial historiographical turning point.

In the wake of the First World War, Czech nationalism’s anti-German undercurrents benefited Czechoslovakia. The victorious Allies – particularly France – supported the establishment of a Czechoslovak state as a buffer against German ambitions. France was the first of the Allies to recognise Czechoslovak independence and, during the interwar period, it focused considerable diplomatic efforts on the young state (see e.g. Ort and Regourd, 1994; Marès, 2004; Michel, 2004: 15; Hnilica, 2009). In the realm of ‘hard’ power, France maintained treaties with the signatories of the Little Entente (Czechoslovakia, Romania and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) to protect against (particularly, German and Hungarian) encroachments upon the states’ sovereignty. In the realm of ‘soft’ power – of which France had a long and illustrious history (see Mulcahy, 2017: 33–63) – hoping to capitalise on Czechoslovak Francophilia, France established the first of its post-war French Institutes in Prague.

The French Institute in Prague¹² offered language courses and lectures in French history and culture. It maintained a French library and supported scholarly exchange between France and Czechoslovakia. The establishment of the Prague Institute was followed by the establishment of smaller institutes in Brno and Bratislava. These institutes were part of a cohort of post-war French-Czechoslovak cultural diplomatic institutions, including the Institute of Slavic Studies in Paris,¹³ as well as French gymnasia in Czechoslovakia and Czech gymnasia in France.¹⁴

To know France was to love France, was to welcome its civilising influence. Nevertheless, interwar Czechoslovakia did not prove quite as susceptible to French influence as France had hoped. Alfred Fichelle (1889–1968), a professor at the French Institute in Prague, blamed on long-standing German influence on Czechoslovakia the country’s lukewarm reception to his country’s cultural diplomatic efforts, as well as the failure of the French language to penetrate the region prior to the First World War (Hnilica, 2009: 96). It is thus, perhaps, of interest that

Salač learned French while a gymnasium student;¹⁵ he also purports to have been an avid reader of Émile Zola in his youth.¹⁶ Perhaps Salač was a true Francophile. Certainly, he was well equipped to take advantage of France's attentiveness to Czechoslovakia.

Antonín Salač and the French School at Athens

In February 1920, Antonín Salač, newly habilitated at the Czech university in Prague, set out for Athens to 'acquaint himself with the Classical lands by *autopsia* [first-hand]¹⁷ before he took up his duties at the university. Shortly after arriving in Greece, Salač sought admission to the French School at Athens,¹⁸ whose archaeological exploits he had followed as a gymnasium professor in Bohemia. In a 1915 article on the worship of Egyptian divinities on Delos, Salač had complained of French scholars' 'habit of using as-yet-unpublished epigraphic material',¹⁹ without publishing it forthwith (1915: 401, n. 1). Admission to the French School would grant him access to those materials.

Salač's petition was supported by the recommendations of two scholars. The first was his mentor at the Prague university, the epigrapher František Groh (1863–1940). Groh, by Salač's account, cared for him 'like a father' (1940: 411)²⁰ during his time in Greece; the two were close until Groh's death. The other recommendation came from Ernest Denis (1849–1921), a historian of central Europe and a supporter of the struggles of Austria-Hungary's Slavs – especially, its Czechs – for nationhood. During the First World War, Denis campaigned for Czechoslovak independence alongside the Czechoslovak National Council. He was a founder of both the French Institute in Prague, which was, for a time, named for him, and the Institute of Slavic Studies in Paris. When Denis visited Prague in October 1920, the Prague-based newspaper *Národní listy* reported, 'it was as if the spirit of [František] Palacký [the aforementioned 'Father of the Nation'] hovered above us' (Hnilica, 2009: 33).

Unfortunately, the content of Denis' recommendation is not extant; along with Groh's, it persists only in a brief note to the French Ministry of Public Education and Fine Arts²¹ by Charles Picard (1883–1965), the director of the French School at Athens: 'Mr A. Salač arrived in Athens in February 1920. He was, at that time, recommended to me, simultaneously, by Mr E. Denis... and Mr Frant. Groh.'²² We have no evidence that Denis and Salač ever met. At any rate, Denis was not equipped to assess Salač's skills as a Classicist. Thus, his recommendation of Salač must have been meant to advance French-Czechoslovak relations. After all, the French School was one of the most venerable organs of French cultural diplomacy.

Like all of the foreign archaeological institutes in Greece, the French

School at Athens – the oldest of the foreign schools – was deeply and unashamedly political. In fact, when it was first founded, the French School's mandate for the propagation of French culture was stronger than its mandate for archaeological research (Valenti, 2006: 24). In this respect, it was a close relative of the newly founded French Institute in Prague.

