

The Thun-Hohenstein University Reforms 1849–1860

Conception – Implementation – Aftermath

Edited by Christof Aichner and Brigitte Mazohl

VERÖFFENTLICHUNGEN
DER KOMMISSION FÜR NEUERE GESCHICHTE ÖSTERREICHS

Band 115
Kommission
für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs
Vorsitzende: em. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Brigitte Mazohl
Stellvertretender Vorsitzender: Univ.-Prof. Dr. Reinhard Stauber

Mitglieder:

Dr. Franz Adlgasser
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Peter Becker
Univ.-Prof. i. R. Dr. Ernst Bruckmüller
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Laurence Cole
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Margret Friedrich
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Elisabeth Garms-Cornides
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Michael Gehler
Univ.-Doz. Mag. Dr. Andreas Gottsmann
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Margarete Grandner
em. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Hanns Haas
Univ.-Prof. i. R. Dr. Wolfgang Häusler
Univ.-Prof. i. R. Dr. Ernst Hanisch
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Gabriele Haug-Moritz
Dr. Michael Hochedlinger
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Lothar Höbelt
Mag. Thomas Just
Univ.-Prof. i. R. Dr. Grete Klingenstein
em. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Alfred Kohler
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Christopher Laferl
Gen. Dir. Univ.-Doz. Dr. Wolfgang Maderthaner
Dr. Stefan Malfèr
Gen. Dir. i. R. H.-Prof. Dr. Lorenz Mikoletzky
Dr. Gernot Obersteiner
Dr. Hans Petschar
em. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Helmut Rumpler
Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Martin Scheutz
em. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Gerald Stourzh
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Arno Strohmeyer
Univ.-Prof. i. R. Dr. Arnold Suppan
Univ.-Doz. Dr. Werner Telesko
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Thomas Winkelbauer

Sekretär:

Dr. Christof Aichner

The Thun-Hohenstein University Reforms 1849–1860

Conception – Implementation – Aftermath

Edited by Christof Aichner and Brigitte Mazohl

FWF Der Wissenschaftsfonds.

Published with the support from the
Austrian Science Fund (FWF): PUB 397-G28

Open access: Except where otherwise noted, this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Deutsche Nationalbibliothek Cataloging-in-publication data: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

© 2017 by Böhlau Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, Wien Köln Weimar
Wiesingerstraße 1, A-1010 Wien, www.boehrlau-verlag.com

Translation: Übersetzungsbüro Schnellübersetzer GmbH (C. Kelly).

ISBN 978-3-205-20553-1

Contents

Introduction

Christof Aichner, Brigitte Mazohl “For the mind and the light! ... Darkness dwindled!” The Thun-Hohenstein University Reforms	5
---	---

Walter Höflechner The Thunian Reforms in the context of the development of the sciences in Austria	18
--	----

Conception of the reforms

Franz Leander Fillafer Leo Thun and the Enlightenmen Thun’s Ideal of Science, University Politics, and the Fortunes of Austrianness	39
---	----

Mitchell G. Ash Was a “German university model” imported to Austria? Open research questions and theses	57
---	----

Thomas Maisel Freedom of teaching and learning and the first steps towards a university and academic reform in the revolutionary year of 1848	77
---	----

The implementation of the reforms

Alois Kernbauer Principles, pragmatism and innovation: The implementation of the Thunian Reform at the University of Graz	94
---	----

Christof Aichner Aspects of the Thunian Reforms at the University of Innsbruck	122
---	-----

Milada Sekyrková The Thunian reforms at the University of Prague	143
---	-----

Maria Stinia The Jagiellonian University in the era of Minister Leo Thun (1849–1860)	159
---	-----

Attila Szilárd Tar The Hungarian law academies in the 1850s	177
--	-----

László Szögi Changes in the foreign university attendance of Hungarian students at the time of the Thunian reforms 1849–1860	191
--	-----

Alessandra Ferraresi The mixed fortunes of the university reforms in Lombardy-Venetia after 1850. The case of Pavia	205
---	-----

Valentina Chierichetti, Simonetta Polenghi The Thun-Hohenstein reform and the Lombardy-Venetian <i>ginnasi</i> . Aspects and problems	226
---	-----

Aftermath and reception of the reforms

Jan Surman Leon (sic!) Thun in Polish historiography: On the tradition of the history	250
--	-----

Johannes Feichtinger, Franz Leander Fillafer Leo Thun and posterity The academic reformer in the Austrian historical and cultural politics of the 19 th and 20 th centuries	274
--	-----

Lists and index

List of abbreviations.....	304
Literature and source material.....	305
Authors	337
Index.....	340

Introduction

Christof Aichner, Brigitte Mazohl

“For the mind and the light! ... Darkness dwindled!”¹

The Thun-Hohenstein University Reforms

This volume presents – in revised and expanded form – the talks given at an international conference on the Thun-Hohenstein university reforms during the Habsburg monarchy, which was held at the University of Innsbruck in June 2013.²

The primary objective of both the conference and this volume of essays was and is to direct attention beyond the boundaries of present-day Austria and to examine in more detail the implementation of the reforms and their consequences at the “Austrian” universities of the time, of which there were ten in total³, with the aim of creating a further basis for future comparative studies. Another key aspect was the – to this day effective – reception history of these reforms and their most important originator, a man who continues to be appraised very differently, the Minister for Religious Affairs and Education, Leo Graf von Thun-Hohenstein.

The conceptual pair of university and reform is one that is again very present in public perception today. This can be seen in, among other things, the Europe-wide implementation of reforms known as the Bologna Process, which was aimed at simplifying university education and qualifications in European countries. But historically, too, universities have always been subject to constant change – even if the reforms of recent decades have taken place at a speed never seen before. In addition, university reforms are often a symptom of social, economic and political change. Reforms in the area of the universities – or generally in the field of education – are an expression of the changing ideas on the role of science and education in society.

Incidentally, just as constant as the changes in the educational system are the complaints associated with each reform. Fears and worries are often expressed, which are manifested in the more or less severe rejection of the new. Just as frequently, however, also from an historical

¹ “Für Geist und Licht! ... das Dunkel schwand.” The title derives from a poem by Innsbruck students, which was presented to the minister on the occasion of his visit to Innsbruck in the summer of 1854. The complete poem can be found in the digital edition of the correspondence of Leo Thun: *Huldigungsgedichte der Innsbrucker Studentenschaft für Leo Thun*. Juli 1854, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D271.

² Original conference title: “Für Geist und Licht! ... Das Dunkel schwand.” *Die Thun-Hohensteinschen Universitätsreformen 1849–1860. Konzeption – Umsetzung – Nachwirkung* (5–7 June 2013).

³ Via Vienna, Graz and Innsbruck, these were the universities of Padua, Pavia, Prague, Krakow, Olomouc (until its dissolution in 1855, respectively 1860), Pest and Lviv.

perspective, it has been shown that the worries were unjustified in the long term, that the reforms were ultimately successful, and that the university would appear to be a very robust institution.

The Thun-Hohenstein reforms also fit this picture. In the revolutionary year of 1848, the mood that had been brewing for some time also broke out in the Habsburg monarchy, and the students and professors who were crucially involved in the revolution demanded not only general civil rights and possibilities for political participation, but also a reform of the universities and the educational system. At this time, the universities had remained largely unchanged since the reforms during the era of Maria Theresa and her son Joseph II. In the sense of the enlightened measures carried out by Joseph II, they were important components in his concept of the restructuring of the state, and were aimed in particular at educating servants of that state. During the Napoleonic Wars, and in particular during the Vormärz, there had been repeated attempts to turn back this development and to open up the universities for other tasks, but ultimately there was a lack of political will to achieve this. Not least, the universities were regarded as possible hotbeds of liberal thought, and a completely free intellectual development was undesirable in this institution. Countless scholars were therefore dissatisfied with the orientation and the quality of the universities. For example, we know of the criticism by Viktor Andrian-Werburg in 1843, which contains numerous motifs of the contemporary criticism of the universities. Admittedly, from today's perspective,⁴ this complaint should be treated with a degree of scepticism, in view of the contemporary discourse.

Da ist keine Freiheit der Diskussion und des Gedankens – für jede Wissenschaft gibt es ein vorgeschriebenes, meistens echt schulmeisterhaftes Lehrbuch, von welchem sich nie und nirgends, nicht einmal durch mündliche Commentarien, entfernt werden darf [...] Das Gedächtnis des Schülers wird auf Kosten seines Verstandes gestärkt, sein Kopf mit einer Menge unnützer, unpraktischer Dinge vollgepropft, daß in demselben kein Raum mehr zum Denken bleibt – sein Charakter, seine moralische Ausbildung werden gänzlich vernachlässigt, und ihm statt dessen ein unverdaulicher Religionsunterricht gegeben, der wenig besser ist, als des gottesfürchtigen Petri Canisii christkatholischer Katechismus. [...] Daher findet man an den österreichischen Unterrichtsanstalten wenig oder gar keine Zuhörer, welche Liebe zur Wissenschaft, Interesse an dem zu Erlernenden dahin rief, beinahe die Gesammtheit der Anwesenden betrachtet die Studien als ein nothwendiges Uebel, als ein nicht zu umgehendes Mittel, um dereinst zu jenem Amte, oder eigentlicher, zu jener Besoldung zu gelangen, welche Jedem von ihnen als das einzige Ziel seiner goldenen Träume in der Ferne vorschwebt [...].⁵

⁴ Cf. in particular the contribution by FILLAFER in this volume.

⁵ Viktor ANDRIAN-WERBURG: Österreich und dessen Zukunft, Hamburg 1843, p. 56–57. “There is no freedom of discussion or thought there – each science has its prescribed, usually quite schoolmasterly textbook, from which one may never deviate, not even with verbal comments [...] The student's memory is strengthened at the expense of his reason, his head stuffed to the brim with loads of useless, impractical things, so that it no longer has any space in which to think – his character, his moral education, are completely neglected, and instead he

Other complaints about the universities followed similar lines, ultimately also demonstrating the new societal demands on the universities: Universities should no longer serve merely to train civil servants, priests or doctors; universities should stimulate rather than restrict thought. The extent to which the social standstill in the Habsburg monarchy was also associated with the state of the universities can be seen clearly from a definition in the *Deutsches Staats-Wörterbuch*. Albeit from a historical perspective – the entry is from 1867 – it nevertheless displays the idea of the creative power and impact of universities on the development of the state. Thus, the constitutional lawyer Heinrich Marquardsen wrote: “that is why everything has been going and is still going downhill in Austria. For of course a particularly healthy nature is required in order not to become mentally crippled and morally ruined under the yoke of this university system.”⁶

The quotation is of interest not least because it also implies a comparison with Prussia, where – according to this interpretation – quite the opposite was the case: there, thanks to their reform at Prussia’s lowest point after defeat in the Napoleonic Wars, the universities experienced a scientific momentum that gave the impetus for national rebirth and led to both an economic and social resurgence.⁷ Ultimately, precisely this narrative obviously exerted an enormous power of attraction on numerous Austrian scholars: Prussian and other German universities acted as a model to be imitated; this served only to fuel even further the dissatisfaction in Austria with its own university system. And therefore we repeatedly read of the German model in both the planning phase and during the implementation of the reform.

The demands of the students and professors were soon met during the course of the revolution of 1848, and a ministry of education was established as early as March 1848, which replaced the previous Imperial Commission on Education (*Studienhofkommission*). This had been – with brief interruptions – the central institution for the organisation and management of the

is given indigestible religious instruction that is little better than the Christian-Catholic catechism of the God-fearing Peter Canisius. [...] That is why one finds hardly any students at the Austrian academies who are summoned by a love of science, an interest in what can be learned there, almost all those present regard the studies as a necessary evil, as an unavoidable means by which to attain that position, or more precisely that salary that each has in mind as the only goal of his golden, distant dreams [...].”

⁶ Heinrich MARQUARSEN: Universitäten, in: Johann-Caspar BLUNTSCHLI, Carl BRATER (ed.): *Deutsches Staats-Wörterbuch*. In Verbindung mit deutschen Gelehrten, Stuttgart, Leipzig 1867, p. 677–728, here p. 703–704: “darum gieng und geht aber auch Alles in Oesterreich den Krebsgang. Denn natürlich es gehörte eine besonders gesunde Natur dazu, unter dem Joche dieses Universitätssystems nicht geistig zu verkrüppeln und sittlich zu verderben.”

⁷ Cf. also the study by Sven HAASE: *Berliner Universität und Nationalgedanke 1800–1848. Genese einer politischen Idee*, Stuttgart 2012.

educational institutions of the monarchy since the days of Maria Theresa.⁸ Franz von Sommaruga (1780–1860) was appointed the first Minister for Education. Furthermore, the first reforms were implemented as early as March and April 1848; above all, the freedom of teaching and learning that had been demanded by the students, and which was especially effective as a slogan, was proclaimed. At the same time, more fundamental reforms were being developed in the background. The key civil servant in the ministry during this phase was Franz Seraphin Exner (1802–1853), who had already drafted guidelines for a future reform of the universities in the Imperial Commission on Education during the Vormärz.⁹ However, no reforms took place in the Vormärz – only the revolution facilitated change.

Thanks to the preliminary work by Exner, however, things moved very quickly in 1848. The first decrees were issued in April and May: the universities were placed under the direct control of the ministry and no longer that of the respective regional authorities. The end-of-semester and annual examinations were abolished – as a consequence of the freedom of teaching and learning. Then in December the regulations on habilitation were passed, thus introducing the position of the private lecturer (*Privatdozent*).

During this phase of the ministry, in which ministers alternated rapidly, Franz Exner represented an important element of continuity, with Franz von Sommaruga being replaced as early as June 1848 by Anton von Doblhoff (1800–1872). The turbulent Viennese Uprising of October 1848 brought another change in the ministry, which was now co-headed by the Interior Minister, Franz von Stadion (1806–1853). However, when Stadion could no longer carry out his duties from the spring of 1849 due to illness, his colleague Ferdinand von Thinnfeld (1793–1868) took on the education portfolio as an interim measure between May and July 1849. This eventful period also saw the appointment of Hermann Bonitz (1814–1888), classical philologist from Berlin, who together with Exner would become the key figure in the development of the reform.¹⁰ For it was essentially Bonitz who wrote the plan for the reorganisation of the secondary schools (*Gymnasien*).

Other important staff members in the ministry of education at this time included Joseph Alexander von Helfert (1820–1910) as undersecretary of state, who also held this position later

⁸ Cf. on this point Helmut ENGELBRECHT: *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens. Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs*, Vol. 3. *Von der frühen Aufklärung bis zum Vormärz*, Wien 1984, p. 84–86.

⁹ On Exner, see in particular Salomon FRANKFURTER: *Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, Franz Exner und Hermann Bonitz*, Wien 1893; Deborah R. COEN: *Vienna in the age of Uncertainty. Science, Liberalism, and Private Life*, Chicago [i.a.] 2007, p. 33–63; more recently Christof AICHNER: *Franz Exner. Professor für Philosophie, Mitschöpfer der Universitätsreform nach 1848*, in: Mitchell G. ASH, Josef EHMER (ed.): *Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft – Wirtschaft*, Göttingen 2015, p. 41–46.

¹⁰ On Bonitz, see FRANKFURTER: *Leo Thun-Hohenstein*, p. 47–53.

under Thun, and Ernst von Feuchtersleben (1806–1849). Feuchtersleben for his part had developed his own ideas for reform, but never managed to impose them. For example, he advocated the nationalisation of the educational sector. In the area of the universities, he favoured a model that was oriented on the French special schools. As a physician, his particular focus was on the medical faculty. Feuchtersleben's suggestions failed above all due to the dominance of Exner's proposals and the fact that Feuchtersleben withdrew into the private sphere after the Vienna Uprising, thus relinquishing his influence on the reform debate. Feuchtersleben died a short time later, resigned to the fact that his radical-democratic views were considered to be disreputable, at least according to Herbert Egglmaier.¹¹

Finally, in July 1849, Leo Thun-Hohenstein (1811–1888) was appointed Minister for Religious Affairs and Education. Thun came from an aristocratic Bohemian family, had studied law and started his career initially at the Prague criminal court before becoming a civil servant in the court chancellery and in the Bohemian provincial administration. However this career appeared to have ended abruptly in 1848 when, as government president in Prague, he failed to bring the revolution under control in the spring of 1848. His appointment as minister was therefore all the more surprising. Thun was considered to be conservative, a strict Catholic, indeed ultramontane, and was associated with the party of Bohemian feudal conservatives, which aimed to reform the monarchy on the basis of a neo class-based order. In order to understand his ministerial activity it is important to know that he obviously insisted on combining religious affairs with education as a condition of taking office. Although this statement is not clearly documented¹², it can be seen from the way he executed his office that he saw a close connection between the educational system and the religious agenda. Moreover, his appointment alone and the naming of his ministry drew public attention to the virulent question of who should be responsible for education, the church or the state, and their relation to each other.

In all, Thun's appointment introduced a new phase in the educational reform, and soon after taking office, Thun was able to present Exner's reform plans to the young Emperor Franz Joseph, who approved these, at first provisionally, in September 1849. The implementation of the educational reform could already begin in the autumn of 1849.

¹¹ Cf. Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Reformansätze vor der Thunschen Reform, in: *Mitteilungen der österreichischen Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 18 (1998), p. 59–85, here p. 80–84; on Feuchtersleben's views in general, see Richard MEISTER: Feuchterslebens Anteil an der Unterrichtsreform 1848 und an der Akademie der Wissenschaften, in: *Anzeiger der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 87 (1950), p. 214–237.

¹² See FRANKFURTER: Leo Thun-Hohenstein, p. 15. Frankfurter received a lot of information from Helfert. The information probably also originated with Helfert, who was well-informed about the circumstances surrounding the appointment of Thun.

What were the central contents and guiding ideas of the reform? A significant innovation was the introduction of the freedom of teaching and learning to the universities. These two freedoms can be seen as fundamental concessions to the rebellious students, and although the extent of these freedoms were once again successively restricted after the end of the revolution, especially for students, they were still regarded as the key achievements of the revolution, which could not be reversed. The principle of the freedom of teaching and learning represents an important step on the path to Article 17 of the Basic Law of 21 December 1867 on the *Allgemeine Rechte der Staatsbürger für die im Reichsrathe vertretenen Königreiche und Länder* and the foundation of the freedom of science.¹³ With the reforms of 1848/49, the universities were defined as scientific institutions, which at least weakened their purely educational character and granted scientific research an important role in the university.

Even though research became an increasingly important task of the universities, the educational nature of the universities nevertheless remained, in particular for the legal and medical faculties, but also for the regenerated philosophical faculties. The latter appreciated in value with the reform. Where they had previously served merely to ensure a uniform educational background for all students, in the sense of a preparatory course, and as a basis for admission to more advanced studies in the higher faculties, during the course of the reform they were established as faculties in their own right, although their primary objective was to train secondary school teachers. Soon, however, the reformed philosophical faculties also formed the focal point of research in the universities, especially since the ‘natural science’ subjects – to use the modern term – were still part of these faculties at the time.

The introduction of freedom of teaching was also accompanied by the establishment of the position of private lecturer. This position particularly illustrates the connection between teaching and research within the university. An essential factor in the establishment of private lecturers was also the introduction of university staff fees, which were aimed at financing the private lecturers. Recently, Bastian Stoppelkamp has also drawn attention to the extent to which the university staff fees were considered by reformers to be an essential prerequisite for the freedom of teaching and learning.¹⁴ To a certain extent they guaranteed a free market (of

¹³ “Science and its teachings are free.” Art. 17/1, RGBl 142/1867.

¹⁴ Bastian STOPPELKAMP: War Humboldt ein Kapitalist? Über den Zusammenhang von Ökonomie und Autonomie in der österreichischen Hochschulgeschichte des mittleren und späten 19. Jahrhunderts, beim Österreichischen Universitätsarchivkolloquium in der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz 14 and 15 April 2015; also Friedrich STADLER, Bastian STOPPELKAMP: Die Universität Wien in Kontext von Wissens- und Wissenschaftsgesellschaft, in: Katharina KNIEFACZ, Elisabeth NEMETH, Herbert POSCH, Friedrich STADLER (ed.), *Universität – Forschung – Lehre (650 Jahre Universität Wien, Vol. 1)*, Göttingen, Wien 2015, p. 203–241, here p. 225–232.

knowledge) in the universities, where private lecturers could offer their knowledge and students could avail of such offers.¹⁵

The increase in the standing of the philosophical faculty necessitated in turn a reform of the secondary schools, which should now take on the previous preparatory function of the philosophical courses. To this end, they were extended by two years to a total of eight years, and ended with the Matura examination, which was now deemed the prerequisite for acceptance into a university.

Fundamental reorganisation was also carried out in the administration of the universities, in that the academic directors were abolished and the management of the universities was transferred to the professors. The academic directors, who had run the administration of the higher education institutes since the era of Maria Theresa, were symbolic for the external control and surveillance of the universities – the transfer of the administration to the professors represented a return to the previous self-management of the universities. Above all, the main hope appeared to be to connect with a diffuse, imaginary idea of the universities as free corporations, as they had been in the Middle Ages. However, the reform did not lead to any clear decision as to whether the university should be a corporation or a public state institution, an issue that would become virulent at the latest upon the election of Hermann Bonitz as dean of the philosophical faculty at the University of Vienna¹⁶ and the question of the rights of the still existing doctoral colleges (*Doktorenkollegien*) at this university.¹⁷

With the provisional approval of the reforms in September 1849, the task now was to implement them. This also formed the starting point for the conference, which aimed – in an Austria-wide comparison – to address the question as to how and with what consequences the reforms were implemented at each individual university in the Habsburg monarchy. The most important findings of the conference are presented in this volume with a series of contributions.

¹⁵ Cf. on this point the order of the Ministry for Religious Affairs and Education of 12 July 1850, Z. 5697/187, RGBI 310/1850; and the programmatic presentation by Thun to the emperor, printed in: Wiener Zeitung, No. 184, 3 August 1850, p. 2335–2339.

¹⁶ Cf. on this point Franz Leander FILLAFER: Hermann Bonitz. Philologe, Mitschöpfer der Universitätsreform, in: Mitchell G. ASH, Josef EHMER (ed.): Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft – Wirtschaft, Göttingen 2015.

¹⁷ Cf. on the legal status of the universities in general: Günther WINKLER: Die Rechtspersönlichkeit der Universitäten. Rechtshistorische, rechtsdogmatische und rechtstheoretische Untersuchungen zu wissenschaftlichen Selbstverwaltung (Forschungen aus Staat und Recht, Vol. 80), Wien, New York 1988, p. 255–266.

First, Walter Höflechner (Graz) traces the framework in which the Thunian Reforms were carried out by sketching an overview of the history of Austrian universities from the end of the Enlightenment until well into the 20th century. He also addresses the question of the universities in the Vormärz and specifically examines the achievements of Austrian science during this period. Höflechner also interprets the key innovations of Thun's reform era against the background of Austrian and international developments, and emphasises the different continuities that extended beyond Thun's reforms, as well as the breaches in various disciplines that were caused by the reforms.

The contribution by Mitchell Ash (Vienna) subsequently addresses the question of the adoption of a German, or "Humboldtian" university model in the course of the Thunian reforms, which has been stressed to date in most previous research and in general perception. In the process he reverts to more recent research by Sylvia Paletschek¹⁸ and Rüdiger vom Bruch¹⁹ on the question of whether there was ever any such thing as a "Humboldtian model". In addition, Ash also discusses the problem of the point from which one can speak of a research university in the modern sense, thus questioning another assumption with regard to the Thunian reforms. His different theses in relation to the adoption of a Prussian university model provide numerous points of reference for further research. In particular, the political implications of the adoption of a 'German model' as central to and essential for the subsequent debates concerning the 'national' character of universities, or in the confrontation with the state's own Austrian, Catholic educational tradition.

Franz Leander Fillafer (Konstanz) examines in detail the mental cosmos of Leo Thun-Hohenstein and attempts to interpret the different images that have been sketched of Leo Thun in the historiography to date. In particular, he emphasises the different variations of the Enlightenment and their impact on the Habsburg monarchy, as well as Thun's position in this regard. Like Höflechner, Fillafer presents a differentiated picture of Austrian science in the Vormärz and does indeed find independent developments and achievements in some areas, which were later ignored, above all by the targeted commemoration of the Thunian reforms.

The role of Viennese students at the beginning of the revolution of 1848 is then studied by Thomas Maisel (Vienna). He recalls the revolutionary roots of the reform, while at the same time stressing that key discussions about and in favour of a reform stretched back to the Vormärz. Maisel also examines the first reform steps and debates at the University of Vienna,

¹⁸ Sylvia PALETSCHEK: Die Erfindung der Humboldtschen Universität, in: *Historische Anthropologie* 10 (2002), p. 183–205.

¹⁹ Rüdiger vom BRUCH: Langsamer Abschied von Humboldt? Etappen deutscher Universitätsgeschichte 1820–1945, in: Mitchell G. ASH (ed.): *Mythos Humboldt. Vergangenheit und Zukunft der deutschen Universitäten*, Wien, Köln, Weimar 1999, p. 29–57.

whereby his essay leads into the subsequent pieces that are primarily concerned with the situation and implementation of the reforms at the individual universities of the monarchy.²⁰ Furthermore, Maisel refers to the assembly of German professors in Jena in the autumn of 1848 and the student congress in Eisenach, illustrating clearly on the one hand the dimension of the university reforms, which spread well beyond Austria, and showing that the revolutionary year of 1848 was a year of reform discussions in universities, not only in the Habsburg monarchy. The assembly in Jena can also be interpreted as a parallel event to the Frankfurt Paulskirche at university level and makes clear the political dimension of the reforms. On the other hand, the meeting in Jena underlines the different versions of the ‘idea of the university’. The reference to the assembly in Jena also appears to be important because this meeting has received little attention to date in the research.²¹ He addresses in detail the aforementioned alternative plans of Ernst von Feuchtersleben, which are impressive in their strongly democratic tenor, and which can also be found in the alternative plans for the shaping of the universities by the aforementioned student congress in Eisenach.

Studying the implementation enables on the one hand a comparative perspective on how the different universities reacted to the challenges of the reforms and how these were perceived in the different Crown lands. Interest in the implementation of the reform lies not least in the fact that it drew attention to the “real form”²² (*Realgestalt*) of the universities.²³ Furthermore, only recently, Marian Füssel has stressed the importance of the charged relationships of each individual university and its actors and the general structural developments, thereby recalling the postulate of Rainer Christoph Schwings: “that one only really knows one university when one knows them all”²⁴. In this respect, one could argue that a comprehensive understanding of the Thunian reforms is possible only when one knows their different forms in the individual universities and relates the normative expectations on these reforms to the local circumstances. In addition, the comparative perspective should also contrast the programme of neo-absolutism, which was, after all, interested in a homogenisation of the empire and the reinforcement of the

²⁰ On the implementation of the reforms at the university see in particular also Kurt MÜHLBERGER: Das ‚Antlitz‘ der Wiener Philosophischen Fakultät in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Struktur und personelle Erneuerung, in: Johannes SEIDL (ed.): Eduard Suess und die Entwicklung der Erdwissenschaften zwischen Biedermeier und Sezession, Göttingen 2009, p. 67–102.

²¹ Recently in part Christof AICHNER: Die Umsetzung der Thun-Hohensteinschen Reformen an der Universität Innsbruck (1848–1860), phil. Diss. Innsbruck 2014, p. 99–100, 367.

²² Sylvia PALETSCHEK: Stand und Perspektiven der neueren Universitätsgeschichte, in: NTM. Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin 19 (2011), p. 169–189, here p. 176.

²³ Cf. also Stefan GERBER: Wie schreibt man „zeitgemäße“ Universitätsgeschichte?, in: NTM. Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin, 22/4 (2014), p. 277–286.

²⁴ Cited in Marian FÜSSEL: Wie schreibt man Universitätsgeschichte, in: NTM. Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin, 22/4 (2014), p. 287–293, “dass man eine Universität erst dann richtig kennt, wenn man sie alle kennt”. In general, see *ibid.*

uniform state structure, a plan that was admittedly bound to lead to conflict in light of the diverging preconditions that prevailed in each of the individual universities of the monarchy. It also provides new insights into the different perception of the reforms, respectively allows a different interpretation of neo-absolutism as ‘modernisation from above’.²⁵

In this section on the implementation of the reforms there are studies on the universities of Prague, Pavia, Innsbruck, Graz and Krakow, as well as – with a slightly different focus – contributions on the development of the Hungarian law academies and student mobility in Hungary, as well as an essay on the secondary school reform in the Kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia. What all contributions have in common is that they all show very clearly how much the reforms were accompanied by both hope and concern.

Alois Kernbauer (Graz) first provides an overview of the quantitative situation and the nature of the Austrian educational system on the eve of the revolution. He then examines how the central specifications of the reforms were implemented at the University of Graz. He analyses the functional transformation both at the level of the individual faculties and at the overall university level, and traces this transformation using different examples. By these means he contrasts the great expectations on the universities with the limited financial means that were available for the implementation of the reforms and shows that precisely these insufficient funds often delayed the greater success of the reforms. Ultimately, this illustrates clearly the situation with which the smaller universities of the monarchy, in particular, were faced.

Above all in the non-German speaking and/or mixed-language Crown lands, such as Bohemia, Galicia or the Kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia, the hope of a scientific upturn was combined with a national spirit of optimism. The latter also makes clear just how much science was already being construed nationally at this time. In this respect, a complete scientific unfolding of the university could only occur with a conformity of scientific culture and language.

In her contribution, Milada Sekyrková (Prague) shows that this national component also influenced the historiography of the Thunian reforms, for example in Prague: In the past, the reform received relatively little attention, since Czech research focussed particularly on the splitting of the Charles University 1882 and on the national conflicts in the run-up to this action. She also makes clear that many innovations that were institutionalised through the reform had already had precursors in the Vormärz, for example the free lectures at the medical faculty, which were the forerunners of the later freedom of teaching. This relativises the view, which

²⁵ For current work on neo-absolutism, see Harm-Hinrich BRANDT (ed.): *Der österreichische Neoabsolutismus als Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsproblem. Diskussionen über einen strittigen Epochenbegriff* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs, Vol. 108), Wien, Köln, Weimar 2014.

was also frequently held in the past, that the Thunian reforms were a complete break with the system of the Vormärz.

Another element that unites the essays is the focus on Thun's personnel policy, which emerged as a central tool of his university policy, thus confirming and differentiating older verdicts, such as that of Hans Lentze. In general, therefore, one can rightly claim that university policy to Thun primarily meant targeted personnel policy. That is also illustrated in the essay by Alessandra Ferraresi (Pavia), who examines Thun's personnel policy in her study of the University of Pavia and shows how much the strong independence efforts in Lombardy-Venetia influenced the personnel policy, especially since the selection of the right people had even greater significance here. It was a similar case in the conferring of the freedom of teaching and learning, which had a greater explosive force here than in the rest of the Habsburg monarchy. For this reason, the reform was initially introduced to Lombardy-Venetia only in diluted form. The look at Lombardy-Venetia is also interesting for assessing the Thunian reforms in the context of neo-absolutism, since the implementation of the reform in the kingdom reveals the discrepancy between centralist tendencies and federal demands in the subdomain of education, for example when Viceroy of Lombardy-Venetia Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian intensively advocated the reform of the universities and secondary schools and suggested alternative solutions, thus frequently entering into conflicts of competence with the ministry for education. The field of tension between unifying efforts and national demands for independence also characterises the reform of the University of Krakow, as shown by Maria Stinia (Krakow).

The situation in Tyrol was somewhat different. While it also had mixed languages, the national conflicts of the 1850s at the university mostly smouldered beneath the surface. For Innsbruck, Christof Aichner (Innsbruck) stresses that the criticism of the reforms by the professors was ignited in particular by the loss of the general educational tasks of the philosophical faculty. Thus here it was not a question of language, but rather pedagogical aspects that initially shaped the debate. In his contribution he also shows how the discussions on the function of the university library in Innsbruck provide an opportunity to examine in more detail the increasing research orientation of the universities in the course of the reforms, taking the functional transformation of the library as an example.

Attila Tar (Győr) examines the impact of the Thunian Reforms on the law academies in Hungary. Many of these academies were closed over the course of the reforms, since this reduced form of legal education had to give way to that at the universities, and became less attractive. Tar also provides an overview of the Hungarian historiography on Thun, revealing a further aspect in the various different perspectives of Thun and the reforms. Thus the essays

above all in the last part of the volume provide a panopticum of the historiography on Thun from the former Habsburg countries.

László Szögi (Budapest) is also concerned with Hungary, examining the impact of the reforms on the traditionally strong *peregrinatio academica* of Hungarian students abroad.²⁶ A key finding is that after 1850, attendance at foreign universities declined significantly for around a decade. The different reasons for this, respectively the impact of the reforms, are presented with various statistical data at many levels.

Finally, Simonetta Polenghi and Valentina Chierichetti (Milan) contribute an essay on the reform of the *ginnasi* in Lombardy-Venetia. The inclusion of this topic allows a comprehensive view of the special situation and starting point of the reforms of the educational system in Lombardy-Venetia. It can be seen especially clearly here the extent to which considerations of educational policy were influenced by general political ideas and just how much – leading us back to the essay by Mitchell Ash and the question of the adoption of university or school models – the educational reform in Lombardy-Venetia was displaced by national and political goals, and thus met with strong resistance. An especially interesting constellation arose in Lombardy-Venetia also from the fact that after the unification of Italy, another – this time supposedly Italian – reform was carried out, and in this context, the Thunian Reforms were indeed once again seen in a positive light.

The last two essays in the volume are concerned with the commemorative culture and the historiography on Leo Thun. Jan Surman (Marburg) takes the example of Galicia, thus to a certain extent also providing a supplement to the essay on the University of Krakow, but also including the University of Lviv. At its core is the reception of Thun and the reforms in connection with or depending on the interpretation in the age of neo-absolutism. He addresses the most famous accusation against the minister, the question of Thun's 'Germanising' intentions. To conclude, Franz Leander Fillafer (Konstanz) and Johannes Feichtinger (Vienna) reveal the different historiographical constructions of Thun and present the different interpretations of Thun (including their hidden contemporary intentions). The authors refer to the assessments of Thun, some of which were diametrically opposed, ranging from eulogistic praise for his great reform work (for example, the biography by Salomon Frankfurter) to the harsh criticism that he "surrendered the state to the church"²⁷ – as formulated by the liberal press. In addition, the essay shows the extent to which the evaluation of the reforms and that of

²⁶ Cf. the comprehensive research by Szögi, recently for example: László SZÖGI: Ungarländische Studenten an den Wienerischen Universitäten und Akademien 1789–1848, Budapest 2013.

²⁷ Der Philologentag, in: Neue Freie Presse (20.05.1893), p. 1–2.

Thun were dependent on each other and mutually influenced each other.²⁸ The authors examine meticulously how Thun the man and the reforms associated with his name were instrumentalised politically. Richard Meister is especially worthy of mention here, who, as the mastermind of Austrian academic history after the Second World War, repeatedly referred to Thun, for example when, in his function as the Rector of the University of Vienna 1949/50, he emphasised Thun's accomplishment in the scientification of the Austrian universities and in freeing the universities from the constraints of the Vormärz, thus creating a point of contact for a new begin after National Socialism. Thun thus became the "Humboldt" of Austria, proof of the existence of an independent Austrian university model, which also served to create a distance to Germany. In addition, Thun's advocacy of the freedom of teaching and learning, so emphasised by Meister, was linked to the demand for the necessary autonomy of the universities, which had become clearer than ever after the calamitous era of National Socialism.²⁹

Beyond the primary objective of the conference to initiate and stimulate a comparative perspective of the Thunian Reforms, the researchers present also became more familiar with the project of the online edition of Thun's correspondence, with the aim of providing an impulse for further research on the subject, based on this extensive correspondence.³⁰ And this was indeed the case for some of the essays that emerged from the lectures, i.e. it was possible to make first use of the online edition of the correspondence, which was constantly expanded and completed at the end of 2016, in connection with this volume.

