

Josef Kalousek: A Half-Forgotten First Professor of Bohemian History at Prague University



Jiří Štaif

KEYWORDS:

Josef Kalousek — Bohemian History Discipline at Prague University — Economic and Social History — Second Half of 19th Century

BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION

Josef Kalousek (1838–1915) established the discipline of Bohemian history in the Prague Faculty of Arts.¹ Remarkably, this discipline had never existed there, as far as I know, and perhaps even more remarkable was the way how Kalousek gained his position. A historiographer cannot complain about not having enough specific information about these facts. Authoritative information allows one to form an idea of facts which played a more important role than other facts. In other words, one asks what motivated Kalousek to become a *homo academicus*.² His case involves moreover an academic career which was not so common in the Bohemian Lands in the long 19th century. It primarily involved Kalousek's close relationship with the founder of modern Czech historiography and the 'Father' of the Czech nation František Palacký (1798–1876) and his son-in-law, the political leader of the Czech nation František Ladislav Rieger (1818–1903). This was a time when a successful career of a university professor of history in central Europe demanded the satisfying of several preconditions.

First of all, the scholar needed an indisputable qualification obtained through university studies and followed by the doctoral degree. Then it was an outstanding performance in the field of scientific research on the past. The career of an ambitious academic historian had to be crowned with a profiling book monograph or a series of factographic studies, which were a prerequisite for a successful *habilitation*. It was also an advantage if these works belonged to the common theme.

1 This paper is an edited and reformulated version of my study on Josef Kalousek between self-fulfilment and devotion to František Palacký and František Ladislav Rieger. In: Pavel Fabini (ed.), *Historik Josef Kalousek. Historiografie, politika, kultura a společnost druhé poloviny 19. století*, České Budějovice — Prague 2016, pp. 13–29. In the following notes I refer to a manuscript edition of Kalousek's diaries. I review the edition of *Deníky Josefa Kalouska II.*, eds. Martin Klečáček, Pavel Fabini, Luboš Velek, Praha 2016 in a relevant section of this journal.

2 Cf. esp. Pierre Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus*, Stanford 1988. See esp. Chapter 3, *Types of Capital and Forms of Power*, pp. 73–127.



Habitus — in this case, a set of personal qualifications for the professional historical work of a particular doctoral candidate interacting within the framework of the social conditions where this took place was very important. It influenced his decision whether to concentrate more on the critical analysis of original historical sources, or to place this initial scientific performance within a wider historical context and a more complex interpretation of the results of his research. He had a comparative advantage if he could offer new historical themes. *Habilitations* took place in already established disciplines or opened the way for the emergence of new academic disciplines constituted in this way. Their establishment was under the decisive influence of both the internal university policy of pursuing or not pursuing innovation, and political interests, as it was precisely in the case of Kalousek.³

Now, a new discipline was only established when its representative first secured the position of an associate professor and then of a full university professor, which were remunerated posts. A private assistant professor generally delivered his lectures free of charge or could receive a financial reward for giving lessons. Therefore, he had to secure a source of livelihood until he became a paid university professor, which meant a historian worked in an archive or taught in a secondary school. In the case of Josef Kalousek, however, the journey to the academic career of his dreams was particularly arduous. He encountered a number of obstacles he had to overcome, which influenced profoundly his view on the role of the historian in society, but he did not respond to his recurring difficulties with feckless defeatism.

PURSUING A VOCATION

The difficulties that Kalousek faced in his career come to light in a simple comparison with his professional peers. They were his German colleagues, history graduates and fellow students in the Prague Faculty of Arts, Ludwig Schlesinger (1838–1899), Julius Lippert (1839–1909) and Hermann Hallwich (1838–1913), who all distinguished themselves without becoming university professors. None of them had to overcome on his way to self-fulfilment such great obstacles as Josef Kalousek. An exception in this respect was the enforced, but temporary, and in the long-term financially beneficial and intellectually stimulating, departure of Julius Lippert for Germany.

As young historians, Schlesinger, Lippert and Hallwich belonged to the group of the founders of the German Historical Society in Bohemia — *Verein für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* (1862). Schlesinger also edited this society's influential journal *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* in the years 1870–1892.

³ Cf. Pavel Kolář, *Geschichtswissenschaft in Zentraleuropa. Die Universitäten Prag, Wien und Berlin um 1900*, Berlin 2008, passim, esp. S. 39ff., 267ff. and 387ff. Unless stated differently, in the historiographic passages of this study I draw on František Kutnar, Jaroslav Marek, *Přehledné dějiny českého a slovenského dějepisectví*, 3rd edition, Praha 2009, in the passages concerning political history it is Otto Urban, *Česká společnost 1848–1918*, Prague 1982. In the same sense see also Jiří Kořalka, *František Palacký (1798–1876)*. *Životopis*, Prague 1998, and Robert Sak, *Rieger, Příběh Čecha devatenáctého věku*, Semily 1993.



As a deputy of the Bohemian Diet he was one of the leading personalities among the German liberals in this country. Together with Lippert he was one German historians in Bohemia who argued passionately about Palacký's conception of Czech history, considering it anti-German and methodologically outdated. Schlesinger, supported by the German Historical Society, published in direct opposition to Palacký's his popular-scientific *Geschichte Böhmens* (1868, 2nd ed. 1870), which became an important point of departure for developing of the common historical consciousness of the Germans in Bohemia.