During the First World War, the French School at Athens had operated as a centre for Allied propaganda (Valenti, 2001: 13). French School 'Athéniens' – as its members were called – populated Léon Rey's Archaeological Service of the Eastern Army,²³ effectively serving as guides for the military (Valenti, 2001: 11–12; René-Hubert, 2010). After the war, the school's new director Charles Picard – a former member of Rey's Archaeological Service – insisted 'the French School at Athens has not lost interest in its role as a propagator of French culture abroad' (quoted in Valenti, 2001: 14).²⁴ It was at this time that Salač, encouraged by Picard, with whom he became close friends, joined the French School's Foreign Section.²⁵

The establishment of a Foreign Section – that is, a division of the French School for those who were not French citizens – had been suggested at the time of the school's foundation (Viviers, 1996: 173–4); however, the section was not established until 1900, after the German Archaeological Institute in Athens²⁶ began to admit foreign scholars, particularly citizens of the Triple Alliance states. The French School's Foreign Section thus emerged in 'a clearly anti-German context',²⁷ as an attempt to rally France and its allies against Germany and its allies (Viviers, 1996: 175). And the war's end did not dissipate French-German tensions – as France guarded against German expansion in central Europe, so, too, did the French School clash with the German School on the archaeological front (see Fittschen, 1996). Salač was thus admitted into the French School as a representative of Czechoslovakia, as an anti-German ally (or supposed to be such)²⁸ of France, in accordance with French foreign policy.

Foreign policy is the correct term to use here. Membership of the Foreign Section was negotiated between governments (see Viviers, 1996: 174). In fact, when the Foreign Section was first established, the French School required that foreign governments wishing to send scholars to the school sign a convention with the French government; it amended this requirement when Belgium proved the only country willing to do so. Salač himself sought aid from a former schoolmate in Czechoslovakia's Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment,²⁹ to hasten the processing of his application to the French School: 'The request needs to go through the Foreign Ministry to our embassy in Prague, there, again, through the Foreign Ministry to the Ministry – probably – of Education; that is a route, which makes my head spin and which could easily take,

in the normal course of things, the whole year.’³⁰ Alfred Fichelle, of the French Institute in Prague, also facilitated Salač’s application to the Foreign Section (Hnilica, 2009: 109). Clearly, then, even without a convention with the French government, admission to the French School was a political affair.

Throughout its history, the Foreign Section of the French School at Athens has been dominated by Belgians (see *École française d’Athènes*, 2014 [2017]). As of November 2017, nearly half of the 111 *membres étrangers* it has hosted have been Belgian. The Swiss and Dutch – of whom there have been nineteen and twelve *membres étrangers*, respectively – also make a good showing. Only one citizen of Czechoslovakia or its successor states – Salač – has ever been admitted to the school.

During Picard’s tenure as director of the school (between 1919 and 1925), its Foreign Section was uniquely diverse (that is, with respect to nationality). *Membres étrangers* hailed from Sweden, Denmark, Russia, Poland, Romania, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland and, of course, Czechoslovakia. No other director in the history of the French School has presided over so diverse a Foreign Section as did Picard; Pierre Roussel’s subsequent directorship saw the Foreign Section dominated by Belgium and the Netherlands once more. This diversity was in line with French cultural diplomatic policy, broadly speaking – like Czechoslovakia, Romania and Poland saw the post-First World War establishment of French Institutes (in 1922 and 1924, respectively).

Picard patently regarded Foreign Section members as cultural envoys for France. In a report to the French Ministry of Education, he claimed that foreign members ‘have contributed, in their countries, to [France’s] winning over public opinion.’³¹ Certainly, Salač declared his ‘devotion to France’³² in his application to the French School.

Salač’s decision to join the French School at Athens thus made sense from the standpoint of interwar diplomacy – the Francophilic Salač could be counted on to advocate for France; France’s support of Salač might be favourably regarded by the Czechoslovak public;³³ for Salač himself, French School affiliation meant access – but it was, in fact, unprecedented. A number of Salač’s gymnasium and university professors, including František Groh, had travelled to Greece with the support of scholarships provided by the Austrian government (Frolíková, 1987). When they had chosen to affiliate themselves with the foreign schools that dominated – or even had a stranglehold upon – Greek archaeology, they generally chose either the Austrian or German Archaeological Institute. After all, as Habsburg subjects, they were fluent in German.

Over the course of his first trip to Greece, Salač joined the French School’s projects on Delos and Thasos, as well as in Greek Macedonia and Delphi. According to Picard, the French School’s encouragement

of its foreign members' participation in School projects was a means of cultivating good will in foreign members' home countries, particularly in contrast to other foreign schools, the policies of which, he claimed, were less open. This policy also expanded the French School's skilled workforce. Salač would eventually contribute to the publication of the Delphic inscriptions; likewise, with the aid of a young archaeology student in Prague, Libuše Jansová (1904–96) – later, a prominent prehistorian – Salač would produce a catalogue of Thasian amphora stamps.³⁴ Despite his wishes,³⁵ the catalogue was never published, though it did serve as the foundation for François and Anne-Marie Bon's later catalogue of Thasian amphora stamps (1957).

Antonín Salač and Greece

Salač never intended his relationship with the French School to define his career. His aim in traveling to Greece and applying to the French School had been to secure training and resources, so that he might lead 'Czechoslovak' excavations in Greece.³⁶ Thus, during his first trip to Greece, Salač cultivated relationships with Greek colleagues as well as representatives of the French School – Athenians as well as 'Athéniens'. Bolstered by Greece and Czechoslovakia's shared status as 'small nations' – rich in culture, if not numbers (see Masaryk, 1916; Beneš, 1925) – Salač had sought to acquaint himself with 'the new Greece'. To his former schoolfellow Otakar Sommer (1885–1940), the aforementioned contact in the Czechoslovak Ministry of Education, he wrote 'so far, after the war, few people have come to Greece who were not already known here; I, as the member of a small nation, spoke with the Greeks differently from the members of large nations. They recognised that I sincerely like ancient Greek culture and that I have a lively sympathy for the new Greece.'³⁷

Salač distributed pro-Czechoslovak propaganda to the Greek government (Salač, 1920) and negotiated business deals between Greek merchants and Czech manufacturers (specifically between Greek medical professionals and Heinrich Hoffmann, a Czechoslovak glass – and glass eye – manufacturer).³⁸ He produced a series of columns about Greek culture for the Prague-based newspaper *Národní listy*. He unsuccessfully lobbied for the establishment of a lectureship in modern Greek – that is, Katharevousa – at the Prague university.³⁹ No doubt, Salač's prominence in Greece as a representative of Czechoslovakia was attributable, in part, to the lack of a Czechoslovak embassy (which would be established in 1922). But it also amounted to an attempt to insinuate himself into the good graces of Greece's political and business classes, for the sake of future research.