In this manner, the two editors hope that they have provided a further component in the history of the Thunian reforms and the history of Austrian universities in general, which will be of benefit to more detailed research.

²⁸ Cf. on the reception of the Thunian reforms also AICHNER: *Umsetzung*, p. 30–45.

²⁹ Cf. also the debates on independent research funding in Austria in the 1950s in Rupert PICHLER, Michael STAMPFER, Reinhold HOFER: *Forschung, Geld und Politik. Die staatliche Forschungsförderung in Österreich (Innovationsmuster in der österreichischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Vol. 3)*, Innsbruck, Wien 2007.

³⁰ The online edition is a transcribed and indexed reproduction of the documents from Inventory D of the Thun estate and around 130 autographs by Thun, which were discovered in various archives. The edition is accessible via the website of the project: see [<http://thun-korrespondenz.uibk.ac.at/>], retrieved 31.08.2016.

Walter Höflechner

The Thunian Reforms in the context of the development of the sciences in Austria

Naturally we can only make a comparative evaluation of the importance of the Thunian Reforms for the development of science in Austria, and therefore it is necessary to outline the situation beforehand, in order to be able to recognise the changes and then the consequences, and finally to attempt to make an assessment.

The term ‘Thunian Reform’ signals that this was a reform from above; conducted during the phase of neo-absolutism by a centralised, controlling authority.

The fact that it was indeed to a certain extent a reform from above demonstrates the enormous deficit in the control of the university-based scientific system before 1848. The Imperial Commission on Education (*Studienhofkommission*) was essentially only a reactive authority; very little happened of its own accord, except that it successfully had countless applications sent from its subordinate institutions. If we read the unabridged version of Hammer-Purgstall’s at times somewhat blunt “Memoirs from my Life”¹, we get an idea of a procedure that appeared to be shaped not only by the inactivity of the Imperial Commission on Education, but also by the hesitant wrangling between Metternich and Emperor Franz, and then in the Directorate by Metternich, Kolowrat² and the two archdukes, Ludwig and Franz Karl, between stalling, annoyance over inactivity and irresolution.³ Metternich himself expressed to Archduke Johann

¹ See Joseph von HAMMER-PURGSTALL: *Erinnerungen und Briefe*. Version 1 201107: Briefe von 1790 bis Ende 1819, edited by Walter Höflechner and Alexandra Wagner, 3 vols., Graz 2011 (not available in bookstores, but freely accessible via the Zentrum für Wissenschaftsgeschichte at the Karl Franzens University of Graz or the Zentrum für Informationsmodellierung in den Geisteswissenschaften (projects) under [<http://gams.uni-graz.at/context:hp>], retrieved 31.08.2016, the “Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben” as scan in Volume 3.

² The comparatively more liberal and open Franz Anton von Kolowrat-Liebsteinsky was still considered to be one of the most likely of the leading personalities to be willing to dare a certain degree of progress; he exerted – with thanks to Dr. Johannes Uray for the reference – considerable influence on the appointment of all professors, he was repeatedly the great hope of Hammer-Purgstall, who trusted him alone to truly advance the academy plan, even though he also accused him, and probably with good reason, of not really wanting to compete with the Royal Bohemian Academy of Sciences; Sommaruga, the first education minister in spring 1848 wrote that the means had been found at the Secret State Conference to “put a stop to Kolowrat-Liebsteinsky’s cravings for innovation”, and it is no coincidence that Kolowrat became the first constitutional Minister President of Austria – albeit only for less than two weeks – in the spring of 1848.

³ The delays caused by censorship also had a very negative impact – some submitted works, which were remembered seven years later, had simply been lost and the author had died many years previously, Hedwig KADLETZ-SCHÖFFEL: *Metternich und die Wissenschaften*, 2 vols., Wien 1992 (dissertation of the University of Vienna, Vol. 234/I + II), I p. 191 f.; the development and realisation of the law against counterfeit, i.e. against the reproduction in Austria of works by others, lasted from 1820 to 1846, KADLETZ-SCHÖFFEL: *Metternich*, p. 211. The academy question dragged on for more than 35 years, until Metternich recognised that the issue was unavoidable and suddenly nailed it to his own mast – It falls short of the mark, however, to make Metternich alone responsible for the situation, even though Metternich, in a style typical for the nobility of the 18th century, did not really recognise the responsibility of the state for the development and encouragement of the sciences – secretly, he still regarded them as an estimable and at times useful hobby. In this regard, the

in 1846 that one found oneself “in age of paralysed government”, and was faced with the “reputation of obscurantism”⁴. At the beginning of March 1848 Kossuth spoke very drastically, but not inaccurately, of the “suffocating vapour of the deathly wind that blows from the lead chambers of the Viennese governing system, oppressing, laming and poisoning everything.”⁵ But we should not overlook the fact that developments did in fact take place – more hidden than open –, precisely in this system, under and despite this administrative level, without which the rapid and resounding ascent after the reform would not have been possible. There were individuals at the polytechnics who were deemed to be more important, in the Josephinian sense, than the universities (one need only think of the large new building on Karlsplatz and the fact that the salaries there were higher than at the university⁶). And there were also individuals in the natural science disciplines and in the medical-clinical area – the physiologist Johann Purkyně was an exception.⁷

In contrast, the disciplines of philosophical studies at the universities, which today are summarised and known as the humanities, were not important – here, censorship had a strongly curbing effect, contributing to the reputation for obscurantism that was so lamented by Metternich.⁸ It impaired above all the historians and the philosophers, who were subject to

emphasis on the differentiation between Metternich the man and Metternich the statesman, which can be found in the literature and also in the highly estimable dissertation by Hedwig Kadletz-Schöffel, is perhaps stressed too much. Metternich’s view was contradictory to the Josephinian ideas. In my opinion, the situation is reflected very well in the person of Hammer-Purgstall, who after all “fought” with Metternich for decades – until both old gentlemen sat together at Rennweg in 1851, reminiscing peacefully – “I sat beside the prince as a private man beside a private man and the subject was not mindful of the injustice with which Prince Metternich had treated him as his superior [...]”, Hammer-Purgstall I 514 (not in bookstores, freely accessible at "<http://gams.uni-graz.at/context:hp>", retrieved [31.08.2016](#).) – KADLETZ-SCHÖFFEL: Metternich, p. 48 attests Metternich as having “too little imagination and mental activity” as a scientist, despite his interest in natural science. In particular, he could not understand the deeper sense in engaging with history, he “became the opponent of the ‘born historian’, as soon as the possibility arose to exploit historical research in a liberal or radical, national or constitutional sense”, KADLETZ-SCHÖFFEL: Metternich, p. 49 after Srbik. Ultimately, he was shaped by the erroneous belief in the uncertainty (and thus harmlessness) of natural-science findings. It is fitting to state: “The ageing Metternich became ever more reserved towards scientists as a group, and of course was ever less willing to agree with a committee of these – in his view – politically unreliable citizens.” KADLETZ-SCHÖFFEL: Metternich, p. 270.

⁴ KADLETZ-SCHÖFFEL: Metternich, p. 293.

⁵ Walter KLEINDEL: Österreich. Daten zur Geschichte und Kultur, Wien 1978, 3 March 1848, Kossuth’s “speech launching the Austrian revolution” in front of the Hungarian parliament. Der “erstickenden Dampf des tödlichen Windes, der aus den Bleikammern des Wiener Regierungssystems alles niederdrückend, lähmend vergiftend einherwehe.”

⁶ In the first implementation paper of the Academy of Sciences in the spring of 1846, the Polytechnic in Vienna – and not the university – is given as the conference venue.

⁷ He had already been appointed to Breslau as a physiologist and pathologist in 1823!

⁸ It should also be recalled here, however, that universities were only teaching institutions until 1848; even after 1819, Austrians were permitted only in exceptional cases to study abroad, which applied until the 1830s. – Only in 1840 did it become mandatory for professors, selected by state exam, to attain a doctorate; many professors obtained their doctorate only after years of executing office (a dissertation was prescribed only after the Rigorosum Ordinance of 1872; see on this point Richard MEISTER, Geschichte des Doktorates der Philosophie an der Universität Wien, in: SBWien phil.-hist. Kl. 232.2 (1958) (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts, Vol. 3, zgl. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Universität Wien II).

special monitoring by the church.⁹ Since only the particularly grotesque excesses of censorship could be halted, but none of the reforms from the ordinance of 1810 had an effect, the negative impact of this instrument grew well beyond the actual situation, and censorship became “stylised” into the classical “enemy stereotype”¹⁰. Thus many emigrants, fleeing from censorship, contributed to Austria’s negative image in scientific matters; domestically, it led to a feeling of anger mixed with humiliation¹¹ and to the fact that much scientific work did not penetrate to the outside, some was published only abroad, and some not at all.¹² Someone like Hammer-Purgstall had excellent contact with natural scientists in Austria, but hardly any to historians or philologists in the universities.¹³ In Austria he was anchored in a somewhat more fruitful sphere, yet one that was equally uninterested in science and barely visible to the public, namely in the court institutions – the archive, the library, the coins and antiquities cabinet, etc.; his actual “spiritual home”, however, was the international academic society by means of extensive correspondence.

I believe Salomon Frankfurter characterised the universities very accurately in his retrospective as a

zusammenhangloses Gemenge von theologischen, medicinischen und juristischen Fachschulen, die nur die Aufgabe hatten, dem Staate gute Beamte zu liefern [...] Ein gelehrtes Studium, das die Pflege der Wissenschaft als Selbstzweck betrachtet, gab es nicht und die Universität war ein Körper ohne Seele, da ihr das fehlte, was sie erst zu einer universitas litterarum macht: die philosophische Facultät¹⁴

– and that, despite the fact that Kant’s pamphlet on the Conflict of the Faculties (*Streit der Fakultäten*) was already half a century old at the time of the revolution; and the fact that science is a system and not the mere accumulation of application-oriented recipes, was also not fully understood in the Vormärz. Frankfurter’s criticism from 1893 corresponds with the less

⁹In 1846, Metternich brought inter alia the Swiss Friedrich Emanuel Hurter, who had converted in 1844, to the country, in order to secure the right line in historicis. – In his memoirs, Hammer railed forcefully against the foreign converted such as Jarcke, Buchholtz, etc.

¹⁰KADLETZ-SCHÖFFEL: Metternich, p. 186.

¹¹KADLETZ-SCHÖFFEL: Metternich, p. 197.

¹²It is, however, typical of the situation that a submission was made 1845 on the censorship, led by Eduard von Bauernfeld and signed by hundreds of writers and scholars – not in fact with the goal of abolishing it, but rather to achieve its prompt and proper processing! The question of censorship was also considerably explosive in connection with the statute of the Academy in 1846/47, whereby quite a few of the presumptive members were willing to subject themselves, as academics, to censorship! For more details see the memoirs of Hammer-Purgstall.

¹³He didn’t even mention his honorary doctorates in philosophy from Graz and Prague in his memoirs.

¹⁴Salomon FRANKFURTER: Leo Thun-Hohenstein, in: Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, Vol. 38, Leipzig 1894, p. 178–212. An “incoherent mixture of theological, medical and juristic schools, whose only task was to supply the state with good civil servants [...] There was no such thing as learned study, which regarded the cultivation of science as an end in itself and the university was a body without a soul, since it lacked that which makes it a universitas litterarum in the first place: the philosophical faculty” – For the sake of clarity, it should be stated that the term “philosophical faculty” was probably used in Austria prior to 1848, but this did not correspond with the issue described in its more recent sense.

pessimistic, yet more sarcastic statement by the mathematician and physicist Josef Petzval from the period before 1848:

Unser Erziehungssystem ist eine [...] Stallfütterung, sie erzeugt sehr viel zahmes Vieh und einiges wilde, das seine Selbständigkeit allen Hindernissen zum Trotz hartnäckig bewahrt [...] und so trotzdem jene wenigen selbständigen Denker liefert, die der österreichische Gelehrtenstand aufzuweisen hat.¹⁵

Petzval could afford to make such a judgement; after all he had already been the forefather of all photographic lenses since the beginning of the 1840s.

When looking for active, stimulating areas, one repeatedly comes across the estates of the countries far from the centre in Vienna: in Bohemia, the Royal Bohemian Society of Sciences (an academy more than 60 years before Vienna), which was founded in 1784 and in whose treatises Doppler published the work on which the effect bearing his name is based, in 1841; one encounters the estates that were motivated primarily by economic aspects, whose ventures were supported by Archduke Johann in Styria, etc. What is striking, again and again, is the battle in Vienna for this or that approval, not for money, but for permission to undertake anything at all. – They were, as formulated by Waltraud Heindl, *obedient rebels*¹⁶.

Despite all of the difficulties, new societies were also formed in the late Vormärz, whose purpose was specialist training: the cholera epidemic of 1831 triggered the initiation of the *Gesellschaft der Ärzte in Wien* by the Viennese doctor Franz von Wirer together with Ludwig von Türkheim; approval was obtained only in 1837. In 1845 – initiated by the geologist Wilhelm Haidinger – the association *Freunde der Naturwissenschaften* was founded, which Hammer categorised as an obstacle on the path to an academy, but which (alongside the disdain for the humanities) arose from the same impatience and annoyance about the stagnation that had been influenced so much by Hammer's behaviour. The discrepancy in the perception of time in the state sector (*sub specie aeternitatis*, so to speak) and among those who wanted to make scientific progress during their lifetimes was simply huge.

Significant initiatives occurred in particular in the area of natural sciences and medicine, which were the least critically regarded in terms of the inhibitory influence of the censor: the foundation of the *Zeitschrift für Physik und Mathematik* by Andreas von Baumgartner and Andreas von Ettingshausen in 1826 was an achievement that can be properly appreciated only when contrasted with the activities of Baumgartner's predecessor Johann Zemantsek; the

¹⁵ Helga PEPPENHAUER: Geschichte des Studienfaches Mathematik an der Universität Wien von 1848–1900, masch. phil. diss. Wien 1953, p. 122. “Our education system is a [...] stable feeding, it generates a lot of very tame livestock and some that are wild, who preserve their independence stubbornly in spite of all obstacles [...] and thus nevertheless produce those few independent thinkers that the Austrian academics have to show.”

¹⁶ Waltraud HEINDL: Gehorsame Rebellen. Bürokratie und Beamte in Österreich 1780 bis 1848, Wien 1991.

endeavours of Justus von Liebig or at least Friedrich Wöhler around 1840 are known. An unusual case, however, was that of Andreas von Ettingshausen, a physicist much appreciated by Metternich, who received approval in 1844 to conduct his own teaching course at the university “for higher physics and for lectures on the latest advances in this science” and who was then able to withdraw from routine teaching in this area by appointing a deputy for routine work. Ettingshausen had written a physics textbook in 1844, which was printed in a second edition as early as 1845 and printed in further editions until 1860, and it was this textbook that formed the basis for training the first successful generation of Austrian physicists: Josef Stefan, Ernst Mach, Viktor Lang, and Ludwig Boltzmann.¹⁷

Somewhat tentative attempts were made at expansion in the area of the non-natural sciences (which was in principle less efficiently anchored institutionally in the universities¹⁸), mostly from the non-university field, for example when Josef Chmel tried to install an historical research community among friars (and failed even to get past the abbots),¹⁹ or when, in the late 1830s, different non-university autodidacts applied – especially to the University of Vienna – for approval to teach in those subjects that served the general sciences, without reference to vocational studies; they finally started receiving approval – hesitantly at first, but then increasingly – in the 1840s, among them Adalbert Stifter, but more importantly men like Hermann Suttner (a pupil of Exner), who in 1845 marked the beginnings of philologically-oriented German studies with his lectures on German linguistics.²⁰

In these years of the late Vormärz, proposals for reform to the basis, but also general reforms concerning the system as such, were worked on by a community of medical doctors, supported by Ludwig von Türkheim, who also sent Josef Škoda and Carl Rokitansky to Paris. And of course very special reference must be made here to the paper concerning philosophical studies, with which the Prague Herbartian Franz Exner – inspired by a stay in Berlin – presented a thorough reform draft in 1844, which would subsequently prove to be a fundamental

¹⁷ See Walter HÖFLECHNER: Materialien zur Entwicklung der Physik und ihrer „Randfächer“ Astronomie und Meteorologie an den österreichischen Universitäten 1752–1938, Graz 2002, not published, but online as a freely accessible manuscript http://www-gewi.uni-graz.at/wissg/geschichte_der_physik/, retrieved 31.08.2016.

¹⁸ Until the end of the 19th, and in some cases until well into the 20th century, professors from this field only came to lectures and examinations, and to the faculty meetings at the university, in general they did not have rooms at the university.

¹⁹ See Walter HÖFLECHNER: Joseph Chmel und Joseph Hammer-Purgstall, in: Herwig EBNER, Walter HÖFLECHNER, Helmut MEZLER-ANDELBERG, Paul ROTH, Hermann WIESFLECKER (ed.): Festschrift Othmar Pickl zum 60. Geburtstag, Graz 1987, p. 237–240.

²⁰ See the informative work by Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Die Errichtung von Lehrkanzeln für Deutsche Philologie in Österreich nach den Universitätsreformen in den Jahren 1848/49, in: Walter HÖFLECHNER (ed.): Beiträge und Materialien zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Österreich (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Vol. 11), Graz 1981, p. 359–411, here p. 366.

preliminary work for the reform and ultimately made Exner the soul and the engine of the reform under no fewer than four ministers.²¹

In summary, one can therefore say that there were quite a few serious approaches and efforts to link up with the contemporary science of the time, and there were also very credible reform ideas, which consistently came from the basis.

All in all, however, and despite the unfairness towards numerous individuals displayed by Jarcke's famous remark, made retrospectively in 1852, it did not appear to be too far removed from the reality of the Vormärz that "no Austrian professor [had] a name in Germany, let alone in Europe. The reputation of most university scholars had not penetrated beyond the restricted area of their abodes"²² – Friedrich Nicolai had thought the same at a much earlier stage. It wasn't as bad as all that – not all Austrian professors sat subdued in their chambers, without any knowledge of what was happening elsewhere.²³ A glance at the title pages of various monographies suggests interesting international networks, while the lists of lectures and personnel, in particular in the field of philosophical studies at the University of Vienna, show that while the number of professorial chairs was low and some of their occupants were mediocre, the number of teachers in total was significantly higher, and the courses on offer were of quite good quality, albeit not at the level of the professors. There is still a lack of knowledge from significant source material, which would allow us to make a viable assessment, especially from the rich inventory of letters from that time.

In view of the circumstances outlined above, it is not surprising that the realisation of long-held hopes took effect unbelievably quickly once the revolution had been ignited.

As early as 27 March 1848 the Imperial Commission on Education was replaced by a ministry for education²⁴, whose head, Franz von Sommaruga, immediately summoned the leading figures – including of course Exner – and within just a few days it had established more incisive innovations than in the many decades before: with the elimination of the propaedeutic part of from philosophy and its movement into the newly created 7th and 8th grades of secondary school, philosophical faculties in the modern sense were created, on the German model. Indeed, this

²¹ Exner left in 1852 and died in 1853. – Exner refused appointment as a minister many times, because he did not want to become mired in details and distracted from the conceptual work.

²² Karl Ernst Jarcke to Leo Thun. Vienna, 7 August 1852. Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D171. Reproduced in part in Hans LENTZE: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, in: SBWien phil.-hist. Kl. 239,2 (1962), p. 192–198.

²³ An insight into the rich international connections is provided e.g. by Helmut W. FLÜGEL: Briefe österreichischer ‚Mineralogen‘ zwischen Aufklärung und Restauration (Scripta geo-historica. Grazer Schriften zur Geschichte der Erdwissenschaften, Vol. 1), Graz 2009; also Hammer Purgstall's extensive correspondence demonstrates the rich and impressive contacts between Austrian intellectuals of the time.

²⁴ This ministry existed until 1860, when the agendas were taken over by the Ministry of State = Ministry of the Interior; these agendas were adopted by a separate ministry again only in 1867, by the Ministry for Religious Affairs and Education.

area experienced the most thoroughgoing changes and was considered to be key.²⁵ The propagation of the freedom of teaching and learning came about²⁶, as did the introduction of habilitation and thus the institute of the private lecturer, and academic self-administration. In August 1848, Ernst von Feuchtersleben²⁷ replaced the selection procedure (*Konkursverfahren*) with the appointment procedure. Exner was also entrusted with overseeing the reform at that time.²⁸

When the Vienna Uprising broke out, the most substantial organisational steps had been taken with regard to the universities, but not truly secured. What now followed was no less important, because it helped to secure the continuity of that which had begun, namely appointments from abroad: Hermann Bonitz, Ernst Brücke, Georg Curtius, August Schleicher, above all – Bonitz 35 years old, the others 30 and younger, outrageous for the Austrian universities of the time, which had been dominated by the idea of seniority.²⁹ Accordingly, these enthusiastic young academics had the expected impact, unleashing a veritably missionary verve and eagerness – they had to appear as true shining lights³⁰ and act as encouragement to local young academics. The Austrians called back from abroad, such as the internist Johann von Oppolzer (41 years old), and even the 62 year old physiologist Purkyně, were much older.

²⁵ Which is why it is also being treated in more detail in this paper. See also Walter HÖFLECHNER: Die Auswirkungen politischer und kultureller Veränderungen auf Forschungsorientierung und Wissenschaftsorganisation, in: Karl ACHAM (ed.): Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften, Vol. 1, Wien 1999, p. 149–214.

²⁶ Of course this was always a questioned principle, for many different reasons. A very late attempt at regulation, which came from a university in 1867, obliging the fulfilment of certain lectures, was strictly rejected by the educational authorities: While the efforts to redress individual irregularities must be recognised, “these personal considerations, however, must under all conditions be subject to the higher principle of the freedom of teaching and learning, which applies to the Austrian universities, where this is feasible, and may not be taken as the starting point for restrictions to this principle. However, the concept of the freedom of teaching and learning also means that the university student who has been declared fit by passing the maturity examination is granted complete freedom to choose which colleges to attend and which lecturers to visit”, Karl LEMAYER: Die Verwaltung der österreichischen Hochschulen von 1868–1877. Im Auftrage des k. k. Ministeriums für Cultus und Unterricht dargestellt, Wien 1878, p. 260 f.

²⁷ As undersecretary of state, but de facto as the actual minister.

²⁸ EGGLMAIER: Errichtung, p. 367.

²⁹ In 1864, as a 26 year-old, Mach was placed at the side of Hummel, who had been born in 1801 and was thus 63.

³⁰ It should not be forgotten here that men like Brücke were themselves breaking into a new world of science; see Wolfram W. SWOBODA: Ernst Brücke als Naturwissenschaftler, in: Hans BRÜCKE, Wolfgang HILGER, Walter HÖFLECHNER, Wolfram W. SWOBODA (eds): Ernst Wilhelm von Brücke. Briefe an Emil du Bois-Reymond, 2 vols. (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Vol. 8/1 + 8/2), Graz 1978, 8/1 p. xxix–xlii. – It was more than just age-related romanticism that prompted the Heidelberg physiologist Wilhelm Kühne to write in 1897, reminiscing on his undergraduate years in Vienna in the 1850s: “I recall nobody with such love and devotion than Brücke; among all the greats that have gone, he was without question of the finest nature and the noblest, most elegant character”, see Alexander Rollett. Seine Welt in Briefen 1844–1903, ed. by Walter HÖFLECHNER and Ingrid M. WAGNER, 2 vols. Graz 2012 (not for sale, soon in a complete version online at <http://gams.uni-graz.at/fedora/get/container:rollett/bdef:Container/get>, retrieved 31.08.2016, there Letter 2493 ddo 1897 VI 20 Heidelberg. Alexander Rollett himself wrote in hindsight: “A rare lucky star shone down on me. Brücke and Ludwig at the same time in Vienna, when I took my first steps there”, Letter 2134, Konzept des Dankschreibens an Ludwig für dessen Brief ddo 1893 XI 30 Leipzig.

Leo Graf Thun-Hohenstein took office as Minister on 28 July 1849³¹ – he had insisted on the amalgamation of religious affairs and education; Hammer-Purgstall aptly called him a man of progress “without being revolutionary”³². When Thun took office, Exner³³ (whom he revered from his days in Prague and who was nine years older) was already in the ministry. The person of Exner proved to be the most significant element of renewal to emerge from the Vormärz on the path to reform. Exner had got to know Hermann Bonitz in Berlin in 1842 and – as he wrote to his wife – the Berlin “scientific life and fabric exercises an electric influence [on him]; I am charged like a Leyden jar and the material is pressing to erupt like a spark”³⁴. Under this overwhelming impression, Exner began to occupy himself with the reform of the university system. In 1844 he presented a memorandum on the educational system “in general and in particular relationship to the philosophical studies” to the Imperial Commission on Education, upon which he was called to Vienna in 1845 to advise on this matter and was soon charged with creating a draft in which he developed the foundations of the new philosophical faculty, which was set up after 1848. He only returned to Prague in 1847. Shortly after the outbreak of the revolution, Exner was summoned to Vienna by Sommaruga, where he conceived the comprehensive “draft of the main features of the public educational system in Austria”, which was based substantially on the aforementioned memorandum.³⁵ And: it was Exner who effected

³¹ Eduard WINTER: *Revolution, Neoabsolutismus und Liberalismus in der Donaumonarchie*, Wien 1969, p. 68 wrote: “Exner was considered so strong at the time that he, as the Güntherian Flir wrote on 23 March 1853, ‘initiated and effected the appointment of Thun as Minister’.”

³² “I have already seen the preparations for the revolution for a year now in the soirées of Baron von Doblhoff, in which three of the current ministers, Bach, Schmerling, Thun, who are men of progress without being revolutionary, belonged to his most distinguished comrades.” Hammer-Purgstall in his recollections of 8 March 1848.

³³ Exner was born in 1802, Thun in 1811.

³⁴ Franz Serafin Exner (1802–1853), the progenitor of the “Exneri”, studied law in Vienna and philosophy under Leopold Rembold, then spent some time in Pavia in 1824/25, where he became acquainted with the – as he saw it, unusable – “old” philosophy, for which John Locke and Immanuel Kant were reprobate heretics and which led him to turn to Herbart in Vienna and in general to philosophy and psychology, even though his teacher Rembold had by now got into difficulties as a philosopher. In 1831, Exner was appointed to the chair of philosophy in Prague and developed an excellent teaching activity, which also promptly caused him difficulties, as many of his comments, based on Herbart, triggered resistance from the Church. At the beginning of the 1840s Exner grappled very critically with Hegel’s philosophy, which was dominant at the time. When Exner travelled to Germany in 1842, he got to know Hermann Bonitz in Berlin. The insightful quotation is taken from his description of his treatment and that of others to his wife: “Das hiesige wissenschaftliche Leben und Weben übt einen elektrischen Einfluss; ich bin geladen wie eine Leydnerflasche und der Stoff drängt, als Funke auszufahren. Ein Monat freie Zeit könnte ihn sehr fördern [One month of free time could greatly enhance him.]” (FRANKFURTER: *Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein*, p. 75). In the 1840s, numerous intellectuals visited Exner’s house in Prague, including Leo Graf Thun and Christian Doppler; Exner himself became secretary of the philosophical section of the Royal Bohemian Society of Sciences in 1844. After his temporary absence in Vienna, he was chosen as Rector in Prague for the 1847/48 academic year. However, Exner declined the appointment.

³⁵ Exner refused the assumption of the ministerial position twice, since he wanted to stay away from politics and not be disturbed in his work on the reform, FRANKFURTER: *Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein*, p. 100 f.

the appointment of Bonitz (from Stettin) and others, and thus a reinforcement of the German influence on the reform, which was already in place through his own presence.

In the spring of 1849, when the university reopened, having been closed since the March days of 1848, Exner and Bonitz developed the ground-breaking and successful reform of the secondary schools and technical schools³⁶ with the teaching qualification examination, which took effect immediately, first provisionally and then definitively in 1856.³⁷ When Thun took office as minister at the end of July 1849,³⁸ this draft legislation was already finished, and Thun adopted it “*unreservedly*” and secured its acceptance in September 1849.³⁹ Within a short space of time, Exner now created the *Provisorisches Gesetz über die Organisation der akademischen Behörden* (“Provisional law on the organisation of the academic authorities”), which was approved by the Emperor on 30 September 1849, thus granting self-administration to the universities.⁴⁰ When this was followed in October by study regulations and also a disciplinary ordinance, the central part of the reforms that were directly relevant to universities, namely that with which Thun’s name is generally and primarily associated, was completed and secured in principle.

Thus the reform work that is associated with Thun’s name proved to be an undertaking in which content that essentially originated with competent, reform-hungry and well-prepared scientists

³⁶ What they did not achieve, although it was a matter dear to Thun’s heart, was the reform of the elementary schools, which was completed only in 1869 in the course of the imperial elementary school law (*Reichsvolksschulgesetz*).

³⁷ This examination was assigned to state examination commissions at the individual high school locations, whose members were appointed by the Ministry and which continued to exist, each in adapted form, until the beginning of the 1990s; thus these examinations were not conducted by the university as such, but rather had the character of a state examination. However, the respective commissions were realised at different times, depending on the university; see Wolfgang BREZINKA: *Pädagogik in Österreich. Die Geschichte des Faches an den Universitäten vom 18. bis zum Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts*, 4 vols., Wien 2000–2013, Vol. 1, p. 141 f. and 144. – Interestingly, there was obviously no resistance to this regulation, in contrast to that of the juridical state examinations. Physicians were not subjected to such a regulation – their field was general in nature and did not appear to have any kind of state-specific relevance. It should also be considered in this context that the differentiation between the purely academic doctorate and the state examination indicates the reluctance of the state to get involved with the development of the aspect of science (including its teaching, naturally) – and that is a huge difference to the period prior to 1848.

³⁸ As a precondition he insisted that religious affairs be removed from the ministry of the interior and added to educational affairs. FRANKFURTER: Leo Thun-Hohenstein.

³⁹ FRANKFURTER: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, p. 108 f. – This reform – which aimed to provide the universities with adequately prepared students – introduced the subject teacher system and the syllabus was adapted to the period; in general, it was said to have a more harmonious balance between the realistic and humanist subjects than in Germany; in fact it provided the Austrian secondary school system with an excellent reputation until well into the 20th century. The new technical schools were very important for the technical colleges. New textbooks, after the old ones had been “ridiculed throughout Germany”, and the foundation of the *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* rounded off this complex.

⁴⁰ “Provisorisches Gesetz über die Organisation der akademischen Behörden”. This makes it understandable why Exner was chosen to be the first elected Rector of the University of Vienna under the new election rules in the autumn of 1849 – an honour he declined.

and intellectuals of the Austrian Vormärz was secured by a Bohemian aristocrat as an exponent of a central government. And in that respect it was only partly a “revolution from above”.

Yet Thun’s achievements should by no means be underestimated, and his function as name-giver is not without justification, for:

Thun took up the liberal intentions of his predecessors and Exner, secured them,⁴¹ and in general continued to represent them resolutely, also after Exner’s death in 1853;⁴² that was by no means self-evident for a very Catholic-conservative aristocrat⁴³ and exposed him to numerous attacks, before the Emperor himself put an end to them.⁴⁴ Thun’s greatest achievement is that there was no relapse. Eduard Winter has remarked appositely that it was probably precisely Thun’s well-known conservative Catholic attitude that allowed him to push through and stabilise the liberal reform. In his person, origin and attitude he “legitimised” that which displeased the Church, which repudiated new humanism as pagan (and, worse, which was also propagated by a protestant Prussian, namely Bonitz), and he was in a position to “legitimise” that which the conservatives and Josephinians despised.⁴⁵ Another factor that favoured Thun’s work was his self-conception as a Bohemian, which gave him the support of the non-German speaking nationalities, who saw him as an opponent of the Bach Germanisation efforts and thus hoped to include their own intentions in the structure of the reform.⁴⁶ And indeed this would become a highly sensitive point in terms of future developments, since the establishment of German faculties was demanded by German students in Prague, and that of other philological areas for languages represented within the monarchy was also demanded by each respective nationality.⁴⁷ Scientific renewal in the sense of philology already became entwined with national interests at this early stage. At the same time, however, supranational

⁴¹ The study regulations, etc. were determined by decree in October 1850, Leo von BECK MANNAGETTA, Carl von KELLE (ed.): *Die österreichischen Universitätsgesetze. Sammlung der für die österreichischen Universitäten gültigen Gesetze, Verordnungen, Erlässe, Studien und Prüfungsordnungen usw.*, Wien 1906, p. 365 and 366, just as an abundance of other detailed regulations were determined only at this time.

⁴² Exner became ill as early as 1850 and deteriorated steadily until he had to take leave for ever longer periods and finally died on a business trip to Padua on 21 June 1853, where he was also buried. FRANKFURTER: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, p. 115 f.

⁴³ After all, Thun travelled to Rome in 1870 to demonstrate his obedience to the Pope after the repudiation of the declaration of infallibility!

⁴⁴ See LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 232 ff.

⁴⁵ WINTER: *Revolution*, p. 69.

⁴⁶ Professorial chairs in Slavic studies were in fact created in this context, not so much for scientific-systematic reasons; their propagators even went so far as to demand Slavic philosophy, in order to trace, so to speak, the unique characteristics of Slavic thought. WINTER: *Revolution*, p. 70.

⁴⁷ One even went so far as to ask whether there were national forms of science in general, whether and to what extent science, like the artistic forms of expression poetry and music, had an inherently specific national form, such as Slavic or even Czech, whether there was such a thing as a “national science”, WINTER: *Revolution*, p. 115. See also Stanislaus HAFNER: *Geschichte der österreichischen Slawistik*, in: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Slawistik in nichtslawischen Ländern*, Wien 1986, p. 11–88.

importance was also ascribed to German, due to the outstanding scientific achievements in Germany.

Despite his personal views, and with his intrinsic tolerance, Thun did not permit the aspired reconsecration of the secular faculties of the universities, as foreseen by the Concordat of 1855, and he also strictly rejected⁴⁸ other similar suggestions⁴⁹ – as an illustration it is worth noting that in 1861, 62.5 % of secondary school teachers were still clergy!⁵⁰ The implications of Thun's position are difficult to estimate, and they formed the basis for everything else, even if, to a certain extent, the keystone was laid only in the liberal era and with the suspension of the Concordat, respectively the Rigorosum Ordinance of 1872 and the Organisation Act of 1873.⁵¹

At the time, of course, the Concordat issue cast a shadow on the reform work; in 1854 Grillparzer remarked acidly: "I have a suicide to report. The Minister of Religious Affairs has killed the Minister of Education"⁵², and Anastasius Grün, alias Anton Graf Auersperg, who was a friend of Thun, later called the Concordat a "printed road to Canossa"⁵³.

In principle, the reform work was concluded and definitively secured by 1854 or 1855, with the consolidation by the Emperor.⁵⁴

Admittedly, it should not be concealed that Thun often flouted his own innovations in the appointment procedures when it came to subjects with ideological relevance; thus Thun made sure that scientists who shared his own views were selected, especially in philosophy (in

⁴⁸ See WINTER: Revolution, p. 126 f. In his ADB article on Thun, Frankfurter examines the various complexities of the confessional matter in more detail. – The disregard of Protestants and Jews remained in all universities; thus the dean of St. Stephen's Cathedral remained chancellor of the University of Vienna, and non-Catholics could not assume the office of rector, or even dean, as demonstrated in an effectively public manner by the Viennese satirist Daniel Spitzer in 1868, with reference to the case of the physiologist Brücke: "The teacher of physiology at the Vienna University, Professor Brücke, has just suffered a calamity that afflicted him 50 years ago. Back then, namely, with the carelessness in religious matters that has sadly become the rule among newborns, he was placed at the bosom of the Protestant Church [...] The Minister of Education, v. Hasner, who is currently occupied with the question as to why our university has fallen behind other universities, is said to have justified the rejection of Professor Brücke by claiming that the university has a 'Catholic nature'. If the university were a monastery, [...] hardly a better answer could have been found. [...] But the university is not a monastery and Professor Brücke is hopefully judicious enough not to seek the honour of prior. The university is nothing other than a 'cooperative of teachers and students'!" Daniel SPITZER: Wiener Spaziergänge, Wien 1877, Vol. 1, p. 196–199 (Kein protestantischer Dekan. Juni 1868).

