by the intensive research of Nožička, who above all exploited material from manorial archives. Firbas’ handbook deserves credit for the fact that the pre- and early history of the Bohemian woodlands is another well-covered area. Thus intensive research in this field remains to be done principally for the Middle Ages and the later part of the modern period.

It would, for example, be necessary to extend the work done by Firbas to cover the decay of the virgin woodlands of Bohemia. The main factors to be examined in this case are the consequences of activity of human agents, through timber felling, burning and pasture land, as well as climatic variations, such as those which have already been demonstrated for the 11th and 16th centuries. Another aspect deserving attention is the structure of the medieval forestry code and its social consequences; in particular it would be worth exploring how the old Slav hunting and military code was penetrated by elements of the Franconian-German forestry code, and why the Bohemian peasants were unable to defend their rights to the common forests against their lords.

A third and very extensive task would be the publication of the data on wood prices contained in the municipal and estate archives. Going beyond the basic treatment of cycles of prosperity and crisis, a framework of data on transport and export could be built up, thereby providing insight, in statistical terms, into the structure of a rational forest economy. By means of a large-scale collective effort, it would, moreover, be possible to present the chronicle of calamities in the Fichtenwald. A fourth problem is that of the step-by-step elimination of large forest property holdings in Bohemia and its consequences for forestry workers and employees in the period from 1919 to 1947.

THE GERMANS IN CZECH HISTORIOGRAPHY
1945—1965

Ferdinand Seibt

The author throws light on the development of Czech historiography since 1945, using as an example what it has had to say about the relationship between Czechs and Germans. In the early post-war period, under the impact of the events after 1938, the Germans were treated — if at all — only as intruders and trouble-makers in Czech history. Their expulsion was therefore regarded as an act of historical justice. After 1948, however, this problem was redefined as part of the system of historical materialism. In the process, social elements of conflict were added to national ones, but on the other hand — and from the same viewpoint — bridged by testimony of a supranational class-conscious solidarity. During this stage of development of historical theory in the 1950’s, there appeared side by side with statements on the „wicked“ Germans, examples of the „good“ Germans as well. The
latter had distinguished themselves as forerunners and standard-bearers of the proletarian class struggle. Having made this selection of themes, however, Czech historiography does deserve credit for dealing with long-neglected interconnections; among these were the German contribution to the Hussite revolution (Macek), the peasant revolts of the 17th century (Koči), and the German working-class movement of the 19th century (Kořalka).

The emergence of a third phase since about 1961 can be discerned. In this phase a more differentiated approach has been taken to the concept of dialectical progress (e.g. by Kalivoda). Thus in treating individual periods of development in economic, social and intellectual history (Fiala, Kavka, Marek, VáIka and others) bourgeois strata of the population have been viewed as having played a progressive role. Only in the field of recent history has a considerable immobility of judgement persisted. The author cites examples for the individual stages of Czechoslovak history to illustrate the changing views of this problem.

ARISTOCRACY AND DOMINION IN MEDIEVAL BOHEMIA AS DEPICTED BY CZECHOSLOVAK HISTORIOGRAPHY

Karl Richter

Aristocracy and dominion have proven over the millenia to be extremely durable constants of sociopolitical and cultural life. Acknowledgement of this fact, however, was achieved only after historians had recognized the errors and misconceptions which arose in the 18th and 19th centuries from applying views of the Enlightenment as well as Romantic and Liberal concepts to the origins of European social development. Interestingly enough, the German and Czech historical views, although originating under similar circumstances and leading to the same errors, had diametrically opposing results. In the German view, the Slavs possessed none of the characteristics needed by a people capable of building and preserving their own state, and were thus doomed to remain the mere objects of despotic rulers, whereas the German ancestors had allegedly lived in an ideal condition of freedom and equality which enabled them, in common, to determine their own destiny. The Czechs likewise claimed for themselves a heritage of primitive democracy and assigned the Germans the role of brutal despots who had introduced inequality and serfdom into Bohemia (Palacký).

The present contribution attempts to outline the changes in the image of the aristocracy in Czech historical science since František Palacký. Just as notions that once prevailed in Germany and Austria have been replaced by more accurate views, above all due to the work of O. Brunner, K. Bosl, W. Schlesinger and others, the traditional ideas of the aristocracy have also