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, Válka 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
changed in the case of Bohemian historians. The works of H. Jireček, W. W. Tomek, the students of J. Goll, J. Susta, V. Novotný, J. Pekař and others represent significant strides on the path to a better understanding of the problem. At almost the same time in the 1930's, Václav Vaněček in Bohemia and Otto Brunner in Austria recognized that statehood was a product of the interplay of sovereign and aristocracy, with Vaněček, who is now Ordinary Professor for Legal History in Prague, for the first time documenting the existence of an influential and independent class of magnates in Bohemia.

After the Communist assumption of power, it first appeared that the upper classes would be entirely disregarded as an object of research. But after a period of dogmatic research coloured by class-struggle concepts, Czech historiography arrived at a more sober and factual approach, thanks largely to the confrontation between dogma and the evidence provided by source material. In this process, František Graus, Zdeněk Fiala, František Kavka and a number of younger historians have made important contributions. Still, the results of the more recent studies on the older leading strata in Bohemia are based on the revolutionary conclusions of Václav Vaněček, which correspond to those of modern German social history. The basis has thus been created for a mutually fruitful exchange of views.

THE "TEMNO" IN RECENT CZECH HISTORIOGRAPHY

Frederick G. Heymann

In the 19th century the period called "Temno" (the time of darkness) was, as already indicated by this name, considered as purely a phase of tragedy and misery. In the early 20th century elements of revising this view can be found, e.g. in the works of Pekař, especially in his "Kniha o Kostí". His views underwent criticism on the part of Kamil Krofta. On the whole the "Temno" seemed to awaken relatively little interest until later times.

In the last twenty years Czech historiography paid more attention to the economic and political development of Bohemia during the 17th and 18th centuries. Much emphasis was put on the peasant revolts, and among those particularly on the great rising of the peasantry in 1775. Scholars like Husa, Petrán, Kočí, Oldřich Janeček published useful works in this field, and Janeček even saw in that rebellion a conscious tie between Hussitism and modern social-revolutionary movements.

Perhaps of even greater significance is the study of economic developments in the fields of manufacture. Here the leading role was played by Arnošt Klíma, particularly in his very substantial work "Manufakturí období v Čechách" (The Time of Manufacture in Bohemia), a specialized and thorough work published in 1955 and followed up by a more general treatment of the period in question in his "Čechy v období temna" (Bohemia in the period of darkness). In these works Klíma explains his views regarding