⁴⁹ Such as the elimination of natural science subjects in lower secondary school grades.

⁵⁰ Even though Protestant teachers had been employed in secondary schools both before and after the Concordat, as it would not have been possible otherwise to fill the posts, see FRANKFURTER: Leo Thun-Hohenstein.

⁵¹ "Einen Selbstmord hab' ich euch anzusagen. Der Kultusminister hat den Unterrichtsminister todtgeschlagen." It should be noted here that, to be precise, a lawless state prevailed from 1858 until 1873, since the provisional law of 1858 had not been extended, especially since Thun avoided this matter due to the opposition of Cardinal Rauscher, see LENTZE: Universitätsreform, p. 259.

⁵² <http://www.gedichte.eu/kl/grillparzer/gedichte3/sinngedichte-und-epigramme.php>, retrieved 31.08.2016.

⁵³ FRANKFURTER: Leo Thun-Hohenstein. This phrase was also used elsewhere.

⁵⁴ On 24 February 1855 Emperor Franz Joseph passed a similar resolution in which he concluded the public debate on the reform and enabled Thun to continue his work, see LENTZE: Universitätsreform, p. 234 f.

particular legal philosophy⁵⁵) and history. Especially unfortunate, but ultimately without consequence, was the little-known appointment of the 28 year-old poet and radical opponent of new humanism, Oscar von Redwitz-Schmölz, as professor for the general history of literature and aesthetics at the University of Vienna⁵⁶, who then failed miserably;⁵⁷ thus the field of general and comparable literature declined in Austria from the very beginning, since the material intended for Redwitz-Schmölz ultimately fell to the philologists, who were primarily concerned with linguistics. It was a similar situation in Pest.⁵⁸ In the process, Thun followed the maxim that Jarcke had already suggested to Metternich: to carefully appoint selected, politically and religiously reliable professors from Germany or Switzerland – incidentally, in a letter during the appointment negotiations with the respected German linguist Franz Pfeiffer in 1855, Thun stated this idea completely clearly and openly, and did not appoint the Catholic Pfeiffer, who was married to a Protestant and who was raising his children as Protestants; although two years later he did appoint him after all.⁵⁹ With such actions, of course, Thun stole some of the thunder from the conservative opposition who fulminated against Protestants, and: just like Jarcke, Thun also rejected science that was completely free of preconditions.⁶⁰

However, such decisions, which from our present-day perspective were perhaps unfortunate and restraining, were soon compensated by the self-cleansing power of the system that now prevailed due to the freedom of teaching and learning, on the basis of differentiation by subject, which soon led to the dissolution of subjects like “universal history”. – After 1855, however, confessional considerations increasingly receded in to the background, even for Thun.⁶¹

A longer-lasting impact of the Concordat of 1855⁶² and perhaps also precisely a consequence of Thun’s protective attitude, was that the University of Innsbruck was chosen as a special site to cultivate conservative Church-related and political tendencies, and its Catholic theological faculty, newly founded in 1857, was transferred by the Emperor to the Jesuit order, which had

⁵⁵ Indeed the legal sciences took up a lot of space in the discussions, since they affected state interests to a very large degree, and the state examinations were interpreted as a restriction of teaching, which is why their revocation was frequently demanded, which however never happened, not even during the phase of high liberalism – with the reference that the state examinations were “not attributable, as is usual, to the reaction that has gained dominance [, but rather ...] had emerged from the interests of the state”; for details, see LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 236 ff. and especially p. 289.

⁵⁶ Due to his Christian-Germanic poetry, see the biography of Redwitz in Constant von WURZBACH: *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, Vol. 25, Wien 1868, p. 122–129.

⁵⁷ He resigned his chair as early as 1852, see *ibid.*, or the relevant files in ÖStA, AVA.

⁵⁸ Here, the Catholic priest and publicist Wilhelm Gärtner was appointed. EGGLMAIER: *Errichtung*, p. 370 f.

⁵⁹ In his letter, Thun pulled back from Pfeiffer due to the danger of the latter’s “insincerity”, LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 125, see also EGGLMAIER: *Errichtung*, p. 371 f.

⁶⁰ The ideal for both was a restricted freedom of teaching, with whose help the government would be able to keep out undesirable professors, LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 85 ff.

⁶¹ EGGLMAIER: *Errichtung*, p. 377.

⁶² The Concordat of 1855 was modified by the May Laws of 1868, declared invalid by Austria in 1870 after the declaration of infallibility, and formally suspended in 1874.

once again been permitted in Austria since 1851.⁶³ – The efforts made towards the end of the 19th century by the ministries of Gautsch and then Hartel to effect a Catholic Renaissance in Austria, and the associated substantial influence exerted on the University of Vienna, harked back to the University of Innsbruck.⁶⁴

Now, with the aforementioned details and the reference that a very respectable and efficient administration had now been established, the most important factors of the further development of science in Austria have been listed.

The fact that Thun clearly advocated those ideals that could be seen in German universities, and thus secured the fertile ground – which had been lacking for so long – for the approaches that had been developing subliminally prior to 1848, in order to successfully imitate the model of scientific development in the German states, especially north of the Main, led to the emergence of a process of scientification, which not only resulted in modern contemporary research, but which also of course affected teaching. Only now were philosophical studies elevated to philosophical faculties in the modern sense. It meant the final independence of the natural sciences from their position as ancillary disciplines to medicine.⁶⁵

Differentiation, which was now unfolding rapidly, initiated an unexpected development and within a very short time the system gained something that cannot be determined by decree and which Jarcke had claimed as the highest maxim: “scientific meaning”, i.e. “Joy in studying as such, pleasure in every mental activity that delves more deeply, the inclination to participate in every expansion of knowledge”⁶⁶.

Thus occurred the scientification of the once so sedate natural sciences, in accordance with the maxims of the now decisive triad of physics, chemistry and physiology, which were now clearer than ever understood to be the probing of those laws behind phenomena that had previously merely been described: this, together with other favourable circumstances in physics, led for

⁶³ The Austrian Provincial Superior could appoint and dismiss professors, and also name the dean (this rule lapsed in 1873, but was renewed by the Concordat of 1933). See BECK, KELLE: *Universitätsgesetze*, No. 4.

⁶⁴ With Ludwig Pastor, who taught in Innsbruck, the idea was to impose a pronouncedly Catholic historian on the University of Vienna; after a long battle, the marginal Josef Hirn was appointed, see Walter HÖFLECHNER: *Metamorphosen und Konsequenzen. Zur Auflösung der Allgemeinen Geschichte an den Universitäten Wien, Prag und Graz*, in: Reinhard HÄRTEL (ed.): *Geschichte und ihre Quellen. Festschrift für Friedrich Hausmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, Graz 1987, p. 289–298, here especially p. 295. And when the appointment of Mach as a philosopher at the University of Vienna alongside Jodl could not be prevented, an additional chair in philosophy was excavated, last occupied in 1859 by Georg Schenach, thus presenting the surprised philosophical faculty of the University of Vienna with an additional – loyal – philosophy professor, namely the theologian Laurenz Müllner (Walter HÖFLECHNER: *Bemerkungen zur Institutionalisierung der Philosophie in Österreich*, unpublished manuscript).

⁶⁵ And that signified the end for many professors of these subjects.

⁶⁶ “Lust und Freude am Studium als solchem, die Freude an jeder in die Tiefe gehenden geistigen Beschäftigung, die Neigung sich an jedweder Erweiterung des Wissens zu beteiligen.” This quotation comes from Jarcke’s memorandum on the tasks of a Minister of Education in Austria from 5 August 1849, printed in LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 295–299 (Annex I), especially p. 296.

example to the fact that the field of theoretical physics (then still “mathematical”) received its own professorial chairs in Austria at an incredibly early stage, compared to other countries – as early as the 1860s; Munich and Leipzig followed only at the turn of the century! In general, physics can be seen as an area in which Austria rose to the top autochthonously, without any great help from outside, within only a few decades – especially with Boltzmann and Mach⁶⁷ – and remained at the top for a long time with scholars such as Marian Smoluchowski, Erwin Schrödinger, Victor Franz Hess, and Lise Meitner. Descriptive systematic botany was soon robbed of its supremacy by plant physiology, which would undergo significant development up to Friedrich (“Friedl”) Weber, the pioneer of protoplasm research, Kerner von Marilaun became one of the founders of plant sociology, and at an early stage – already from the Vormärz – palaeobotany achieved world-leading status with Franz von Unger and Constantin von Ettingshausen. There were similar developments in zoology, where the Adriatic region provided rich research material on primitive marine species, and a research station was established on the Kvarner Gulf, in addition to the one in Naples. In the earth sciences, modern methods were also being used to understand geodynamic processes, leading to Otto Ampferer’s tectonics and Wegener’s Continental Drift theory; in pharmacy, progress was also made in Austria – albeit with some delay – by physiology-based pharmacology, overtaking pharmacognosy (which led within a short time to the groundbreaking work by Otto Loewi; the impact of physiology on the other medical sub-disciplines, including surgery, was huge and contributed significantly to the international reputation of the Second Viennese Medical School until well into the 20th century. Towards the end of the century, disciplines that had previously lain very far apart were brought together fruitfully, as can be seen from the example of the development of seismology and the mathematical modelling of meteorological events by the internationally renowned, no less well-known meteorologist Max Margules, one of the most tragic figures of science in Austria before National Socialism.

Those disciplines that we now refer to as the humanities⁶⁸, were now subjected to a certain classification – the less than fortunate symbiosis of classical philology and aesthetics was

⁶⁷ It should be noted here that the reception of Newtonian physics in Austria occurred quite early, namely in the 1740s (i.e. almost simultaneously with the third edition and with the translation of the *Principia* into French by the Marquise du Châtelet), when younger Jesuits became interested in it; not without reason, Rudjer Boscovich’s *Theoria* was printed in Vienna in 1758, facilitated by Karl Scherffer, who had been transferred there from Graz. A certain minimum of physical tradition was preserved by former Jesuits like Leopold Biwald and his textbook until the 19th century (the information that Biwald published an edition of Boscovich’s *Theoria philosophiae naturalis* in Graz in 1765 cannot – sadly – be verified).

⁶⁸ It should not be forgotten here that the German term “Geisteswissenschaften” (if we ignore earlier uses of the word, with a different meaning, in the 18th and mid-19th centuries) arose only later (although the methodical differences had been discussed earlier), and was shaped specifically in 1883 by Wilhelm Dilthey, whose analysis of this topic started from the question of the certainty of knowledge – which had been aspired to since the 16th century – to be gained outside of mathematics by means of the non-natural sciences, in order to achieve

abolished by dissolving the latter into the art-related triad of (general) literature studies, art history and musicology⁶⁹ and, not least enabled and promoted by the aforementioned political attitude of Thun, pioneering subjects developed that resulted from Austria's special situation, such as Slavic linguistics and literature studies (mainly due, specifically, to Franz von Miklosich, who had been brought from the court library in 1849, for whom Josef Dobrovský, Jernej Kopitar and Pavel Jozef Šafárik had already worked⁷⁰), which very soon effected a cultural-historical processing and thus led to a significant expansion of the historical field of observation beyond the classical image of Europe or the Occident. But also the field of modern Oriental studies, of which Hammer-Purgstall was the godfather, where August Pfizmaier and Stefan Endlicher worked and where Joseph von Karabacek embarked on new territory, is worth mentioning here, just as much as the history and archaeology of south eastern Europe as far as Anatolia, where Austria still holds an important position to this day. General and comparative linguistics developed under Anton Boller in Vienna and August Schleicher in Prague, while in Graz, Johannes Schmidt and Hugo Schuchardt – both appointed from Germany – developed linguistic wave theory. The humanities experienced a great upswing under the Protestant Theodor Sickel, not so much in the sense intended by Helfert and Thun, i.e. the history of the

acceptance of the disciplines he termed “Geisteswissenschaften” in the sense of scientia (a discussion that had previously been enlivened primarily by Droysen in his analysis of positivism or the natural sciences). The key steps here in attaining reasonably well-founded knowledge from disciplines that were not adequately empirical were taken by means of the development of critique, both in the historical and in the philological area. Once one was forced to accept in the mid-18th century that no certainty of knowledge that is adequate for experimental physics, let alone mathematics, can be achieved in history from the nature of the thing, and that not even the natural sciences in the strictest sense of the word were suitable, the demands on scientific certainty changed, at least in the German area, in the sense that Kant's concept of opinion (“Meinen”) was accepted as sufficient. And in this context, the development of historical critique and the development of critical linguistics based on comparative Indo-Germanic studies, increased in scientific-constituting importance. The merging into a superordinate unity known as “Geisteswissenschaften” took place only in the last third of the 19th century; the reasonably alert awareness of the epistemological foundation was aroused only now by Droysen's and Dilthey's understanding. In that respect, one cannot yet regard the mid-19th century humanities disciplines at the philosophical faculties as a scientific block that is comparable with the natural sciences. – When the Academy of Sciences was finally created in Vienna, the natural scientists Anton Schrötter and Wilhelm Haidinger tried to raise both categories to independent academies in 1848 by means of the statutes, in other words a complete separation of both areas, see Hammer-Purgstall in his memoirs of 15 April 1848. – In this context, of course the discussions of the division of the philosophical faculties are also of interest (in Graz in 1878 under the leadership of Ludwig Boltzmann), as well as those on the relationship between “pure”, i.e. “theoretical”, and “applied” science, from the middle of the century, reaching its climax at the beginning of the 20th century; these questions are touched upon in LEMAYER: Verwaltung, p. 13 ff., who followed the discussions in Germany, but they did not yet play a role in the reform discussion.

⁶⁹ As mentioned, this concept – in itself logical – did not really materialise, not least due to the failure of Redwitz-Schmölz.

⁷⁰ The image held abroad of the fate of Austrian scholars in the Vormärz can be seen in the example of Josef Dobrovský: In 1824 the Danish bishop Friedrich Münter from Copenhagen implored Hammer (-Purgstall) to advocate providing a pension to the 70 year-old Dobrovský, who was living in straitened conditions in a stable (probably at the palace of Count Nostitz), which would allow him dignity in old age (Letter by Münter of 8 December 1824 in the estate of Hammer-Purgstall in Schloßarchiv Hainfeld, Styrian state archive).

Austrian Empire, but in the auxiliary historical-medieval sciences and thus new critical historical research, which radiated as far as modern history.

In this process during Thun's era, the creation of new kinds of institutions proved to be very fruitful; namely two central institutes in combination with the new Academy of Sciences: the Central Geological Institute (*Geologische Reichsanstalt*) in November 1849 and the Central Institute for Meteorology and Earth Magnetism (*Zentralanstalt für Meteorologie und Erdmagnetismus*) in 1851 (the oldest state weather service in the world), whose leadership was always held by professors of the University of Vienna and whose practical objectives provided material for valuable scientific work. And on the other hand two institutes that, while they emerged from the old ideas of teaching (their establishment was a result of the secondary school reform), yet they embarked on a different, more fruitful development than originally intended, under the influence of the general transformation. These were the Institute of Physics, founded in 1850⁷¹ and the Institute for Austrian Historical Research (*Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*), which was opened in 1854,⁷² whose teaching staff were drawn from the general operations of the university. At the time, these institutions, with their directorial constitutions, represented an organisational form that was far ahead of the general faculty development, and each – with their respective narrow subject areas – made a significant contribution to the scientific advancement.

Now, a rigid, minimalistic system aimed solely at teaching was no longer decisive for the establishment of professorial chairs and laboratories, but instead research, respectively the development of the scientific system, with the resulting consequences, namely a balance

⁷¹ The Institute of Physics was intended to “[provide] prospective trainee teachers in the subjects of physics, chemistry and physiology the opportunity to gain the fundamental knowledge that is necessary for successful teaching, mechanical dexterity in experimentation, and the requisite instructions for independent research”. Its management was transferred to the most renowned Austrian physicist of the time, Christian Doppler. Under Etingshausen and Josef Stefan this institute developed very quickly in the scientific direction and an ever increasing gulf arose between the “normal” trainee teachers and the “pupils” of the institute. The importance of this institute in the first decades of its existence was enormous, as it produced the most important Austrian physicists of the second half of the 19th century; very soon, however, the institute almost fell into oblivion, especially as Stefan became more and more involved in the Academy of the Sciences. It was dissolved without a whimper during the restructuring caused by the recall of Boltzmann to Leipzig in 1901/02. See Walter HÖFLECHNER: *Materialien zur Entwicklung der Physik und ihrer „Randfächer“ Astronomie und Meteorologie an den österreichischen Universitäten 1752–1938*, Teil I: Institutionen, at http://www-gewi.uni-graz.at/wissg/geschichte_der_physik/, retrieved 31.08.2016.

⁷² Ultimately, the Institute for Austrian Historical Research was created for similar reasons – as a nursery for patriotic historical research to provide evidence of an Austrian empire that had grown organically in its diversity, willed by God, so to speak. However, at its head Thun appointed the Tyrolean Benedictine Albert Jäger, who was anything but equal to the demands of the time and who, hopelessly out of his depth, soon gave way to Theodor Sickel, under whom the institute transformed into an internationally renowned scientific research institution, which distanced itself completely from the “normal education” that it was originally intended to provide. In terms of mediaeval auxiliary science, it attained a position of international importance and until 1983 produced all of the professors for Austrian history, and for almost as long, all of the occupants of the mediaeval and historical auxiliary chairs in Austria, until at the end of the 20th century the old educational tradition was extinguished by way of the “Institutskurs”.

between research and systematic and research-led teaching. Professorial chairs, initially only “extraordinariates” or teaching assignments, were now created in line with the developments of the disciplines according to international standards and with regard to the best possible education for the students.⁷³

The very significant increase in the number of chairs, together with the Institute of Private Lecturers, resulted in an explosive increase in courses and thus also the freedom of learning, but also benefited research goals. Internal competition was also very fruitful.

Table 1: Chairs at philosophical faculties 1848, 1867, 1876. Source: LEMAYER: Verwaltung.

University	1848 ⁷⁴	1867	1876		
	Professors	Professors (total full +associate)	Professors (total full +associate)	Private lecturers	Total with habilitation
Vienna	11/17	32	52	29	81
Prague	15	24	37	16	53
Graz	6	14	28	6	34
Innsbruck	6	12	19	6	25
Total	38 (44)	82	136	57	193

Another important aspect of the reforms concerned teaching, which now ideally and rapidly transformed from textbook-based **lectures** into much livelier lessons, which also used critical examples and application instructions. The key element in this regard in the humanities were the **seminars** that gradually emerged and soon – like many other things – completed a transformation from the originally intended practice school for trainee teachers into trial field for prospective scientists, thus becoming the nucleus of the institutes and – especially with the conversion of original seminar stipends into library endowments – the later institute libraries as special libraries.

⁷³ Despite this enormous improvement, the important ministerial bureaucrat Karl Lemayer complained in 1878 of a deficit in what he believed was necessary (LEMAYER: Verwaltung, p. 67 ff.). Ultimately, it should be seen as a positive sign that the expansion and improvement in quality that was triggered by the reforms led to such a rapid attainment of equivalence in many subjects. One consequence, however, was that a series of younger staff were called abroad, while at the same time the influx from outside was rather throttled by the events of 1866 and 1871. Therefore a deficit in teaching staff and accordingly a significant number of vacancies already became apparent by the mid-1870s. This was intensified by the fact that many jurists and political scientists were appointed to the now higher-quality administration, jurisdiction and other state positions, while retirement was introduced from the age of 70 (plus one honorary year for professors). Attempts were made to counter these factors with the proven means of systematised travel subsidies with declarations of obligation for upcoming staff, who were to be kept at the universities by these means.

⁷⁴ Vienna 1848–1850.

Nothing, however, documents the process more obviously than the material expansion of the universities that resulted from the reforms, and the successive conversion, from the 1860s, of the old polytechnics into technical universities, in terms of their personnel, their premises, and the equipping of both laboratories and libraries. A prime example is provided by the buildings in the area of the natural sciences at the University of Graz; here, in the mid-1870s (admittedly under favourable aspects), one building was built for each of the subjects chemistry and physics which, like the new building for anatomy and physiology, were generally considered to be splendid and could compete with the best⁷⁵ – at the time, of course, physics and chemistry were subjects of the philosophical faculty; and in 1874, when construction began, this faculty had a total of 199 students, who were later joined by 65 pharmacists.⁷⁶ This renewal occurred much earlier and clearer in the provincial universities than in Vienna.⁷⁷

An abundance of further flanking measures could be mentioned here, such as the development of endowments, the expansion of libraries, etc.

It can be seen how deep and extensive the renewals caused by the Thunian reforms were in the subsequent detectable understanding shown in the public sphere and in parliament for the requirements of the universities, which should be seen as testimony to the effectiveness of the reforms and the acceptance of science – despite the difficult external conditions of those years. In that respect, the enormous impetus of the initial phase broke through into a broader generality. And that was indeed the most valuable element: the impulse for renewal, which arose from the deficit of the Vormärz, the pent-up yearning for free development, the ability to release oneself from the shame of obscurantism. It was released in 1848 and supported by Thun. The effect is reminiscent of our idea of a big bang.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Parts of the physics building were kept iron-free, in order to be able to conduct interference-free magnetic experiments.

⁷⁶ The figures are from Franz von KRONES: *Geschichte der Karl-Franzens-Universität in Graz. Festgabe zur Feier ihres dreihundertjährigen Bestandes*, Graz 1886, p. 560.

⁷⁷ It is well known by now that the situation of physics, for example, was much less favourable in Vienna, which was partly (in the initial period) due to the fact that the improvements had begun quickly after 1848, with the expansion of the physical institute; it was a different matter at the “provincial university” of Graz, where the subject had a pitiful existence until the establishment of the medical faculty in 1863, and Minister Stremayr found that a “new shack” had to be built. In Vienna, however, there was also an undoubted lethargy among the professors, which had not a little to do with the miserable conditions around 1900 (when institute chairmen left Vienna before the assembly of natural scientists in 1894 to avoid having to show their foreign colleagues around their institute, and when a ceiling fell through in the Physical Institute in Türkenstraße); only in 1913 was the enormous new building in Boltzmanngasse occupied.

⁷⁸ However, this impetus began to decline already in the 1880s, or is used in the sense of an increasing nationalisation or confrontation between the nationalities and with the Jewry. In this context it should also be seen that which one can read in BECK, KELLE: *Universitätsgesetze*, p. 1: “The following was noted about the legal position of the universities, in response to an enquiry [in a ministerial file of 1897]: The Austrian universities were called to life by the princes as independent corporations, equipped with constitutional privileges and asset rights. Over time, however, these have for the most part lost their independent position and are currently organised as state institutions, without however their position as legal entities having been expressly suspended by legal means.”

Another circumstance casts a telling light in the situation: Neither the provisional nor the definitive organisation law of the academic authorities defined what a university is – there was so much unity on this matter that a definition was not even considered.⁷⁹ Such a definition was made only in 1922, and then only in order to insert a single adjective: “Universities are German research and teaching institutions”⁸⁰.

The reform work associated with Thun’s name, led to a thoroughgoing expansion of the concept of science, and in its basic structure it determined the Austrian universities and secondary schools until 1975 – it was therefore the foundation for the scientific development in the Cisleithanian area of old Austria, and in the Second and Third Republic, and thus for a whole range of globally recognised scientific achievements.

It goes without saying that this process, in its further course, did not correspond with every one of Thun’s intentions. Nevertheless, when honouring the initial spark for quite a few areas, one can pick up on Herbert Egglmaier’s dictum, who stated in 1981, in relation to German studies: “The same process that was completed in Austria in the years 1849–1859 took almost half a century in Germany”⁸¹.

Naturally, the assessment of the scientific development must be distinguished from an evaluation of the development, or “success”, of the political intentions of the Minister for Education, Thun. In this regard, it can be said that in general, as in the numerous details mentioned, the development that was triggered ultimately took a different route than the one

⁷⁹ The fact that the cultivation of science was the primary task of the universities can be found in numerous speeches and writings of the time. In the protocol of the Council of Ministers on university reform, it was said at a session on 26 November 1853 that a historical introduction to the question of the mission of the university was superfluous and it was therefore sufficient to recognise the statute “that ‘the purpose of the Austrian universities’ exists ‘in the cultivation of science in harmony with the spirit of the Church, with special consideration of the interests of the state’.” – LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 307 ff (Annex IV); in other discussions illustrated in the protocol, apart from the preferences relating to the Church, the comments made by the Minister of the Interior, Bach, are also notable, namely that no textbooks should be prescribed because “even in positive disciplines no unconditional conclusion, no standstill can be considered, these must also progress and become more complete from year to year [...]”. – Both together anticipate what Karl Lemayer, one of the decisive representatives of the Austrian university administration in the liberal era, wrote in the register of the universities in 1877/78 (preface to his book about the administration of the Austrian universities): “[...] while the universities [are] state institutions, institutes that represent a state interest and a state mission, they also have an independent scientific occupation, which they pursue in freedom according to their own determination. Thus these institutions, to put it this way, have one side that is turned towards the state and one that is withdrawn from state influence. [...] According to this latter side, the history of the universities is often the history of science itself”, and: “the universities [are] in the first instance that which the academic teachers make them; the actual strength and shine of the institutions actually emanates from them – ‘men not measures’ therefore applies here all the more than in any other area of state rule”. The universities were now seen as the central site of science, and not any randomly small or large “sum of knowledge, but rather complete knowledge about the object of study”, LEMAYER: *Verwaltung*, p. iv, v and 1.

⁸⁰ See Walter HÖFLECHNER: *Die Baumeister des künftigen Glücks. Fragment einer Geschichte des Hochschulwesens in Österreich vom Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in das Jahr 1938* (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 23), Graz 1988, p. 187.

⁸¹ EGGLMAIER: *Errichtung*, p. 389.

intended and that – to put it briefly – the development in the area of science, once unleashed, naturally went well beyond Thun's objectives and attempts at control.

The spirits he invoked ... – ultimately went their own way. And that, at least at first, was not the worst way.

Conception of the reforms

Franz Leander Fillafer

Leo Thun and the Enlightenmen

Thun's Ideal of Science, University Politics, and the Fortunes of Austrianness

Leo Thun's university reform is a good protective amulet, Thun is foremost among the holy helpers of Austrian education politicians. *Sancte Leo, ora pro nobis!* Referring to Thun has become a chiliastic genre in its own right, all subsequent reformers are measured against Thun's towering accomplishment. A thriving Thun hagiography emerged, which had continued resolutely since Salomon Frankfurter's work.¹

There are many Thuns: the Austro-Slavist national patriot and the Germanising centralist², the liberal statesman and the reactionary bureaucrat; the enlightened Catholic³, who saved the universities and the commercial colleges from the claws of the Church, and the ultramontane, papist architect of the Concordat⁴; the competing interpretations continue to reproduce

¹ Cf. on this point the essay I wrote together with Johannes FEICHTINGER in this volume.

² Miloslav NOVÁK: *Austroslavismus, příspěvek k jeho pojetí v době předbřeznové*, in: *Sborník archivních prací* 6, (1956), p. 26–50; Zdeněk ŠAMBERGER: *Austroslavismus ve světle snah feudální reakce. (Poznámky k jeho třídnímu charakteru a pojetí)*, in: *Slovanské historické studie* 16 (1988), p. 49–81; IDEM.: *Časopis Vídeňský deník a jeho poslání v letech 1850–1851: Ke ztroskotanému pokusu Leo Thuna o založení české konzervativní strany*, in: *Slovanský přehled* 71 (1985), p. 25–40, and the good literature overview by Miroslav ŠESTÁK: *Der tschechische Austroslavismus bis zum österreichisch-ungarischen Ausgleich in der tschechischen Historiographie*, in: Andreas MORITSCH (ed.): *Der Austroslavismus. Ein verfrühtes Konzept zur politischen Neugestaltung Mitteleuropas*, Wien 1996, p. 24–35. Šamberger chastises Hermann Freudenberger's and Christoph Thienen-Adlerflycht's (who, as Šamberger notes, comes from a noble Sudeten German family that was suspected of collaboration) accounts of Thun as an "awakener" or revivalist (buditel), ŠAMBERGER: *Austroslavismus ve světle snah feudální reakce*, 71, fn. 1–6. Instead Thun appears as a "feudal-bureaucratic" reactionary, NOVÁK: *Austroslavismus*, p. 26, cf. in contrast the nuanced review of Thienen's book by Valentin URFUS in: *Pravnik* 107 (1968), p. 170–171. Urfus acknowledges Thienen's excellent work and states that it breaks with the tradition of Austrian historiography, which sees liberalism as the sole heir of the Enlightenment and of Josephinism, p. 170. Urfus concedes the possibility of a creative handling of the revolutionary challenge on the part of conservatives (Panajotis Kondylis interpreted this somewhat too instrumentally in one of his brilliant studies as a "conservative attempt to use Enlightenment language and Enlightenment ideas against the liberal and democratic excesses [Auswüchse] of the Enlightenment", Panajotis KONDYLLIS: *Der Niedergang der bürgerlichen Denk- und Lebensform. Die liberale Moderne und die massendemokratische Postmoderne*, Weinheim 1991, p. 210). Urfus' observation, highly controversial at the time, that federal-feudal conservatism should not be simply labelled as reactionary, is connected to a very interesting safeguarding move in order to situate his argument within Marxist historiography: Urfus observes that the admixture of revolutionary ideas to Thun's conservatism produced "contradictions"; these contradictions resembled, in turn, the simultaneously emerging social contradictions generated by the changes to the capitalist relations of production, *ibid.*, p. 171. On the Marxist historiography of the time see Bohumil JIROUŠEK (ed.): *Proměny diskursu české marxistické historiografie*, České Budějovice 2008.

³ To the followers of Günther he was considered clearly to be a Bolzanist and Herbart disciple, Peter KNOODT: *Anton Günther. Eine Biographie*, 2 vols., Wien 1881, II, p. 72.

⁴ Cf. Alois FLIR: *Briefe aus Rom*, ed. Ludwig Rapp, Innsbruck 1864; In 1850 Ignaz von Beidtel presented 1850 with the motion to completely abolish the placetum regium for Papal decision, which Thun rejected, cf. Erika WEINZIERL-FISCHER: *Der Ministerrat und die kaiserlichen Verordnungen vom 18. und 23. April 1850*, in: *MÖSTA* 11 (1958), p. 467–494, here p. 476. On the jurisdiction autonomy of the bishops and the extensive immunity of the priests from secular courts see also Thun's conflict with the president of the Imperial Council (Reichsrat), Carl von Kübeck, Franz POTOTSCHNIG: *Staatlich-kirchliche Ehegesetzgebung im 19. Jahrhundert*:

themselves when it comes to the intellectual foundations of Thun's administration: Here he appears either as an independent thinker or merely as his advisors' tool. In parallel there is the discrepancy between Thun's reputation as a saviour, who finally opened up the universities of the Habsburg countries to the intellectual progress of the larger Germany, and the image of the "Prussianiser" ("*Verpreußer*"), who destroyed the overarching, pan-monarchical Austrian identity.⁵

In this essay I want to address these questions from the angle of Leo Thun's relationship to the Enlightenment and analyse how this perspective can serve to better understand the faults and transitions around 1848.

Thun's intellectual biography shows clearly how the Enlightenment of the 18th century transformed from an event into history. At the same time it becomes clear that the self-conception and charm offensive of liberalism of the mid-19th century was based on a secondary exploitation of the late Enlightenment. The newly-construed legacy of the Enlightenment was defined on the basis of natural law, deism, popular sovereignty and rationalism. The Enlightenment now appeared to feed on Protestantism and lead to the French Revolution.

This new understanding of the Enlightenment became anchored by means of strategies of selective amnesia and polemic legacy-building. A historical picture thus emerged whose potency was based on the mutual reinforcement of two assessments: The Enlightenment invoked by the liberals increasingly represented a tradition that the conservatives wished to dispense with. Two political genealogies interlock here. This interlocking had the effect that this newly-defined legacy of the Enlightenment became the focal point of the inchoate liberal and conservative directions around 1848, in other words: one's attitude to this conceptually refurbished legacy of the Enlightenment began to decide what was liberal and what was conservative.

Since the late Vormärz *one* distinct version of liberalism came to mould the historical understanding of the Enlightenment, and *one* particular version of conservatism emerged, which distanced itself from the very same Enlightenment. These two versions ousted other

Problematik, Auswirkungen, Gegenwartsbedeutung einer österreichischen Rechtsreform, Freiburg 1974, p. 151.

⁵ See the analyses of the views of i.a. Alphons Lhotsky, Hans Lentze, Richard Meister, Robert Kann and Fritz Fellner in the essay by FEICHTINGER, FILLAFER in this volume.

varieties of liberal and conservative thinking and condemned them to obscurity. Around the mid-19th century the history of thought was forced into a Procrustean bed: A pattern emerged in which the late Enlightenment led to liberalism, and the Counter-Enlightenment culminated in conservatism. Older versions, in particular the conservative Enlightenment and the Catholic Enlightenment, fell into oblivion.

In his outstanding monography on Leo Thun, Christoph Thienen-Adlerflycht contradicted the “fatalistic, as it were, liberal doctrine”, according to which “the centralistic constitutional state of the second half of the [19th – F.L.F.] century [was] the only logical historical continuation of Josephinism in Austria”.⁶ The liberal legacy rhetoric of 1848 must be put aside in order to detect the sedimentations and fractures that lay between the late Enlightenment and its reconstructed legacy. Contrary to the liberal’s self-congratulatory legacy-building it must be stated that the Enlightenment of the 18th century was many before it became one. Its varieties proliferated and interacted well into the 19th century and did not simply dissolve into liberalism. It is important to first ascertain carefully how these versions of the Enlightenment were connected to the political alternatives of liberalism and conservatism, without succumbing to the history politics that surrounded 1848.

Leo Thun’s biography is revealing here in two respects: First, it gives us an insight into this diversity of the late Enlightenment of the 18th century and its impact during the Vormärz; second, Thun – as I will now show – was also significantly involved in obliterating this diversity of the Enlightenment. This double significance of Thun also explains the discrepancy of interpretation in the two most important studies of Thun to date; Thienen-Adlerflycht sees Thun’s Bohemian patriotism as a late consequence of the Josephinian Enlightenment, while Hans Lentze writes that Thun suffered from a veritable “Josephinism complex”.⁷ The key to

⁶ Christoph THIENEN-ADLERFLYCHT: *Graf Leo Thun im Vormärz: Grundlagen des böhmischen Konservatismus im Kaisertum Österreich*, Graz 1967, p. 25. “The fact that liberalism, and its subsequent historiography, considered the conservatives’ idea of freedom to be a feudal reaction, is one of the specific peculiarities of Austrian historical consciousness, which has remained stuck, to a certain degree, in the combative concepts of liberalism.”, THIENEN-ADLERFLYCHT, Thun, p. 53. Cf. the letters by Franz Anton Thun to his mother, with detailed descriptions of his trip to England before joining the army in 1806, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Fond 3, A XVI-O; on Thun’s later friendship with Anglican Whig social reformers and Quakers Joseph Alexander von HELFERT: *Graf Leo Thun: Lehr- und Wanderjahre*, in: *Österreichisches Jahrbuch* 15 (1891), p. 123–212, 150, 153, 169, 178, 184; recently the comprehensive and informed work by Sieglinde KAPFERER: *Graf Leo von Thun und Hohenstein – ein Böhme zwischen deutschem und tschechischem Kulturkreis*, Dipl. Innsbruck 2013.

⁷ Hans LENTZE: *Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 239. Band 2. Abhandlung sowie Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts, Heft 7), Graz, Wien, Köln 1962, p. 81. On the concept of Josephinism, its historiographical trends and political implications in the

solving this contradiction lies in the politics of memory around 1848, which redefined what the Enlightenment was, in the mutual reinforcement of the aforementioned interlocking genealogies.