In 1874, Lippert was forced to resign from his post of college professor in České Budějovice for his liberal and anti-clerical views. In Germany he worked as an educator and official in various educational institutions until 1885. After his return to Bohemia he began to develop his concept of medieval cultural and social history and was elected as a German liberal deputy of the Bohemian Diet where, in 1895–1898, held the post of deputy provincial marshal. Hallwich worked for a long time as secretary to the Chamber of Trade in Liberec (1869–1890). He was an influential liberal Diet and Reich deputy. In 1890 he took part, together with Schlesinger, in unsuccessful compromise talks which aimed to reduce the confrontation potential between Czech and German nationalists in Bohemia. Then, after settling in Vienna, he initiated the establishment of Central Association of Austrian Industry [*Zentralverband der Industriellen Österreichs*] (1892). As a historian he specialised in modern economic (corporate) history and in the personality of a military leader during the Thirty-Years War, Albrecht of Valdštejn (1583–1634).⁴

Between Czech historians was Josef Emler (1836–1899) the closest to Kalousek in terms of age, having advanced his professional career more systematically than the later, as editor of medieval historical sources, archivist, secretary of the Museum of the Kingdom of Bohemia (1877–1893) in Prague, editor of the museum journal (1870–1890), and, in particular, Professor of Historical Auxiliary Sciences at Prague University. Compared with them, Kalousek had difficulties completing a gymnasium education, and did so with a certain delay because his family's financial circumstances were very modest. In Prague, he studied first at the Polytechnic. He joined the Faculty of Arts later than his peers at the age of twenty-four. As he himself said, this intellectual *salto mortale* was only the first step in his dream career. He had to earn a living giving private lessons and in journalism, which influenced his professional career for many years.⁵

4 Cf. Jiří Štaif, *Historici, dějiny a společnost. Historiografie v českých zemích od Palackého až po Gollovu školu, 1790–1900*, vol. I., Prague 1997, p. 153ff. and 160ff.; Astrid Tönnies, *Julius Lippert. Sein Leben und Wirken in den Jahren 1839 bis 1885*. Dissertation. Hamburg 1987, see esp. S. 105ff. and 194ff.; Marcela Oubrechtová (ed.), *Julius Lippert a německé prostředí v Čechách, Ústí nad Labem 2010*, passim; Jan Kilián, Robert Rebitsch, Milan Svoboda et al., *Hermann Hallwich 1838–1913: historik, politik, byrokrat, sběratel a básník*. Prague, Teplice 2015, passim.

5 Cf. Otakar Josek, *Život a dílo Josefa Kalouska*, Praha 1922, p. 41ff.; Karel Kazbunda, *Stolice dějin na pražské univerzitě II. Od obnovení stolice dějin do rozdělení univerzity (1746–1882)*, Prague 1965, p. 106.



He understood soon that journalism is primarily the power to sway public opinion, which demands swift reasoning skills and the ability to argue, for which showed an undoubted talent. He felt keenly a constant tension between ideological foundation, pragmatic editorial policy, and newspaper profitability. But, he definitely did not want to rely on the uncertainty of the journalist's trade in the future. He saw with his own eyes the fates of those Czech journalists and writers who did not achieve a higher social position, and lived more or less in material uncertainty. Of the celebrities known today he perceived thus the dramatist Josef Kajetán Tyl (1808–1856), the poets Jan Neruda (1834–1891) and Vítězslav Hálek (1835–1874), and, with particular contempt, the versatile writer Karel Sabina (1813–1877), who died in poverty, and was despised by the Czech national society as an informer working for the Austrian police.⁶

The first time he made personal contact with Palacký was on 20 December 1864 as a collaborator of the Old-Czech newspaper *Národ* [The Nation], which suffered from protracted financial problems, and had to be shut down in May 1866.⁷ The first debate with Palacký concerned inter alia the relation between the Czech National Movement and Russia after the Polish uprising in 1863. Palacký, who did not approve of this revolutionary act, broached in their discussion also a topic that was to become perspective over time for Kalousek as a historian. He mentioned that the Old Slavonic system of “democratic” rural municipalities with common groundproperty is still existing in Russia, which he clearly considered positive. He added grudgingly that in the Bohemian lands ‘this died out rapidly and our documents are all but monuments to Germanism, with privileges and exemptions which the Old Slavonic orders abolished one at a time and killed off’.⁸

After this, Kalousek was invited as a promising Old Czech journalist to the not formal political debates with Palacký and Rieger. He was not very happy about their content because he patently expected more detached points of view instead of partial insights and political anecdotes. Nonetheless, during one of them he witnessed Rieger realised a possible increase in social tension in the Czech villages. He emphasised that the farmers could, as representatives of the rural municipalities, orchestrate a protest movement of the rural proletariat led by smallholders by reckless sales of municipal assets. This was again a rural question, in which Rieger and Kalousek and others participants in the debate viewed an important topic for the internal stability of the Czech national society.⁹ Kalousek was doubtless very honoured to be present in such meetings of the leading representatives of the Czech national and political movement. But he found in his private talks with Palacký, that the latter did not in-

6 Josef Kalousek, *Deník*, entries of 12.7.1865 and 10.1.1866. Archiv Národního muzea v Praze [National Museum Archive in Prague], Fund: Pozůstalost J. Kalouska. Cf. Karel Kazbunda, Sabina, Neuzavřený případ policejního konfidenta, Prague 2006; Petr Kovařík, *Národní soud nad zrádce Karlem Sabinou*, Prague 2010.

7 Luboš Velek, *Staročeský deník Národ (1863–1866) a jeho redaktor Josef Kalousek*. In: *Historik Josef Kalousek. Historiografie, politika, kultura a společnost druhé poloviny 19. století*, pp. 30–63.