During that first trip to Greece, Salač also became acquainted with some of the luminaries of the Greek archaeological establishment, in particular, with the sometime director of the Greek Archaeological Service Konstantinos Kourouniotis (1872–1945). Salač seems to have approached Kourouniotis with plans for an Athenian epigraphic archive and journal, both of which he hoped to organise and administer.⁴⁰ Unfortunately, these projects were cut short, owing to turmoil in the Greek government. As we shall see, perhaps ironically, Salač's relationships with the French School would prove far more useful in facilitating research in Greece – at least, at the administrative level – than would his relationships with Greeks.

'Czechoslovak' excavations

Salač returned from his first trip to Greece in the autumn of 1921. He kept up contact with his French School colleagues over the following year, hosting his collaborator on the Delphic inscriptions Georges Daux (1899–1988) in Prague in February 1922.⁴¹ Salač and Picard discussed the possibility of 'Czechoslovak' excavations; Picard pressed Salač to consider an expedition to the Sanctuary of the Great Gods on the Greek island Samothraki, a vast temple complex that had been explored by Austrian-, French- and Greek-led excavations in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: '[Y]ou would be given authorisation without difficulty and I would help you financially... there would be, doubtless, important discoveries to be made there. Have no illusions about the value of new excavations; hardly any of the first order remain, while the questions on Samothrace are very important.'⁴²

On Picard's recommendation, then, Salač chose Samothraki. At first, he attempted to leverage Greek connections to access the site. Salač sought advice as to how he might secure an excavation permit from the archaeologist Efstratios (Stratis) Pelekidis (1880–1958), of the Macedonian Ephorate of Antiquities, whom he may have met while working with the French School in Greek Macedonia.⁴³ As instructed by Pelekidis, Salač then applied to the Greek Ministry of Education for permissions to excavate on Samothraki.⁴⁴ He did so in the name of the recently established, Prague-based State Archaeological Institute,⁴⁵ of which the division for 'antique' excavations appears to have been established, in large measure, with the aim of supporting Salač's excavations in Greece.

Unfortunately, the Greek Ministry of Education reported to Salač, only foreign schools residing in Greece could be granted excavation permissions.⁴⁶ Thus, Salač was compelled to turn to the French School, with the request that the French apply for the Samothraki excavation rights

on behalf of the Czechoslovak government: 'In thus becoming our intermediary with the Greek government, the French School would render a great service to our institute and to the development of Greek archaeology in our land, a service which would attest to... the amicable relationship of our country with the great and powerful French civilisation.'⁴⁷ The French School readily complied. So, the 1923 French-Czechoslovak excavations on Samothraki became a largely 'French' enterprise. The excavations were – per Picard's promise – largely funded by the French School; the Samothraki excavation permit was secured in the name of the French School; Salač was even supplied with a young 'Athénien' to assist him, Fernand Chapouthier (1899–1953), a recent inductee into the school. Picard characterised the French School's support of Salač's Samothraki excavations as 'scientific liberalism'.⁴⁸ To the French Ministry of Education, he wrote, '[a] good future is expected from this enterprise, which, in principle, renews that of Asine (1922)'.⁴⁹ Picard was referring to the excavations of Salač's Foreign Section colleague, the Swedish archaeologist Axel W. Persson (1888–1951), at Asine.

In the *Národní listy* Salač reported: '[T]hough we had very little money at our disposal' – a persistent motif in Salač's research – 'we obtained satisfactory results' (Salač, 1926a: 5).⁵⁰ But rather than returning to Samothraki the following year, Salač determined 'to consider a more extensive and entirely independent enterprise' (Salač, 1926a: 5)⁵¹ – presumably, one in which he would not be compelled to rely on French money or institutions. He had already seen that such an enterprise was not possible in Greece. Accordingly, he applied himself to the western coast of Asia Minor.

In the summer of 1924, Salač set out for Turkey, with the aim of locating a site to excavate the following year. Czechoslovakia (that is, its predecessor in Austria-Hungary) had long-standing ties with Turkey (that is, its predecessor in the Ottoman Empire). Austrian sugar, production of which centred in Bohemia, represented 74 per cent of the Ottoman Empire's sugar exports (Novák, 2006: 206); Salač would secure funding for the expedition from a consortium of Czechoslovak sugar manufacturers.⁵² Likewise, Austria's centre of fez production, with a majority of its exports to the Ottoman Empire, lay in Strakonice in southern Bohemia (see Purkhart, 2010). Still more significant than these economic ties was the fact that it was legally possible to secure an excavation permit in Turkey without an affiliation with a foreign archaeological institute.