My essay comprises four brief sections. The first concerns Thun and the Enlightenment in the Vormärz, the second addresses the problems of natural law and the university reform. While the overall design and decision-making processes of the reform are well known, very little attention has been devoted to date to how jurists outside Vienna, for example at the Universities of Prague or Pest, reacted to the reform. To allow these voices to be heard, in this second section, on legal history, I expand the source spectrum and present the criticism of the academic reform based on new Bohemian and Hungarian material. In the third section I turn to the university organisation and the problem of Germanisation, and in the fourth section I will examine the Bolzanist roots of the educational reform and the “Austrian philosophical tradition”.

Thun and the Enlightenment

Thun was an enlightened conservative. Thun’s social-ethical conservatism was predicated on the abolition of peasant dues and services, ensuring tenants’ and owners’ full property of their land; Thun advocated loans and subsidies for the poor and indigent, his propagation of an holistic life practice in the service of the common good rested on a reformed Catholic basis, as defined by Bernard Bolzano, the Prague theologian and philosopher whose teachings were spread by a flock of distinguished followers.⁸ Thun’s enlightened conservative conception of society was the fruit of Bolzano’s doctrines as well as of Bohemian regional patriotism.⁹ A decisive role was played here by the first-hand acquaintance Thun’s family enjoyed with Ferdinand Kindermann von Schulstein’s elementary school reforms in the

Central European context cf. Franz Leander FILLAFER, Thomas WALLNIG (ed.): *Josephinismus zwischen den Regimen. Eduard Winter, Fritz Valjavec und die zentraleuropäischen Historiographien im 20. Jahrhundert*, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2016.

⁸ See Jiří KOŘALKA: František Palacký a čeští bolzanisté, in: Zdeněk KUČERA, Jan B. LÁŠEK (eds.): *Modernismus: studie nebo výzva? Studie ke genezi českého katolického modernismus*, Brno 2002, p. 98–134.

⁹ Jiří ŠTAJF: *Obezřetná elita. Česká společnost mezi tradicí a revolucí 1830–1851*, Praha 2005, p. 106. Cf. also Tomek’s comments on Thun’s father, Václav Vladivoj TOMEK: *Paměti mého života*, I, Prague 1905, p. 151 and Helena SMÍŠKOVÁ: František Antonín Thun a správa děčínského panství v letech 1808–1844, in: *Z minulosti Děčína a Českolipska III, Ústí nad Labem 1977*, p. 163–187.

Leitmeritz/Litoměřice diocese.¹⁰ Thun's debt to Bolzano's circle is illustrated vividly by his scathing notes on the works of Franz von Baader, Adam Müller and other Catholic romantics.¹¹

Thun, educated by Bolzano's pupils Franz Schneider and Johann Rohrweck, was shaped by the spirit of the Catholic Enlightenment from an early age.¹² Leo's father, Franz Anton Thun, cultivated contacts, both in person and by letter, with English friends, with Quaker social reformers and with the "philosophical radicals" around Bentham, in particular with Nassau William Senior.¹³ Franz Anton Thun opened the castle library of Děčín to the public, awarded bonuses to successful teachers and, when granting parish rectorates and prebends, ensured that the selected priests acted in keeping with enlightened Christianity.¹⁴ Leo, the third and youngest son of Franz Anton, adopted this English horizon from his father, along with his disillusionment with the Vormärz state.

Thun was educated by private tutors, completed his final examination at Prague's Kleinseitner Gymnasium,¹⁵ and then studied law at the Charles-Ferdinand University in Prague. Leo Thun's later tenure as minister was shaped by his pre-1848 experiences. In the 1830s and 1840s he complained vehemently about the existing institutions and the garbled administrative practice, and later he would follow this sharp criticism with action: Thun's personnel policy and his model for the university reform were influenced by his unease about the conditions during the Vormärz, which he had experienced personally. After completing his studies, Leo Thun was first appointed to the Prague Court of Appeal,¹⁶ then he worked in the district administration (Kreisamt), and later in the Court Chancellery and as a legal assistant in the office of the State

¹⁰ Kristina KAISEROVÁ: Litoměřická diecéze – několik otazníků 19. století, in: Litoměřická kapitula. 950 let od založení, Ústí nad Labem 2007, p. 107–115; Eduard WINTER: Ferdinand Kindermann, Ritter von Schulstein (1740/1801), der Organisator der Volksschule und Volkswohlfahrt Böhmens: ein Lebensbild und nach archivalischen Quellen, Augsburg 1926.

¹¹ Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Fond 3, XXI, Inventory J, fol. 23, 34.

¹² Marcela OUBRECHTOVÁ: Duchovní orientace děčínských Thun-Hohensteinů v době předbřeznové, in: Zdeněk R. NEŠPOR, Kristina KAISEROVÁ (ed.): Variety české religiozity v „dlouhém“ 19. století (1780–1918), Ústí nad Labem 2010, p. 254–269. Cf. the recent knowledgeable and subtle work by Ivana MADLOVÁ: Hrabě Leo Thun a revoluce 1848/49, Bakk. Univerzita Karlova Praha 2012.

¹³ THIENEN-ADLERFLYCHT: Graf Leo Thun und der böhmische Vormärz, p. 79–80.

¹⁴ SMÍŠKOVÁ: František Antonín Thun, p. 177, on the purchase of the estate and library of František Martin Pelcl Alena RICHTEROVÁ: Děčínské rukopisy ze sbírky Františka Martina Pelcla (1734–1801), nyní ve fondech Národní knihovny České republiky, Prague 2007, p. 6–7. F. A. Thun's tolerance was also demonstrated by the fact that he offered the use of the castle chapel to the evangelical subjects for their services, but this was forbidden by the governor after a query by the regional office, OUBRECHTOVÁ: Duchovní orientace, p. 258.

¹⁵ Cf. Thun's school essay that he wrote in 1826 about the dictum of the Massylii King Jugurtha (ca. 160 BC – 104 AD) "O venalem urbem et mature peritum, si emtorem inveneris!", HELFERT: Graf Leo Thun: Lehr- und Wanderjahre, p. 134–135.

¹⁶ Petr KREUZ: Das Appellationsgericht in Prag 1548–1783. Forschung, Quellen und historische Entwicklung, in: Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte Österreichs (2013), p. 231–250; Václav ŠOLLE: Trestní soudnictví předbřeznové v českých zemích, in: Sborník archivních prací 12 (1962), p. 87–142.

Council (some of these were “supernumerary”, unsalaried positions, similar to internships.) Due to his Vormärz career Thun knew the *modus operandi* of the central offices and the district administration better than most ministers in Felix Schwarzenberg’s cabinet, perhaps with the exception of Franz Stadion and Karl von Krauß.¹⁷ Significantly, young Leo Thun’s criticism of the stolid bunglers and sclerotic desk jockeys of the court offices was similar to that of a typical bourgeois social climber of those years, the top civil servant Carl von Kübeck, who would become a relentless adversary of Thun during the 1850s.¹⁸

Thun took over the Josephinian reform programme of the free purchasability and peasant property of land,¹⁹ he castigated the unequal taxation of dominical and peasant holdings in the hereditary lands. Thun referred to the *glebae adscriptus* status of the peasantry in Hungary as profoundly outmoded, and the same applied for the compulsory offer and milling ban systems, by which the landlords controlled market access and processing conditions for farm products. However, Leo Thun combined this programme with strict partisanship for the patrimonial jurisdiction of the nobility, which was abolished in 1848, and whose renewal he would energetically and unsuccessfully continue to advocate after the Revolution.²⁰

¹⁷ Cf. Lorenz MIKOLETZKY: Karl von Krauß (1789–1881). Die Stellung eines österreichischen Staatsmannes zur Innenpolitik seiner Zeit, in: Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur 14 (1970), p. 57–71.

¹⁸ Cf. Franz Leander FILLAFER: Sechs Josephiner, in: Rainer BENDEL, Norbert SPANNENBERGER (ed.): Katholische Aufklärung und Josephinismus. Religionsformen in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa, Köln, Wien, Weimar 2015, p. 349–389.

¹⁹ Cf. also the memorandum by Thun’s father Franz Anton (in 1850 the former subservient town of Děčín elected him as mayor): “Divide et impera is the election slogan of all those who fish in troubled waters. And just as the absolute government strives to prevent close unity between landowners and subjects, in order to forestall joint resistance to its arbitrary bureaucratic tendencies, now the party that aims to spread anarchy, from which only its adherents can benefit, foments all kinds of conflicts between the landowners and the peasants, in order to prevent the strong cooperation of all of the right-minded against their overthrowing intentions to destroy the Fatherland. The sorage [Robot] question is also being used as a lever for this pernicious purpose, and because most of the landowners are from the nobility, this issue has been inextricably connected to the position of the nobility, thus pitting the peasant against the lord, although the latter showers the former with good deeds and, in the previous constitution, once greater activity had become again possible in the estates [Landtage], always sought to vote for in the best interest of the subjects.” [...] “Auch ein Wort über die Robotfrage und wohlgemeinter Vorschlag zur Robotablösung 1848 von Grafen Franz Anton Thun”, cf. THIENEN-ADLERFLYCHT: Graf Leo Thun und der böhmische Vormärz, p. 92. In the Rodinný archiv Thun C 123, there is also an excerpt from Joseph von Sonnenfels: Über die Liebe des Vaterlandes: “Ownership of land and personal freedom makes patriots of farmers. The Helots did not consider Sparta to be their Fatherland.” F. A. Thun’s comments resemble Burgrave Karl Egon Fürstenberg’s physiocratic drafts of 1772 on the “estates lending bank”, Jaroslav PROKEŠ: Memoriály o hospodářském stavu Čech před selskou bouří z r. 1775, in: Časopis pro dějiny venkova 12 (1925), p. 49–57, 111–116, 158–167. This idea of a land bank again occupied the authorities in the Vormärz: such a suggestion by the estates was resisted by Kübeck, who feared that the bonds-based financing of the state budget would become more expensive due to these competing bonds, cf. Heinrich von SRBIK: Metternich. Der Staatsmann und der Mensch, 3 vols., München 1925–1954, II, p. 208–209.

²⁰ Waltraud HEINDL: Einleitung, in: Die Protokolle des österreichischen Ministerrats, 1848–1867, III/2 (15. März 1853–9. Oktober 1853), Wien 1979, xxvii. Cf. Ralph MELVILLE: Adel und Revolution in Böhmen: Strukturwandel von Herrschaft und Gesellschaft in Österreich um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts, Mainz 1998, esp. the annexes, Leo THUN: „Die Ereignisse in Galizien und das Patrimonialverhältnis in Österreich, April 1846“, p. 285–293 and IDEM.: „Zur Revision der Verfassung von 1849. Eigenhändige Notizen für die

In the memorandum *Die Universitätsfrage in Österreich*, written at the behest of Thun in 1853, a beautiful phrase is used to exorcise what the brochurist calls “officially enacted shallow Kantianism”²¹ (“*verseichtiger Kantianismus von Amtswegen*”) that is said to have dominated the universities of the Monarchy prior to 1848. This dissociation throws Thun’s own dilemma into sharp relief. Thun was an eager reader of Justus Möser, who vaunted “local reason” against the abstractions of a – caricatured – French Enlightenment.²² For many years Thun corresponded with Alexis de Tocqueville,²³ who wished to strengthen the “free institutions” against individualism.²⁴ These impulses led to Thun’s plea for the lively “self-government” of the district community.

Leo Thun considered Josephinism to be responsible for the fact that the bourgeoisie turned to liberalism. At the same time, Thun, like Tocqueville, conceptually connected absolutism and Revolution: In Josephinism he saw the Austrian version of this linkage, of a development, which peaked in the Revolution of 1848. This need for dissociation led to a careful reappraisal of concepts that pointed back to the 18th century, to a severing of intellectual and sentimental ties in the service of a novel, post-revolutionary self. The work of depletion and de-contextualisation that went with this reassessment led to a reduction of the Enlightenment to a truncated and absolutized segment, the late Enlightenment à la Friedrich Nicolai. This meant that positions like that of Leo Thun could no longer be included in the spectrum of the Enlightenment, and Thun himself played a considerable part in this readjustment.

Beratungen im Kabinett, November 1851“, p. 359–362. Admittedly, Thun’s proposal for the elimination of noble land ownership from the rural community and for voluntary noble colleges of dignitaries as district corporations of the states became obsolete with the Silvesterpatent of 31 December 1851, which suspended the constitution and basic rights and subjected the nobility to the bourgeois or farmers’ local administration, cf. Hannes STEKL: *Zwischen Machtverlust und Selbstbehauptung. Österreichs Hocharistokratie vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, in: IDEM.: *Adel und Bürgertum in der Habsburgermonarchie, 18. bis 20. Jahrhundert*, Wien 2004, p. 14–34, 27–28. Recent competent overview based on detailed source studies by Georg SEIDERER: *Das Ringen um die Kommunalverfassung 1849 bis 1859*, in: Harm-Hinrich BRANDT (ed.): *Der österreichische Neoabsolutismus als Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsproblem. Diskussionen über einen strittigen Epochenbegriff*, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2014, p. 281–305.

²¹ ANONYMOUS [Joseph UNGER?]: *Die Universitätsfrage in Österreich: Beleuchtet vom Standpunkte der Lehr- und Lernfreiheit*, Wien 1853, p. 22.

²² Thun calls Möser the “[...] noblest and most talented representative of a true conservative ethos”, Leo Thun, diary entry, 12 December 1840, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Fond 3, XXI, C16, cf. Justus MÖSER: *Sämtliche Werke, neu geordnet und aus dem Nachlasse herausgegeben von Bernhard Rudolf ABEKEN*, 10 vols., Berlin 1842–1843, IV, p. 250, V, p. 22–23, 24, VII, p. 259.

²³ Cf. the new complete edition of the correspondence: Doubravka OLŠÁKOVÁ, Hana FOŘTOVÁ (ed.): *Lev Thun – Alexis de Tocqueville, korespondence 1835–1856*, Praha 2011.

²⁴ A comparative examination of the correspondents of Tocqueville in the Habsburg lands is overdue, cf. e.g. also the correspondence with József Eötvös, see Győző CONCHA: *Báró Eötvös József állambölcsélete és a külföldi kritika*, Budapest 1908 and István FENYŐ: *Eötvös és Tocqueville*, in: *Aetas* 22 (2007), p. 127–134.

Natural law and legal history

Thun also played a leading role in disavowing the Vormärz. The crisis in ramshackle education, the misery of university life, was described vividly by Thun and his staff. The contrast was deliberate: compared to the supposedly “impartial” and “unprejudiced” (*voraussetzungslos*) Greater German appointment policy Thun pursued and to the programmatic embracing of the historical school of law, the decades prior to 1848 were intended to offer a bleak picture. Pre-1848 Austria was depicted as a small, sequestered world, where law in particular was taught at the lowest scientific level, where the long outdated *and* crypto-revolutionary natural law had dominated the field without challenge.²⁵

Now the image thus presented of the Vormärz legal sciences by no means corresponds with the facts. As soon as one transcends the more traditional and constrictive historiography of legal dogmatics and turns to the study of styles and practices of scholarship from the perspective of dogma and argumentation history, the prefabricated history of ideas, which operates with model-like blocks such as “natural law” and “historical school of law”, begins to crumble. Reading the Vormärz legal commentaries and essay series by Joseph von Winiwarter, Franz Xaver Nippel and Michael Schuster²⁶ reveals distinctive developments: In civil law dogma, new solutions were initiated for the warranty adjustments, replevin, demurrages, and the redhibitory action. In ways that veered on virtuosity, the jurists of the Vormärz mediated between trust theory and will theory in contractual law, they created new dogmatic foundations for the purchasing company, the moral person and the *societas*, by means of often very creative interpretations of the 1811 Civil Code.²⁷

What holds true for civil law also applies for state law: The state theorists of the Vormärz also did not stew in their own juices, they were not satisfied with merely repeating the textbooks written by Franz von Zeiller, Karl Anton von Martini and Franz von Egger, instead they chose to parse the officially prescribed books and to insert new meanings to the sanctioned texts. In

²⁵ Franz Leander FILLAFER: *Escaping the Enlightenment. Liberal Thought and the Legacies of the Eighteenth Century in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1790–1848*, Diss. Konstanz 2012, p. 255–263.

²⁶ The accumulated Innsbruck research efforts by Gerhard Oberkofler and Peter Goller have given us important insights into these works: Gerhard OBERKOFER: *Studien zur Geschichte der österreichischen Rechtswissenschaft*, Frankfurt am Main, 1984; Peter GOLLER: *Naturrecht, Rechtsphilosophie oder Rechtstheorie? Zur Geschichte der Rechtsphilosophie an Österreichs Universitäten 1848–1945*, Frankfurt am Main, 1997, p. 11–38; IDEM.: *Joseph Winiwarters Verteidigung von Karl Anton Martinis natürlichem Staatsrecht (1833). Zum Fortleben von Martinis Denken im Vormärz*, in: Heinz BARTA, Rudolf PALME, Wolfgang INGENHAEFF (ed.): *Naturrecht und Privatrechtskodifikation. Tagungsband des Martini-Colloquiums 1998*, Wien 1999, p. 543–570.

²⁷ FILLAFER: *Escaping the Enlightenment*, p. 403–421.

state theory we find representatives of the reason-based social contract and the separation of law and morality, as well as champions of a young Hegelian underpinned “moral state” underpinned by “substantial ethics”. In the journals of the period, contributions by jurists who see the state as a contractually established aggregate of subjects’ individual volitions beside essays that perceive the state as a polity permeated by a primordial, unique, and eternal “spirit”.²⁸

These conflicts of objectives and collisions of principles did not only affect the conception of statehood, they also touched on the procedures for the generation and ascertainment of norms: in the 1830s and 1840s these justificatory techniques were widely discussed, and the “syllogistic” method of Civil Code interpretation was among the most controversial subjects of the day. Also in church law, there were several solvents under an apparently solid crust: Mihály Szibenliszt in Pest, for example, reconstructed the concept of the *societas imperfecta* from Martini’s textbook, breaking with the supremacy the Catholic Church and with the princely prerogatives that sapped the autonomy of religious congregations. To Szibenliszt, the *churches* (plural) are autonomous private companies, he releases them from the “subordination nexus” of the Monarch’s superintendence; similar shifts and redescriptions can be found Tivadar Pauler’s work on natural law.²⁹

Contrary to what the familiar cliché suggests about the Vormärz sclerosis of the legal sciences there was a vibrant and dynamic development in different areas of jurisprudence in the 1830s and 1840s, and these tendencies can by no means be gathered under the collective term “natural law”. Rationalists, young Hegelians, and followers of both the Savigny school and German and Slavic legal historians jostled, vied for pre-eminence, and crossed swords in the legal journals of the Habsburg countries: Johann N. Berger, Moritz Heyßler, Emil F. Rößler and Hans Perthaler deserve mention here as representatives of the young Hegelian and historical jurisprudence,³⁰ while defenders of rational law included Anton Hye von Glunec and Eduard Herbst. Vormärz intellectual life was shrunk to the Zeiller–Martini tradition only in hindsight, and this truncation is due to those suppliers of political keywords around 1848, who denounced natural law as the intellectual breeding ground of the revolutions since 1789: Students of

²⁸ Ibid, p. 383–403.

²⁹ Anna PETRASZKOVSKY: Szibenliszt Mihály természetjoga, különös tekintettel az államra, phil. Diss. Miskolc 2011, 253–269; József SZABADFALVI: A magyar észjogi iskola, in: Állam- és Jogtudomány 50 (2009), 17–44.

³⁰ Wilhelm BRAUNEDER: Leseverein und Rechtskultur. Der juristisch-politische Leseverein zu Wien, 1840–1990, Wien 1992, p. 154–156; Peter KURANDA: Großösterreich und Großdeutschland bei den Hauptvertretern der deutschösterreichischen Literatur, 1830–1848, Wien 1928, p. 76–95.

Savigny's such as Imperial Councillor Anton von Salvotti were instrumental in this reinterpretation of the immediate past.³¹

Leo Thun adopted this derogatory assessment of natural law and abruptly ended the Vormärz development. At the same time, Thun glorified German legal history to such an extent that he abandoned the ideal he had defended before 1848³², namely the study of the 1811 Civil Code in the light of its native Habsburg sources.³³ The intricate conceptual system the Austrian pandectist around Joseph Unger implanted into Austrian jurisprudence under Thun's patronage excluded these very regional traditions. The metaphors used in the 1850s in transferring Savigny's Roman-law erudition to the Habsburg countries³⁴ speak for themselves: there is much talk of floodgates that must be opened, in order to redirect the "rich flow of German science" to the barren wastelands of Austrian jurisprudence, and also of the lifting fog that had previously obscured the view of the lush meadows of true science.³⁵

The reform of legal studies launched by Leo Thun introduced German legal and imperial history as a main subject. Thun's objective of modernisation in accordance with the standards of German science increasingly made his Bohemian patriotic convictions untenable. Now it was precisely the followers of enlightened natural law in Bohemia and Hungary who took umbrage at the disavowing of their subject in the context of Alexander Bach's "absolutism", but also at the novel syllabuses and curricula Thun's reform provided.³⁶ The Bohemian and Hungarian natural lawyers worked with equivalencies and substitutions: For example, the Bohemian jurists claimed that old Slavic law corresponded closest with natural law, especially as both provided

³¹ Nikolaus GRASS: Rudolf Kink. Der Geschichtsschreiber der Universität Wien. Der Vorkämpfer der österreichischen Rechtsgeschichte, in: IDEM.: Österreichische Historiker-Biographien, I, Innsbruck 1954, p. 227–268; IDEM.: Francesco Schupfer und Tullius von Sartori-Montecroce als Rechtshistoriker an der Universität Innsbruck, in: Hans LENTZE, Peter PUTZER (ed.): Festschrift für Carl Hellbling zum 70. Geburtstag, Salzburg 1971, p. 195–258.

³² Cf. Altböhmisches Recht von Dr. Hofmann nach der Ordnung des ABGB zusammengestellt, Exzerptheft Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Fond 3, XXI, Inventory J.

³³ Thun also formulated this objective in his infamous speech on the natural-law worship of the "Civil Code tin god" that had dominated Austrian legal science to that point: Leo THUN-HOHENSTEIN: Rede bei der Sub Auspiciis-Promotion des Dr. Julius Fierlinger (11 May 1852), reprinted in: Werner OGRIS: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein. Festvortrag anlässlich des Rektorstags im Großen Festsaal der Universität Wien am 12. März 1999, Wien 1999, p. 39–42.

³⁴ Cf. Hans LENTZE: Die Eingliederung der österreichischen Zivilrechtswissenschaft in die deutsche Pandektenwissenschaft, in: Andor CSIZMADIA, Kálmán KOVÁCS (ed.): Die Entwicklung des Zivilrechts in Mitteleuropa (1848–1944), Budapest 1970, p. 59–70; Werner OGRIS: Die historische Schule der österreichischen Zivilistik, in: Nikolaus GRASS, Werner OGRIS (ed.): Festschrift Hans Lentze. Zum 60. Geburtstage dargebracht von Fachgenossen und Freunden, Innsbruck, München 1969, p. 449–496.

³⁵ Josef UNGER: System des österreichischen allgemeinen Privatrechts, I, Leipzig 1856, VI.

³⁶ Zdeněk KRYŠTŮFEK: Historický základy právního pozitivismu, Prague 1967; Jaroslav MORÁVEK: K bojům Českých právníků 60. let XIX. století o orientaci České právní kultury, in: Právník 107 (1968), p. 610–617.

for trials by jury, elective kingship and the peasants' full property of their holdings.³⁷ For these jurists, Roman law was a regression in terms of both legal philosophy and material law, which can be seen from property law: Full ownership, for instance, could not have been construed by means of the doctrine of the historical school, since the powers flowing from the usage ownership of the *superficiarius* or tenant were interpreted as rights in rem to a foreign item, the *dominium eminens*, possessed by the lordship.³⁸ The Bohemian natural lawyers and the representatives of Slavic legal history were in particular agreement where "German law" was concerned, which supposedly brought serfdom and feudalism to Bohemia (the arguments here were much less nuanced than forty years when Enlightenment historians such as Gelasius Dobner, Ignaz Cornova and Josef Dobrovský had published their musings on this subject).³⁹

The Austrian legal history that had been conceived and practiced for selected areas already during the Vormärz was re-launched in the 1850s by the Bohemian jurists who were either deeply steeped in natural law or in Slavic legal history: Austrian legal history, they maintained, should be taught at the universities instead of the German imperial and legal history proposed by Thun. The various different "historical state rights" of the Monarchy's principalities and lands, which had become popular since the 1850s, could be innocuously placed under the wing of this desired subject of Austrian legal history.⁴⁰ Like the "old Josephinians" in the cabinet and at the universities,⁴¹ the Bohemian jurists warned that the new generation of lawyers, reared according to Thun's curriculum, would neither have any attachment to the Austrian state nor sufficient knowledge of the Civil Code.⁴²

University organisation and the question of language

If one ponders the history of the university reform, ties to the late Enlightenment also become immediately tangible. Two dimensions deserve to be highlighted: the university organisation since Gottfried van Swieten and Karl Anton von Martini, and the question of the languages of

³⁷ Vincenc VAŇOREK: Procházky v oboru právní filosofie a národním hospodářství, in: *Právník* 1861, p. 251–258; 1862, p. 97–116.

³⁸ Anton RANDA: *Das Eigenthumsrecht nach österreichischem Rechte mit Berücksichtigung des gemeinen Rechts und der neueren Gesetzbücher*, Leipzig 1884, p. 17, Josef UNGER: *System I*, p. 527–529, 608, note 8.

³⁹ Cf. Dorota LEŚNIEWSKA: *Kolonizacja niemiecka i na prawie niemieckim w średniowiecznych Czechach i na Morawach w świetle historiografii*, Poznań, Marburg 2004.

⁴⁰ Karel JIČINSKÝ: Vývin českého právnictví s obzvláštním zřetelem na jeho zdroje, Prague 1862; IDEM.: *Kritická úvaha o schfizi německých právníků*, in: *Právník* 1862, p. 326–330, p. 367–375.

⁴¹ Here, excellently, Hans LENTZE: *Andreas Freiherr von Baumgartner und die Thunsche Studienreform*, in: *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse* 96 (1959), p. 161–179.

⁴² *Národní listy*, 5 January 1862 and 18 January 1862.

instruction. The last point in particular is very relevant to the question of the feasibility of Thun's Bohemian patriotic and Austro-Slavist ideals once implemented.

First, therefore, some comments on the university organisation since the late Enlightenment: In the 1790s the jurist Karl Anton von Martini had developed so-called academic commissions (*Studienkonsesse*), which also involved the universities' doctoral colleges (*Doktorenkollegien*), these institutions dating back to the Middle Ages comprised all graduated medics, clerics, and lawyers who had earned their degree at a university and remained residents of the city where it was located.⁴³ Such commissions were to be established in all main cities of the Monarchy's provinces, consisting of a representative of each of the four faculties of the university, a representative of the secondary schools and one of the normal schools; the chair should be held by the rector of each provincial university. According to Martini's plan, the representatives of the philosophical faculties in these commissions supervised the secondary schools, while the delegates of the secondary schools in turn had the right of inspection of the technical and normal schools. It was also stipulated that the estates commissions of the individual lands should be involved in school administration insofar as they would supervise the philosophical teaching institutions in the individual countries. Yet these commissions were rather shortlived, their power was trimmed as early as 1794 and they were suspended in 1802. This was due to Count Heinrich Franz von Rottenhan, who chaired the Aulic Educational Revision Committee (*Studienrevisionshofkommission*) set up by Franz II, and Joseph von Sonnenfels, who had already been concerned by the glut of academics in the 1770s ("On the disadvantage of an increased number of universities").⁴⁴ Since the Josephinian age – with an interruption during the rule of Leopold II, who leaned towards Martini's autonomist drafts for the university constitution – academic directors (*Studiendirektoren*) at each faculty supervised the performance of the professors.

⁴³ Gustav STRAKOSCH-GRASSMANN: *Geschichte des österreichischen Unterrichtswesens*, Wien 1905, p. 140; Sigmund ADLER: *Die Unterrichtsverfassung Kaiser Leopolds II. und die finanzielle Fundierung der österreichischen Universitäten nach Anträgen Martinis*, Wien, Leipzig 1917.

⁴⁴ "Über den Nachteil vermehrte Universitäten." Hubert WEITENSFELDER: *Studium und Staat*. Heinrich Graf Rottenhan und Johann Melchior von Birkenstock als Repräsentanten der österreichischen Bildungspolitik um 1800, Wien 1996; Grete KLINGENSTEIN: *Akademikerüberschuß als soziales Problem im aufgeklärten Absolutismus. Bemerkungen über eine Rede Joseph von Sonnenfels' aus dem Jahre 1771*, in: IDEM, Heinrich LUTZ, Gerald STOURZH (ed.): *Bildung, Politik und Gesellschaft. Studien zur Geschichte des europäischen Bildungswesens vom 16. zum 20. Jahrhundert*, Wien 1978, p. 165–204.

In the 1840s the physician, pedagogue and writer Ernst von Feuchtersleben, an admirer of the English college system, advocated the involvement of students in university self-governance.⁴⁵ Ultimately, Exner's reform law provided for the self-governance of the university by elected deans and an academic senate composed of the professoriate. That did not fall on fertile ground with Thun. Against the financial autonomy of the universities, which were funded by means of property, benefices and domains, he advocated state subsidies, argued for the revaluation of the professorship⁴⁶, and forcefully rejected the academic directors and the doctoral colleges.⁴⁷ In view of the imperial decree of 25 June 1856, in which the future statutes of the University of Vienna were listed – non-teaching doctors should be favoured in the elections for the deanship, academic directors should be re-introduced as heads of faculties –, Leo Thun decided to have the provisional organisation (*Organisations-Provisorium*) measure of 1849 renewed annually, in order to prevent these regulations, which he deemed pernicious.⁴⁸

Now to Thun's reputation as a "Germaniser" of the university system. Let us take the example of the University of Krakow, which clearly shows Thun's dilemma, the dichotomy between the high standards of scientific quality and the support for the vernacular languages.⁴⁹ During his period in office, Thun explicitly supported the committee for the development of Slavic juristic

⁴⁵ Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Feuchtersleben und das Konzept einer genuin österreichischen Universitätsreform, in: *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 18 (1998), p. 59–85.

⁴⁶ Thun's statute draft of 1854/1855 eliminated the membership of the students in the faculty's bodies and relied on the scenario of a professorial university, however without explicitly mentioning the German model. He argued very cleverly with the tradition of the House of Habsburg, the foundation of Rudolf IV, etc., cf. "Gegenbemerkungen des Ministers für Kultus und Unterricht Graf Leo Thun zum Protokoll der Ministerkonferenz vom 5., 12., 16. und 19. Dezember 1854 und 13. Januar 1855 die statuarische Verfassung der Universität Wien betreffend", of 1855 April 1, in: *Protokolle III/3*, p. 394–399. He called the doctors "drones", the professoriate should be bolstered. Thun vehemently rejected the proposed reintroduction of the academic directors who had supervised the professors until 1848 (as suggested by Bach and Krauß, "Bemerkungen des Ministers des Inneren zum Protokoll der Ministerkonferenz vom 5, 12, 16 und 19. Dezember 1854 und 13. Jänner 1855", in: *Protokolle III/3*, p. 389–393). When the monarch was persuaded to reintroduce the academic directors, Thun commented that he considered it futile to attract renowned scholars for the Austrian universities under such conditions, and he found the activities of the academic directors "dangerous": they produced only flattering and sycophantic professors who vied for the favour of the academic director, Thun saw in this the "germ of the demoralisation of the teaching staff", lecture by Leo Thun (concept), s. d. [1856], AVA UM-AR n. 1414/1856 (Sammelakt). Thus, according to Thun, the power of the professors should be strengthened, but the elected rector should have disciplinary power.

⁴⁷ *Provisorisches Gesetz ü. d. Organisation der Akademischen Behörden v. 30. September 1849*, *Geschichte der Wiener Universität von 1848 bis 1898*. Als Huldigungsfestschrift zum 50jährigen Regierungsjubiläum Seiner k. k. Apostolischen Majestät des Kaisers Franz Joseph I., ed. akad. Senat der Wiener Universität, Wien 1898, p. 25.

⁴⁸ Waltraud HEINDL: *Universitätsreform – Gesellschaftsreform. Bemerkungen zum Plan eines Universitätsorganisationsgesetzes in den Jahren 1854/55*, in: *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 35 (1982), p. 134–149, here p. 148, with reference to a vivid lecture by Thun in which he implored the Emperor to refrain from expanding the power of the doctors and introducing academic directors, AVA UM-AR, n. 1414/1856 (Sammelakt); however the lecture was found "unsent", after Thun had stood down from his ministerial office, cf. HEINDL: *Universitätsreform – Gesellschaftsreform*, p. 148, fn. 53.

⁴⁹ Cf. Wilhelm Paweł Radziwiłł and Johann Szlachetowski to Leo Thun-Hohenstein, *Státní olastní archiv v Litoměřicích, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, A 3, III, D 13, 1.11.1849, D 17, 24.11.1849, D 32, 21.1.1850*.

terminologies.⁵⁰ With regard to Krakow, Thun advocated that lectures, such as those of the law faculty, should be held in alternate years in German and in Polish, as it was done in Prague, Olomouc (Czech) and Graz (Slovenian) until 1854.⁵¹ To the Minister for Police Johann Franz Kempen, Thun defended four Krakow professors against accusations of disloyalty; when they were still dismissed despite Thun's intercession, he pushed through an ample annual salary for all four and provided two of them with other chairs in Lviv and Innsbruck.⁵² At the same time, Thun defied the suspension of the University of Krakow's autonomy by the appointment of a curator who did not belong to the teaching staff. Such a guardianship arrangement would, said Thun, deter every qualified scholar: The appointment of top-class candidates would be thwarted as a result, and moreover this construction would lead to contraproductive effects, as it would undermine the professors' and students' overall loyalty to the state. At the same time, Thun rejected the pure Polonisation – as pursued by the Galician governor Count Agenor Gołuchowski – and Czechisation of the universities.

With a view to the languages of instruction, critical posterity has described Thun as a reed in the wind, his administration was considered to be mere dithering manoeuvring that satisfied neither side. In contrast, I would like to stress that one can detect Thun's overarching objectives from his decisions: He feared that the pure "nationalisation" of the universities would undermine their character as research universities, that it would lead to a relapse into the era of Josephinian training institutes for civil servants and breadwinning professions, because the Polish and Czech scientific languages simply were not yet as refined as German.⁵³

⁵⁰ Vladimír RŮŽIČKA: Vědecké zpracování české právní terminologie, zvláště v 19. století, in: Právně-historické studie 3 (1957), 137–176. On the legal validity of Slavic terminology, enforced by Thun, Helmut SLAPNICKA: Die Sprache des österreichischen Reichsgesetzblattes, in: Zeitschrift für Ostforschung 23 (1974), p. 440–454, here p. 452; Michael MOSER: Prüfsteine des Austroslavismus: Das Allgemeine Reichs-Gesetz- und Regierungsblatt für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich und die „Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen Sprachen Oesterreichs“, in: Ivo POSPÍŠIL (ed.): Crossroads of Cultures: Central Europe, Brno 2002, p. 75–129.

⁵¹ STRAKOSCH-GRASSMANN: Geschichte des österreichischen Unterrichtswesens, p. 185.

⁵² Waltraud HEINDL: Universitätsreform und politisches Programm. Die Sprachenfrage an der Universität Krakau im Neoabsolutismus, in: Österreichische Osthefte 20 (1978), p. 79–98, here p. 83; Christof AICHNER, Tanja KRALER, Brigitte MAZOHL: Aspekte der Thun-Hohensteinschen Bildungsreform – ein Werkstattbericht, in: Harm-Hinrich BRANDT (ed.): Der österreichische Neoabsolutismus als Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsproblem. Diskussionen über einen strittigen Epochenbegriff, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2014, p. 195–220, here p. 197–208.