8 Josef Kalousek, *Deník*, entry of 20.12.1864.

9 *Ibid.*, entry of 2.2.1865.

tend to grant his fervent wish, to employ him as a paid assistant to work on his life's work, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě* [History of Czech People in Bohemia and Moravia]. With acute embarrassment he heard Palacký's argument that he considered the work of a journalist as good training for a future historian.¹⁰

The fact, that he only completed his university studies of history with doctoral and state examinations in 1868, was also influential upon his decision to be professional historian in the future. Palacký's favoured nevertheless at this time Antonín Gindely (1829–1892), who he had choice to continue his *Dějiny národu českého* after the year 1526. He evidently ranked Josef Emler behind him in his preferences, and rightfully expected that he would assist him effectively with the work on medieval historical sources, than Kalousek. Emler gained i. e. his eminent historical training at the Vienna-based Institute for Austrian Historical Research — *Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*. Therefore, Kalousek regarded Emler as his main competitor in winning the favour of Palacký.¹¹

He was indeed very keen on receiving repeated assurances from Palacký that he was supporting him morally in the fulfilment of the ideas about the career of an academic historian. As a comparative advantage over Emler he considered the fact that his rival was not a skilful stylist and his conception of a historian's work would never go beyond the framework of auxiliary historical sciences. He also objected to his making many promises in the 'Young Czech' manner and then doing little to advance his ideas.¹² He strove to maintain good relations with Czech influential historians Václav Vladivoj Tomek (1818–1905) and later with Josef Jireček (1825–1888). While Palacký was alive he did not want to upset in any way Gindely, who was his university teacher. He did so because the judgements of these three historians were authoritative in the Czech community of historians and their support on one side or disfavour on another side could profoundly affect young colleagues' professional careers.

An even greater rapprochement between Kalousek, Palacký and the Rieger family came about during the Austro-Prussian war in 1866, which they spent together at Rieger's manor Maleč near Chotěboř. By then Kalousek was reconciled to the fact that he noticed from time to time a certain difference between the way Palacký and Rieger appeared in public and the way they acted in private life as people who had their likes, dislikes, personal preferences and weaknesses. His opinion became fixed in the sense that he saw in Palacký a man of "European renown with so much merit for his homeland that his homeland does not have more than one". As for Rieger, he judged that he was the "most capable Czech statesman of the new era".¹³ Palacký was such a great authority to him that he never dared to contradict him in mutual debates, not even in cases when he disagreed with him wholeheartedly. But, he had the courage to communicate to Rieger his critical opinions.

10 Ibid, entry of 9.10.1865.

11 Cf. Ivan Hlaváček, *Přehledné dějiny pomocných věd historických v českých zemích*. (Se zvláštním zřetelem ke stolici oboru na filozofické fakultě Univerzity Karlovy). In: *200 let pomocných věd historických na filozofické fakultě Univerzity Karlovy*, Prague 1988, p. 49ff.

12 J. Kalousek, *Deník*, entry of 3.12.1874.

13 J. Kalousek, *Deník*, entry of 19.8.1866.



This happened in a case when the Czech deputies decided under Palacký's pressure to join the Bohemian Diet in September 1870 without having sufficient guarantees that the government would be willing to back their constitutional demands. This opportunistic stance ran conspicuously contrary to the constitutional declaration adopted by the Czech deputies on 22 August 1868 in protest against the Austro-Hungarian dualism. According to Kalousek, joining the Diet would weaken solidarity with France as it was 1870 in war against a coalition of German states led by Prussia. Moreover, in Kalousek's opinion it was too accommodating towards Russian foreign policy which was not sure which side it should back then.¹⁴ He also held against Rieger the fact that he let the Old Czech newspaper *Národ* go to the wall with his unwillingness to become more personally engaged in the matter.¹⁵ He internally disagreed with Palacký in cases when Palacký emphasised the idealistic motivation in his work for the nation and chided the younger generation of supporters of the Czech National Movement for wanting to be decently paid for their engagement. This position was evidently regarded by Palacký as a senescent authoritative expression of social insensitivity.¹⁶

When the military campaign ended in 1866 Kalousek came to terms, with certain bitterness, that for the moment all he could do was to make a living as a journalist. Equally unattractive to him was the idea that he would become a supply teacher at some remote grammar school for a meagre salary, which would not allow him to find a well-off maiden for bride. Following the example of Palacký, he considered an expedient marriage essential if he were to advance his career as a professional historian. On the other hand, he did not mind becoming a public figure through journalism because he could obtain a parliamentary seat. This idea was suggested to him by Palacký as being feasible until he reached the age of thirty, the age one had to reach to become a deputy.¹⁷

Kalousek's great financial difficulties were eased by Palacký and Rieger with the offer that he could live and take meals with them in their Prague house. At the same time, he became tutor to Rieger's daughter Marie, later married Červinková. This provision was favourable in terms of his future prospects as it permitted him to devote more time to completing his university studies in addition to journalism, and to begin archive research on the historical issue of the state law of Bohemia.¹⁸ For Palacký and Rieger this was a political theme growing in importance and they expected a historical treatment of this issue from an obliging Josef Kalousek. A shorter German treatise on this theme was published by him under the title *Einige Grundlagen des böhmischen Staatsrechts* in 1870. Then he published the most extensive of his historical monograph *České státní právo* [State Law of Bohemia] (1871, 2nd expanded edition 1892), which played in the further development of this discipline an irreplaceable role.