Accordingly, France's influence on Salač's subsequent excavations was relatively limited. Apparently, Salač initially requested that France transfer to him its permissions for one of its excavations in Asia Minor – presumably, Teos or Aphrodisias (Bouzek, 1980: 22). When this was

denied to him, at Picard's recommendation, Salač determined to excavate at Aeolian Kyme, not far from İzmir.⁵³ The Kyme excavations were Czechoslovak-funded and Czechoslovak-led. Salač was assisted on the project by a Czech architecture student from the Technical University in Prague, Jan Nepomucký (1895–1948). He liaised with the Czechoslovak embassy in İzmir during his excavations, becoming close to its consul Emil Kubelka. Except for the selection of the site itself and Salač's publication of partial results in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* (Salač, 1927), the excavations were very much a 'Czechoslovak' affair.

If independent 'Czechoslovak' excavations were at issue, that Salač attempted to return to Kyme before going back to Samothraki is no surprise. Moreover, the Kyme expedition appears to have received wider popular coverage than had the Samothraki expedition (e.g. *New York Times*, 1925; Salač, 1926b, 1926c). Previous explorations of Kyme, by contrast with Samothraki, had been relatively limited, so Kyme had the sheen of 'new excavations'. But persistent unrest in western Turkey curtailed Salač's plans. In the summer of 1927, Salač attempted to return to Kyme. He travelled to İzmir, only to learn that the western coast of Turkey had been declared a military zone, and excavations that year would be impossible.⁵⁴ Having already secured funding for the planned Kyme expedition, Salač hastily sent a telegram to the French School at Athens, asking if he might return to Samothraki that summer.⁵⁵ As a result, Salač and Nepomucký conducted a second series of limited excavations on Samothraki.

The 1927 excavations on Samothraki would be Salač's last collaboration in the field with the French School. In the following years, he shifted his focus to the Slavic Balkans, where pan-Slavic networks preceded him (see Curta, 2013), and the French School had little to offer. In establishing the antique division at the State Archaeological Institute in Prague, its director Lubor Niederle (1865–1944) had foreseen this eventuality, observing that, if Czech archaeologists were unsuccessful in the well-trodden centres of Classical antiquity – that is, in Greece, Italy and Asia Minor – they might turn to 'some of the Slavic parts of the Balkans, where a great deal of rewarding work still awaits the Classical archaeologist and where a Czech worker would be welcomed and supported.'⁵⁶

In summary, then, Salač's archaeological research began in one of the centres of Classical archaeology, Greece, where he was only able to work as an affiliate of the French School, an affiliation he was able to secure, mostly thanks to France's interwar foreign policy. He proceeded thence to Turkey – relatively speaking, a centre of Classical archaeology, but somewhat less central than Greece geographically (that is, *vis-à-vis* Europe), and with a less intensive history of archaeological exploitation and, concomitantly, less stringent cultural heritage laws; there, until the

tumultuous early years of the Turkish Republic curtailed his research, Salač was able to work with minimal French input. By the time Salač began to work in the Slavic Balkans – in Bulgaria and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, still more ‘marginal’, still less regulated – he no longer needed France.

We have no evidence that Salač was in any way hemmed in by the French School’s oversight – Picard’s ‘scientific liberalism’ appears to have built up skills and resources among its beneficiaries, without exacting anything more onerous than Francophilic gratitude from them. Nevertheless, French-Czechoslovak excavations – hyphenated excavations – limited the recognition that might accrue to Czechoslovakia. And recognition, for Salač and for Czechoslovakia, was one of the central aims of Classical archaeological excavations. Salač’s story ought to be a familiar one – national aggrandisement via archaeological excavation, what Suzanne Marchand, in the German case, calls ‘spiritual “propaganda”’ (1996: 245). It only seems unfamiliar because we are unaccustomed to considering the motives and the means by which the geopolitical margins – ‘small nations’ – might seek global recognition. On his excavations and during his travels abroad, Salač devoted a great deal of energy to acquainting the world with Czechoslovakia. On Samothraki, he reported in the *Národní listy*, ‘I made sure that, always and everywhere, it was known of me that I am a Czech, even if I had to again and again indicate where my country was’ (1923: 9).⁵⁷

The path from benevolent French oversight to independent archaeological excavations – and an archaeological institute – has been traversed by a number of states, which once had foreign members at the French School. The Swedish Institute at Athens, for one, was established shortly after the Second World War (you will recall that Picard invoked the excavations of Sweden’s Axel Persson, Salač’s colleague in the Foreign Section, as a model for Salač’s Samothraki excavations). Belgium, too, the only country to sign a convention with France to facilitate its sending students to the French School (see above), now has an archaeological institute in Athens.

At the end of the 1920s, Czechoslovakia seemed to be investigating the possibility of entrenching itself on Greek soil. In 1929, on returning from Prague, where he had been invited to give a lecture, the French historian Jérôme Carcopino (1881–1970) informed the French School that Czechoslovakia sought to sign a convention with France to facilitate its sending students to the school.⁵⁸ And in February of the following year, Czechoslovakia’s president Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1850–1937) created a fund for the establishment of a Czechoslovak institute in Athens; the fund was to be administered by Groh and Salač.⁵⁹ Neither the convention nor the fund bore fruit. As far as we can tell, the

Great Depression intervened, and then the Second World War and the Communist Party takeover. Today, there is no Czech or Slovak (and there never was a Czechoslovak) archaeological institute in Athens.