⁵³ HEINDL: Universitätsreform und politisches Programm. Cf. Pavel J. ŠAFÁRIK's comments in the preface to the first edition of the juridical-political terminology for the Slavic languages of Austria (Commission für slawische juridisch-politische Terminologie (ed.): Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen Sprachen Österreichs. Deutsch-böhmische Separat-Ausgabe, Wien 1850, III): "When it came to implementation, this disadvantage became conspicuous that languages which had been excluded for a long time from the higher political circles did not have practicable expressions for certain terms that were now indispensable for the life of the state [Staatsleben], and are also otherwise incapable of meeting the demands now suddenly being placed on them." The preface also clearly mentions the divergence between the source language and the target language, *ibid* X: "[...] to translate thousands of already finished artificial juridical and political words at once, adequately and with a sharp conceptual definition, from German into Slavic, i.e. from a language that is already beginning to suffer from excessive refinement and artificiality and which moves way to much, namely in the new legislation, in artificially fabricated rigid and abstract forms, formulas and phrases,

Later on, after his resignation as minister, Thun repeatedly had to justify his actions in the cabinet: Above all his supposed participation in governmental “Germanisation” and “centralisation” cost him dearly.⁵⁴ When, in an Reichsrat debate of 1865, Thun very feistily opposed the “Germanising attempts” in the schools, he was accused by the German-Austrian liberal side of his vacillation during his tenure as Minister for Education from 1849 to 1860, upon which he replied that he could not be held responsible for that, “but that he would never reveal the true backgrounds.”⁵⁵

“Austrian philosophy” and the Bolzanist character of the university reform

Thun’s anti-Kantianism and anti-idealism were an inheritance from Bernard Bolzano; his misgivings against Hegel are sufficient evidence.⁵⁶ The construct of “Bolzanism” is insufficient if we wish to appreciate finer nuances, the dynamics of legacy-building and conceptual refurbishment.

Bernard Bolzano had repeatedly modified the Wolffian-scholastic harmonisation (*praedicatum inest subjecto*) which considered substance to bear the attributes of the monads, under the inclusion of all its virtual conditions. Bolzano’s rejection of the Cartesian and Kantian separation of the intelligible world from the sensory world meant that he saw the world not as a basis for verifying possible experience, but as an enlightened-metaphysical and “univocal”, extrasensory “objective reality”. This reality conveys transcendental concepts accessible to knowledge as “truths in themselves” through the thought-substance of the thought, by means of this strategy Kant’s apriorism could be circumvented. Bolzano and Franz Brentano argued that it was wrong to conclude from the demands of reason their fulfilment and the provability of composite concepts (*zusammengesetzte Begriffe*): The freedom and immortality of the soul, and the existence of God, simply cannot be derived from this premise. Rather, these truths

into an idiom that is still loyally attached to the original natural type and which therefore expresses its strength primarily in the presentation of concrete thought forms that sensualise the abstract.”

⁵⁴ Leo Thun to Julius von Ficker, 4.7.1861: “We went through a period of more than ten years, in which – initially as long as Prince Schwarzenberg lived – attempts were made with a certain impressive energy and intellectual strength to reshape Austria into a modern centralised state by bureaucratic means. All arguments that were made against this attempt remained in vain for so long, until the undertaking failed due to the impossibility of continuation.” Heinrich FRIEDJUNG: *Österreich von 1848 bis 1860*, 2 vols., Stuttgart 1908–1912, II, p. 481 and Julius JUNG: *Julius Ficker (1826–1902). Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Gelehrten-geschichte*, Innsbruck 1907, p. 297–298.

⁵⁵ Eduard WINTER: *Frühliberalismus in der Donaumonarchie. Religiöse, nationale und wissenschaftliche Strömungen von 1790–1868*, Berlin 1968, p. 259.

⁵⁶ Taras von BORODAJKEWYCZ: *Aus der Frühzeit der Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte*. Rudolf Eitelberger und Leo Thun, in: Karl OETTINGER, Mohammed RASSEM (ed.): *Festschrift für Hans Sedlmayr*, München 1962, p. 321–348, here p. 344.

should act as the prerequisite for the demand to raising of reason to the status as greatest good.⁵⁷ Thun could agree unreservedly with these philosophical teachings.

Bolzano has been styled a saccharine hero of Austrian liberalism, but young liberals' relationship with "Bolzanism" around 1848 was much less clear-cut than it was for Leo Thun. It is true that the young liberal Herbartians, who would become important supporters of the university reform, proudly invoked Bolzano in 1848, whom they regarded as a martyr of Metternich's regime. But we must make a clear distinction here between ancestor worship and epistemological connections. The liberal Herbartians rejected the Bolzanist synthesis of belief and knowledge.⁵⁸ In contrast to Bolzano, they did not judge the connection between individual the individual's knowledge of moral law and its observance in a stipulative or aprioristic manner, and they broke, like – famously – Exner, with Bolzano's concept of a prepositional objectivity that is not bound to intellect and language.⁵⁹

That is noteworthy for two reasons: First, the template of a "Bolzanist" educational reform, which has remained tenaciously present in overviews and special studies since Salomon Frankfurter and Eduard Winter, must be reconsidered.⁶⁰ Second, the scrutiny of these connections challenges the coherence of the "Austrian philosophical tradition" concocted in the twentieth century by Otto Neurath and Rudolf Haller.⁶¹

Conclusion

Leo Thun's attempt to rehabilitate historical-positive knowledge against "natural law" speculation by means of a redesigned curriculum design and by means of professorial appointments, led to unintended consequences in three respects: First, this undertaking proved

⁵⁷ Franz Leander FILLAFER: Die Aufklärung in der Habsburgermonarchie und ihr Erbe. Ein Forschungsüberblick, in: *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 40 (2013), p. 35–97, here p. 53, with numerous references.

⁵⁸ Cf. *ibid.*

⁵⁹ Cf. FILLAFER: *Escaping the Enlightenment*, p. 131–141.

⁶⁰ The usually quite crude assumption of a Bolzanist blueprint of the education reform after 1848 (outlined, for example, by William M. JOHNSTON: *The Austrian Mind: An Intellectual and Social History 1848–1938*, Berkeley 1972, p. 279. – Salomon FRANKFURTER: *Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, Franz Exner und Hermann Bonitz: Beiträge zur Geschichte der österreichischen Unterrichtsreform*, Wien 1893, p. 26, 73, 92) was intensified by a hagiographical and decontextualized exaggeration of the sole responsibility of Thun for the reform and by the one-sided view of Exner as a true "disciple" of Bolzano. A nuanced sketch is provided by Brigitte MAZOHL-WALLNIG: *Der Einfluss Bolzanos und der Bolzanisten auf die österreichische Universitätsreform der Jahre 1848/49*, in: Helmut RUMPLER (ed.): *Bernard Bolzano und die Politik: Staat, Nation und Religion als Herausforderung für die Philosophie im Kontext von Spätaufklärung, Frühnationalismus und Restauration*, Wien 2000, p. 221–246.

⁶¹ Cf. FILLAFER: *Kant und die katholische Theologie im Vormärz*, in: Violetta L. WAIBEL (ed.): *Umwege: Annäherungen an Immanuel Kant in Wien, Österreich und Osteuropa*, Göttingen 2015, p. 74–83.

to be a gateway for the very liberalism Thun loathed and abhorred. Second, the focus on German legal history undermined the Greater Austrian idea, which Thun himself advocated. Third, the reconciliation between belief and knowledge, which Thun envisaged as a good Bolzanist ideal congruence ideal, failed utterly: It was a vision that was no longer attractive to many young liberals by 1848, especially the group surrounding Franz S. Exner.

In a cross section of the areas discussed, three conclusions emerge:

Thun was a central figure in the process of reshaping and reconstruction of the Enlightenment legacy: This process led to liberals' self-perception as sole legatee of the Enlightenment, and to the perception that conservatism was the archenemy of the Enlightenment. As a conservative enlightener, Thun himself tried to remove the blots from his escutcheon, glossing over the significance of the Enlightenment to his intellectual career.

What united Thun's coterie of canonists and converts to his liberal fellow-travellers was the disavowal of intellectual life and teaching in the Vormärz that they all shared. In order to create a sharp contrast to the – disputable – post 1848 freedom of teaching and learning, the view had become established that professors prior to 1848 had been forced to keep to the prescribed textbooks under threat of reprisals.⁶² The rejection of the Vormärz educational system was the cement that bound very different political-intellectual groups after 1848. But this devaluation of the Vormärz only briefly concealed the fact that its despisers reviled the pre-48 system for very different reasons: Where the liberals saw the systematic persecution of the Enlightenment, conservatives discerned the unimpeded spread of rationalism, especially in the universities, in law and theology, from lecterns and pulpits.

Thun played a distinct part in firmly establishing Austrian academics' feeling of inferiority and insufficiency in comparison with Germany, and this entailed several side effects. He identified Austrian intellectual life lock, stock and barrel with the misery of the Vormärz, and hoped that the scientific advances of the "greater Germany" would bestow progress on the Austrian universities. He pursued his professorial appointments in accordance with this model. By these means, Thun himself provided the foundation for the creation of the legend that shaped his posthumous fame. He most certainly did not have "Humboldt" in mind. As Sylvia Paletschek and Mitchell Ash have shown,⁶³ Humboldt's guiding principles were not as effective in Berlin

⁶² In contrast Jiří KLABOUCH: *Osvícenské právní nauky v českých zemích*, Praha 1958, p. 335; LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 117; SRBIK: *Metternich*, II, p. 231.

⁶³ Sylvia PALETSCHEK: *Verbreitete sich ein „Humboldtsches Modell“ an den deutschen Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert?* in: Rainer Christoph SCHWINGES (ed.): *Humboldt international. Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Basel 2001, p. 75–104; Mitchell G. ASH: *Bachelor of What*,

as has been long assumed: Also, the supposedly obvious model function of the Berlin University of the early 19th century in the German-speaking area is a retrospective fiction. Yet the fact that Thun was elevated in the 20th century to the status of an Austrian ersatz Humboldt resulted from the logic of cultural distinction and adaptation needs that he himself had initiated in the 1850s.⁶⁴

Master of Whom? The Humboldt Myth and Historical Transformations of Higher Education in German-Speaking Europe and the US, in: *European Journal of Education* 41 (2006) 2, p. 245–267.

⁶⁴ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 134, p. 213–214, p. 221; Lorenz MIKOLETZKY: *Karl Freiherr von Krauß (1789–1881): Die Stellung eines österreichischen Staatsmannes zur Innenpolitik seiner Zeit*, Diss. Wien, 1969, p. 17–27; Franz Leander FILLAFER: *Hermann Bonitz. Philologe, Mitschöpfer der Universitätsreform*, in: Mitchell G. ASH, Josef EHMER (ed.): *Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft, (650 Jahre Universität Wien, Bd. 2)*, Göttingen, Wien 2015, p. 189–195.

Mitchell G. Ash

Was a “German university model” imported to Austria?

Open research questions and theses

Introduction

For many years in overviews of the history of Austrian universities and universities in general, it was stated tersely that a “German” or even “the Humboldtian university model” was imported to Austria during the course of the university reform in the Habsburg monarchy in 1848 and afterwards. This view appears to have become an unquestioned matter of fact, at least in depictions for the general public. This chapter examines the extent to which this statement still applies or should apply in the historiography of the universities, and what was meant by such claims in the first place.

The essay is divided into three parts. In the first part I provide a brief overview with selected examples of descriptions of the reform as the adoption of a, or “the” German university model, and then ask whether and what has changed here in recent years in light of new work on the history of German universities. In the second part, I attempt to highlight the descriptions from the period itself in this regard, also selectively, and ask the question as to whether there was talk of such an adoption of a, or “the” German model at the time of the university reform itself, or whether the focus lay elsewhere in this respect. In the third and last part, I will attempt to take a longer-term view and discuss selected changes in both German and the Austrian universities during the course of the second half of the 19th century, in order to approach the question of this paper at least rudimentarily from a different time perspective.

Of course one cannot yet speak of completed research findings on this topic. The words “research questions and theses” in the subtitle are meant literally, since that is all we have at present. It is my hope that these remarks will make some contribution towards contextualising the research in this area, which has recently been taken up again with new intensity, and place the subject within a broader framework of university history and history of science.

What is written in the literature

For reasons of space, no thorough discussion of possibly relevant literature can be presented here. To keep things brief, I have chosen, in particular, to ignore for now the relevant older

titles by Frankfurter¹, Meister² and Lentze³; however, I will refer to these selectively in the second part of my discussion. In this part I only mention some selected examples from the relevant works published since the 1980s, of which there are not many.

In the overview provided by Susanne Preglau-Hämmerle, *Die politische und soziale Funktion der österreichischen Universität* (1986), she writes in the relevant section that “the great educational reform of 1848/49” happened “according to the model of the Prussian secondary school reform and of the Humboldtian University”.⁴ Preglau-Hämmerle adds that this is “not understandable”⁵ without the political background – meaning the dominance of the Greater German viewpoint at the beginning of the March Revolution. The fact that the rest of this section actually disproves this thesis by referring repeatedly to independent Austrian reform proposals and strong opposition to the import of a German model is another matter (see Part II below).

In the frequently-cited ceremonial lecture by Werner Ogris in 1999, which is based essentially on older accounts, the author speaks also of a “German university model” and in particular of Wilhelm von Humboldt. Ogris says that the Prussian state accepted “the leadership of the mind”, which found expression and “its organisational realisation in the university reform of Wilhelm von Humboldt, and in its purest form in his central creation, the Berlin University of 1810”.⁶ These ideas then spread in the 1830s and 1840s “to the university life in Austria”, so that the freedom of teaching and learning became a “catchword” there.⁷ In Austria after 1848 the issue then was “essentially to imitate the German model in the Habsburg monarchy, with greater or smaller modifications”, although only the restructuring of the philosophical faculty succeeded “without problem according to the German model”, while the situation in the faculty of law was more complicated.⁸ Neither Ogris nor Preglau-Hämmerle go into any further detail about what the “German model” actually comprised in 1848, apart from a reference to the

¹ Salomon FRANKFURTER: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, Franz Exner und Hermann Bonitz. Beiträge zur Geschichte der österreichischen Unterrichtsreform, Wien 1893.

² In particular Richard MEISTER: Entwicklung und Reformen des österreichischen Studienwesens (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 239. Band 1. Abhandlung sowie Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts, Heft 6), Graz, Wien, Köln 1963.

³ In particular Hans LENTZE: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 239. Band 2. Abhandlung sowie Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts, Heft 7), Graz, Wien, Köln 1962.

⁴ Susanne PREGLAU-HÄMMERLE: Die politische und soziale Funktion der österreichischen Universität, Innsbruck 1986, p. 96.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Werner OGRIS: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Leo Graf Thun-Hohenstein. Festvortrag anlässlich des Rektorstages im Großen Festsaal der Universität Wien am 12. März 1999, p. 9.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid., p. 11, 16.

slogan of freedom of teaching and learning. Apparently the readers or listeners are supposed to know this already, even if they lack any knowledge of the history of German universities.

Let us now jump to the present and select the habilitation thesis by Elmar Schübl on the institutionalisation of the earth sciences in the Austrian universities since 1848 for closer examination! There, specifically in the introductory chapter on the politics and organisation of science, talk is once again, or still, of a “Humboldtian university model” and of Humboldt himself as the developer of the concept of the University of Berlin (allegedly taken by contemporaries to be the “great model”).⁹ In a long footnote appended here, Schübl however then refers to more recent research that shows that “the ‘Humboldt University’ myth arose only in the early 20th century as the identity-forming and mentality-shaping moment of the German university system”.¹⁰ The next page then refers more carefully to a “Prussian university model” and no longer to a German one.¹¹ At least Schübl does not claim explicitly that such a “model” was imported into Austria after 1848; whether or not this was the case is irrelevant to his subsequent analysis. We shall return to his work in the last part of these remarks in a more positive vein, taking it an important source of information.

With regard to the name “Humboldt”, or his writings on the idea of the university and their reception in the 19th century, Sylvia Paletschek published a provocative piece more than 10 years ago. In her account, which is based essentially on an examination of relevant lexis of the time, Humboldt was barely known by name in the 19th century, and not as a university reformer or even as the founder of the University of Berlin, but primarily as a linguist.¹² Recently, the Belgian university historian Pieter Dhondt told me, based on his own research on the history of the universities in Belgium in the 19th century, that names such as Humboldt and Schleiermacher certainly were mentioned in the oral tradition from the 1840s as founders of the university, at least in Berlin.¹³ Nevertheless, the key findings of more recent research confirms

⁹ Elmar SCHÜBL: *Mineralogie, Petrographie, Geologie und Paläontologie. Zur Institutionalisierung der Erdwissenschaften an österreichischen Universitäten, vornehmlich an jener in Wien, 1848–1938*, Graz 2010, p. 6.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 7.

¹² Sylvia PALETSCHEK: *Verbreitete sich ein „Humboldt’sches Modell“ an den deutschen Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert?* in: Rainer C. SCHWINGES (ed.): *Humboldt international. Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Basel 2001, p. 75–104.

¹³ Pieter Dhondt, personal communication to the author, 28 November 2011. According to extensive research by Dhondt, only two men are supposed to have mentioned the name Humboldt or Altenstein in publications on the educational reform at that time: the moral philosopher Charles Loomans and the pedagogue Joseph Demarteau, both professors in Liège. Loomans travelled to Berlin in 1845 on behalf of his government, and Demarteau studied there and elsewhere.; Dhondt assumes that they became familiar with the aforementioned oral tradition during these stays. Cf. here now Pieter DHONDT: ‘Humboldt’ in Belgium: Rhetoric on the German University Model, in: Peter JOSEPHSON, Thomas KARLSOHN, Johan ÖSTLING (ed.): *The Humboldtian Tradition: Origins and Legacies*, Leiden, Boston 2014, p. 97–110. More evidence against the strong thesis by Paletschek is provided by a citation from a lexicon of the educational system from 1869, in which it is written

this conclusion: The eponymous cult surrounding the name “Humboldt” as a symbol of the utopian “idea of the German university” emerged only after his now iconic writings were discovered in his papers in the 1880s and were published in the 1890s. The ideals formulated there then began to congeal into a veritable myth during the revival of neo-humanism at the turn of the 20th century, in particular prior to the centenary celebrations of the Friedrich-Wilhelm-University of Berlin in 1910.¹⁴

Let me add the following briefly, to avoid misunderstanding: I am not concerned with whether or not the master narrative of Humboldt and the foundation of the Berlin university is true or false, for a myth is not necessarily a lie! The ‘Humboldt myth’ lives in a place beyond “true” and “false”; its function is to embody and establish the identity and self-esteem of an academic subculture by means of an origin story.¹⁵ Precisely in this capacity, as an identity-forming foundation narrative, the ‘Humboldt myth’ has unfolded its historical potency. The discourse-determining power of this narrative must therefore be seen as an independent, contributing factor in the history of universities and of higher education policy in the German-speaking area – and not only there – in the 20th century and beyond. For the most part, the set pieces of this story that are repeated constantly in rectors’ speeches and other celebratory addresses would appear to be immune to the revisions in university historiography to this very day. The details of the further history of the ‘Humboldt myth’ and its diverse political functions in the 20th century have been described in detail by many authors by now.¹⁶ The man, or rather, the symbol bearing his name, has taken on zombie-like dimensions – his death is frequently and loudly lamented, but he, or more precisely, the ideals associated with his name, seem impossible to

in the article on Humboldt that “the University of Berlin [should] really actually [be seen] as H.’s (Humboldt’s) creation”. Cf. Heinz-Elmar TENORTH: Eine Universität zu Berlin – Vorgeschichte und Einrichtung, in: IDEM., Charles MCCLELLAND (ed.): *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden*, Bd. 1. Gründung und Blütezeit der Universität zu Berlin 1810–1918, Berlin 2012, p. 3–75, here p. 70.

¹⁴ Cf. here Sylvia PALETSCHEK: Die Erfindung der Humboldtschen Universität. Die Konstruktion der Humboldtschen Universitätsidee in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts, in: *Historische Anthropologie* 10 (2002), p. 183–205. According to Dieter Langewiesche, the symbolic reference to “Humboldt” in this version became a regular part of (west) German rectors’ speeches only from the 1970s. Cf. Dieter LANGEWIESCHE: Humboldt als Leitbild? Die deutsche Universität in den Berliner Rektoratsreden seit dem 19. Jahrhundert, in: *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte*, 14 (2011), p. 15–37.

¹⁵ Cf. here Mitchell G. ASH: Bachelor of What, Master of Whom? The Humboldt Myth and Transformations of Higher Education in Germany and the US, in: *European Journal of Education* 41 (2006), p. 245–267, with numerous references. For a concise analysis of the cultural function of such origin stories, see Albrecht KOSCHORKE: Zur Logik kultureller Gründungserzählungen, in: *Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte* I/2 (Summer 2007), p. 5–12.

¹⁶ See, among many others, as well as the cited work by Sylvia PALETSCHEK, Walter RÜEGG: Der Mythos der Humboldtschen Universität, in: Mathias KRIEG, Martin ROSE (ed.): *Universitas in theologica. Theologica in universitatae. Festschrift für Hans Henrich Schmitz zum 60. Geburtstag*, Zürich 1997, p. 155–174; Mitchell G. ASH (ed.): *German Universities Past and Future: Crisis or Renewal?* Oxford 1997; Rüdiger vom BRUCH: Langsamer Abschied von Humboldt? Etappen deutscher Universitätsgeschichte 1810–1945, in: ASH (ed.): *German Universities Past and Future: Crisis or Renewal?* p. 29–57; and Heinz-Elmar TENORTH: Wilhelm von Humboldts (1767–1835) Universitätskonzept und die Reform in Berlin – eine Tradition jenseits des Mythos, in: *Zeitschrift für Germanistik, Neue Folge* 20 (2010), p. 15–28.

kill off.¹⁷ However, that is only indirectly relevant to this topic. So to conclude the first part, I shall formulate my first thesis:

Thesis 1: The claim that “a” single “German” university model was adopted in Austria around 1848 and thereafter, with direct reference to Wilhelm von Humboldt, cannot be supported.

On the treatment of the symbol or topos “German university” in the revolutionary and early reform period (1848–1855)¹⁸

If Humboldt was not mentioned by name, then was there nonetheless talk of a “German model” during the actual reform period? If so, then what – if anything definite – could have been meant by it? More precisely: What was taken, or could have been taken, as a reference for such talk? To put this question perhaps even more incisively: To what extent did the Viennese university reformers actually refer to their own experiences of the German universities of their time, and to what extent did they draw their ideas from other sources?

The conventional and repeatedly cited statement on this comes from a speech by Minister Franz von Sommaruga in the main auditorium of the University of Vienna on 30 March 1848. Only a few days after taking office he announced to the students who had, together with some teachers, demanded the freedom of teaching and learning and had raised the black-red-gold flag on 12 March:

Wir wollen ein Gebäude aufführen von fester Dauer, ähnlich jenen blühenden Hochschulen Deutschlands, die wir als Vorbilder gründlicher wissenschaftlicher Ausbildung erkennen. Lern- und Lehrfreiheit, durch keine andere Schranke als jene der konstitutionellen Gesetze gebunden, wird ihre Grundlage sein.¹⁹

That is how he is quoted by Eduard Winter. Richard Meister reproduces the speech in somewhat more detail. After the word “similar”, he adds “– where permitted by the conditions of the Fatherland –”.²⁰ Precisely that is the crux of the matter. While almost all authors quote

¹⁷ Cf. here Uwe SCHIMANK: Humboldt in Bologna – falscher Mann am falschen Ort? in: HIS (ed.): Perspektive Studienqualität – Themen und Forschungsergebnisse der HIS-Fachtagung „Studienqualität“, Bielefeld 2010, p. 44–61; Mitchell G. ASH: Humboldt the Undead: Multiple Uses of ‘Humboldt’ and his ‘death’ in the ‘Bologna’ era, in: JOSEPHSON, KARLSOHN, ÖSTLING (ed.): The Humboldtian Tradition, p. 81–96.

¹⁸ On this section see also the account in: Mitchell G. ASH: Die Universität Wien in den politischen Umbruchzeiten des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts. In: IDEM., Joseph EHMER (ed.): Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft (650 Jahre Universität Wien, Bd. 2), Göttingen 2015, p. 29–172, here p. 48–57.

¹⁹ Cited from Eduard WINTER: Revolution, Neoabsolutismus und Liberalismus in der Donaumonarchie, Wien 1969, p. 66. „We want to erect a permanent building, similar to those thriving universities in Germany, which we recognise as models of thoroughly scientific education. Its foundation will be the freedom of teaching and learning, limited by no other barrier than that of the constitutional laws.“

²⁰ MEISTER: Entwicklung und Reformen, p. 69; also in Carl HEINTL: Mittheilungen aus den Universitätsacten (vom 12. März bis 22. Juli 1848), Wien 1848, this insertion is on p. 10: “so sehr es nur immer die Verhältnisse des Vaterlandes gestatten”.

Sommaruga's statement only in the first version given above (by Winter, or by others who cite Winter, probably copied), and thus assume that this meant an orientation to the "German" model, I believe it is equally worth stressing the restrictions suggested in the subsequent words, which speak of a selective adoption. After all, the adoption of German university structures by other countries, where this occurred at all, was also very selective, due to the different conditions in each of the adopting countries.²¹

But we are only at the beginning of our analysis. As is known, Sommaruga's period in office did not last long; he resigned as early as 15 May 1848, though he was formally discharged only on 18 July by Archduke Johann "per handbill".²² In April, however, he had appointed the Prague philosopher Franz Serafin Exner, the physician and dean of the Vienna medical faculty Ernst von Feuchtersleben, the Viennese botanist Stephan Endlicher and five other persons to the ministry as expert consultants.²³ Now, as soon as Exner was able to represent his reform ideas at the centre of the revolution, he openly advocated following model of "the" German universities in his – since then frequently cited – article, *Die Reformen des öffentlichen Unterrichtes in Österreich* (The reforms of public education in Austria), in the *Constitutionellen Donau-Zeitung*. Due to its significance, the relevant passage is cited here in detail (with translation in the footnotes):

Am meisten verwandt mit unseren inneren Zuständen sind die Zustände derjenigen auswärtigen Länder, mit welchen wir seit Jahrhunderten innig verbunden sind, der Deutschen, und in Deutschland ist zugleich das Unterrichtswesen mit einem Ernste und Erfolge emporgebildet, wie in keinem anderen Lande; Deutschlands bewährteste Einrichtungen werden uns allen zumeist als Muster zu dienen haben.²⁴

However Exner does not state which German institutions could be meant here. And he immediately qualifies and differentiates this view in the sense of the interpretation, suggested above, of the statement by Minister Sommaruga, as follows:

Zweitens werden wir aber darauf zu sehen haben, dass auf allen Punkten, wo unsere Verhältnisse eine organische Entwicklung von sich aus gestatten, diese auch möglich bliebe

²¹ For numerous examples see SCHWINGES (ed.): Humboldt international. Incidentally, this also applies to the USA – the country in which many claim that 'Humboldt' found his true home. Cf. R. Steven TURNER: Humboldt in North America? Reflections on the Research University and its Historians, in: Rainer Christoph SCHWINGES (ed.): Humboldt international. Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, Basel 2001, p. 289–311, and ASH: Bachelor of What, Master of Whom?

²² Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Österreich 35 (1877), here p. 279.

²³ MEISTER: Entwicklung und Reformen, I, p. 69–70. On the biography and role of Exner cf. Christof AICHNER: Franz Exner. Professor für Philosophie, Mitschöpfer der Universitätsreform nach 1848, in: ASH, EHMER (ed.): Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft, p. 182–188.

²⁴ "Most closely related to our internal conditions are the conditions of those foreign lands with whom we have been intimately connected for centuries, those of the Germans, and at the same time, the educational system has been built up in Germany with earnestness and success, as it has in no other country; Germany's most established institutions will act at the least as a model for us all."

und eintrete, und nirgends durch gewaltsames Eingreifen, ohne Not gestört werde. Nur der Baum, der in der Tiefe wurzelt, steht fest.²⁵

So it was clear to Exner, simply due to the inconceivability of a “large-scale immigration”²⁶ of German teachers within a short space of time, the great expense of the German universities, and the needs of the many other nations in Austria, which had to be considered, that:

eine Einrichtung unseres Unterrichtswesens, welche dies sofort zu einer getreuen Kopie des auswärtigen deutschen macht, weder stattfinden kann, noch darf. Sie kann nicht, weil uns für jetzt die Mittel fehlen; sie darf nicht, weil sie uns der Gefahr aussetzen würde, uns in allerlei Widersprüche mit unseren fachlichen Verhältnissen zu versetzen, und manche Kräfte unserer Individualität zu brechen, statt sie zu entwickeln und zu stärken.²⁷

Thus the “foundations and main walls” of the reform building should correspond with German conditions, but its interior structure and ornamental decoration should be independent.²⁸

Shortly after the formal dismissal of Sommaruga, the *Entwurf der Grundzüge des öffentlichen Unterrichtswesens in Österreich*²⁹ (Draft of the main features of the public education system in Austria) was published in the *Wiener Zeitung*, composed mostly by Exner and known by now to all who are well-informed. Fifty years ago, Richard Meister called it a “Report on the activities of the Sommaruga ministry”³⁰ and for more than a century it has been regarded as the basic concept for the later university reform. Sommaruga was succeeded, for equally short periods, by Ernst von Feuchtersleben (19 July to 23 November 1848) and Joseph Alexander von Helfert (24 November 1848 to 27 July 1849); neither of them, however, held the office of minister, but rather they were undersecretaries in Doblhoff’s Ministry of the Interior. As

²⁵ Franz Serafin EXNER: Die Reformen des öffentlichen Unterrichtes in Österreich, in: Constitutionelle Donau-Zeitung, Nr. 20, 22, 25 und 28, vom 20., 22., 26. und 29. April 1848, reproduced in: MEISTER: Entwicklung und Reformen, II, p. 228–240, here p. 230: “Secondly, however, we will have to ensure that in all points where our circumstances in themselves allow an organic development, this will also remain possible and will occur, and will not be destroyed unnecessarily by violent intervention. Only a deep-rooted tree can stand firm.”

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid. “...that our educational system cannot and may not be established in a manner that immediately makes it a faithful copy of the foreign German one. It cannot, because we do not have the resources at present; it may not, because it would expose us to the risk of all kinds of contradictions in our functional circumstances, and thus break the power of our individuality, instead of developing and strengthening it”.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Entwurf der Grundzüge des öffentlichen Unterrichtswesens in Österreich, in: Wiener Zeitung, 18 bis 21. Juli 1848. The text was published anonymously, but the general consensus is that it bears the signature of Exner. Helmut Engelbrecht specified his authorship most precisely in 1986: “The concept of the ‘Entwurf der Grundzüge...’ was demonstrably drafted by F. Exner (Vienna, University Library, Manuscripta III 992 A), however, not all of the thoughts and suggestions contained therein originated with him. He also integrated the ideas of his coworkers and of experts he consulted”. Helmut ENGELBRECHT: Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens, Bd. 4: Von 1848 bis zum Ende der Monarchie, Wien 1986. Excerpts in: 1848: Einrichtung des Unterrichtsministeriums, in: Wendepunkte und Kontinuitäten. Zäsuren der demokratischen Entwicklung in der österreichischen Geschichte (ed. by the Forum Politische Bildung), Innsbruck, Wien 1998. Sonderband der Informationen zur politischen Bildung, p. 23–38, here p. 38, note 4.

³⁰ MEISTER: Entwicklung und Reformen I, p. 72, II, p. 241. As suggested in the preface to the first article of the series, the title cited here “Bericht über die Tätigkeit des Ministeriums Sommaruga” comes from Meister, and does not appear in the printed original. Cf. Wiener Zeitung, No. 197, 18. Juli 1848, p. 1.

mentioned above, Exner was not the only advisor appointed by Sommaruga's government; many of the others so named advocated and published their own reform ideas at this time. As we know, Feuchtersleben in particular had his own reform ideas, especially with regard to the organisation of the medical faculty, which foresaw the integration of the so-called doctoral colleges (*Doktorienkollegien*, assemblies of alumni) and even, to a certain extent, the students, and which, for this reason alone, could hardly be interpreted as an import of German structures.³¹ Nevertheless, he and Helfert were in a position to realise significant elements of the concept published in July 1848, such as the suspension of semester and annual examinations, a new regulation of promotion to the doctorate without a disputation, the introduction and provisional regulation of the habilitation, and the rearrangement of the appointment procedure for professors without competitive examination, based on recommendations from the relevant faculties. This period also saw the definitive establishment of the bisection of the philosophical faculty, which had already been ordered provisionally in May 1848, with the relocation of the propaedeutic part to 7th and 8th grade of secondary school and the establishment of the remaining philosophical subjects as new, independent and equal faculties of "higher" standing, equal in rank to the faculties of law, medicine and theology.³² So did an "import of the German model" already begin with these measures? At any rate, I have found no indication to date in the literature I have read so far that any German or Prussian rescripts or university statutes were consulted for the specific formulation of these or later reform measures.

Already under the management of Stadion and his undersecretary responsible for education, Helfert, in other words – contrary to often contradictory statements in the literature – *before* Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein took office, Protestants from Germany, such as the anatomist and physiologist Ernst Brücke and the philologist, archaeologist and pedagogue Hermann Bonitz, were appointed to Vienna.³³ These facts may be known by the well-informed (or not, since the

³¹ For a detailed description and analysis of the mostly failed proposals of Feuchtersleben and the differences between his position and Exner's concept, see Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Reformansätze vor der Thunischen Reform, in: Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsgeschichte 18 (1998), p. 59–86. Unfortunately, the views and reform proposals of others are addressed only selectively there.

³² MEISTER: Entwicklung und Reformen I, p. 75–85. According to Salomon FRANKFURTER: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, p. 98, the definitive appointment of Exner to the state council took place on 4 September 1848, i.e. already during Feuchtersleben's time in office, and not under Sommaruga, as claimed in some writings.

³³ On the appointment of Bonitz see the Allerunterthänigsten Vortrag des provisorischen Ministers des öffentlichen Unterrichts Franz Grafen von Stadion, 16. Januar 1849. ÖStA AVA Bestand Unterricht Allgemein, Ktn. 664 (= Fz. 634). On the appointment of Brücke see the Allerunterthänigsten Vortrag des provisorischen Ministers des öffentlichen Unterrichts Franz Grafen von Stadion, 7. Februar 1849. Ebenda, Ktn. 621 (= Fz 596). On the chronology of the appointment of Bonitz cf. Theodor GOMPERZ: Hermann Bonitz, Biographisches Jahrbuch der Alterthumskunde, Jg. 1888, p. 53–99, here p. 65–66. It says there that Exner asked Bonitz in a letter already in summer 1848 if he was interested in principle in being appointed to Vienna. FRANKFURTER: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, cites extensively the letter by Exner "as a private man" to Bonitz on 3 August 1848 on p. 95–96

information in the literature is inconsistent), nevertheless I wish to stress them here – it will soon be clear why.

It was only after the appointment of Graf Thun-Hohenstein as Minister for Religious Affairs and Education on 28 July 1849 that the educational reform, and thus also university reforms, took comprehensive form in the *Provisorisches Gesetz über die Organisation der akademischen Behörden* of 30 September 1849 and the associated decrees and regulations.³⁴

Due to space limitations I cannot deal with the details of the organisational structure of the ministry under the leadership of Thun,³⁵ although a deeper analysis of the question posed in the title of this essay should really begin there: Was the structure of the Prussian education ministry, for example, taken as a model, or was the ministry rather created uniquely from the very outset? I can only let this as yet unexplored question stand, without an answer.