Kalousek was surely flattered to be regarded in the Czech political circles and by many leading representatives of the Bohemian aristocracy as a trusted adviser on

14 Ibid, entries of 14.5.1870, 6.9.1870 and 4.10.1870.

15 Ibid, entry of 9.10.1865.

16 Ibid, entry of 3.12.1874.

17 Ibid, entries 10.1, 19.8, 29.9.1866.

18 Cf. Otakar Josek, *Život a dílo Josefa Kalouska*, Prague 1922, p. 90ff.

what was from the political perspective a rather sensitive issue. Yet he was not sure about the strength of the historical constitutional arguments in the struggle for political power, as he wrote in his journal verbatim: “If historical law helps us in these revolutions”. By this he doubtless meant the stark realisation that Germany was not being united after the Battle of Sedan by the force of historical arguments but by the force of arms.¹⁹ Likewise, he was far from flattered when he heard that some of his colleagues regarded his *Státní právo* as “a mere political pamphlet”, which was not based on thorough historical research but on superficial subservience to the current political interests. This was so because they called into question in this sarcastic manner his qualifications for scientific work and, by extension, for an academic career.²⁰



FIRST EXTRAORDINARY AND THEN FULL PROFESSOR OF BOHEMIAN HISTORY AT PRAGUE UNIVERSITY

We can regard as a clear concession to the Czech constitutional policy the fact that Josef Jireček, until then an influential official in the ministry, and son-in-law of the main romantic representative of Slavonic studies in Czech national society Pavel Josef Šafařík (1795–1861), was made minister for religious affairs and education in the Cisleithanian government of Karl Hohenwart in February 1870. In his new post, Jireček enforced his will to have Polish as a language of tuition at Lvov University, and Kalousek could take his degree in August 1871 at Prague University as a private *docent* [assistant professor] of Bohemian history, which he could teach in Czech. In his application for *habilitation* he gave as his professional qualification his treatise *České státní parvo* [State law of Bohemia], whose printing was not yet finished. Then he placed an emphasis on his planned course in history of Bohemia from its beginnings to 1848, which he presented in more depth on this occasion. Inspired by Palacký, he understood it not only from the perspective of political history, but also from that of the role of the people as an indispensable social factor in Czech history. From today’s perspective we can class this lecture series in the field of study of economic and, more particularly, social history, although those were regarded then at universities as separate scholarly disciplines. The first person to be appointed as a professor of economic history in Great Britain in 1910 was George Unwin (1870–1925) at University of Manchester. He too embarked on an academic career with some difficulties because of strained circumstances in which he was born. But, in comparison with him, Kalousek had to overcome more handicaps.

In this context, let us consider that he did not study or have a research fellowship at any university other than that of Prague. On the other hand, he had relative extensive linguistic and scientific expertise. Unlike the founder of the Czech political economy school Albín Bráf (1851–1912), who was Rieger’s son-in-law, he was not much interested in the modern social question. Likewise, in comparison with Bráf,

¹⁹ J. Kalousek, *Deník*, entry of 5.9.1870.

²⁰ *Ibid*, entry of 3.6.1876.



he did not try to delve deeper into methodological approaches to economic and social history, outlined in his day by the leading representatives of the German historical school (Gustav Schmoller) or the Austrian *marginalist* school of economics (Carl Menger). Bráf was also conversant with the opinions and methods employed by Heinrich Herkner (1863–1932), Lujo Brentano (1844–1931) and Eugen Philippovich (1858–1917), who, together with Schmoller, ranked among the leading supporters of the *Verein für Sozialpolitik* [German Association for Social Policy] (1873). In this sense Bráf was incontestably a more intellectually agile Old Czech conservative liberal than Kalousek.²¹

This historian understood the concept of social change as a historical process that gave birth, from the ‘original’ Czech, i. e. Slavonic people under the pressure of ‘German’ feudalism that began from the 13th century to penetrate into Bohemia, a civic (municipal) and peasant class, while in the original Slavonic society all people enjoyed, in his opinion, civic and legal equality. In this interpretation line, highlighted by Palacký, which had its base in romantic notions about the Czech national past, class distinctions in Bohemia only originated as a result of special legal regulations which were imposed in the medieval kingdom of Bohemia by the German colonists. This was the main reason why an aristocratic and ecclesiastic estate was formed, separate in its rights and at the same time, privileged by its prerogatives. Later it was followed by the urban estate, originally represented by German colonists. In his monograph on the state law of Bohemia Kalousek emphasised in concurrence of views with Palacký that the decline of the original “democratic” system of the Czech Slavonic society, which was said to have been regenerated in the Hussite period, was caused by the Battle of Lipany (1434), in which the Hussite troops were decisively defeated. This paved the way to the creation of the aristocratic oligarchy and as its result, the later subjugation of the peasantry during the reign of King Vladislav [Jagiellon], who was King of Bohemia in 1471–1516.²²

He repeated Palacký’s claim that in this respect the epoch-making ruling was that of the Bohemian Diet of 1487, which paved the way to the long-term subjugation of the peasantry accompanied by paralysing of the political influence of towns. Only after Palacký’s death Kalousek began to take into account that fact that feudalism had its origin in Bohemia also in inner development of society, in which the rising aristocracy was beginning to assert their material interests to the detriment of the rural population. The legal influence of the ‘German’ feudalism he therefore considered later as an ‘accelerating’ rather than ‘initiating’ factor in this historical development. However, he never did a fundamental historical revision of Palacký’s conception of feudalism and the estates ruling order. On the occasion of his *habilitation* he expounded on the Bohemian past with a view to economic and social history, in which he found, on the basis of Palacký’s romantic construction, the initial influence of the class and national distinctions for the formation of the social relations from the 13th

21 Cf. Albín Bráf, politik, národohospodář a jeho doba, ed. Antonie Doležalová, Prague 2013, p. 51ff., 65ff., 77; Albín Bráf, Dělnická otázka. In: Ottův slovník naučný VII. Prague 1893, pp. 216–226.

