

century. Before that, F. Palacký dealt with the aesthetics history, although his “Přehled dějin krásovědy a její literatury” (1823) deals only with the world aesthetics history. Palacký was convinced about the fact that in the Czech setting it is not possible to talk about a development of any aesthetic theories. His work significantly influenced Czech aesthetic historiography because Palacký accepted the idea of development. In his opinion all man’s endeavour is aimed to achieve humanity (much later M. Novák also thinks the same way).

The need for recording history of the Czech aesthetics appeared not until a half of 19th century. The effort to make the national philosophy independent was the main condition for this need. Herbartians – F. Čupr, J. Dastich and J. Durdík – returned to aesthetic ideas of Tomáš Štítný ze Štítného whom they, by mistake, considered to be the original thinker and predecessor of formal aesthetics. Among Czech Herbartian writings we can find not only revivalist efforts, but also certain “cosmopolitanism”, knowledge that Herbart’s philosophy is the holder of the truth (Herbart’s philosophy was important for Czech philosophical thinking mainly because of terminology).

The name Štítný became “a milestone” in the Czech aesthetics history. It played an important role in A. Krecar’s work “Česká literatura estetická” which is based on formalism and considers “Všeobecná estetika” by J. Durdík as a top of the Czech aesthetic thinking. Later, when Štítný’s ideas were confirmed not to be original (J. Král), the attention moved more to Herbartian interpretation of Štítný’s aesthetics.

Opposite to Krecar, who was devoted to Durdík’s aesthetics, Z. Nejedlý, an author of “Katechismus esthetiky”, put emphasis on aesthetics by O. Hostinský. Then the view on aesthetics history gradually changed.