'I do not cry, I work': 1938–48

For much of the 1930s, Salač's correspondence with his French School colleagues was irregular but warm. In the latter half of the decade, he deepened his acquaintance with Prague's French community, particularly employees of French diplomatic institutions. Salač befriended the librarian of the French Institute in Prague, Madeleine Vokoun-David (1902–??), supporting her bid to become a lecturer at the Prague university;⁶⁰ he struck up an acquaintance with the French ambassador Léopold Victor de Lacroix (1878–1948) and his family, particularly his wife Mary Ann and his youngest daughter Marie (later, Rist; 1912–96); Marie, nearly thirty years Salač's junior, was the object of his (unrequited or, perhaps, Platonic) affections.⁶¹ In 1937, Salač was admitted into the French Legion of Honour.⁶² Why Salač was thus honoured only after he had essentially ceased working with the French School is unclear. Perhaps the award was intended to re-enlist Salač as an intermediary for the French state, in view of a rising Germany.

In September 1938, the predominantly German-speaking regions of Bohemia and Moravia, known as the Sudetenland, were ceded to Adolf Hitler. Present at the meeting in Munich that wrought this state of affairs were representatives of Italy, Germany, Great Britain and France; Czechoslovakia's representatives were confined to their hotel room. Ironically, the 'Munich betrayal',⁶³ which saw anti-French rioting in the streets of Prague, heralded a renewal of relations between Salač and his French School colleagues. The now former French School director Charles Picard deplored the Germans' annexation of the Sudetenland, but 'here, people like me are like Cassandra'.⁶⁴ To Picard, Salač responded 'I do not cry, I work... What I feel for your country is not hate, but rather – pardon the cruel word – *pity*. Poor France!'⁶⁵

For six years, as the Second World War raged, Salač lost contact with his network of French School colleagues. Salač again heard from Picard in September 1945, by which time the war had been over for several months. Nevertheless, Czechoslovakia's postal service had not yet been restored, so Jacqueline Mazon, daughter of the director of the Paris-based Institute of Slavic Studies André Mazon (1881–1967), brought Picard's letter with her to Prague, where she would be teaching at the French Institute.⁶⁶ André Mazon was Ernest Denis' successor in the sphere of French-Czechoslovak relations.

For some time, despite the 'shadow of Munich',⁶⁷ it seemed that France

and Czechoslovakia might resume interwar relations (Olšáková, 2007: 729). France attempted to restore its relationship with Czechoslovakia, in part, by decorating Czech citizens with honours (perhaps the same grounds for Salač's earlier admission into the Legion of Honour); shortly after the war, it issued so many as to stir up controversy (Hnilica, 2009: 135, n. 63). Salač was included among the ranks of the honored; he received an honorary doctorate from the University of Dijon, where his French School collaborator Georges Daux worked.

Salač accepted the doctorate on the occasion of a trip to France for the centennial of the French School at Athens.⁶⁸ At the invitation of André Mazon, Salač delivered two lectures at the Sorbonne. The cultural-diplomatic tenor of this invitation merits emphasising – like his predecessor Denis, Mazon was not a Classicist but, rather, a Slavist and a French-Czechoslovak cultural emissary. In Paris, Salač also attended a ceremony at which the Czechoslovak ambassador to France awarded the Order of the White Lion to Albert Pauphilet (1884–1948), a former professor at the French Institute in Prague, as well as several French journalists. While in Dijon, Salač delivered a lecture on Latin inscriptions at Prague Castle, which segued into a brief discussion 'of Charles University's founder [Charles IV] and French-Czech relations during his time'⁶⁹ – obviously, framed as a medieval precedent to contemporary relations between the two nations.

The trip to France rang with the echoes of First Republic Czechoslovakia. Salač had been reunited with his French School colleagues; the pre-eminent French-Czechoslovak cultural diplomatic institutions – the French Institute in Prague, the Institute of Slavic Studies in Paris – and their representatives – Albert Pauphilet, André Mazon – had been honored and involved in the festivities. But, once again, the renewal was brief.

The break-up: 1948

The French Institute in Prague had been closed for most of the Second World War. It reopened in June 1945, but it did not stay open for long. In February 1948, twelve non-Communist ministers resigned from the Czechoslovak government in protest against the Communist Interior Minister Václav Nosek's management of the police force. They had hoped that the Czechoslovak President Edvard Beneš would not accept their resignation. Their gamble did not pay off – in poor health and, perhaps, fearing a civil war, Beneš did accept it. In a matter of days, a new Communist government was formed.

French-Czechoslovak relations rapidly declined thereafter. Heliodor Píka (1897–1949), the head of Czechoslovakia's French Alliance,⁷⁰ a

pre-First World War establishment aimed at the promotion of French language and culture, was arrested and executed in a show trial, convicted of espionage for Great Britain (see Olšáková, 2008). Píka's conviction substantiated further repression of France's representatives in Czechoslovakia. The French Alliance was dissolved. The French gymnasium in Prague was dissolved, and its professors were expelled from the country. Finally, Czechoslovakia's French Institutes – the Institutes in Brno and Bratislava and, at last, the Institute Ernest Denis in Prague – were closed (see Olšáková, 2007: 732–43; Hnilica, 2009: 140–50).