22 Josef Kalousek, České státní právo, Prague 1871, p. 386ff.

to the mid-19th century, which was neutralised only for a time by the Czech Hussite movement.²³

He saw his special focus in writing a history of subjugation of the ‘originally free’ peasantry becoming a peasant class enslaved under serfdom. In this context he worked with the following line of interpretation: After the Hapsburgs became the kings of Bohemia (1526), the subjugation was further tightened. A trend towards improving of the social position of the country population was started by reforms of the enlightened absolutist rulers in the last decades of the 18th century, and then led, in the revolutionary year 1848, to complete abolition of economic servitude and others relicts of feudal subjection. But, he did not succeed in writing a monograph on this theme. For this reason his real merit in this field of study remained his publishing of an extensive anthology of historical sources. He entitled his project *Řády selské a instrukce hospodářské* [Rural Laws and Economic Instructions], and published it in 1905–1910 as the 22nd–25th volume of the editorial series *Archiv český* [Bohemian Archive], founded by Palacký as early as 1840. His *Řády selské* bring an abundance of historical documents of normative character from 1350–1850, and are still a very useful edition for historians.²⁴

Kalousek’s advance in his academic career, in which he began to be ‘overtaken’ by some younger colleagues, such as Jaroslav Goll (1846–1929), was stopped when the so-called Fundamental Articles were repealed (1871). Their aim was to revise the Austro-Hungarian dualism in the sense that the state law of Bohemia would become the foundation for an autonomous status of the Bohemian Lands, i. e. the Lands of the Bohemian Crown (Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia) in Cisleithania. It came as no surprise then, that after the fall of the Hohenwart government, which was to guarantee the success of this project together with the Czech constitutionalists, Josef Kalousek went through a severe spiritual crisis. The Bohemian history discipline was namely not a mandatory part of the state examinations until 1918 in the Faculty of Arts of Prague University. Its development moreover depended ‘conspicuously’ on the political circumstances which were really unfavourable for further development of Kalousek’s academic career at the time of passive resistance in the Czech politics which ended definitely in 1879.²⁵

For some time he might have been happy as he married a wealthy bride (1873) and thereby started his own family. His wife, however, lost her dowry after several years because of her brother’s business failures and her mother’s financial troubles. Prior to his marriage, Kalousek was forced to accept what was initially a not very well-remunerated high school professorship on which he lived in 1872–1882 to prove to his closest relatives that he had an acceptable social status for marriage. His contentment

23 František Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě V/1*. Prague 1878, pp. 264–271; O. Josek, *Život a dílo Josefa Kalouska*, p. 173.

24 K. Kazbunda, *Stolice dějin II*, p. 110ff.; Marie Ryantová, *Josef Kalousek jako redaktor Archivu českého*. In: *Historik Josef Kalousek*. Historiografie, politika, kultura a společnost druhé poloviny 19. století, pp. 147–168.

25 J. Kalousek, *Deník*, entry of 15.6.1872; Cf. Bohumil Jiroušek, Jaroslav Goll. *Role historika v české společnosti*, České Budějovice 2006, p. 76ff.



was not deepened by the fact that, in spite of all the intercessions of Palacký and Rieger, he entered a competition for the place of an adjunct in the Prague City Archives and it was won by a ten years younger jurist, Jaromír Čelakovský (1849–1914), son of the famous National Revival poet František Ladislav Čelakovský (1799–1852). This archive was maintained after the death of Karel Jaromír Erben (1811–1871) by Josef Emler, who became an extraordinary professor in 1879 and in 1887, a full professor of auxiliary sciences of history in Prague's Faculty of Arts.

Nonetheless, several years before Palacký's death Kalousek was able to give him direct assistance in the completion of his *Dějiny národu českého*, without receiving any remuneration. He was therefore well informed of the original intentions of Palacký in this field of study which he could compare with the results achieved. He essentially believed that Palacký was still peerless among the Czech historians. With certain self-satisfaction he stressed that he was already surrounded by a number of his younger colleagues who "were working with success in that field." He reflected on their influence in the community of historians and on the extent to which their track record and formal position placed them on a certain level in the hierarchy. There are some indications that after Palacký he placed V. V. Tomek and behind him Antonín Gindely. They were followed by a Moravian land archivist and energetic editor of historical sources, Vincenc Brandl (1834–1901).

In his opinion, Palacký's legacy should be also fulfilled in the Czech historiography by the creation of authoritative syntheses of Czech legal and literary history. The first he evidently expected from the legal historian Hermenegild Jireček (1827–1909), and another one from his brother Josef Jireček. He was not content with the state of Czech history of arts where there was no hope in the foreseeable future that somebody would be found among the Czech historians to take on this arduous task. The task demanded both a sound knowledge of the history of architecture, the plastic and fine arts and a special historical training. He also had a number of reservations about the Czech church history because of the partisanship of the Catholic authors. The fact that more consistent work in world history was being neglected probably did not trouble him much. He realised that Emler's star was rising because as a historian and editor he could deliver many more incontestable results than Kalousek could. He conceded that Palacký *Dějiny národu českého*, which he regarded as a classic historical work, would have been different if Emler's editorial work had preceded it and if Palacký could, as a result, continue his exposition from 1526 to complete it.²⁶

After Palacký's death, Josef Kalousek was justly afraid that there would be hierarchical shifts in the Czech historians' community. In this context, he believed that Antonín Gindely would try to monopolise his research on Bohemian history after 1526, which, for him as a private lecturer on this subject waiting for a university professorship could significantly narrow the range of professional competence.²⁷ A few years later (1881) he voiced these fears in public in his critical review in the magazine *Osvěta* of the fourth volume of Gindely's *Dějiny českého povstání léta 1618*. He did not

