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 Kosti“. 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, Petráň, 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
the development from feudalism through mercantilist industrialization to modern capitalism, including the influence upon the abolition of serfdom.

On the whole the role of the Habsburgs is evaluated by modern Czech historiography, generally in agreement with earlier treatments, in a highly critical way. In its sharp criticism of enlightened despotism and especially of the role of Emperor Joseph II, recent Czech historiography has probably gone rather too far. Positive evaluation of phenomena of the Temno can be found, on the other hand, in the treatment of the cultural development of Bohemia in the period in question.

There is a steadily growing number of works relating to the visual arts of the Baroque period, many of them beautifully illustrated. Even more important is the treatment of the Czech literature in the 17th and 18th centuries. This includes older forms as well as the revival of historiography. It also gives us a lively understanding of the forms of poetry and prose developing in those phases, to some extent open, to another anonymous popular writings, including the remarkable so-called „Ovčácká poesie“ (Shepherds poetry). Some of these treatments go back to the work of Jaroslav Vlček published first in the thirties of this century, others found an excellent treatment by Josef Hrabák in the great History of Czech Literature published since 1959 by the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN „AUSGLEICH“ OF 1867:
A REVIEW OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS IN THE SLOVAK CAPITAL (28 AUGUST — 2 SEPTEMBER 1967)

Friedrich Prinz

Notable was a Hungarian contribution (by P. Hanák) to the conference theme, drastically revising, as it did, by means of an analysis of the economic development since 1867, the old clichés of an alleged exploitation and colonialization of Hungary by the Western half of the Empire. A German participant (H. Mommsen) examined the repercussions of the Ausgleich legislation on the political mechanism of the state as a whole. The important fact was noted that the Dualist construction of the state permitted the Emperor and an intimate circle of unofficial advisors at the Court to intervene in the affairs of state with complete disregard for ministerial responsibility. This went so far as to allow a certain measure of absolutism to take root along the structural boundary-line between Austria and Hungary, and led to a dangerous partial paralysis of parliamentarianism in the Western half of the Empire. H. Lentze saw an essential feature of Austrian constitutional history after 1867 in the compromise between the high state bureaucracy and German liberalism; the Liberals hoped to profit from the preservation of bureaucratic centralism to secure German pre-eminence, while the ruling bureaucracy was, for its part, prepared to tolerate some degree of