Salač's relationships with his French colleagues declined in tandem with the declining status of the French in Czechoslovakia. In a curriculum vitae dating to the second half of the 1950s, Salač claimed to have severed all ties with foreign nationals after 1945.⁷¹ As we have seen, this was not true – in fact, 1945 marked the post-Second World War renewal of Salač's ties with foreign colleagues. Salač had a strong incentive to conceal evidence of French contacts from his archives. The trial of Píka and, later, the trial and imprisonment of Salač's colleague Jindřich Čadík (1891–1979) – who, according to Jan Bouzek, was framed by way of his friendship with the French ambassador to Czechoslovakia (Bouzek, 2012)⁷² – revealed these ties to be dangerous. However, by the beginning of the 1950s, if Salač's personal archives are to be believed, he was no longer regularly corresponding with his French colleagues.

There is a poignant coda to these ruptured relations. In February 1956, three years after the untimely death of Fernand Chapouthier, his co-director on the first Samothraki excavations – and perhaps not coincidentally, following the death of Czechoslovakia's 'little Stalin' Klement Gottwald – Salač sent a note and a book (of uncertain title) to Chapouthier's wife, Odette. To Salač, Odette wrote 'I leafed through it with a great deal of melancholy, thinking about the pleasure that my husband would have had at looking through it.'⁷³ It perhaps merits reminding the reader that Salač's relationships with his French colleagues were not merely professional.

A romance and a tragedy

In the preceding pages, I have laid out Salač's career-long relationship with France, particularly, with the French School at Athens. His relationship with the French School ebbed and flowed, according to Czechoslovakia's relationship with France. First, as a rising docent in post-First World War Czechoslovakia, bolstered by French-Czechoslovak mutual appreciation, with its roots in shared anti-German sentiment, Salač joined the French School's Foreign Section. With the aid of the French School, Salač led excavations in Samothraki and Turkey. Throughout, he aimed

for independent, Czechoslovak excavations, which he nearly achieved at Kyme. Salač's network of relationship with French colleagues declined over the 1930s and was nearly ruptured by the Second World War; it was, at last, well and truly broken – as far as we can tell from his archive – by the 1948 Communist takeover. Thus, the relationships that brought Salač to prominence apparently came to naught. His post-1948 networks – the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Eirene – are the associations that lasted.

How, then, does a geopolitically 'marginal' scholar make his way in the pre-eminent 'centre' of archaeologies? In Salač's case, he did so by leveraging the cultural-diplomatic policies of the geopolitical centre to his benefit – by insinuating himself into its network. Notwithstanding Salač's scholarly prowess, he likely would have found himself unable to entrench himself in Classical archaeology without the support of the French School. Thus, if Salač's relationship with the French was a casualty of historical contingency – that is, of the Communist Party takeover – it also benefited from historical contingency – France's inter-war cultivation of Czechoslovakia.

Of course, Salač's relationship with France was not solely a matter of historical contingency. It derived from the geographies that shaped – and continue to shape – Classics. Classical archaeology might cross borders – inasmuch as the Roman Empire did – but it does not transcend them. Certain parts of the Classical world were more or less accessible to citizens of Czechoslovakia than they were to citizens of France. Accordingly, Classical archaeology – its ambit and its history – takes a different form in Czechoslovakia than it does in France.

We must not be too hasty to consign Salač's relationship with France to the dustbin of history. Shortly before the Communist takeover, Salač's student, the archaeologist, Jiří Frel (1923–2006) travelled to France, as Salač had to Greece, bearing what must have been a somewhat ambivalent letter of introduction (if the draft in Salač's Academy of Sciences archive is anything to go by)⁷⁴ to Albert Pauphilet, formerly of the French Institute in Prague but, lately, head of the *École normale supérieure* in Paris. Frel – a dubious figure to many 'western' archaeologists but foundational in Czech archaeology – would bring his students to Paris, foremost among them Jan Bouzek and Jan Bažant, and he would be buried there, at Père Lachaise Cemetery.

Notes

This chapter is dedicated to my father, M. Keith De Armond. Thanks to Anna Hofmanová De Armond for checking my Czech transcriptions. Thanks to Angeliki Anagnostopoulou for the translation of modern Greek archival materials.

Thanks to Mark Pyzyk, Julia Roberts, Kathleen Sheppard, Ulf Hansson and Jonathan R. Trigg for comments on drafts. All errors are mine.