In any case, as is known, Franz Serafin Exner remained as an advisor to the ministry with the rank of State Councillor until his early death in 1853; he rejected the numerous offers of a position as undersecretary and also, in 1849, the position of Rector of the University of Vienna. He and Bonitz, alongside other gentlemen (some of whom will be mentioned below) were the key advisors in the first years of the reform, i.e. also in the political context of the reaction and neo-absolutism, respectively. Much has been written about these two men and their role in comparison or in contrast with the importance of Minister Thun, but the details of their cooperation have never been examined in detail. This also cannot be done here, for I am only concerned with the specific question of whether Exner and Bonitz or even Thun himself made reference to “the” German or any German university.

I want to stay first with Exner and Bonitz first and ask: Where could they have drawn their knowledge from? Exner himself never studied or taught at a German university. He was supposed to be appointed to Bonn at some stage in the early 1840s, but he didn’t even start negotiations, and that was that. He wanted to hear his mentor Herbart personally, but Herbart died before this could happen.³⁶ So from where could Exner have received specific, practical information about the German universities – in contrast to his profound knowledge of the ideas of Johann Heinrich Herbart and others on the ideals of scientific education in general? We get a partial answer with the quotation by Salomon Frankfurter from a letter by Exner to his friend

and records on p. 100: “The appointment was made with the Imperial rescript of 6 [sic!] February 1849, and Bonitz arrived in Vienna at Easter 1849”. The earlier appointment of Bonitz was prevented by the October Uprising. This, along with other appointments of the time, has not yet been reconstructed in detail.

³⁴ *Provisorisches Gesetz über die Organisation der akademischen Behörden* Cf. still MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen I*, Teil III, and the documents in: MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen, II*, here Part VI.

³⁵ Cf. the unfortunately sparse information in ENGELBRECHT; 1848: *Einrichtung des Unterrichtsministeriums*, p. 23–24.

³⁶ FRANKFURTER: *Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein*, p. 72.

Josef Mozart of November 1841. It says there that he spent eight days in Berlin during the last holidays and listened to “lectures of famous men”³⁷ – unfortunately, this passage does not reveal which men, or on which topics. The same source does however also tell us of his friendship with the Leipzig philologist Hartenstein and an acquaintance with the Berlin philosopher Trendelenburg and other important scholars from the same time.

Hermann Bonitz got to know Exner in Berlin in 1842, but at the time Bonitz was a secondary school teacher in Stettin and not a university professor – that occurred only on the initiative of Exner in Vienna which occurred, as mentioned above, already prior to Thun’s appointment. As far as the relative extent of the common activity of both reformers is concerned, it – and above all the work of Bonitz – focused more on the reform of the secondary school system in general than on the universities.³⁸ Of course both of them were aware from the outset that one was not possible without the other, and that the position of the “philosophical” subjects was of central importance. In his report for the Imperial Commission on Education in 1846, Exner already advocated equating the philosophical faculty with the three “higher” faculties, as a place in which to cultivate science for its own sake, claiming that this was the structure of almost all universities in Germany.³⁹ Thus Exner anticipated a central moment of the later university reform, with explicit reference to the German universities.

We should not ignore here the social-historical significance of Exner’s suggestion then and later in the context of the German developments: Whatever the philosophical faculty might contribute to science, it could only claim equality with the other three faculties, in a manner the state could understand, as a professional training institute for secondary school teachers (the other faculties also being responsible for the “higher” professional training of physicians, lawyers and priests). One passage in Exner’s article of April 1848, cited above, shows that he at least was also aware of this dimension of the reform. Among the reasons he gives there for the establishment of an independent philosophical faculty at the universities, he states: “It is particularly (expedient) for the numerous teachers in all branches of secondary and high schools, for future scholars and for such offices that demand higher education in any kind of general science”.⁴⁰

³⁷ Ibid., p. 74.

³⁸ Cf. recently Bernd-Richard MÜLLER: *Die Rezeption der österreichischen Bildungsreform und ihre Auswirkungen auf das Selbstverständnis der Lehrerschaft anhand der deutschsprachigen pädagogischen Zeitschriften 1848–67*, Dipl. Wien, 2012.

³⁹ FRANKFURTER: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, p. 85. Cf. in more detail Brigitte MAZOHL: *Universitätsreform und Bildungspolitik. Die Ära des Ministers Thun-Hohenstein (1849–1860)*, in: Klaus MÜLLER-SALGET, Sigurd Paul SCHEICHL (ed.): *Nachklänge der Aufklärung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Innsbruck 2008, p. 129–149.

⁴⁰ EXNER: *Die Reformen des öffentlichen Unterrichts*, in: MEISTER, *Entwicklung und Reformen*, II, here p. 234: “Es ist besonders (zweckmäßig) für den zahlreichen Lehrstand in allen Zweigen des Gymnasial- und höheren

Thun's appointment and the previously mentioned "Provisional law" of 30 September 1849, decisively set the course for new power relationships within the universities – specifically with the introduction of the professorial university by accepting associate professors into the professorial staff (while retaining the doctoral colleges in Vienna and Prague) – and the freedom of teaching (with the regulation of 30.6.1850). There is much to suggest that the keyword "German model", used in combination with the equation of the philosophical faculties with the others, refers only to these not insignificant features of the university organisation, and that these changes in the power relationships within the university were without doubt borrowed from the "German model". However the retention of the doctoral colleges in Prague and Vienna, although, or perhaps because they agitated for the "Catholic character" of the universities from the very outset, the associated retention of the old doctoral examinations, the state regulation of the disciplining of students by the university with the "Provisional Disciplinary Ordinance" of 1850, and the explicit treatment of the universities as "academic administrations" (*akademische Behörden*), that is as integral parts of the state administration, not only in this respect, are all aspects that point to a difference between the Austrian model and the "German model", at least from the beginning of the Thunian Reforms.⁴¹ Hans Lentze even calls the law of 30 September 1849 "the first victory achieved by the old Austrian tradition over the reform party".⁴²

However, if we now ask, as we did above with regard to the brief periods in office of Feuchtersleben and Helfert, whether the legal texts, decrees and regulations that gave shape to the university reform in 1849 and subsequent years mention anything explicit about the adoption of a "German university model", or whether there are recognisable adoptions from German laws, rescripts, university statutes or other similar sources, I must once again reply: We do not know for sure. Not even Richard Meister, in his work on the subject, which was considered the standard work at the time, provided any results from his own research in the state files; instead he relies essentially, as far as the measures of this reform period are concerned, on the legal compendium of Leo Ritter Beck von Mannagetta and Carl von Kelle from 1906.⁴³ But apparently this compendium was apparently written as a handbook for

Unterrichts, für künftige Gelehrte und für solche Ämter, welche höhere Bildung in irgend einer allgemeinen Wissenschaft erheischen".

⁴¹ Walter HÖFLECHNER: *Nachholende Eigenentwicklung? Der Umbau des habsburgischen Universitätssystems nach der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, in: Rüdiger VOM BRUCH (ed.) with the cooperation of Elisabeth MÜLLER-LÜCKNER: *Die Berliner Universität im Kontext der deutschen Universitätslandschaft (Kolloquien des Historischen Kollegs 76)*, München 2010, p. 93–107, here p. 99.

⁴² LENTZE: *Die Universitätsreform*, p. 35.

⁴³ Leo Ritter BECK VON MANNAGETTA, Carl VON KELLE: *Die österreichischen Universitätsgesetze. Sammlung für die österreichischen Universitäten gültigen Gesetze, Verordnungen, Erlässe, Studien- und Prüfungsordnungen*, Wien 1906. In reproducing the earlier reform measures, Meister cites, as well as the

everyday administrative use, with no references or comments from the time concerned, which would have provided the only basis for answering this question.

One reference might suffice here as an indication: A key difference from the situation of the German universities, then as now, is the simple fact that all of this happened already prior to the establishment of the ministry by means of the Imperial rescripts and that the legal measures involved legislation that applied at the time to the whole empire. At that time there was no such thing as a German nation, whose government could have decided anything, and after the foundation of the German Empire in 1871, the German universities were not placed under central state administration, but were placed under the jurisdiction of the federal states, where they remained, with the exception of the National Socialist period and the much longer lifetime of the GDR. The contrast could hardly be greater: While the faculties of the German universities were all called corporations at that time, in the Habsburg monarchy the question of whether the universities should be treated as autonomous corporations or as state institutions was deliberately left unanswered. Yet the very designation, mentioned above, of these entities as “academic administrations” in the legal text of 1849 indicates that they were treated as state institutions. To use Walter Höflechner’s term, the so-called “moment of immaturity”⁴⁴ that this embodied was intended to relativize from the outset any talk of the freedom of teaching or of institutional autonomy. And that is precisely what happened.⁴⁵

If we now briefly address the question as to which explicit references there were to a “German university model” or any German university in the first years of Thun’s ministerial reign, we must examine the long memorandum, *Die Neugestaltung der österreichischen Universitäten* (The Restructuring of the Austrian Universities) from 1853.⁴⁶ There, the “highest purpose” of the universities is defined as “the cultivation of science in harmony with the spirit of the Church under special consideration of the interests of the state”.⁴⁷ More specifically, in the minutes of the meetings of the Council of Ministers Thun says directly that, this formulation means “that everything that is contrary to the Catholic Church should be excluded from the Austrian

Imperial Law Gazette, contemporary legal compendiums, for example by C. HEINTL: *Mitteilungen aus den Universitäts-Acten* (vom 12. März bis zum 22. Juli 1848), Wien 1848.

⁴⁴ HÖFLECHNER: *Nachholende Eigenentwicklung?*, p. 106.

⁴⁵ Cf. here the passage cited by Höflechner from the aforementioned compendium by BECK/KELLE, which could not be clearer: “The Austrian universities were called into life by the sovereigns as independent corporations equipped with constitutional privileges and property rights. Over time, however, they lost most of their independence and are currently organised as state institutions, albeit without their status as corporate entities having been removed explicitly by legal means.” BECK/KELLE: *Die Österreichischen Universitätsgesetze*, p. 1.

⁴⁶ *Die Neugestaltung der österreichischen Universitäten über Allerhöchsten Befehl dargestellt von dem k. k. Ministerium für Cultus und Unterricht*, Wien 1853, p. 23. The anonymously published text probably had several authors – Thun himself is said to have contributed –, but it was probably edited for the most part by the Innsbruck professor for classical philology and aesthetics, Aloys Flir. Cf. LENTZE: *Die Universitätsreform*, p. 198–217.

⁴⁷ *Die Neugestaltung*, p. 23.

universities, and that Catholic-minded men should be employed by them.”⁴⁸ However, this should not prevent “the employment of men who do not belong to the Catholic Church for subjects that are less closely related to the [Church], such as mathematics, natural sciences, etc. etc., under circumstances to be described in more detail.”⁴⁹

Accordingly, and indeed two years before the Concordat in Rome, the memorandum of 1853 contains praise for the medieval university and a polemic against the universities of the Protestant sovereigns that were founded during the Reformation. Hence in the Middle Ages, the universities had autonomy and extensive freedom of teaching, but they “were not mere teaching institutes, but rather scientific authorities that had the power to submit legally valid reports [...] In particular, the universities in Vienna and Prague were at the same time the highest state authorities in all of public education.”⁵⁰ The spirit of science also managed to thrive for a long time at the sovereign universities in the Protestant regions of Germany, primarily Göttingen:

Aber es nagt an diesen Blüten auch Gewürm und die glänzende Erscheinung hat ihre düsteren Flecke. Das Prinzip der freien Forschung führte zu ungebundenen, zur zügellosen. Gleichwie der Organismus seine Bande hat, welche nicht die Bewegung hemmen, sondern sie bewirken, so sind auch Erfahrung, Gewissen und Offenbarung nicht Hindernisse der echten Wissenschaft, sondern natürliche Bedingungen ihres normalen Lebens. An den protestantischen Universitäten Deutschlands artete die Wissenschaft in Monstrositäten aus, welche der schauervolle Beweis sind, zu welchen Resultaten der Verstand gelangt, wenn er sich an den Tatsachen der Offenbarung nicht mehr orientiert.⁵¹

It is relevant to our topic that in the description of recent times in this memorandum, the talk is no longer of Berlin, let alone Humboldt, but rather of Munich as a modern Catholic university:

Eine Universität, die durch Koryphäen katholischer Wissenschaft sich auszeichnete, war einen kurzen Zeitraum hindurch die Universität München. Selbst die kurze Zeit hat gezeigt, was eine solche Universität für Staat und Kirche zu leisten vermag. Es ist hoch an der Zeit, dass nun

⁴⁸ “[...] dass aus den österreichischen Universitäten alles ausgeschlossen seyn soll was der katholischen Kirche entgegen ist, und dass katholisch gesinnte Männer auf denselben angestellt werden sollen”. Minutes of the Council of Ministers of 29 November 1853. Reproduced in: Hans LENTZE: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, Wien 1962, here p. 307–308.

⁴⁹ Ibid. “für Fächer, welcher zu der [Kirche] in minder naher Beziehung stehen, wie Mathematik, Naturwissenschaften, etc. etc., unter näher zu bezeichnenden Umständen auch Männer, die nicht der katholischen Kirche angehören, angestellt werden können.”

⁵⁰ Die Neugestaltung, p. 7.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 20. “But worms are also gnawing on these blossoms and the shining appearance has its dark spots. The principle of free research led to looseness and a lack of restraint. Just as the organism has ligaments that do not impair but rather enable movement, thus experience, conscience and revelation are also no impairment to true science, but rather the natural conditions of its normal life. At the Protestant universities in Germany, science is degenerating into monstrosities, which is the awful proof of the results of reason when it is no longer oriented to the facts of the revelation.”

Österreich aufnehmen, was Baiern wieder fallen gelassen hat, und es mit seinen größeren Mitteln die schöne Aufgabe auch in größerem Maße löse.⁵²

This, it was claimed, was also necessary for general political reasons, because Austria was summoned to do so, as “Germany’s, indeed Europe’s great Catholic power for centuries”; however Austria could have no political influence on Germany, “if it does not continue to develop its power, also scientifically, to equal to every other power in Germany”.⁵³ It seems we are faced with a fundamental transformation in the aim of the university reforms during the restoration. Already fifty years ago, Hans Lentze spoke of a Catholic university as an answer to Germany – more precisely: to the evangelical Prussia – but also including the removal of the old Austrian clergy from academic influence.⁵⁴ If that is the case, and I believe it probably is, then we are dealing with anything but the “import” of a “German” model as a uniform entity. Thus I come to my second thesis:

Thesis 2: What was to be understood by the “German university” obviously changed fundamentally in the course of the political transformation towards neo-absolutism.

It is surprising not only how much Thun was nevertheless willing to adopt from the liberal principles of Exner and Bonitz, and to defend against both the bitter Catholic-conservative polemic that started up immediately after the introduction of the reforms, and also against the late Josephinians of the Vormärz, with their idea of the strict state regulation of the university.⁵⁵ It is also surprising that he did not dismiss the aforementioned Protestants who had been appointed before he took office. It is known that Thun refused to confirm the proposal by the philosophical faculty of the University of Vienna in 1851 to elect Bonitz as its dean, due to the “concerns” of the theological faculty.⁵⁶ Furthermore, the autonomy of the professors in making

⁵² Ibid., p. 22–23. “For a short time, one university that was characterised by luminaries of Catholic science and scholarship was the University of Munich. Even that short time showed what such a university could do for the state and the Church. It is high time that Austria now take up the task that which was dropped by Bavaria, and pursue this high aim to a greater degree with its large resources”. The signature of Constantin von Höfler, who had worked in Munich, might be apparent here, who at this time, according to HÖFLECHNER: *Nachholende Eigenentwicklung?*, p. 101, note 27, “belonged to Thun’s inner circle of advisors”, might be apparent here. However, LENTZE sees here, as elsewhere, evidence instead of the involvement of Karl Ernst Jarcke, who had also worked previously in Munich. Cf. e.g. LENTZE: *Die Universitätsreform*, p. 119. But according to LENTZE’S account, Jarcke’s comrade George Phillips, who also worked in Munich until 1847 – i.e. during the “short time” mentioned in the passage, is also a possibility.

⁵³ *Die Neugestaltung*, p. 23.

⁵⁴ LENTZE: *Die Universitätsreform*, p. 79–128, in particular p. 88.

⁵⁵ Cf. here once again in detail LENTZE: *Die Universitätsreform*, and in brief HÖFLECHNER: *Nachholende Eigenentwicklung?*, p. 99–100, 102.

⁵⁶ For a detailed description of this “supposedly for both sides embarrassing occasion”, see *Geschichte der Wiener Universität von 1848 bis 1898*. Als Huldigungsfestschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Regierungsjubiläum seiner k. und k. apostolischen Majestät des Kaisers Franz Josef I. herausgegeben vom Akademischen Senate der Wiener

appointment proposals and in other aspects of the internal “governance” of the university remained nominally in effect, but was very restricted in practice. As we know, the “provisional” organisational law of 1849 took effect definitively only in 1873; and Thun often ignored faculty suggestions when appointing professors.⁵⁷ As Lentze rightly stated fifty years ago: Had Thun allowed the senate and the faculties to operate autonomously in accordance with the law from the very outset, they would very quickly have abandoned the reform.⁵⁸ The initially proclaimed freedom of teaching and learning, especially the latter, was also gradually restricted. The relevant literature contains very differentiated explanations of these matters; but it is not mentioned anywhere that this was also the case at the German universities at that time and later, although the study and examination regulations were in fact not as detailed and structured as in the universities of the Habsburg monarchy.

In this context, one point should be highlighted explicitly: The famous words “Science and its teachings are free”, in other words the principle of the freedom not only of teaching, but also of teaching and *research* (noticeably without the freedom of learning!), came from the Frankfurt Pre-Parliament and were included in the (later rescinded) constitutional draft of 1849⁵⁹, but they were finally adopted only after the departure of Thun, namely in the constitution of 1867. Even after that, this noble principle was much more present in practice than before, but was never applied without restriction.

This brings me to the third part of my comments:

Viewed over the longer term: Can we not perhaps speak of an adoption of the German model over the course of the 19th century after all?

This question could be the subject of a separate study. Here, I just want to examine two aspects: First, we may ask: Did “the” German university in fact have its origin as a research university with the foundation of the University of Berlin in 1810, as is repeatedly claimed? As Heinz-Elmar Tenorth stated in his introduction to the fourth volume of the anniversary history of the Humboldt University in 2010, “one can hardly claim today, however, that it [the University of Berlin] provided an image since its foundation and to the present day, that can be characterised

Universität, Wien 1898, here p. 43–45. Cf. Franz Leander FILLAFER: Hermann Bonitz. Philologe, Mitschöpfer der Universitätsreform, in: ASH, EHMER (ed.): Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft, p. 189–196.

⁵⁷ On Thun’s appointment policy, especially in the “national” subjects of law, history and philosophy cf. Johannes FEICHTINGER: Wissenschaft als reflexives Projekt. Von Bolzano über Freud zu Kelsen: Österreichische Wissenschaftsgeschichte 1848–1938, Bielefeld 2010, Abs. 3.2.

⁵⁸ LENTZE: Die Universitätsreform, p. 40.

⁵⁹ Kaiserliches Patent vom 4. März 1849 über die, durch die constitutionelle Staatsform gewährleisteten politischen Rechte. Reproduced in: ENGELBRECHT: Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens, Vol. 4, 523–524, § 3.

sufficiently by the emphatic founding texts alone.”⁶⁰ Rather, the so-called “research imperative”,⁶¹ as it is known in the literature, took hold only gradually at the University of Berlin as the basis of an “education through science”. Accordingly, the system of the modern disciplines only started to take recognisable form around 1860, and only from this basis did the practices of the research university, with the accompanying, often lamented diversity of individual disciplines, become institutionalised in the second half of the 19th century.⁶² Evidence enough for this statement is provided by the palaces in Berlin that were fundamentally renovated, for example for the newly appointed natural scientist August Wilhelm Hofmann as professor of chemistry in 1865, or even built, as for Hermann Helmholtz, who became professor of physics in 1877. These magnificent buildings housed practically the entire teaching and research operations of each discipline, and at times also the institute directors themselves, with their families, who had official apartments there. The same can be said for the period of the institutionalisation of the humanities, albeit not for the size and splendour of their respective buildings. As early as the 1990s Bernhard vom Brocke prepared a table showing the foundation dates of the seminars at the German universities, namely for the classical and then for the modern philologies, modern history and philosophy; they appear in the plural only from the 1870s onward.⁶³

If we do not take the philosophical faculty *pars pro toto* for the university as a whole, as happens too frequently, but instead think also of the medical, legal and theological faculties, whose primary function as training centres for the professions has never been doubted, the question arises: Did the universities of the Habsburg monarchy actually and extensively become research universities in the sense of the supposed “German model”, however one wants to understand it, immediately after 1848, or was it not rather the case that something else emerged as a result of the reforms – in Prussia and the other German states as well as in Austria –, possibly a kind of hybrid mixture of teaching institution and research university?

A few years ago, in his essay “Österreich: eine verspätete Wissenschaftsnation?”, Walter Höflechner rightly referred to the fact that the rapid development of the natural sciences and

⁶⁰ Heinz-Elmar TENORTH: *Genese der Disziplinen – Konstitution der Universität. Zur Einleitung*, in: IDEM. (ed.): *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden, Vol. 4. Praxis ihrer Disziplinen. Genese der Disziplinen. Konstitution der Universität*, Berlin 2010, p. 9–42, here p. 10.

⁶¹ For this term see R. Steven TURNER: *The Prussian Universities and the Research Imperative 1806 to 1848*. Phil. Diss. Princeton University 1973; IDEM.: *The Growth of Professorial Research in Prussia, 1818 to 1848: Causes and Context*, in: *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences* 3 (1971), p. 137–182.

⁶² TENORTH: *Genese der Disziplinen*, p. 35–36.

⁶³ Bernhard VOM BROCKE: *Wege aus der Krise: Universitätsseminar, Akademiekommission oder Forschungsinstitut. Formen der Institutionalisierung in den Geistes- und Naturwissenschaften 1810 – 1900 – 1995*, in: Christoph KÖNIG, Eberhard LÄMMERT (ed.): *Konkurrenten in der Fakultät. Kultur, Wissen und Universität um 1900*, Frankfurt a. M. 1999, p. 191–217, here the table in p. 196–199.

the differentiation of subjects like the humanities, as well as the associated growth of the university, which however did not always keep pace with these developments, that all of this happened almost simultaneously in the German and in the Cisleithanian universities of the Habsburg monarchy, in other words in parallel and with reference to one other.⁶⁴ A concrete example of this might be the institutionalisation of the discipline of history. According to Oswald Redlich, the history seminar at the University of Vienna was initially established together with the seminar founded by Bonitz for philology already in 1849, but according to Redlich the objective of the founder, Wilhelm Heinrich Grauert, was rather teacher training than education for or by means of scientific research. Only the new statutes of the seminar in 1873 fixed the modern objective.⁶⁵

The work by Elmar Schübl, mentioned in the first part of this essay, provides an abundance of examples of a parallel development in the natural sciences. There, the differentiation of the professorial chairs and institutes in the earth sciences from the original chair in “natural history” is presented impressively; however upon closer inspection it can be seen that this development took off fully only from 1860, i.e. after Thun’s period in office.⁶⁶ If we now also include the series of non-university research institutes and projects, which began as early as 1847 with the foundation of the Academy of Sciences and continued during the neo-absolutist period with the Imperial Geological Institute (*Geologische Reichsanstalt*, 1849), the Central Institute for Meteorology and Earth Magnetism (*Zentralanstalt für Meteorologie und Erdmagnetismus*, 1851) and the Institute (significantly, initially called: School!) for Austrian Historical Research (*Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 1854), it is justifiable to ask whether a research policy centred on the monarchy during neo-absolutism was oriented towards these institutes, while the universities continued to be conceived in the first instance as teaching institutes – as they were indeed called in the “Draft of the main features” in 1848.

I would like to ask a second question in this connection, which refers to a different, as yet undiscussed level of meaning of the term “German university”: Did the scientists and scholars educated in Austria actually and without restriction become part of a now transnational,

⁶⁴ Walter HÖFLECHER: Österreich: eine verspätete Wissenschaftsnation? in: Karl ACHAM (ed.): Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften, Vol. 1: Historischer Kontext, wissenschaftssoziologische Befunde und methodologische Voraussetzungen, Wien 1999, p. 93–114.

⁶⁵ Oswald REDLICH: Zur Geschichte des historischen Seminars an der Universität Wien (1911), in: IDEM.: Ausgewählte Schriften, Zürich, Leipzig, Wien 1928, p. 127–140, here p. 128, 132–133. On the institutionalisation of the discipline of history in Austria see i.a. Pavel KOLAR: Geschichtswissenschaft in Zentraleuropa. Die Universitäten Prag, Wien und Berlin um 1900, Leipzig 2008.

⁶⁶ ENGELBRECHT 1848: Einrichtung des Unterrichtsministeriums lists further examples of institute foundations, which he considers to have resulted from the Thunian university reform, but many of these, too, took place only after 1860. The majority of the listed institute and clinic foundations that occurred during Thun’s time in office, were in the medical faculty, whose development towards research orientation had already begun before 1848.

German-speaking system that also included the German-speaking universities in Switzerland? This is claimed everywhere as a matter of course, but rarely actually proven. If we recall the aforementioned consequences of the Concordat of 1855 until its suspension in 1870, we can already find reasons there for a sceptical view of this issue. Let us extend the view to the whole period until the turn of the 20th century and ask, at first purely empirically: How did the circulation in the overall system look, compared to that within the German-speaking parts of the Habsburg monarchy?

I draw clues for answering this question from two new works: the dissertation by Jan Surman, “Habsburg Universities: Biography of a Space”⁶⁷ and the previously mentioned postdoctoral thesis by Elmar Schübl, which provides valuable information on this topic. I shall keep my findings as brief and concise as possible: The saying that was also bandied about at the time: “condemned to Czernowitz, pardoned to Graz, appointed to Vienna” sounds quite nice, does actually reflect something like a hierarchy of the Cisleithanian universities in the late 19th century (interestingly, without including Innsbruck), and was perhaps peddled constantly at the time as a result, but it does not represent a typical career description. Of course, what applied to great researchers like Ernst Mach and Ludwig Boltzmann must not necessarily have been the norm, and nor was it. The stage model of the career paths at the German universities in the 19th century, advanced by Marita Baumgarten in 1997, with introductory, transit, and goal or top universities⁶⁸ is applicable to the Cisleithanian universities only to a very limited degree at best. Rather, it would appear that a kind of Austrian model of remaining and advancing at one university continued to be the general rule in many faculties. This implied, but apparently self-evident career model foresaw limited vertical mobility – essentially up to the title of associate professor. Thereafter, the vast majority remained where they were, a few rose – often after long waiting periods – to the position of tenured associate professor, and even fewer then became full professors. This applies in particular to the medical faculties, especially in Vienna, for obvious reasons: a doctor generally set up his own practice, completed his habilitation, and then had no reason to move elsewhere. A few stars managed to achieve career advancement in medicine by means of geographical mobility, but this does not appear to have been possible for the majority of professors. And the limits of this social mobility, along with economic reasons, were manifold – for example, religion (for Jews), but this was not the only limiting factor. The famous exceptions only confirm this rule.

⁶⁷ Jan SURMAN: Habsburg Universities: Biography of a Space, phil. Diss. Universität Wien, 2012.

⁶⁸ Marita BAUMGARTEN: Professoren und Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert. Zur Sozialgeschichte deutscher Geistes- und Naturwissenschaftler (Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft Bd. 121), Göttingen 1997. The terms “goal or top university” for the universities in Berlin, Munich and Leipzig come from me; Baumgarten speaks instead, somewhat clumsily, of “final stations”.

Incidentally, this Austrian career path, like so many other things, was already mapped out in one essential sense in the aforementioned “Draft of the main features” of 1848, like so many other aspects. It states there that “the associate professorial chairs are the preliminary steps to full professorship”.⁶⁹ And that is how it was generally managed subsequently – in the Habsburg monarchy, but much more rarely in the German lands. The published results from the project “The philosophical faculty of the University of Vienna around 1900” reinforce this finding.⁷⁰ There were repeated attempts to appoint professors from Germany, but they often failed simply because the Ministry of Finance was not prepared to meet the salary demands and other requirements of those colleagues sought by the faculties – and because the Ministry of Education, well aware of this fact, only rarely dared to take on and forward such demands.⁷¹ All of this produces the following, third thesis with regard to our subject:

Thesis 3: Viewed over the longer term, there was an (almost) simultaneous development towards the research university (only partly realised) in the German-speaking countries with mutual or unilateral reference made by the competing states and countries to one another, rather than an adoption or imitation of only one (in itself barely formed) “system” by another.

Conclusion

It would appear that a differentiated new version of the narrative that has been continued for decades is needed, with regard to the adoption of **the** German university model into the Habsburg monarchy around 1848. I have suggested aspects of such a new version here, without being able to address them in detail. The reason why the conventional story had such a long life is probably due, apart from the known lethargy and laziness of some authors in the academic and political fields, to their different motivations, some of which were political in nature. First steps have already been taken to analyse these motives.⁷²

In his essay from 2010, which has been cited frequently in this chapter, Walter Höflechner asked in this context whether we are in fact dealing with a “catching-up self-development” (“*nachholende Eigenentwicklung*”), and he bristled somewhat – rightly – against the title prescribed for him by the editor of the volume. As far as “catching up” is concerned, the key

⁶⁹ Entwurf der Grundzüge, § 69.

⁷⁰ Irene RANZMAIER: Die Philosophische Fakultät um 1900, in: Katharina KNIEFACZ, Elisabeth NEMETH, Herbert POSCH, Friedrich STADLER (ed.), Universität – Forschung – Lehre (650 Jahre Universität Wien, Bd. 1), Göttingen, Wien 2015, p. 133–148.

⁷¹ This situation became the subject of a severe public controversy due to a report by the faculty published in 1902. A detailed description of the controversial positions is provided by Walter HÖFLECHNER: Die Österreichische Rektorenkonferenz 1911–1938, 1945–1969, Fassung B. Preprint, Graz 1992.

⁷² Cf. the essay by Johannes FEICHTINGER and Franz Leander FILLAFER in this volume.

point has just been covered by Thesis 3. But Höflechner also refrains from explicitly using the word “self-development” for the Austrian universities, with regard to their organisational form: “It is very bluntly borrowed from the German model.”⁷³ Despite all of the qualifications presented by himself and in this essay, he therefore continues to uphold the accepted view that the reformers oriented themselves to a German model, without asking the perhaps more obvious question, frequently raised here, as to what extent this supposedly uniform, but strangely vague “German model” existed at all around 1848, in other words, what could have been meant specifically by this concept at the time, and what on earth had to be “caught up to”. Thus also in this regard, the Austrian historiography – like the historiography of the monarchy overall and like many other national historiographies too – still remains much too self-contained.⁷⁴ A truly thoroughgoing analysis of this European relational history from both, indeed: from several sides would be a worthwhile topic for further research.

⁷³ HÖFLECHNER: *Nachholende Eigenentwicklung?*, p. 107.

⁷⁴ Matthias STICKLER: „Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918“ – Ein Jahrhundertwerk auf der Zielgeraden, in: *Historische Zeitschrift* 295 (2012), p. 690–719.

Thomas Maisel

Freedom of teaching and learning and the first steps towards a university and academic reform in the revolutionary year of 1848

Hardly any slogan of the Vienna Revolution of 1848 is more firmly anchored in the collective memory than that of the freedom of teaching and learning. It was one of the demands made by the students of the University of Vienna on 12 March in their petition to Emperor Ferdinand I, along with the granting of the freedom of the press, free speech, the equality of the denominations, the publicness and orality of legal procedures and general popular representation.¹ This student petition was one of many that were formulated prior to the assembly of the Lower Austrian estates, which was planned for 13 March. The political situation had been unstable for some time, due to social and economic tensions; by the time news of the revolutionary events in France reached Austria, the government was incapable of reaching decisions.² While there certainly was a willingness to make reforms in the Vormärz, at least in terms of the academic system, no specific measures were ever taken. The bourgeois-liberal opposition that was forming at the time no longer trusted the ruling powers to manage the urgent economic and social problems, and demanded both reforms and participation in the political decision-making processes. In this heated pre-revolutionary climate, ca. 2,000 students of the university, above all medical, law and technical students of the polytechnic institute, assembled on 12 March, a Sunday, on the square in front of the university church, where they listened to the sermon by the university clergyman Anton Fuster,³ later chaplain of the Academic Legion, who incited their oppositional mood. The students forced their way into the university's auditorium, where the draft of the petition was resolved, signed by “Your Majesty's loyal students of Vienna”.

At the same time, the university professors had gathered in the nearby *Konsistorial-Saal*. They were concerned with preventing an escalation. They sent the professors Anton Hye⁴ and

¹ The text of the petition is printed i. a. in: Carl Ritter von HEINTL: *Mittheilungen aus den Universitäts-Acten* (vom 12. März bis 22. Juli 1848), Wien 1848, p. 1–2.

² Unless otherwise cited, the description of the revolutionary events of 1848 are based primarily on: Wolfgang HÄUSLER: *Von der Massenarmut zur Arbeiterbewegung. Demokratie und soziale Frage in der Wiener Revolution von 1848*, Wien, München 1979; Juliane MIKOLETZKY: „... um der Rettung der Freiheit willen!“. *Das Jahr 1848 und die Folgen am k. k. polytechnischen Institut in Wien* (Veröffentlichungen des Universitätsarchivs der Technischen Universität Wien, Bd. 3), Wien 1998; Thomas MAISEL: *Alma Mater auf den Barrikaden. Die Universität Wien im Revolutionsjahr 1848*, Wien 1998.

³ *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon (ÖBL) 1815–1950*, vol. 1, 2nd edition, Wien 1993, p. 382.

⁴ Gerhard OBERKOFER: *Studien zur Geschichte der österreichischen Rechtswissenschaft* (Rechtshistorische Reihe, Bd. 33), Frankfurt am Main u. a. 1984, p. 95–100; Wilhelm BRAUNEDER: *Juristen in Österreich 1200–1980*, Wien 1987, p. 152–155.

Stephan Ladislaus Endlicher⁵ to the students in the auditorium, who accepted their offer to present the petition at court. The next day, however, the assembled students were not pleased with what the two professors had to report from their audience. Neither the government nor the court agreed specifically to any of their demands. Consequently, and despite attempts by Professor Hye to urge “law and order”, the students decided to march on the Lower Austrian parliament, to reinforce their demands. The Vienna March Revolution took its course.

The government made extensive concessions as early as 15 March. On 23 March 1848, it resolved for the first time to establish a ministry of public education, to replace the Imperial Commission on Education,⁶ with authority transferred to the jurist, Franz von Sommaruga⁷ on the 27th of that month. Just three days later, the minister appeared before the students in the university auditorium and announced the reform of the educational system and a restructuring of the universities, namely, “similar [...] to those thriving universities in Germany, which we recognise as models of thorough scientific education. Its foundation will be the freedom of teaching and learning, bound by no other barrier than that of the constitutional laws.”⁸ The next day he also visited the polytechnic institute, although here his speech did not satisfy everyone. Later that same day he felt it was necessary to confirm in writing to the technical students that they would be treated as the absolute equals of the university in terms of being granted the freedom of teaching and learning.⁹

However Sommaruga was not the first to announce the much invoked freedom of teaching and learning in the revolutionary exuberance of the March days. The vice-director of the faculty of medicine, Ernst von Feuchtersleben,¹⁰ had already proclaimed this for medical studies at the University of Vienna on 19 March.¹¹ His role in the reform plans and measures of 1848 will be addressed in more detail below.

As already suggested by Sommaruga's sentence quoted above, the “classical university idea”, shaped by German idealism and new humanism, which emerged in deliberate contrast to the system of the French special schools, was an important reference point for the reformers of 1848. They considered the key task of the universities to be the free development of the sciences

⁵ Helmut DOLEZAL: Endlicher, Stephan Ladislaus, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 4, 1959, p. 496–497, [<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd100122434.html>], retrieved 31.08.2016.

