The present study deals with the professionalization of obstetrics and midwifery that came about in Bohemia at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries. It focuses on the linguistic and socio-linguistic problems of this process, which took place in a period of gradual vernacularization and de-Latinization. Possible connections between the improvement of obstetric services at the behest of the state, and the language question, are analysed on three levels: First, the author demonstrates how difficult it was to introduce and enforce obligatory training for midwives. A second important aspect is the creation of textbooks which had to take into account language proficiency as well as the overall educational level of different target groups - students, physicians, and midwives. Finally, the example of the conflict about filling the chair of obstetrics at Prague university, which was won by Antonín Jungmann, is used to demonstrate the importance attached by the professors involved in the selection, with the future development of their discipline in mind, to the demand that the candidate have a good command of both German and Czech.

"THERE REALLY WERE GERMANS I WAS NOT LOATH TO MEET"

WHAT THE CZECH HISTORIAN VÁCLAV VOJTIŠEK REVEALED IN 1966 ABOUT WARTIME GERMAN COLLEAGUES

Karel Hruza

This contribution comprises the Czech original and a German translation of a letter which Czech historian and archivist Václav Vojtišek wrote, in 1966, to Gerda Blaschej, a young historian from (East) Berlin, as well as an introductory commentary. In the letter, Vojtišek answers questions relating to the university having adopted, during the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia and even before and without too much coercion, some Nazi views, above all the overriding importance given to considerations of a political nature. He offers a number of brief portraits of university rectors such as August Naegle and Marian San Nicolo, of professors engaged in the "Volksstumskampf" (the struggle for the preponderance of everything German) such as Erich Gierach, Josef Pfitzner, and Eduard Winter, of Heinz Zatschek who was a colleague of his as an archivist and teacher of the auxiliary disciplines relating to history, and of influential figures in the ranks of the Reinhard Heydrich Foundation such as Alfred Buntru and Hans Joachim Beyer. Vojtišek's remarks betray his
intimate knowledge of the Prague university environment and scientific scene, but also the fact that he fundamentally disapproved of all Germans at the time, and his pronounced anti-Semitism. His verdicts about his former German “colleagues” reveal how he understood his own role as a scholar and a Czech. In addition, the document offers insights in the rather complicated matter of scientific communication between the GDR and Czechoslovakia during the 1960s.

CZECH RESEARCH INTO NAZI GERMAN RULE IN OCCUPIED BOHEMIA AND MORAVIA
AN EVALUATION PROMPTED BY THE PUBLICATION OF A STANDARD WORK

Jaroslav Kučera / Volker Zimmermann

The driving force behind the two authors undertaking an evaluation of Czech research activities concerning developments in the Bohemian lands for the period of German occupation and their findings, has been the publication, in 2006 and 2007 respectively, of two part-volumes belonging to the book series “Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české” (A Comprehensive History of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown) and devoted to the period 1938-1945. The resulting article emphasizes a number of factors the authors consider problematic. These are: a lack of efforts which would place the occupation authorities in the context of overall Nazi German politics, caused among other things by a certain disregard for research conducted abroad; the absence of an integrating perspective encompassing both regional varieties of Nazi German rule over formerly Czech territory: on the one hand, the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, and on the other hand the “Reichsgau Sudetenland”; the fact that the Second Czech republic is often rather simplistically adorned with the label of “period without freedom”; a certain neglect of aspects of societal development, of the history of everyday life and of social and economic history; the preponderance of accounts devoted to Czech efforts at resistance, with a systematic evaluation of the behaviour of various social groups under Nazi German rule completely lacking so far.