26 Cf. Josef Kalousek, Přehled dějepisné činnosti české v letech 1872–1876, *Osvěta* 7, 1877, Part 1: pp. 70 — 80.

27 J. Kalousek, *Deník*, entry of 3.6.1876.

sign it in his name because of inherent editorial cuts were made in his genuine text, which emphasised its unfavourable effect. At the same time, in personal talks with Gindely he tried ‘hypocritically’ to give the impression that the review was written by someone else. Kalousek did not ask directly the question whether Gindely was a worthy successor to Palacký, but he emphasised that Palacký’s historical legacy had to be divided into more parts, so that in the research on Bohemian history after 1526 a younger generation of Czech historians could take part. Simultaneously he hinted that Gindely was not writing about Bohemian history in the spirit of Palacký, as he veered towards the history of European diplomacy. What is more, he accepted without moral reservations the post-White Mountain repressions running after 1620 that hit hard the Bohemian Lands in many respects as a historical necessity that did not have a more moderate alternative.²⁸

A very impatient Kalousek tried to use the return of the Czech political representation to active politics to finally obtain his extraordinary professorship. He subjected to this his willingness to take charge as editor of a planned edition of speeches by F. L. Rieger in different bodies of the representatives. This leading Czech politician had however different priorities in his university policy at this time and Kalousek were forced to suppress his desires although his intercessor was again Josef Jireček.²⁹ He had to wait for this title until the division of the Prague University into Czech and German parts in 1882. A full professor he was made in 1885, and he went into retirement at the age of seventy in early October 1908. For many reasons, he was however unable to make his mark in the Prague Faculty of Arts during his tenure as a leading personality.³⁰

A contributing factor in this was the fact that he was considered to be an exponent of the interests of Rieger’s Old Czech Party. It was at the same time when prominent personalities such as Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1850–1937) and Jaroslav Goll (1846–1929), who represented, in comparison with Kalousek, a more self-confident type of the Czech intellectual elite, intended to emancipate themselves from direct interventions of party politics in academic affairs. It is not surprising, therefore that Kalousek felt somewhat isolated in the Faculty in terms of age and opinions. Making warmer personal contacts in the university milieu was evidently prevented by his reserved manners and a certain tendency to subtle irony. His lectures on Bohemian history were always not a profiling subject unlike the lectures on general and Austrian history. This is why no permanent circle of students formed around him to pub-

28 Cf. J. Kalousek, *Deník*, entry of 6.12.1880; J. Štaif, *Historici, dějiny a společnost*, vol. II, Prague 1997, p. 212ff.

29 Cf. J. Kalousek, *Deník*, entry of 12.8.1880; Marie Červinková-Riegerová, *Zápisky I.* (1880–1884), eds. Milan Vojáček, Luboš Velek et al., Prague 2009, p. 85 and 102. This is edition of Josef Kalousek (ed.), *Řeči dra F. L. Riegera a jeho jednání v zákonodárných sborech I* (1848–1849), vol. II. (1861–1862), vol. III. (1863–1864) and vol. IV. (1865–1867), Prague 1883, 1884, 1887, 1888. Kalousek did this in collaboration with Marie Červinková-Riegerová.

30 Cf. Karel Kazbunda, *Stolice dějin na pražské univerzitě*, vol. III., *Stolice dějin na české univerzitě od zřízení univerzity do konce rakousko-uherské monarchie (1882–1918)*, Prague 1968, pp. 23 and 67–84.





licly declare that they were his 'successful' pupils, recognising thus his academic authority. Unlike Emler, Goll and other historians, he took no part in holding historical seminars, which also did not strengthen his position among the academic historians.

Apart from *České státní právo* of 1871 he published no monograph that could be regarded as profiling. As a university professor he can be seen as a personality lacking in comparison with Masaryk and to an extent, with Goll, personal *charisma*, or the stamp of editorial originality as Emler. Nothing in this was changed by the fact that he gave important impulses for the development of research on economic and social history. This focus on historical research was exploited at Prague University by young historians. They included Goll's pupil Kamil Krofta (1876–1945) with his monograph *Přehled dějin selského stavu v Čechách a na Moravě* (1920, 2nd edition, 1949), in which he no longer shared Palacký concept of 'fatal' consequences of the 'German' feudalism penetrating into the Bohemian Lands. In comparison with Krofta, a more perspective direction for research on agrarian history was set by Goll's favourite pupil Josef Pekař (1870–1937). In his work *Kniha o Kosti* (1909 and 1911) he posed the question how the mutual relations between the aristocratic masters and their subjects were influenced by their mentality, emotional bond to the land, yield of farming land, and natural and other disasters. He tried to elaborate the issue of the state burdening the subjects with taxes more analytically in his major study *České katastry 1654–1789: se zvláštním zřetelem k dějinám hospodářským a ústavním* (1915).³¹

Kalousek university prestige was not much enhanced by his ability to enter into professional polemics in which was able to give a number of original interpretation stimuli. This was the case, in my judgment, when he defended a contentious matter, such as the dispute over the authenticity of *Rukopisy zelenohorský a královédvorský* (1886). Jaroslav Goll declared on this occasion with dry wit that a historical poem cannot be judged as an ordinary historical source according to the criteria of the critical recognition of historical facts as a poet is a completely sovereign author over a historical subject.³² It should be also noted that he could comment critically on the introduction of Darwinism in historical research as evidenced by his lecture at *Historical Club* of February 1883 on the topic *Historie a materialism* [History and Materialism]. That time he took aim at a popular German traveller and cultural historian Friedrich von Hellwald (1842–1892), reproaching him for trying to convince the public with fallacious arguments that throughout history, laws of mechanics and physics and laws of organic chemistry apply in Nature to such an extent that free human will has to submit to them. He had voiced similar considerations earlier (1874), emphasising the fact that materialism cannot explain the ideal motives of human behaviour.