⁶ HEINTL: *Mitteilungen*, p. 6.

⁷ ÖBL, vol. 12, 2005, p. 411–412.

⁸ Quoted from Richard MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen des österreichischen Studienwesens: Teil I: Abhandlung*, Wien 1963, p. 69.

⁹ MIKOLETZKY: *Rettung der Freiheit*, p. 25–26.

¹⁰ Karl PISA: *Ernst Freiherr von Feuchtersleben. Pionier der Psychosomatik*, Wien, Köln, Weimar 1998.

¹¹ Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: *Reformansätze vor der Thunschen Reform. Feuchtersleben und das Konzept einer genuin österreichischen Universitätsreform*, in: *Mensch – Wissenschaft – Magie. Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 18 (1998), p. 61.

without any influence from the authorities, and in the scientific character of teaching. This, along with the specific organisational form – keyword “professorial university” – is what characterised the “German university model”, as it developed primarily in Prussia, and it contrasted conspicuously with the Austrian academic system prior to 1848.¹² This system was widely rejected, especially by students and younger intellectuals. In the latter group, the medical students in particular must be highlighted, who were strongly represented among the leaders of the 1848 revolution.¹³

Universities and instruction in Austria had been subjected to rigorous state supervision with its associated restrictions ever since the Theresian-Josephinian reforms of the 18th century.¹⁴ The dominance of the Jesuit order was replaced successively in the case of the University of Vienna by state supervision under the auspices of enlightened absolutism. The German “Enlightenment universities” of Halle (1694) and Göttingen (1734), where the foundations were laid for the freedom of teaching and learning on the basis of religious tolerance and the free development of scientific discourse, formed an important reference point; yet the state control of university teaching as practised in Austria represented a special development in the Holy Roman Empire.¹⁵ In Austria, while the traditional corporative organisational forms of the University of Vienna that emerged in the Middle Ages were formally retained, they were, however, undermined and marginalised.¹⁶ Academic directors appointed by the Emperor belonged, as instructors in their subjects, to the Imperial Commission on Education, which was established in 1760. They were simultaneously presidents of their respective faculty, they chaired the faculty assembly, and controlled the observance of the study regulations. In Vienna, they were assisted by vice-directors. Professors could not be elected as deans, and also did not belong to the university consistory, which was subordinate to the Imperial Commission on Education. In Vienna and

¹² On the Prussian university model cf. Christophe CHARLE: Grundlagen, in: Walter RÜEGG (ed.): *Geschichte der Universität in Europa*, Bd. III: Vom 19. Jahrhundert zum Zweiten Weltkrieg (1800–1945), München 2004, p. 55–59.

¹³ Gernot STIMMER: Die Mythologisierung der Revolution von 1848 als Modell einer Studentenrevolution, in: *Student und Hochschule im 19. Jahrhundert. Studien und Materialien*, Göttingen 1975, p. 245.

¹⁴ Cf. Peter STACHEL: Das österreichische Bildungssystem zwischen 1749 und 1918, in: Karl ACHAM: *Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften*, Vol. 1: Historischer Kontext, wissenschaftssoziologische Befunde und methodologische Voraussetzungen, Wien 1999, p. 115–127, and still the standard work by Helmut ENGELBRECHT: *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens. Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs*, Bd. 3: Von der frühen Aufklärung bis zum Vormärz, Wien 1984, p. 180–202.

¹⁵ Cf. Notker HAMMERSTEIN: Besonderheiten der österreichischen Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsreform zur Zeit Maria Theresias und Josephs II., in: *Österreich im Europa der Aufklärung*, Bd. 2, Wien 1985, p. 787–812; Hubert WEITENSFELDER: Studium und Staat. Heinrich Graf Rottenhan und Johann Melchior von Birkenstock als Repräsentanten der österreichischen Bildungspolitik um 1800 (Schriftenreihe des Universitätsarchivs, Universität Wien, Bd. 9), Wien 1996, p. 13–19.

¹⁶ On the extensive dissolution of the university corporation rights in the Josephinian period cf. Rudolf KINK: *Geschichte der kaiserlichen Universität zu Wien*, Erster Band, I. Theil: Geschichtliche Darstellung der Entstehung und Entwicklung der Universität bis zur Neuzeit, Wien 1854, p. 559–564.

Prague the faculties mutated into colleges, which were dominated by the alumni, the doctors. Faculty meetings were chaired by the academic directors in their dual function as faculty president. The “doctoral faculties” had no influence on teaching, except for their involvement in viva voce examinations and doctorates, and their power was limited to the remains of the representational and corporation rights, and the administration of widows’ welfare funds. Professors, who could also belong to the doctoral colleges (*Doktorenkollegien*) as individuals (indeed compulsorily from 1817, when all doctors based in Vienna had to join their faculty), formed the personnel of the so-called “studies”, which were set up in parallel to the faculty structure: the theological, juridical-political, medical and philosophical studies, chaired by the respective academic directors. Professors were appointed to vacant chairs by means of competition. Chairs could also be filled temporarily by associates, and some chairs were filled by adjuncts and assistants as a form of developing junior staff.¹⁷

State curricula determined university teaching; in their lectures, professors mostly had to keep to the textbooks prescribed by the state, which was monitored by the academic directors. Professors required approval to use their own notebooks, manuscripts and propositions. The reformers of the 18th century regarded the purpose of university study above all under the aspect of usefulness with regard to the training of state officials, teachers and doctors. In all faculties, studies were structured by year, in which students had to prove their docility in semester and annual examinations. Philosophical studies had above all a propaedeutic function. In order to study at one of the “higher” faculties of theology, law or medicine, it was necessary to prove the completion of two obligatory philosophical years (from 1824, prior to that it had been three), which was done at the six-grade secondary school. A subsequent course of study at the philosophical faculty to attain a doctorate was not very attractive and considered by most to be pointless – for example, in 1833 there were only 4 candidates for a doctorate in philosophy, while in the same year 20 doctors of law and 78 doctors of medicine were created.¹⁸

The deficits of this academic system under state paternalism, which had nonetheless effected some progress upon its introduction, for example in the area of medical training, were widely recognised. There was a temporary relaxation of state control under the brief regency of Emperor Leopold II, when the academic directors and the Imperial Commission on Education were abolished and the teaching staff of the universities were granted a large share of the management and administration of the teaching system. An academic committee served as a

¹⁷ On the organisation and studies at the University of Vienna in the Vormärz cf. Hans LENTZE: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsberichte 239/2), Wien 1962, p. 19–24, and MEISTER: Reformen, p. 47.

¹⁸ These figures were taken from: Taschenbuch der Wiener Universität für das Jahr 1834, Wien, p. 110–117.

supervisory authority, chaired by the rector, in which representatives of the teaching staff could also be present. Some even dreamed of the realisation of a “Catholic Göttingen” in Vienna.¹⁹ But it didn’t come to that. Under the regencies of Emperors Franz II/I and Ferdinand I there was a return to the stricter supervision of the educational system. The fear of the spread of revolutionary ideas, of the idea of freedom and national identity, determined the government’s view of the universities, which should continue serving as training establishments and not as centres of science. The students in particular were rightly regarded as potential refuges of revolutionary activity. Academic directors (1802) and the Imperial Commission on Education (1806) were reintroduced.²⁰

When in March 1848 a fundamental reform of university studies on the basis of the freedom of teaching and learning was announced by Minister Sommaruga, one did not have to rely solely on the model of the German universities. It was also possible to revert personally and conceptually to Austrian initiatives that had been taken well before the outbreak of the revolution. Reform discussions had been conducted for all faculty areas in the decades prior to 1848, which were nurtured both by the teaching staff and the government, where not least concerns about the disadvantageous scientific consequences of scientific backwardness had a motivating impact.²¹ The plans and drafts from the fields of medical and philosophical studies were of particular significance for the measures taken from 1848, containing the beginnings of some of the reforms that were implemented later.²² A new curriculum for the philosophical faculty was produced in 1805, which aimed to contribute “to richer scientific development” with the help of so-called “free lectures” alongside the obligatory one.²³ The success, however, was modest, also because some of the teaching staff available were not up to the job. A new syllabus was introduced in 1824, and would become more comprehensive during its implementation in the area of the so-called “free subjects” over the course of the 1830s and 1840s. From 1826/27 it was intended to develop plans for the reform of the entire philosophical curriculum, however it took until 1837 before a detailed report could be presented to the Emperor by the Imperial Commission on Education. He returned the report in 1838 with the demand to improve secondary school teaching at the same time. The Imperial Commission on

¹⁹ Cf. Sigmund ADLER: *Die Unterrichtsverfassung Kaiser Leopolds II. und die finanzielle Fundierung der österreichischen Universitäten nach den Anträgen Martinis*, Wien, Leipzig 1917, and WEITENSFELDER: *Studium und Staat*, p. 18–19, 147–151; the vision of a “Catholic Göttingen” was held above all by Johann Melchior von Birkenstock, *ibid.*, p. 48–52.

²⁰ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 22.

²¹ Walter HÖFLECHNER: *Nachholende Eigenentwicklung? Der Umbau des habsburgischen Universitätssystems nach der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, in: Rüdiger VOM BRUCH (ed.): *Die Berliner Universität im Kontext der deutschen Universitätslandschaft*, München 2010, p. 93–94.

²² MEISTER: *Reformen*, p. 111.

²³ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 19.

Education established a committee specifically for this purpose only in 1845, to which the Prague philosophy professor Franz Exner belonged, who had written reports and a memorandum already in 1844 on the reform of the philosophical studies, the educational system, and the new provisions on appointments to professorial chairs. The report then presented by the committee in 1846 is influenced very significantly by his ideas. While by necessity the philosophical faculty was to continue providing general education in preparation for university studies, it was at least planned to expand the free subjects into a scientific course. Exner also foresaw a second department of philosophical studies, which would offer a higher specialist education.²⁴

A new curriculum was issued for medical studies in 1833, however three years later it was modified and improved. A key point of the proposals addressed by a commission in 1845 and 1846 was the abolition of the separation between physicians and surgeons, and the introduction of a doctorate in general medical science. At the same time, a faculty panel dedicated itself to the organisational reform of the faculty of medicine by creating a draft of new faculty statutes. The draft was still based on traditional organisation. It provided for expanded authorisation for the dean, who led the faculty, and the independence of the teaching staff from the faculty (doctoral college) in academic matters. Some sections were to be established within the faculty for scientific purposes. The teaching staff, i.e. the professors, should form the academic department in the faculty under the chair of the academic (vice-) director. This solution contains elements of that which was later implemented by the provisional organisation law of 1849 for Vienna and Prague.²⁵

What all of the drafts – there were also some for the theological and the juridical-political studies – have in common is the retention of the obligatory preparatory studies at the philosophical faculty and the six-grade secondary school. The structure of the studies by year with mandatory semester and annual examinations was also preserved, with the exception of medicine, where the corset of division-by-year was not deemed expedient. There was agreement on the desire to abolish the previously prescribed examinations for the appointment of new professors (with some exceptions). Incoming applications should be examined by the teaching staff, and their report, based on scientific criteria, was to be presented to the Imperial Commission on Education, which would then make the appointment suggestion to the Emperor. In general, all of the proposals and reports provided for an extension of the possibilities of influence by the teaching staff. Along with professors there should also be lecturers, who should

²⁴ On the Vormärz reform efforts in the area of philosophical studies cf. MEISTER: Reformen, p. 58–63.

²⁵ On the reform proposals for medical studies cf. MEISTER: Reformen, p. 52–54.

provide evidence of their scientific ability and a teaching programme, in order to receive approval. All drafts on academic reform prior to 1848 are aimed at a freer and more scientific design of teaching; although admittedly there was no talk of the freedom of teaching and learning. Jurists and physicians demanded the abolition of the prescribed textbooks (though not the theologians), the philosophers wanted to keep the textbooks for the (obligatory) general education studies; the teaching contents of the free subjects were to be made known to the directorate (or vice-directorate). What all of the proposals, drafts and reports also had in common was that they were not implemented. This can also be seen as a symptom of the government's inability to act prior to the outbreak of the revolution. Only the turbulent events of the March days of 1848 led to the first specific measures.

Thus the possibility to draw on the preliminary work and reform discussions of the 1840s contributed significantly, along with the much-vaunted model of the German universities, to the fact that the reform process took off astonishingly quickly from the end of March 1848.²⁶ Under pressure from students and young academics, the university decided already on 24 March to “democratise” the consistory, which was to be strengthened by additional members from the doctoral colleges and, for the first time, by representatives of the students.²⁷ However this was never implemented, since in the meantime the Ministry of Education had been called into life, under whose leadership the development of the general university reform should take place. This remained to be seen.

On 5 April 1848 the Minister of Education, Sommaruga, convened a committee of experts to develop the reforms, which included the professor for botany at the faculty of medicine, Stephan Ladislaus Endlicher, and the law professor Anton Hye, who were already mentioned as bearers of the students' petition, and, with the Prague professor Franz Exner and the vice-director of the faculty of medicine, Ernst von Feuchtersleben, two personalities who would significantly influence the further development.²⁸ Plans and specific measures covered the entire complex of questions regarding the renewal of the universities and secondary schools: the management of the universities and faculties, appointments to professorial chairs, the approval of lecturers and the whole reorganisation of the academic and examination system stood on the agenda.

The first decisive decree (one of the “provisional orders”) by the ministry on 6 April 1848 concerned the leadership of the educational institutes, which included the faculty studies.²⁹ This

²⁶ HÖFLECHNER: *Nachholende Eigenentwicklung*, p. 96.

²⁷ Walter GOLDINGER: *Die Wiener Universität und die Studienreform von 1848/49*, in: *Wiener Geschichtsblätter* 4 (1949) No. 1, p. 10.

²⁸ MEISTER: *Reformen*, p. 69–70.

²⁹ GOLDINGER: *Studienreform*, p. 10, and MEISTER: *Reformen*, p. 70.

was transferred to the teaching staff, i.e. the professors, however still under the chairmanship of the academic vice-director. Decisions on academic matters were to be made within the college by majority vote.

On 10 May 1848 the relocation of the two preparatory years from the philosophical faculty to the secondary school was introduced.³⁰ With the temporary retention of the existing obligatory subjects (religion, philosophy, mathematics, classical literature and natural history), the establishment of the seventh secondary school grade was ordered from the 1848/49 academic year. This formed the key prerequisite for the complete redesign of the philosophical faculty studies, which would become the core of the incipient reform process. It can be seen how strongly the measures and plans introduced affected the traditional view in Austria of the structures of a university from the fact that, for example, the new concept of faculty, based on the German model had to be explained to an interested public in a newspaper article as the “epitome of the teachers and students”, in contrast to the local understanding as a corporation of doctors.³¹ The communication with the “general intelligence” (Feuchtersleben’s term) by explaining the reform programmes in press organs that were now uncensored was at any rate a characteristic of the reform process during the revolution: It was intended to be transparent and obliged to the general public.³²

Equally, the students – who were, after all, responsible for prompting the rapid implementation of the freedom of teaching and learning – were also to be involved in the reform process. On 29 March, i.e. just a few days after the creation of the Ministry of Education, a decree was passed concerning the establishment of a students’ committee that would address the planned academic and university reforms in an advisory capacity.³³ The fact that this committee however was soon dedicated to other tasks and began to take on executive functions instead of centralised authorities, can perhaps be explained by the fact that the key demand of the students for the freedom of learning had been conceded very quickly. The obligation to sit the hated semester and annual examinations was suspended, first by the faculty of medicine, from 25 March; the entitlement to continue studying was now dependent only on frequentation records.³⁴ This was soon extended to the juridical-political and philosophical studies.³⁵ The obligation to attend church services on Sundays and holidays was also abolished. As a result of

³⁰ MEISTER: Reformen, p. 71.

³¹ HÖFLECHNER: Eigenentwicklung, p. 96. The article from the Constitutionellen Donau-Zeitung (April 1848) is reproduced by MEISTER: Reformen, Teil 2: Dokumente, p. 231–234.

³² EGGLMAIER: Reformansätze, p. 82–83.

³³ MIKOLETZKY: Rettung der Freiheit, p. 24–25, and STIMMER: Mythologisierung, p. 270.

³⁴ HEINTL: Mittheilungen, p. 7–8.

³⁵ Ibid.

the freedom of learning, the examinations system was also changed, so that the obligatory subjects could be examined in any order. Only somewhat later, in summer 1848, were the prohibitions on studying abroad and on the attendance at Austrian universities by foreigners were suspended, since these were not compatible with the freedom of teaching and learning.³⁶

The approval of lecturers was first regulated in that, in accordance with the freedom of teaching in faculties, which had the right to award doctorates, all doctors were permitted to hold scientific lectures after prior registration.³⁷ A ministerial decision of 6 July 1848 then approved, at first provisionally, the regulation on the habilitation of academic lecturers as presented by the philosophical faculty: The candidate had to prove his specialist knowledge with a treatise in German, a lecture programme, and a trial lecture including colloquium.³⁸

This overview summarises the key specific measures taken prior to the overthrow of the Pillersdorf ministry on 18 July 1848, during which the Minister of Education, Sommaruga, also resigned. Immediately afterwards, the “Draft of the main features of the public educational system in Austria” was published in the *Wiener Zeitung*, which had been written by the member of the scientific advisory board at the Ministry of Education, Franz Exner.³⁹ The “draft” was at the same time a statement of the activities of the ministry to date, and a programme for the reform measures to be realised in the future, presented for public evaluation by all who are qualified by their knowledge and interest, as it says in the introduction. Divided into three “departments”, it is concerned with all levels of the educational system, although the secondary schools and universities in particular were to be subjected to significant reform. It openly addresses some problems that hinder the implementation of such a comprehensive task, and which could not yet be removed in the short time since the outbreak of the revolution, such as the fact that “a sufficient number of competent teachers” did not yet exist and had to be trained. The defined purpose of the universities was that they should guarantee an academic education in the general sciences and humanities, but also training for those “official positions” that required preparatory education in special subjects on the basis of secondary school education. The orientation on the model of the “non-Austrian” German universities was mentioned explicitly by Exner, especially also with regard to the expected future “exchange traffic” between the Austrian and German universities. This corresponds with the “draft” in that it places the expedient leadership of an educational institute in the hands of “expert men” – in the

³⁶ HEINTL: *Mittheilungen*, p. 84–85.

³⁷ GOLDINGER: *Studienreform*, p. 10.

³⁸ MEISTER: *Reformen*, p. 71, and HEINTL: *Mittheilungen*, p. 79.

³⁹ “Entwurf der Grundzüge des öffentlichen Unterrichtswesens in Österreich”, published in the *Wiener Zeitung* in July 1848, auch als Sonderdruck der k. k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei (o. J.) im Archiv der Universität Wien (Signatur B-793). The text is also reproduced in full in MEISTER: *Reformen*, Teil 2: *Dokumente*, p. 241–261.

case of the universities, therefore, of the teaching staff. Control and financing lay with the state. The freedom of teaching and learning should effect a “strong development” in the students and the “refinement of the character” by means of science and scholarship and “appropriate discipline” – a formulation that reveals the fear that the freedoms just granted might lead to a degree of aimlessness among students.

The organisational plan of the “Draft of the main features of the educational system” speaks clearly in favour of the realisation of a professorial university and provides the foundations for the provisional law on the organisation of the academic authorities, which was decided one year later.⁴⁰ Exner’s draft envisaged that there should be four academic departments in the university, which should be called faculties (although theology should be comprised of two departments, one Catholic and one Protestant – this plan could not be realised in the era of neo-absolutism). In the broadest sense the faculty encompassed all teachers and students, in the narrower sense, however, i.e. as an administrative collegiate authority, only the teachers, namely all full and associate professors and two representatives of the private lecturers. However only the former were entitled to elect the dean. In contrast to the later Thunian regulations, students were granted participation in faculty agendas and in the academic senate to a limited degree; of course this was a concession to the revolutionary student body. Furthermore, the students were entitled to found their own fraternities, but the academic senate had to be informed of the name of the fraternity and its purpose, board and number of members. The permission to form a fraternity was also not adopted during the neo-absolutist era.

A very specific problem for the University of Vienna was the doctoral colleges, which had previously been considered the “actual” faculties. According to the “draft”, the corporations of doctors could only remain in existence if they themselves so wished. The description of their role in university life remains incredibly vague. This problem influenced the reform discussion not only in the revolutionary year, but also for a long time afterwards. The doctoral colleges were finally excluded from the universities only with the organisation law of 1873.⁴¹

After Sommaruga’s resignation, Exner rejected the offer of the office of education minister; as did Ernst von Feuchtersleben, who had been an advisor for medical studies. The latter then took on a leading role in the reform process as undersecretary until the suppression of the revolution in October 1848, while the department was being run provisionally by the Minister of the Interior, Franz von Doblhoff-Dier. Although Feuchtersleben agreed with Exner on many points,

⁴⁰ RGBl. 401/1849, also contained in Georg THAA: Sammlung der für die österreichischen Universitäten giltigen Gesetze und Verordnungen, Wien 1871, No. 33.

⁴¹ RGBl 63/1873, reprinted and commented in Leo Ritter BECK VON MANNAGETTA, Carl VON KELLE: Die österreichischen Universitätsgesetze, Wien 1906, p. 23–29.

he took a different path in matters of university organisation: The doctoral colleges should still be involved, and should exert a larger influence on university business, together with the (private) lecturers and students.⁴²

Feuchtersleben's previous activities under Sommaruga were mostly limited to the medical faculty, whereby his suggestions were at first strongly influenced by the Vormärz drafts of 1845/46.⁴³ In his view, these required above all the additional foundation of the now granted principle of the freedom of teaching and learning. The competitive procedure for occupying professorial chairs should be abolished. Instead, he envisaged a completely free contest and the selection of the candidates by the academic senate. It should also be possible to appoint foreigners and practical physicians. However, a conversion into a professorial faculty was not his goal, according to his draft of April 1848, the chair of studies should remain with the state-appointed directors. He did not believe that this contradicted the freedom of teaching: Lecturers should be allowed to teach in accordance with their scientific convictions. The medical doctoral college should also not be excluded from the university. Rather, Feuchtersleben considered it to be an academic guild organisation that should contribute to the development of scientific life and act as a professional body.

The necessary natural science and philosophical pre-education of the students should be provided by the secondary schools and certified by a maturity examination. However the freedom of learning, which must be guaranteed under all circumstances, presented a problem. In Feuchtersleben's draft for a medical curriculum of May 1848, which was submitted to the faculty for consultation, it says: one can no longer speak in any case of a curriculum, with "the given freedom of teaching and learning".⁴⁴ He merely wanted to provide students with a programme of suggestions as to which sequence of courses was the most expedient. Theoretical lessons should have priority over practical ones. Naturally, students should be granted the free choice of teachers. In a newspaper article for the non-medical public, Feuchtersleben explained the future position of the medical faculty. He advocated the suspension of the separate graduations of physicians and surgeons, the independent development of medical education (secured by the freedom of teaching and learning), and the establishment of institutes, a proposal that had already been made in 1846 by Josef Skoda.⁴⁵ Particularly important to

⁴² MEISTER: Reformen, p. 76–77, and in particular EGGLMAIER: Reformansätze, p. 59 and 82–85.

⁴³ The following depiction of the reform activities of Feuchtersleben is based above all on EGGLMAIER: Reformansätze. On his reform plans with regard to medical studies, cf. also ERNA LESKY: Die Wiener medizinische Schule im 19. Jahrhundert (Studien zur Geschichte der Universität Wien VI), Graz, Köln 1965, p. 119–121.

⁴⁴ Cited from EGGLMAIER: Reformansätze, p. 63.

⁴⁵ LESKY: Schule, p. 121.

Feuchtersleben was competent preliminary education and training in the area of the natural sciences⁴⁶ and philosophy, where he agreed for the most part with Exner.

The first specific measures of academic reform during Feuchtersleben's time as undersecretary also affected medical studies above all. With a decree of 4 August 1848, the writing of a dissertation and the presentation of a disputation were abolished as prerequisites for a doctorate in medicine; now only the viva voce was required.⁴⁷ A short time later there was an ordinance on the suspension of the lower surgical studies for the training of surgeons. The purpose of studying medicine should be to attain a doctorate medical science in general, but the introduction of a contemporary medical viva voce ordinance was not yet successful.

Two further decrees were issued by the ministry in August, which ordered the abolition of competitive examinations for the occupation of vacant professorial chairs and introduced an appointment policy, which envisaged the involvement of the teaching staff, whose suggestions should be presented to the Minister of Education.⁴⁸ This affected all faculties. However, no definitive regulation came into effect before the suppression of the revolution; that only occurred with a decree of December 1848.

Feuchtersleben was not satisfied with the progress of the reform under Minister Sommaruga. He recognised that its realisation was also hampered by the fact that professors belonged to the teaching staff who did not meet the desired requirements. Structural reforms take a long time, and a lot could have been achieved if those teachers who had been unsatisfactory for years were simply removed. Feuchtersleben regarded this as the easiest measure to guarantee improved teaching as quickly as possible. Thus he conceived a series of subservient talks for the departmental head, Interior Minister Doblhoff, which contained "discharge suggestions" – not only dismissals, but also transfers – for all educational institutes in Vienna.⁴⁹ In this respect, Feuchtersleben obviously stood much more strongly under the impression of the revolutionary spirit of optimism than other agents of the educational reform, and also considered it his task to meet the demands of the student body, in which the radical-democratic had been successively gaining the upper hand since May 1848. Thus he also advocated the dismissal of the law professor Anton Hye, whom he by no means regarded as incapable, but who had lost all credit among the revolutionaries due to his agreement with the unsuccessful efforts by the government

⁴⁶ On the plan developed by Feuchtersleben and Carl Bernhard Brühl for a natural history institute based on the French model cf. Herbert Hans EGGLMAIER: *Naturgeschichte. Wissenschaft und Lehrfach. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des naturhistorischen Unterrichts in Österreich* (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz 22), Graz 1988, p. 213–219.

⁴⁷ MEISTER: *Reformen*, p. 109.

⁴⁸ EGGLMAIER: *Reformansätze*, p. 75.

⁴⁹ EGGLMAIER: *Reformansätze*, p. 68–72.

to dissolve the Academic Legion in May, and who was even accused of high treason. Therefore he was also concerned with the political safeguarding of the reform by considering the expectations of the students and proving the ministry's ability to act. The upcoming semester should be able to begin without disturbance. However his personnel measures only had actual consequences for the faculty of medicine, where five professors were removed with the consent of the Emperor at the end of September 1848. Due to the events of October there were no further subservient ministerial "discharge suggestions" for other faculties.

The planned, comparatively radical personnel measures point to Feuchtersleben's somewhat problematic relationship with professors, which can be ascribed to him based on a statement in the *Wiener Zeitung* of August 1848, in which he explained his ideas for reforming the university. These deviate clearly from Exner's draft, who envisaged the creation of professorial faculties based on the German model. To prevent a "caste-like closure" of the teaching staff, Feuchtersleben believed it was necessary to involve the existing doctoral colleges, which would be easy to implement, "if the professors did not consider themselves to be infallible".⁵⁰ It can be assumed that, here too, Feuchtersleben responded to political powers that determined the course of the revolution. In particular the medical students, alongside the technical students, represented an especially active element, and it can be assumed that the interest of the physicians in participating in the reform of the medical studies also influenced Feuchtersleben's standpoint. Accordingly, the doctoral colleges were to remain integrated in the university, and should exert a greater influence on university business, together with the institute of (private) lecturers. Feuchtersleben stood up for the faculties as "scientific corporations" of the graduates which should be reformed only in keeping with the times. He aspired to a university organisation in which all groups involved (also the students) had a – to a certain degree democratic – share. However, Feuchtersleben never developed in detail how the specific organisational forms of this participation should look.⁵¹

So while there was unity in the question of the university constitution on the highest principles of the freedom of teaching and learning, and the connection between research and teaching, and while the transfer of immediate management to the teaching staff was also more or less undisputed, the question as to what extent the traditional corporation character of the university should be preserved in modified form, remained unresolved. The events of October 1848, during which, and as a consequence of which, Feuchtersleben's activities in the Ministry of

⁵⁰ Feuchtersleben in an article in the *Wiener Zeitung* No. 223 v. 15.8.1848, p. 399–400; cited from EGGLMAIER: *Reformansätze*, p. 67–68.

⁵¹ Summary of Feuchtersleben's activities as a university and academic reformer EGGLMAIER: *Reformansätze*, p. 82–85.

Education also came to an end, prevented the development of an organisational structure in accordance with his wishes.

The question of university reform was addressed not only in university panels or ministerial working groups, but also at “national” level. In September 1848 the German university teachers held a conference in Jena. The University of Vienna was also represented at the conference with a considerable number of delegates.⁵² Among them were not only professors, but also members of the doctoral colleges, which alienated the representatives of the German universities, especially as they held the view that the reform of the university organisation would have to start from the perspective of the doctoral colleges.⁵³ One of the Vienna delegates was the doctor Johann Alexander Lerch⁵⁴, as a member of the doctoral college he was also dean of the faculty of medicine and a major actor in the liberal group of leaders of the Vienna revolution. He demanded the participation of lecturers and students in the design of the university, which he understood as a corporative organisation.⁵⁵ He therefore represented a viewpoint that was very similar to Feuchtersleben’s.

At the same time, the student parliament (or student congress) in Eisenach was also concerned with the question of university organisation. As with the university teachers’ conference in Jena, Vienna sent the largest group of participants: The twenty student delegates made up more than a quarter of the assembly.⁵⁶ The constitutional draft that was decided for the German universities was heavily influenced by liberal and democratic principles, and demanded universities that were not mere training centres for state officials, but instead were dedicated solely to pure science. The universities “take an encyclopaedic position, with the suspension of all faculty separation”.⁵⁷ It is not surprising that the demand already presented at the “Wartburg Festival” in June 1848 that students should be involved in the election of academic authorities, was also included in the draft. In general, the draft was not very specific, as one believed that a

⁵² Nine delegates took part from Vienna; this made them the largest group of all participating universities. These also included Professors Hye and Endlicher. Cf. Ottomar DOMRICH, Heinrich HÄSER: *Verhandlungen deutscher Universitätslehrer über die Reform der deutschen Hochschulen in der Versammlung zu Jena vom 21. bis 24. September 1848*, Jena 1848, p. 2. See also: *Officielle Protokolle über die Verhandlungen deutscher Universitätslehrer zur Reform der deutschen Hochschulen in Jena vom 21. bis 24. September 1848*, Jena [1848].

⁵³ GOLDINGER: *Studienreform*, p. 11; [Robert v. ZIMMERMANN]: *Allgemeiner Theil*, in: *Geschichte der Wiener Universität von 1848 bis 1898* (ed. Akademischen Senat der Wiener Universität), Wien 1898, p. 28. On the confusion of the assembly about the composition of the Viennese delegation cf. also DOMRICH, HÄSER: *Verhandlungen*, p. 71–72. Since nobody knew how the representatives of the doctoral colleges should be assigned, they were allocated at short notice to the associate professors (see also *ibid.*, p. 3).

⁵⁴ ÖBL 1815–1950, Vol. 5, Lfg. 22, 1970, p. 150–151.

⁵⁵ Cf. e.g. DOMRICH, HÄSER: *Verhandlungen*, p. 52.

⁵⁶ Karl SCHURZ: *Der Studentencongreß zu Eisenach am 25. September 1848. Seine Bedeutung und seine Resultate*, Bonn 1848, p. 9.

⁵⁷ SCHURZ: *Studentencongreß*, p. 19.

university organisation anchored at national level could only be realised when the liberal-democratic principle had become “incorporated in fixed, state form”.⁵⁸ This never came about. There was another project that was shaped by radical-democratic ideas and supported by the Eisenach student parliament, and which originated with a conference of scholars who had assembled in Frankfurt in August 1848. It was the plan to found a “general German free academic university”, which was to be established in Vienna.⁵⁹ The plan was the initiative of the young Hegelians Arnold Ruge and Ludwig Feuerbach; the other participants in the conference were mostly young academics, including Simon Deutsch from Vienna, a Jewish scholar and Hebraist, who had joined the revolution and was forced to emigrate to France in 1849, where he became involved in the revolt of the Paris Commune in 1871.⁶⁰

The ideas written in a memorandum⁶¹ on the subject contain a clear criticism of the existing universities, whose main purpose was preparation for a particular profession: “Accordingly the previous universities appear like learned seminaries in relation to the [projected] academic university, which aspires to the philosophical penetration of the previous specialist sciences, without however excluding a spirited empirical treatment of the same.”⁶² The free academic university “represents, by means of writings and lectures, the philosophical organism of the special sciences and these in their ideal generality.”⁶³ The “academic science” to be practised there was to be divided into the science of nature (mathematics, physics, physiology) and of the mind (ethics, cultural philosophy, philosophy of world history). Theology was not envisaged; religions were included in the area of world history. The “self-government” was to be entrusted to a committee chosen by the academic teachers, and the students would also elect the president from this committee. There were no faculties or academic degrees. Thus this establishment was conceived as a kind of postgraduate philosophical educational institute without a formal qualification, since only graduates of a “German university” were admitted as students. The teaching staff was to be nominated by the annual conference of scholars; everyone who fully recognised “the principle of the self-determination and self-generation of the human intellect”,

⁵⁸ SCHURZ: Studentencongreß, p. 33.

⁵⁹ Frankfurt am Main, seat of the German national assembly, was originally considered. Vienna was probably given preference due to the “much-admired battle against the Reaction”. Cf. Rudolf JUNG: Frankfurter Hochschulpläne 1384–1868 (Frankfurter historische Forschungen N.F. 1), Leipzig 1915, p. 87–91.

⁶⁰ Constant von WURZBACH: Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Österreich, Bd. 3, Wien 1858; Bd. 24 (addenda) Wien 1872; Deutsche Biographische Enzyklopädie Online, o. D., [<http://www.degruyter.com/view/db/dbe>], retrieved [31.08.2016](#). In Vienna Deutsch was a member in 1848 of the democratic society “Der Deutsche Adler”; cf. HÄUSLER: Massenarmut, p. 215.

⁶¹ JUNG: Hochschulpläne, p. 146–153.

⁶² Ibid., p. 149.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 148

should be allowed to appear as a private lecturer or associate academic teacher. The designation “professor” for the teachers was to be avoided at all costs.

During the last phase of the revolution, the revolutionary Vienna students published the ceremonial appeal by the Eisenach student parliament to the “people of Vienna” to support this project.⁶⁴ The chances that this might happen were never very large; the defeat of the revolution finally destroyed the plan. However the fact that a young Hegelian model existed for the possible design of universities, remained in the memory of the Herbartian Robert von Zimmermann as one of the dangers of the revolution.⁶⁵

It is no surprise that in view of the brief revolutionary period of around half a year, the concrete measures to reform the educational system remained necessarily fragmentary. In addition there were the difficult and changing political conditions, which hindered decisions on important matters. During the era of neo-absolutism, under Minister Thun-Hohenstein, those reform approaches of the revolutionary year were taken up and adapted that were just about compatible with the Catholic-conservative state-forming principles.⁶⁶ The recognition of the freedom of teaching and learning for the restructuring of the universities was allowed to remain, as long as a strong ministry could intervene and exert control with its appointment policy and rigid curricula.⁶⁷ And the formulation borrowed from Frankfurt’s “Constitution of St. Paul’s Church” – “Science and its teaching is free” – even found its way into the catalogue of fundamental rights of the imposed and soon revoked constitution of 1849.⁶⁸

⁶⁴ Politischer Studenten-Courier No. 96, Wien 12. Oktober 1848, p. 388.

⁶⁵ [ZIMMERMANN]: Allgemeiner Theil, p. 29. On Zimmermann as a representative of an Austrian “state philosophy” cf. Johannes FEICHTINGER: *Wissenschaft als reflexives Projekt. Von Bolzano über Freud zu Kelsen: Österreichische Wissenschaftsgeschichte 1848–1938*, Bielefeld 2010, p. 150–151.