- 1 All institutions, titles and quotations not originally in English will be translated in the text. Footnotes will contain institutions, etc. in their original language. Unless otherwise stated, all translations are mine. Secondary texts will be cited in-text. All archival materials will be cited in the footnotes.
- 2 'Drobné zprávy', published in the preeminent Czech philological journal, *Listy filologické*.
- 3 'Organizátor vědeckého života' is a Czech phrase, with no exact English equivalent.
- 4 Kabinet pro studia řecká, římská a latinská.
- 5 Kabinet pro klasická studia.
- 6 Československá akademie věd.
- 7 Salač also edited the first issue of the journal *Eirene*. At the time, it was not clear that *Eirene* would be issued regularly; its second issue did not appear until after Salač's death (see Frolíková and Oliva, 2013).
- 8 Akademie věd České republiky.
- 9 The remaining 5.5% were made up of 'Russians' – including Russians, Ukrainians and Ruthenians (3.45%) – Jews (1.35%), Poles (0.57%) and 'others' (0.19%) (Státní úřad statistický, 1924: 60). Nationality remained a slippery affair in Czechoslovakia for some time (see Sayer, 1996; Zahra, 2004).
- 10 Czech nationalism – particularly, the Czech national revival – has been the topic of numerous scholarly works (e.g. Kočí, 1978; Macura, 1983; Hroch, 1985; Agnew, 1993; Gellner, 1994; Holy, 1996).
- 11 See Macura, 1983 for an excellent analysis of the significance of language to Czech nationalism.
- 12 Francouzský institut v Praze/L'Institut français de Prague.
- 13 L'Institut d'études slaves.
- 14 Particularly given the centrality of language to both French and Czechoslovak national identity, such foreign-language gymnasia were inherently cultural diplomatic institutions. Gymnasia are the equivalent of high schools.
- 15 Masaryk Institute and Archives of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague (hereafter, MÚA AV ČR), Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 29, results of Antonín Salač's *maturita*, 12 July 1904. As of January 2019, this archive has not been processed.
- 16 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 28, fragment of memoir by Antonín Salač, n.d.
- 17 '[P]oznati z autopsie půdu klasickou'. Archives of Charles University, Philosophical Faculty 1882–1966 (1970), Prague (hereafter, AUK FF UK), inventory 637, box 55, letter from František Groh to the Professoriate of the Philosophical Faculty, 1919. The Greek term *autopsia* means 'seeing for oneself'; by using it, Groh intends to invoke ancient historians' use of the term.
- 18 École française d'Athènes.
- 19 '[Z]vyk, užívati materiálu epigrafického, dosud nepublikovaného'.

- 20 '[[J]ako otec'. Given that Salač's father died when Salač was young, this statement is particularly poignant.
- 21 Ministère de l'instruction publique et des beaux arts.
- 22 'Il m'a été, à cette date, recommandé simultanément par M. E. Denis... et par M. Le Prof. Frant. Groh.' French National Archives, Paris (hereafter F), F/17/13599, letter from Charles Picard to the Ministry of Public Education and Fine Arts, 17 July 1920.
- 23 Service archéologique de l'Armée d'Orient.
- 24 '[L]'École française d'Athènes ne s'est désintéressée de son rôle de propagatrice de la culture française à l'étranger.'
- 25 Section étrangère.
- 26 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut.
- 27 '[D]ans un contexte nettement anti-allemand'.
- 28 It merits noting that Salač does not display any particularly anti-German sentiments. He maintains strong ties with German colleagues at Charles University – especially with the epigrapher Heinrich Swoboda (1856–1926) – and, even after the Second World War, aids and communicates with German colleagues ousted from the university.
- 29 Ministerstvo školství a národní osvěty.
- 30 'Žádost musí přes ministerstvo zahraničí k našemu vyslanectví v Paříži, tam zase přes ministerstvo zahraničí na ministerstvo asi školství, to je cesta, ze které se mi točí hlava a která by mohla trvati při normálním běhu krásně celý rok.' MÚA AV ČR, Otakar Sommer, letter from Antonín Salač to Otakar Sommer, 5 April 1920.
- 31 '[O]nt contribué, dans leurs pays, à nous gagner la faveur de l'opinion publique'. F, F/17/13598, report on work from October 1920 to October 1921 from Charles Picard to the Ministry of Public Education and Fine Arts, 30 October 1921.
- 32 '[S]es sentiments dévoués envers la France'. F, F/17/13599, letter from Charles Picard to the Ministry of Public Education and Fine Arts, 17 July 1920.
- 33 Of course, the effectiveness of 'soft power' is notoriously difficult to assess (see Mulcahy, 2017: 34–7).
- 34 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 21, draft of letter from Antonín Salač to Charles Picard, n.d.; MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 36, letter from Charles Picard to Antonín Salač, 23 October 1922; MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 36, letter from Charles Picard to Antonín Salač, 26 April 1923.
- 35 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 7, draft of letter from Antonín Salač to Günther Klaffenbach, 23 September 1956.
- 36 That is, Czechoslovak-led. On Salač's excavations – as, of course, on the majority of archaeological excavations at this time – diggers were locals. See Quirke, 2010 for a much-needed reminder of the significance of diggers to archaeological expeditions.
- 37 '[P]o válce přišlo dosud do Řecka málo lidí, kteří by tu nebyli známi; já jako člen malého národa hovořil jsem s Řeky jinak, než s nimi mluví členové národů velikých. Poznali na mně že mám starou kulturu řeckou upřímně rád a pro nové Řecko že mám živé porozumění.' MÚA AV ČR,