Kalousek held that human behaviour is determined in principle by freedom in decision-making. In this he may have been inspired by the opinions of Palacký on the key role of divinity, or the striving for 'likeness to God' in earthly history, in which they both saw the mainspring of progress in the development of human civilisation.

31 Cf. František Kutnar, *Vývoj agrárního dějepisectví v českých zemích*. Undated typescript, pp. 53–57, 94ff. and 99ff. Národní zemědělské muzeum v Praze. Sběrka písemné dokumentace.

32 Cf. J. Štaif, *Historici, dějiny a společnost*, vol. II, p. 228ff.

He also claimed on this occasion that this ideal stance is confirmed by both empiric and inductive methods, which are common to natural sciences and the humanities. He augmented his conviction with a moral explanation, saying that history could not be a teacher of life if we took as its starting point the material inescapability of human actions. He showed that he was able to advance arguments in more abstract philosophical dimensions. This said, he applied this disposition only occasionally. Perhaps he did not feel that he could in this way enhance his prestige in the academic milieu of the Czech University of Prague, where T. G. Masaryk, who was twelve years younger and better prepared for this role, began to intervene in this sphere with increasing vigour.³³



BY WAY OF CONCLUSION

For the history of the Czech historiography it was indeed important that Josef Kalousek became the initiator of the research on František Palacký. He started it with his brief outline of Palacký's biography on the occasion of the completion of *Dějiny národu českého* (1876). He particularly appreciated the fact that based on discussions with his protagonist he developed a world view which had been formed since Palacký's youth. In doing this he stressed that the principal role in it was played by the concept of divinity which Kalousek construed as 'concord and likeness with God', that which arouses in a noble man a desire for freedom, truth, goodness, and beauty. In history it manifests itself to endless degrees and variants as an initial impetus for positive historical changes.³⁴ In a way, Kalousek was proud of having succeeded on this occasion in capturing the way in which František Palacký went far as to interpret the Czech history and the objectives of the Czech National Movement in the Old Czech fashion, in the state-law context of the history of the Bohemian Lands with an emphasis on Czech national unity.

Immediately after Palacký's death Kalousek was entrusted directly by F. L. Rieger to prepare a definitive edition of *Dějiny národu českého*, which became the basis for all subsequent editions. It was introduced with a reprint of Kalousek's *Nástin životopisu Františka Palackého*, which had, according to Rieger, the advantage that Palacký had read it without any reminders.³⁵ Before this Kalousek had witnessed Palacký's completion of the second volume of his *Dějiny národu českého* with last-ditch effort as his mental and physical strength was draining away. He had great difficulties when treat-

33 Cf. J. Kalousek, Deník, entry of 31.8.1874, Josef Kalousek, Historie a materialismus, Časopis Českého musea 58, 1883, pp. 185–193. The lecture was given at a celebration marking the tenth anniversary of the Historical Club.

34 Josef Kalousek, Nástin životopisu Františka Palackého. Na oslavu dokončení Dějin národu českého. S podobiznou, Prague 1876, cit. p. 10–11; Cf. Jiří Štaif, František Palacký. Život, dílo, mýtus, Prague 2009, p. 32ff. and 39ff.

35 Josef Kalousek, Nástin životopisu Františka Palackého. In: František Palacký, Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě I/1, Prague 1876, p. IX — L; Cf. J. Kalousek, Deník, entry of 3.6.1876.



ing the time period between 1253 and 1403 to translate the original German text of *Geschichte von Böhmen* into Czech because he was no longer able to reformulate it. He had to rework Part 1278–1283 considerably and the demolition and reconstruction caused him much exasperation, with much hard thinking about reconciling the new with the old, so that the exposition would make an integrated impression. He did not have enough energy to supplement the Czech text about the period of the 14th and early 15th century with a description of the internal circumstances, genealogy of the aristocracy, and a list of the Hussite strongholds. Rieger and Kalousek also called on him to start writing his memoirs but he no longer had any desire for this.³⁶

On the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Palacký birth in 1898, Kalousek presented an insider's analysis of the central ideas in the historical work of František Palacký. He developed his earlier opinions on his concept of divinity and stressed even more Kant's influence on his world view. This German philosopher had offered to Palacký the key to the understanding of the limits of intellectual knowledge and to combining them with man's need to find the mainstay of existence in God's existence, without which divinity would be just an empty notion. Divinity as a central theme on Palacký's spiritual horizon was a result of his adolescent reading of a treatise by the English philosopher Francis Bacon (1551–1621) on the importance and development of the sciences. On the other hand, Kalousek mentioned only briefly the concept of humanity, to which Palacký was inspired by the German Protestant preacher and 'pre-Romantic' Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), although it was perfectly compatible with the ideal of national equality.