- Otakar Sommer, letter from Antonín Salač to Otakar Sommer, 21 October 1920.
- 38 See e.g. MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 18, draft of letter from Antonín Salač to Henry [Heinrich] Hoffmann, 31 March 1920; MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 18, draft of letter from Antonín Salač to Henry Hoffmann, 26 April 1920; MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 18, copy of letter from Antonín Salač to Henry Hoffmann, 29 April 1920.
- 39 Salač would help establish modern Greek studies in Prague, thirty years later.
- 40 AUK FF UK, inventory 637, box 55: letter from K. Kurouniotes (Konstantinos Kourouniotis) to the deacon of the Philosophical Faculty of Charles University, 5 June 1920.
- 41 See e.g. MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 36, postcard from Georges Daux to Antonín Salač, 20 February 1922.
- 42 '[O]n vous donnerait sans difficultés l'autorisation, et je vous aiderais pécuniairement... il y aurait sans doute des découvertes capitales à faire. Notez qu'il ne faut pas s'illusionner sur la valeur des chantiers nouveaux; il n'y en a plus guère qui soient de 1^{er} ordre; tandis qu'à Samothrace, les questions sont très importants.' Underlining present in original. MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 36, letter from Charles Picard to Antonín Salač, 14 July 1922.
- 43 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 36, letter from Efstratios (Stratis) Pelekidis to Antonín Salač, 1922.
- 44 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 14, draft of statement about Samothrace excavation permissions, written by Antonín Salač but signed by Lubor Niederle, 16 April 1923.
- 45 Státní archeologický ústav.
- 46 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 14, draft of statement about Samothrace excavation permissions, written by Antonín Salač but signed by Lubor Niederle, 16 April 1923.
- 47 'En devenant ainsi notre intermédiaire auprès du gouvernement grec, l'École *Française* rendrait un grand service à notre Institut et au développement d'archéologie grecque dans notre pays, un service; qui témoignerait... [les] relations amicales de notre patrie à la grande et puissante civilisation française.' MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 14, draft of statement about Samothrace excavation permissions, written by Antonín Salač but signed by Lubor Niederle, 16 April 1923.
- 48 '[L]ibéralisme scientifique'. F, F/17/13598, report on work from November 1922 to August 1923 from Charles Picard to the Ministry of Public Education and Fine Arts, August 1923.
- 49 'Un bon avenir est attendu de cette entreprise qui, en son principe, renouvelle celle d'Asine (1922).' F, F/17/13598, report on work from November 1922 to August 1923 from Charles Picard to the Ministry of Public Education and Fine Arts, August 1923.
- 50 '[P]řes to, že jsme měli k dispozici obnos velmi malý, dosáhli jsme slušných výsledků'.
- 51 'abych pomýšlel na podnik rozsáhlejší a úplně samostatný'.

- 52 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 14, budget for the Kyme expedition, 1925.
- 53 F, F/17/13598, report from Charles Picard to the Ministry of Public Education and Fine Arts, 30 September 1925.
- 54 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 36, letter from the Greek Consulate in İzmir, 28 July 1927.
- 55 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 36, letter from R. Demangel to Salač, 27 July 1927.
- 56 '[V] některých slovanských částech Balkánu, kde na klassického archeologa čeká ještě mnoho vděčné práce a kde český pracovník byl by rád viděn a podporován'. Quoted in MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 9, memorial of the organisation of foreign research of the State Archaeological Institute, n.d.
- 57 'Snažil jsem se, aby se o mně vždy a všude vědělo, že jsem Čech, i když jsem musil znovu a znovu vykládati, kde leží ma vlást.'
- 58 F, F/17/13599, letter from Pierre Roussel to ?, 24 June 1929.
- 59 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 14, letter from Antonín Salač to the Ministry of Finance, 15 December 1948. In 1948, the fund appears to have been included in an assessment of Salač's personal property. In this letter to the Ministry of Finance, Salač argues against that assessment, relating the history of the fund and his role as its manager.
- 60 Vokoun-David was a philosopher, Orientalist and translator – as well as a librarian – whose *Debate about Writing and Hieroglyphs in the 17th and 18th Centuries and the Application of the Idea of Decipherment to Dead Writings* (*Le Débat sur les écritures et l'hieroglyphe aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles et l'application de la notion de déchiffrement aux écritures mortes*) inspired Jacques Derrida's *Of Grammatology* (*De la grammatologie*).
- 61 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 6, draft of letter from Antonín Salač to Marie de Lacroix, n.d.
- 62 Légion d'honneur.
- 63 'Mnichovská zrada'.
- 64 '[L]es gens comme moi, ici, jouent les Cassandre.' MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 21, letter from Charles and Gilbert-Charles Picard to Antonín Salač, 10 November 1938.
- 65 '[J]e ne pleure pas, je travaille... Ce que je sens pour votre patrie, ce n'est pas une haine, mais – pardonnez moi le mot cruel – plutôt *une pitié*. Pauvre France!' MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 21, draft of letter from Antonín Salač to (?Charles Picard), 1938.
- 66 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 4, letter from Charles Picard to Antonín Salač, 2 August 1945.
- 67 'Stín Mnichova'.
- 68 For a detailed account of Salač's trip to France, see AUK, FF UK, inventory 637, box 55, report on Antonín Salač's November 1947 visit to France, 17 November 1947.
- 69 '[O] zakladateli university Karlovy a stycích česko-francouzských za jeho doby'. AUK, FF UK, inventory 637, box 55, report on Antonín Salač's November 1947 visit to France, 17 November 1947.
- 70 Alliance française.

- 71 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 29, CV of Antonín Salač, n.d. (post-1955).
- 72 See also Morávková and Řehoř, 2012 for an extended account of Čadík's trial, for which Bouzek is a key source.
- 73 'Je l'ai feuilleté avec beaucoup de mélancolie en pensant au plaisir que mon mari aurait eu à le parcourir.' MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 1, letter from Odette Chapouthier to Antonín Salač, 4 February 1956.
- 74 MÚA AV ČR, Antonín Salač, inventory 410, box 1, draft of letter of introduction for Jiří Frel by Salač, n.d.