It is clear from Kalousek's discourse that he knew Palacký well in person. He could therefore imagine how Palacký would have reacted to an exposition of his attitude to the Christian faith, religion, and different forms of church organisation. He was also well aware that this topic was fairly delicate, and the fact that Palacký expressed in private and in his historical work sympathies for Jan Hus (c. 1371–1415) and the Bohemian Brethren, represented but one aspect of this topic. Kalousek evidently knew that Palacký restored his membership of the Lutheran church, to which he had belonged from childhood like his parents, just under two years before death. For the most part of his life he preferred an undogmatical and non-denominational approach to Christian piety.³⁷ In his private life, historical work and published outputs he did not conceal his strongly critical attitude to the uncompromising conception of authority in the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, before marrying he signed a declaration that children from the marriage would become Catholics as his father-in-law wished, and his future wife, who was a devout Catholic.³⁸

It was manifestly for these reasons that Kalousek concluded his treatise on the leading ideas in the historical work of František Palacký with an emphasis on his generally Christian understanding of humanity. In comparison with T. G. Masaryk, whom he considered an ambitious careerist acting expediently, he was much more

³⁶ J. Kalousek, *Deník*, entry of 3.6.1876.

³⁷ Cf. J. M. Lochman, *Duchovní odkaz obrození. Dobrovský, Bolzano, Kollár, Palacký. Náboženské profily*, Prague 1964, p. 253ff.

³⁸ Cf. Jiří Kořalka, *František Palacký (1798–1876). Životopis*, Prague 1998, p. 110ff.

restrained in this respect.³⁹ Therefore, he highlighted the exemplarity of the world view of František Palacký without giving in to the enticing possibility of constructing on this foundation the moral sense of Czech history, which Masaryk began to find in his exposition of the *Czech Question* and the *Social Question* (1895 and 1898).⁴⁰ As a conservative liberal of the Old Czech type Kalousek could not go farther in the interpretation without having a nagging feeling that he was too accommodating to the democratic pressures of the day. Like Palacký, he had no great sympathy for them although they both pointed out the more or less 'original' Slavonic "democracy" in Czech history. Of course, they understood it de facto in the liberal fashion as equality of the citizens before the law, and the striving to establish the greatest possible political or social equality was alien to them.⁴¹

Remarkable were also Kalousek's introductions to an edition of Rieger's parliamentary speeches which he published jointly with his daughter and his former ward Marie Červinková-Riegerová (1854–1895) in 1883–1886. Of particular historical interest is the fact that they consulted Rieger about the circumstances in which they were produced.⁴² Kalousek's journals also contain a number of snippets of information on Palacký and in particular, on Rieger's attitudes towards France and Russia in the cultural and political sense. Then, we can mention a funeral oration he delivered after Rieger's death on 15 March 1903 at the request of members of *Historical Club* at Prague University. In it he pointed out, as he did in the case of František Palacký, to the paramount importance of synergic cultural and social activities of these national protagonists for the successful development of the Czech national society in Europe in the 19th century, which was taking however place without they had great political successes.⁴³ He was also well aware of what he owed to them though they were not always as amenable to his self-realisation ideas as he would have wished.

Josef Kalousek can be best described as a personality in search of a position 'between currents'. His mentality was moreover marked by his need to rely on moderate liberal and sometimes rather conservative life and scholarly certitudes at a time which began to call them more and more into question. He firmly believed that historical progress can be achieved in small steps and at the cost of great sacrifices, and always to a limited extent. In his opinion, striving for objectiveness in historical judgements should not lead to cynicism, and in the same sense, politics should never

39 J. Kalousek, *Deník*, entries of 15.10.1886, 12.3. and 18.12.1888, 2.2. and 4.4.1890.

40 Milan Machovec, Tomáš G. Masaryk, Prague 1968, p. 107ff.; Jiří Štaif, *Die soziale Frage, der Kapitalismus und die intellektuellen Eliten vor 1914: T. G. Masaryk und die anderen*. In: Lukáš Fasora — Jiří Hanuš — Jiří Malíř (eds.), *Sozial — reformatorisches Denken in den böhmischen Ländern 1848–1914*, München 2010, p. 120ff.

41 J. Kalousek, *O vůdčích myšlenkách v historickém díle Palackého*. In: *Památník na oslavu stých narozenin Františka Palackého*, Prague 1898, pp. 177–232, esp. see pp. 180–194 and 230ff; Cf. Jiří Štaif, *František Palacký*, Prague 2009, p. 63 and 284ff.

42 Marie Červinková-Riegerová, *Zápisky I* (1880–1884), pp. 79, 243, 254, 275, 308, 547. Červinková made the initial selection of documents and translated most of them into Czech if the originals were in German.

43 Josef Kalousek, *O Dru. F. L. Riegerovi*, Prague 1903.





lose sight of loftier ideals. At Prague University he did not become, as we already know, a leading personality although he initiated research on economic and social history and made his mark as a historian considering more general theoretical and methodological questions.

Neither he nor his pupils succeeded in creating in the Czech historiography a pressure group of their own against what is called Goll's 'Positivist School',⁴⁴ which gradually took over, between 1900 and 1938, all the history professorships in the Czech Faculty of Arts and after 1918 expanded to the new universities in Moravian Brno and Slovakian Bratislava. This can explain, as well as a certain conceptual rigidity of Kalousek's conception of the past, the fact why he became a half-forgotten historian. His life and his scholarly career show quite vividly the multifarious interactions that fundamentally affected generation changes, legitimisation of claims to leading roles, and the complex relations between the methodological continuities and discontinuities in the modern Czech historiography. At the same time, it stimulates the desire to return to the personalities of historians who made their mark to a more modest extent in comparison with what they had wished in their heart of hearts.

44 Cf. at least Roman Pazderský, Jaroslav Goll — Seine Bedeutung und sein Einfluss auf die Entwicklung der tschechischen Historiographie. *Prager wirtschafts- und sozialhistorische Mitteilungen*, Bd. 18, 2/2013, S. 97–113; Bohumil Jiroušek, Josef Kalousek a česká historická věda. In: Pavel Fabini (ed.), *Historik Josef Kalousek*, České Budějovice, Prague 2016, pp. 133–146.