⁶⁶ HÖFLECHNER: *Nachholende Eigenentwicklung*, p. 98; FEICHTINGER: *Wissenschaft*, p. 132–134.

⁶⁷ FEICHTINGER: *Wissenschaft*, p. 134–135, and IDEM.: ‘Staatsnation’, ‘Kulturnation’, ‘Nationalstaat’: The Role of National Politics in the Advancement of Science and Scholarship in Austria from 1848 to 1938, in: Mitchell G. ASH, Jan SURMAN (ed.): *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848–1918*, Basingstoke 2012, p. 57–82, here p. 64–66.

⁶⁸ RGBl. 151/1849, § 3. As already in the draft of the Kremsier constitution. On the freedom of teaching in the Paulskirche constitution see Rainer A. MÜLLER: *Geschichte der Universität. Von der mittelalterlichen Universitas zur deutschen Hochschule*, München 1990, p. 80.

The implementation of the reforms

Alois Kernbauer

Principles, pragmatism and innovation: The implementation of the Thunian Reform at the University of Graz

The position of the University of Graz in the heterogeneous educational landscape of the third-level education sector prior to 1848

There were ten universities in the Austrian Empire around the mid-19th century – Vienna, Prague, Krakow, Buda, Graz, Innsbruck, Olomouc, Lviv, Pavia and Padua – plus seven lyceums, eleven diocesan theological institutes, 29 philosophical teaching institutes, five midwifery schools and a few other institutions with a specific educational programmes at university level, such as the Protestant theological educational institute in Vienna, the Joseph Academy in Vienna, the polytechnic schools in Vienna and Prague, the Joanneum in Graz, the mining schools in Banská Štiavnica and Vordernberg, the schools of veterinary medicine in Vienna and Milan, etc.

If we ignore the two universities in the Italian provinces, there were therefore eight institutes of higher-level education, compared to eighteen complete universities in the other lands of the German federation, including the Academy in Münster. This produced a geographical ratio of one university per 438 square miles in “Germany”, while the Austrian Empire, without the Upper Italian provinces, had one university for every 1,613 square miles. This ratio also corresponded with that of universities per population: In the German lands, there was one university per 1,694,000 inhabitants, while the ratio in the Habsburg monarchy was one university to 4,920,179 inhabitants.¹ – The difficulty with this comparison is that the German universities were comparatively small, while two of those in the Habsburg monarchy, namely Prague and especially Vienna, were significantly large.

Whereas the institutions in “Germany” were – in contemporary terminology – “complete” universities with four faculties, in Austria this was true in only four cases. Along with the universities of Prague and Vienna, which were also important research institutes during the Vormärz and between which there was a brisk personal fluctuation of professors, these were the universities in Buda and in Krakow. The former Free City of Krakow became an imperial city in 1846 and was incorporated into the Kingdom of Galicia in 1849. The universities of the

¹ Universitätsarchiv Graz (UAG) Med.-chirurg. Studium, Denkschrift für die Vervollständigung der kais.kön. Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz 1860.

Italian provinces had a special position, with the University of Pavia² (in 1859) and that of Padua (in 1866) leaving the Austrian federation of states with their respective provinces.

The other universities were incomplete: the University of Graz, with three faculties and a medical-surgical course had a similar setup to the University of Olomouc, which was closed down in 1855, although the theological faculty remained in this bishopric, with the continued right to award doctoral titles, and the medical-surgical course was disbanded only in 1875.

The University of Lviv was restored in 1817 as “Franz’ University” and, like Graz and Olomouc, had three faculties and a medical-surgical course, which ceased in 1875. Almost two decades later, in 1893, a medical faculty was established in Lviv.

After its resurrection as a university in 1826, the higher secondary school (*Hohe Schule*) in Innsbruck, which had been founded in 1669, consisted of a juridical and a philosophical faculty with the doctoral rights, and a medical-surgical course. After the end of the theological faculty in 1822, a new one was established in 1857 and, to the great displeasure of most of Austria’s university members, transferred to the Jesuit order, receiving the right to grant doctorates in 1866. In 1869 the medical faculty replaced the medical-surgical course in Innsbruck.

Of the Benedictine University in Salzburg, which had existed since 1622, only a lyceum with a theological and philosophical faculty and a medical-surgical course remained by the Vormärz. The “lower” medical training continued to exist until 1875, after the suspension of the lyceum in 1850, while the theological institute continued at the seat of the archbishop, also after 1875. The effects of the educational reform of the second- and third-level areas become particularly clear when we call to mind the large number of philosophical or theological schools, which continued to be conducted every two or sometimes three years after the suspension of the Jesuit order in 1773³, namely the philosophical schools in Klagenfurt, Ljubljana, Zagreb, Lviv, Linz and Olomouc. These were joined by an abundance of similar institutions of a propaedeutic nature, of which there were many in the kingdom: for example, in Lower Austria after 1815 there were one each in the University of Vienna, the Theresian Military Academy, and the philosophical school of the Piarists in Krems; in Upper Austria at the lyceum in Linz, the philosophical school of the Benedictines in Kremsmünster, and the lyceum in Salzburg; in Bohemia, alongside the University of Prague, the philosophical schools of the Cistercians at Hohenfurt Monastery in Budweis (České Budějovice) and of the Piarists in Litomyšl, and the

² Cf. also the essay in this volume by Alessandra FERRARESI.

³ A detailed compilation of the educational institutions can be found in: Alois KERNBAUER: Hochschulabschlüsse in der Habsburgermonarchie in der Zeit der Professionalisierung akademischer Berufe, in: Rainer Christoph SCHWINGES (ed.): Examen, Titel, Promotionen. Akademisches und staatliches Qualifikationswesen vom 13. bis zum 21. Jahrhundert (Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft für Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Bd. 7) Basel 2007, p. 89–168.

philosophical school in Pilsen. In Moravia and Silesia there was the University of Olomouc, the philosophical school in Brno, that of the Piarists in Nikolsburg (Mikulov) and the secondary school in Teschen (Cieszyn). In Galicia there was an educational institute at the University of Lviv, and the philosophical schools in Tarnów, Czernowitz (Chernivtsi), Przemyśl, that of the Jesuits in Ternopil, and the philosophical monastic school of the regular clergy in Lviv.

In Dalmatia there was a lyceum in Zara/Zadar and a monastic school in Spalato, in Illyria a lyceum in Ljubljana and one in Klagenfurt, in the Trieste governorate a philosophical school in Gorizia and the philosophical monastic school of the Franciscans in Castagnavizza.

In Tyrol, along with the University of Innsbruck, there was the philosophical school in Trento, the philosophical monastic schools of the North Tyrol Franciscans and Capuchins in Schwaz and in Bruneck, and those of the South Tyrol Franciscans and Capuchins in Rovereto and Arco.

In 1815 Austria annexed the Kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia. This region contained the philosophical-mathematical school at the University of Pavia, the St. Alexander lyceum in Milan, the Porta nuova lyceum in Milan, the lyceums in Bergamo, Brescia, Mantua, Cremona, Como, the communal lyceum in Lodi, the philosophical monastic school of the private educational institute in Desenzano and the philosophical monastic schools in the episcopal seminaries of Monza, Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Cremona, Crema, Lodi, Mantua, and Pavia.

Veneto also had a comparatively dense educational network, namely the philosophical monastic schools at the episcopal seminaries in Rovigo, Belluno, Feltre, Ceneda, Chioggia, Portogruaro, Padua, Treviso, Udine, Venice, Verona, and Vicenza, plus the philosophical monastic school of the Minorites in Vicenza and that of the Capuchins in Padua. At the University of Padua there was the philosophical-mathematical school; there was also the Patriarchate Seminary in Venice and the lyceums in Venice, Verona, Vicenza and Udine. The chair for childbirth and basic surgery in Mantua, and the public school “Gesuiti” in Venice, demonstrate the diversity of the educational institutes in Upper Italy.

The theological diocesan institutes should also be counted among the third-level educational sector. They existed for Bohemia in Budweis, Königgrätz (Hradec Králové), Leitmeritz (Litoměřice), for Galicia in Przemyśl, and the Greek-Oriental theological school in Czernowitz. In Venetia there was the Patriarchate Seminary in Venice, in Dalmatia the school in the episcopal central seminary in Zadar, in the Littoral that of Gorizia, in Tyrol that of Brixen and Trento, and in Moravia the school in Brno. In addition, there were the theological monastic schools of the monasteries.

The polytechnics in Prague, Graz and Vienna were joined in 1844 by a technical academy in Lviv. Due to its exposed geographical and ethnic situation, Lviv demonstrated a particular

diversity of university-like institutions, including a Roman-Catholic and a Greek-Catholic seminar, a state forestry school with collections, teacher training colleges for women and men, a state vocational school and colleges for veterinary studies, trade and craftwork. The institute founded by Count Ossolinski had developed into a national institute.

In Galicia there was a second technical school in Krakow; it was converted into a craftworks institute in the mid-1870s. The polytechnic in Brno, the ‘Austrian Manchester’, was approved in 1843, but only opened in 1850.

Comparing the sizes of the universities

Student numbers remained almost unchanged at the universities during the Vormärz, the only exception being the University of Vienna in the mid-1840s.⁴ However, after 1848 there were greater fluctuations, although these did not affect the relative size ratios of the universities among each other. – After Vienna, by far the largest university, Prague, and Lviv, the University of Graz came in fourth place, with a little more than quarter of the number of Viennese students. The number of those enrolled was directly proportionate to the number of graduates.

Table 1: Student numbers at the Austrian universities 1850/51 and 1865/66

University	Academic year 1850/51	Academic year 1865/66
Vienna	2440	3034
Prague	1390	1394
Lviv	632	713
Graz	436	605
Krakow	230	302
Olomouc	290	215
Innsbruck	225	392
Salzburg	50	–

⁴ Irma VÖLLMECKE: Österreichische Hochschulstatistik 1829 bis 1979, in: Geschichte und Ergebnisse der zentralen amtlichen Statistik in Österreich 1829–1979. Festschrift aus Anlass des 150jährigen Bestehens der zentralen amtlichen Statistik in Österreich (Beiträge zur österreichischen Statistik 550), Wien 1979, p. 479–512. Irma VÖLLMECKE: Österreichische Hochschulstatistik 1829 bis 1979, in: Geschichte und Ergebnisse der zentralen amtlichen Statistik in Österreich 1829–1979, attached tables (Beiträge zur österreichischen Statistik 550A), Wien 1979.

On the structure of the University of Graz after 1827

The elevation of the Graz lyceum to a university had no significant impact on the basic internal structure. Only the law faculty regained its right to grant doctorates; in addition, the estates financed lectures on Styrian history, educational sciences, accounting and lessons in Slovenian, which also interested the state, since the native language of one-third of the population of the Duchy of Styria was Slovenian, that of the other two-thirds being German. It was also intended to provide midwifery lessons in Slovenian.

In 1827 the university attempted to attain completion, in other words the establishment of a medical faculty instead of the existing medical-surgical course, but without success. An initiative by the City of Graz in 1846 was also in vain. Nevertheless, academic traditions were cultivated in Graz, similar to those of the theological school in Salzburg, which in turn started granting doctorates from 1831⁵; representatives of the subject of medicine were integrated into the university association whenever possible. They also gave extraordinary lectures for no fee, and appeared after 1827 at the annual celebrations of the re-elevation of the university, giving ceremonial talks with which they aimed to prove to themselves and to the invited audience that they were up to date scientifically. In the revolutionary year of 1848, the most urgent concern of the university was its completion. A petition to this effect was submitted to the ministry as early as 6 May 1848, in other words even before it was stated in the “Draft of the main features of the public education system in Austria” of 18 July 1848: “The aim should be that only complete universities exist in future.”⁶

The “complete” university as a model of university self-perception after 1848

Reform measures were taken at a rapid rate in August 1848: the ministry ordered by a decree of 13 August the principle suspension of the lower form of medical training, which was considered to be “outdated”⁷ and requested speedy applications with regard to the foundation of a faculty. Four days later, on 17 August, it announced their establishment, and with a decree of 19 August it ordered that no more students should be accepted for the medical-surgical course. This attempt at founding a faculty – the sixth since 1585 – looked as if it would be successful within only a few weeks.

⁵ KERNBAUER: Hochschulabschlüsse, p. 107–108.

⁶ Paragraph 93 of the “Entwurf der Grundzüge des öffentlichen Unterrichtswesens in Österreich”, written by Franz S. Exner, in: Wiener Zeitung 18–21 July 1848.

⁷ Franz von KRONES: Geschichte der Karl Franzens-Universität in Graz. Festgabe zur Feier ihres dreihundertjährigen Bestandes, Graz 1886, p. 170.

However there was bitter disappointment about the decree of 1 November, which announced that the foundation of a faculty of medicine was “currently unworkable”⁸. In response to the official enquiry by the university on 25 November, Minister Stadion stated on 4 December that the project would not be realised. – Thus everything remained the same. When, in October 1849, the university presented the report on the constitution of the academic authorities, which stated that – as had happened repeatedly since 1827 – the medical doctor Leopold Langer had been elected as rector, the ministry rejected this and made it clear that the medical-surgical course did not belong to the faculties, and that the election was therefore not “valid”⁹.

Thus it was clear that the character of the university had changed decisively; from now on it should involve only a form of academic education that was committed to scientific research and teaching, while the medical-surgical course was run as a school.

Subsequently, the philosophical faculty naturally had the greatest interest in the establishment of a medical faculty, since it expected a resulting improvement to the equipping of the natural science subjects. It applied for completion in 1851, and again the following year¹⁰, however without success. At this time, the speed of reform measures also slowed within the philosophical faculty.

After the end of the Austro-Sardinian War of 1859, the situation of the University of Graz became more critical in light of the empty state coffers. Minister Thun thanked the university and above all its students on behalf of the Emperor for their involvement in the war, but in spite of this, rumours soon spread in the second half of the year about the impending suspension of the University of Graz and its conversion into a legal academy. A look at the situation of the university at this time would suggest that this plan was understandable from the perspective of the government, for after 1848 the reforms to the law faculty has been implemented quickly, i.e. the representatives of natural law had been replaced by those of the historical school of law.¹¹ The decisive members of government believed that the most urgent objective was to raise a new civil service, appropriately trained, who would then play an active role in the development of the state as a whole.¹²

⁸ KRONES: Geschichte, p. 171.

⁹ KRONES: Geschichte, p. 174.

¹⁰ The first petition dates from 31 May 1851, the second from 3 July 1852. KRONES: Geschichte, p. 178–179.

¹¹ Cf. Hans LENTZE: *Naturrecht und historische Schule in der österreichischen Rechtswissenschaft*, in: *Wissenschaft und Weltbild* 23 (1970) p. 40–41.

¹² Hans LENTZE: *Graf Thun und die voraussetzungslose Wissenschaft*, in: Helmut J. MEZLER-ANDELBERG (ed.): *Festschrift Karl Eder zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Innsbruck 1959, p. 197–209, here p. 199. Alphons LHOTSKY: *Das Ende des Josephinismus: Epilegomena zu Hans Lentzes Werk über die Reformen des Ministers Grafen Thun*, in: Alphons LHOTSKY: *Aufsätze und Vorträge*, Bd. III: *Historiographie – Quellenkunde – Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, Wien 1972, p. 276–277.

Where in the winter semester of 1851/52 the theological faculty, with six professors, had 94 students, the faculty of law and political science (117 enrolled) consisted of eight professors, four associate professors and two private lecturers, and could be considered at the time to be sufficiently equipped for the education of lawyers. The development of student numbers reflects this: They rose from 181 in the 1854/55 academic year to 240 in the 1860/61 academic year. This was also a result of the new railway network, for 70 of these law students, who primarily spoke Italian, came from Lombardy-Venetia, Istria, Dalmatia and Trentino. This influx continued for a while and was also noticeable in other faculties. In 1863 the newly appointed professor of physiology, Alexander Rollett, even saw the need to expand his language skills, in order to be able to conduct examinations also in Italian, which appeared to be necessary, since the Italian students used Italian in their written correspondence with the Graz academic authorities, in contrast to the non-German native speaking students of all other nationalities. A comparison of the size of the law faculty in Graz with the corresponding faculties of other universities confirms the impression that it was adequately equipped: It was larger than those in Innsbruck or Krakow, but also than the faculties in Erlangen, Freiburg, Gießen, Greifswald, Halle, Jena, Kiel, Marburg, Rostock and Würzburg. Thus the legal sciences were afforded priority for reasons of state policy, which was also shown by the implementation of the Thunian Reform at the universities of Padua and Pavia from 1855.¹³

So while the faculty of law was regarded as being state-of-the-art, this was by no means true of the philosophical faculty. Although it had more teaching staff than the law faculty, key subjects were not represented, or only insubstantially, so that they could do only partial justice to the new remit of scientific research in a kind of ‘cosmos of the sciences’.

Therefore, at the end of 1859 the faculty intensified its activities, applying for the establishment of a natural sciences cohort in the medical-surgical course¹⁴, thus hoping to develop natural science subjects in its own faculty. The ministry reacted with the alarming news that the survival of the University of Graz “would remain precarious and uncertain for as long as it does not join the ranks of the complete universities.”¹⁵ The university lost no time, submitted a senate report

¹³ Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Graf Thun und das Rechtsstudium an den oberitalienischen Universitäten Padua und Pavia. Ein Beitrag zur Bildungs- und Wissenschaftspolitik im Alpen-Adria-Raum, in: Herwig EBNER, Paul W. ROTH, Ingeborg WIESFLECKER-FRIEDHUBER (ed.): Forschungen zur Geschichte des Alpen-Adria-Raumes. Festgabe für em. o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Othmar Pickl zum 70. Geburtstag (Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Geschichte, Bd. 9) Graz 1997, p. 107–118, here p. 109.

¹⁴ Universitätsarchiv Graz (= UAG) Philosophische Fakultät (= Phil. Fak.) ZI 303 ex 1859/60.

¹⁵ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 458 ex 1859/60.

on the preservation and expansion of the university to the ministry¹⁶ and presented the matter personally to the governor¹⁷. It was significantly supported in its efforts by the newspapers.

The city and the duchy were munificent: As early as 27 March 1860 the Graz municipal council approved an annual contribution of 8,000 fl. to the university budget, in the event of the establishment of a medical faculty, and on 4 April the corporate committee of the state promised annual support of 3,000 fl. Considering the starting salary of a professors was around 1,000 fl. per year, these were substantial sums. Furthermore, the Styrian Savings Bank declared its willingness to make a one-off donation of 15,000 fl. to cover the construction costs of the faculty of medicine, later increasing this sum by a further 3,740 fl.¹⁸

Finally, as a member of the Styrian state parliament, Rector Johann Blaschke introduced the application for the completion of the university at the last parliamentary session on 20 April 1861.¹⁹ After more than one year, the relieving governor's decree²⁰ was received by the university, announcing the establishment of the faculty of medicine, which took legal effect by highest resolution on 13 January 1863. Thus the Graz alma mater was now complete and corresponded with the principle mentioned in the "Draft of the main features of public education" of 1848.

As important as the criterion of completion obviously was around the middle of the century, it seems to have declined in importance subsequently. After the suspension of the medical-surgical course at the University of Lviv in 1875, a medical faculty was established only in 1893. The newly-founded Franz-Josephs University in Czernowitz was composed of a Greek-Oriental-theological faculty, a law and political sciences faculty, and a philosophical faculty. There was no faculty of medicine.²¹

The implementation of the principles of the university reform at the University of Graz – starting from the "Draft of the main features of the public education system in Austria" of 18 July 1848

The educational task of the university: § 62 of the "Draft":

Die Universitäten haben die gelehrte Bildung in den allgemeinen Wissenschaften zu gewähren, sie haben ferner für jene öffentliche Dienste vorzubereiten, welche eine Vorbildung durch specielle Fachwissenschaften auf Grundlage der Gymnasialbildung erfordern und die gelehrte

¹⁶ The ministerial decree dated from 23 February 1860, the petition of the university from 10 March 1860.

¹⁷ KRONES: Geschichte, p. 183.

¹⁸ KRONES: Geschichte, p. 183.

¹⁹ KRONES: Geschichte, p. 184.

²⁰ KRONES: Geschichte, p. 186.

²¹ Rudolf WAGNER: Alma Mater Francisco Josephina. Die deutschsprachige Nationalitäten-Universität in Czernowitz. Festschrift zum 100. Jahrestag ihrer Eröffnung 1875, München 1975.

Bildung in diesen Fachwissenschaften zu pflegen; sie haben endlich in den Jünglingen durch Lehr- und Lernfreiheit die kräftige Entwicklung durch Wissenschaft und angemessene Disciplin die Veredlung des Charakters zu bewirken.²²

The willingness to implement the new freedoms with regard to teaching was more than large in Graz. Already in the Vormärz, many professors had given extraordinary lectures without salary, which had had to be approved by the Imperial Commission on Education; the Graz professors interpreted the innovations extensively and included the doctors and doctoral candidates in the scientific discourse before the relevant ministerial decree had even been issued.²³ The release from the obligatory lecture text was received with great relief. Each specialist representative – especially in the philosophical faculty – sought the rapid expansion of the scientific literature contained in the university library.

All kinds of practical matters had to be clarified, for example the search for rooms for the deans²⁴; while the seal of the academic director, which had previously been used, was replaced at the philosophical and juridical faculties by the respective faculty seal.²⁵

The superior state authorities also respected the freedom of opinion. When, in the early 1850s, the chemist Anton Schrötter von Kristelli²⁶, who had been called to Graz from Vienna, spoke disparagingly of the House of Habsburg on academic soil, this was reported in the old manner by a witness to the Ministry of the Interior, which responded with the statement that the time for such reporting had passed.²⁷ – The ministerial orders stipulating that students must refrain from all political activity were obviously accepted, but the students still wore the uniform of the Academic Legion, even after its suspension.²⁸ Strict surveillance of student activities was ordered in February 1849,²⁹ who were not permitted to wear any insignia in future.³⁰

²² The universities must guarantee scholarly education in the general sciences, furthermore they must prepare for those public services that require pre-education in specialist subjects on the basis of secondary school education and must cultivate the scholarly education in these specialist subjects; they must finally effect the refinement of character in the youth and the strong development through science and appropriate discipline by means of the freedom of teaching and learning.

²³ Manfred Werner BAUER: Eine Reform unter dem Mikroskop. Die Umsetzung der „Thun-Hohensteinschen“ Universitätsreform an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Diplomarbeit, Graz 2011, p. 80.

²⁴ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 14 ex 1849/50.

²⁵ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 502, ZI 533 ex 1850/51.

²⁶ Anton Schrötter belonged to that small group of chemistry professors who promoted the new direction of chemistry in Austria, oriented on Justus Liebig and his laboratory lessons. Alois KERNBAUER: Die Emanzipation der Chemie in Österreich um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Von der Hilfswissenschaft zur freien Wissenschaftsdisziplin, in: Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften 4 (1984) p. 11–44.

²⁷ Sadly, the quotation of the file has disappeared from the inventory of the Ministry of the Interior.

²⁸ The rectorate decree of 8 February 1849 made it clear that the students were no longer allowed to appear in public in uniform or with cocked hats, since the Academic Legion had been disbanded. – KRONES: Geschichte, p. 173.

²⁹ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 88 ex 1849.

³⁰ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 119 ex 1849.

The students of Graz had been politically active in 1848; this led to heated debate about the organisational form of the Academic Legion, especially as the Slavic students had demanded a special position within the Academic Legion.³¹ Graz students, among them the later professor, Leopold von Pebal, went to Vienna to support the Academic Legion there in the critical situation in autumn 1848. Thus the treatment of those pardoned for their political offences became a matter of discussion, and was finally settled uniformly in the mid-1850s.³²

Freedom of learning: § 78 of the “Draft”: The previous semester and annual examinations are abolished. Frequentation certificates will be issued for lectures attended.

Die Studierenden genießen die Lern- oder Hörfreiheit, d. i. es bleibt ihrer Wahl überlassen, welche Docenten sie, und in welcher Reihenfolge hören wollen. Eine Anleitung zu zweckmäßigster Vornahme dieser Wahl wird ihnen im Anfange eines jeden Semesters gegeben. Es sind aber diejenigen Hörer, welche sich den strengen oder den Staatsprüfungen unterziehen wollen, gehalten, ein Minimum von Jahren und zwar für jetzt die Candidaten der Gymnasial-Lehrämter zwei Jahre auf der philosophischen Facultät, die Theologen vier, die Juristen vier, die Mediciner aber fünf Jahre auf der Universität zuzubringen, und die für jene Prüfungen vorgezeichneten Gegenstände zu hören.³³

The freedom of learning was implemented quickly in accordance with the provisions. However in at least one point the professors displayed a lack of humour with regard to how the freedom of learning was interpreted by the students: When some students obviously appeared only sporadically at lectures, the faculty placed this on the agenda of a meeting in 1852, at which these students were prompted to be more diligent in attending lectures by having their names posted on the bulletin board.³⁴ In addition, the bursary advisor Josef Knar demanded a list of defaulting lecture attendees in the 1852 summer semester.³⁵

Viva voce examinations, state examinations, dissertations: § 79–80 of the “Draft”: Public disputations are abolished. Viva voce examinations (*Rigorosen*) are “public examinations” to be heard by full professors; state examinations are to be audited by mixed commissions, including the last viva voce of the medical students and the examinations of the qualified theologians. The students remain free to opt for the composition and publication of a

³¹ Alois KERNBAUER: Slowenen als Professoren an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, in: Ludwig KARNIČAR, Vincenc RAJŠP (ed.): Graz und Slowenen. Gradec in Slovenci. Sammelband zum gleichnamigen Symposium vom 20.–21. V. 2010 an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Wien, Graz, Ljubljana 2011, p. 39–59, here p. 49–51. Reinhold REIMANN: „Ein freies Lied der Freiheit darzubringen“. Vom Studententum in Graz 1848/49 (Schriftenreihe des Steirischen Studentenhistoriker-Vereines, Bd. 25), Graz 1998.

³² UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 202 ex 1854/55.

³³ The students enjoy the freedom of learning or attendance, i.e. they are free to choose which lecturers they wish to hear, and in which order. They will be given guidelines on the most expedient execution of this choice at the beginning of each semester. However, those students who wish to complete the strict or the state examinations are obliged to spend a minimum of years at the university, namely for the candidates in secondary school training two years in the philosophical faculty, the theologians four, the jurists four, the physicians however five years, and to attend the prescribed subjects for those examinations.

³⁴ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 291 ex 1850/51.

³⁵ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 292 ex 1851/52.

dissertation. A doctorate can be completed in the simple manner of “handing in the doctoral diploma” in the “usual, yet most expedient manner”.

The ministry soon displayed an interest in the impact of the new freedom of learning and ordered a survey of the results of oral examinations. Seven viva voci had been presented at the philosophical faculty in Graz in the 1846/47 academic year; in 1851/52 there were six, and the examination success was satisfactory. There were therefore no indications of a “lower scientific endeavour or more inadequate preparation [...] as a result of the new academic facilities”³⁶.

Gradually, a kind of academic exchange of documents set in, which drew attention to the dissertations. Towards the end of 1851 the universities of Heidelberg and Gießen sent their curricula and dissertations to the University of Graz, which were forwarded to the members of the university for inspection. In 1855, 33 dissertations from the University of Padua were sent to Graz.³⁷

In 1851, shortly after his appointment as professor, the Germanist Karl Weinhold, who came from Germany, proposed a reform of the philosophical viva voci³⁸, which occasioned the two long-serving professors, the mathematician Josef Knar³⁹ and the physicist Karl Hummel⁴⁰ to vote against; obviously they could not really imagine how dissertations could be designed in their subjects. However, the ministry did not react to the faculty report.⁴¹ It took another two decades before a new viva voce ordinance took effect.

Clarification of the definition of faculty: § 86 of the “Draft”: In its widest sense, the term encompassed all teachers and students of an “academic department”, in a narrower sense the leading authority, consisting of all full and associate professors and two representatives of the private lecturers; in certain matters, the two senior representatives of the students were also included.

Although the status of professors, lecturers and teachers had been addressed in individual ministerial decrees, all kinds of uncertainty remained as to the rights associated with each group, for example with regard to the question of whether assistant professors in a subject should be consulted in academic meetings.⁴² A regulation was announced by the ministry in February 1849⁴³, but further uncertainties remained⁴⁴ until it was established in November 1849

³⁶ BAUER: Reform, p. 259.

³⁷ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 238, Zl 246 ex 1854/55.

³⁸ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 547 ex 1850/51.

³⁹ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 597 ex 1850/51.

⁴⁰ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 598 ex 1850/51.

⁴¹ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 613 ex 1850/51.

⁴² UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 222 ex 1848.

⁴³ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 85 ex 1849.

⁴⁴ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 4 ex 1849/50.

that assistant professors did not belong to the professorial council, for – so the reason – they had not qualified by habilitation.⁴⁵

At the beginning of May 1849 the ministry clarified explicitly the difference between the command of a language and philology; from now on, teachers of modern languages had the character of a professor if they taught “philology, literature, history of the language or science”; consequently, they also belonged to the councils. The designation “associate teacher” became obsolete, “teacher” alone sufficed.⁴⁶ The term “lecturer” was used in certain cases in plural to mean all those teaching at the university.

The conventional thinking in terms of hierarchy and rank, shaped by corporative attitude and civil service status, had an enduring effect. When the universities and lyceums had established themselves as state institutions at the end of the 18th century and found their new role in the state structure, categorisation into the hierarchy was necessary, especially as the certificates they issued were regarded as state-recognised qualification and employment prerequisites. From 1792 university and lyceum professors were granted the rank directly below that of the imperial councillors; at the same time, professors and their wives were given the title and rank of “Herr” and “Frau”. There were also precise rules within the university, where even the students of the individual faculties were bound to a certain order at official occasions.

The rapid changes led to conflicts after 1848. Quarrels between the long-serving physics professor Karl Hummel and the newly-appointed professor for natural history, Ludwig Karl Schmarda, gave cause to an enquiry as to which of the two was of higher rank⁴⁷, in response to which the ministry decided that Hummel had already held the rank of professor since his appointment to the philosophical chair in Ljubljana, and was therefore “well ahead”⁴⁸ of Schmarda. Length of service also played a role in the imminent procedure for appointment to professorial chairs, when it came to ordering candidates in sequence. It would take some time before scientific qualifications and research interests grew to become the most important criteria.

On the question of “autonomy”: § 87 of the “Draft”: the reorganisation was accompanied by all kinds of uncertainties, although where there were open questions, the university tended towards the extensive interpretation of its autonomy and sought to decide as much as possible itself. For example, in 1852 the 1st of May was declared to be a holiday.⁴⁹ The

⁴⁵ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 83 ex 1849/50.

⁴⁶ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 127 ex 1849/50.

⁴⁷ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 171 ex 1850/51.

⁴⁸ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 303 ex 1850/51.

⁴⁹ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 229 ex 1851/52.

pharmacy course had barely been introduced in 1853 when a sponsorship plan was developed, even before the ministerial regulation.

The university repeatedly took the initiative, in particular the philosophical faculty, which many times demanded the establishment of a medical faculty and a teacher training examination commission. The expansion of the philological disciplines was given priority out of cultural-political considerations and for reasons of state policy, and led in 1851 to the appointment of the Germanist Karl Weinhold and in 1854 to the creation of an associate professor for Italian language and literature, which was certainly also due to the influx of Italian-speaking students to the University of Graz. The faculty petition for the establishment of a chair of French language and literature remained without consequence. When Johann Pettovar approached the faculty in April 1851 with the request to “grant a chair in the Hungarian language”⁵⁰, he was refused. The reason probably did not lie in a rejection of the subject in principle, for when, at the end of 1859, Josef Drobnic⁵¹ applied for approval as a teacher for Illyrian, the faculty certainly showed an interest in the expansion of the range of courses, however the ministry wanted clarification in advance as to whether there was any need for such a thing.⁵²

When the professor for legal philosophy and the encyclopaedia of law, Heinrich Ahrens, left Graz in 1860 and a second chair was created, the philosophical faculty looked with envy at the juridical one and suggested to the ministry to finally consider the desires of their own faculty rather than that of the lawyers, and instead of appointing yet another professor of law to think about the vacant chairs of chemistry, botany and mineralogy.⁵³ In general, the ministry reacted positively and encouraged the faculty “to take into account the desirable increase in teaching staff as expressed.”⁵⁴

The orientation of university activity towards research meant that it was necessary to procure scientific literature. Each professor, especially those newly appointed, applied to the ministry for special endowments at substantial amounts.⁵⁵ In all, there is evidence that more than 3,300 fl. was made available to the philosophical faculty alone for the purchase of books in the period from 1850 to 1863, but it is likely that around 5,000 fl. in special endowments was provided for the purchase of books.

⁵⁰ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 342 ex 1850/51.

⁵¹ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 58 ex 1859/60.

⁵² UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 153, Zl 184, Zl 210 ex 1859/60.

⁵³ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 163 ex 1860/61.

⁵⁴ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 253 ex 1860/61.

⁵⁵ Thus in 1860 Emmanuel Hoffmann applied for 600 fl. for classical-philological textbooks. UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 63, Zl 335 ex 1850/51; Zl 282 ex 1852/53.

From 1853 it became common practice to request the procurement of very specific works via the library.⁵⁶ As in the Vormärz, lists of new acquisitions were created annually⁵⁷, which were now exchanged between universities, so that book inventories of other libraries became known. Prague was especially exemplary, whence a list of the works bought in 1852 reached Graz.⁵⁸ A new habit formed around 1860: The university library received an extraordinary endowment of 500 fl., which prompted the rector to invite teachers to make suggestions for the purchase of books.⁵⁹ Increasingly – probably also as a result of the enhanced public attention on the universities –, private donations were made in the form of money and books.⁶⁰

The collegial bodies and elections: § 88–91 of the “Draft”: After the March Revolution the University of Graz reacted promptly to the imminent changes. The collegial bodies started to function rapidly, which was not very easy organisationally in view of an overall staff level of fewer than thirty professors. The first conference of deans was held in 1855.

On 4 April 1848 the incumbent rector Friedrich Wagl resigned and demanded a new election.⁶¹ The collegial bodies started their activities immediately and presented the corresponding session protocols. The number of sessions was initially oriented on the agendas that arose, in other words, they were not regulated.⁶² It obviously took some time before business was conducted with a certain regularity; it is also not always clear from the correspondence with the ministry whether or not a letter was based on a decision by the faculty.

Apart from in the theological faculty, religious confession was not an obstacle to the appointment of professors, but until the end of the 1850s it provided grounds for exclusion from the passive right to vote for academic offices, which prompted the Germanist Georg Theodor Ritter von Karajan, who was Greek-Orthodox, to resign his position as professor in Vienna and return to the court library. One of the main obstacles was probably considered to be the fact that academic dignitaries had to participate in public events, some of which were religious in nature; a Corpus Christi procession without a representative from the university was inconceivable.⁶³ There were also repeated difficulties in Graz in electing non-Catholic professors to the office of dean. On 4 September 1855 the ministry rejected the election of Karl Weinhold and ordered

⁵⁶ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 274 ex 1852/53.

⁵⁷ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 380 ex 1852/53.

⁵⁸ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 387 ex 1862/53. At this time the Prague university library was in fact the best-run of all, indeed well beyond the Habsburg monarchy. Jan PEISKER: *Geschichte und Verwaltungstechnik eines zweifachbuchenden Bibliotheksystems*, Graz 1919.

⁵⁹ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 347 ex 1861/62.

⁶⁰ In 1863, for example, Ritter von Lilienthal donated 100 fl. – UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 151a ex 1862/63.

⁶¹ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 133 ex 1848.

⁶² UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 207 ex 1849/50.

⁶³ For example, an outdoor mass was held on 2 September 1849 to celebrate the peace with Sardinia, in which it was only natural that the representative of the university participate. KRONES: *Geschichte*, p. 173.

the process to be repeated.⁶⁴ The ministry once again refused to accept the next election, on 17 September, and demanded another repetition.⁶⁵ This time, Karl Hummel was elected dean, and Lorenz Gabriel was confirmed as vice-dean.⁶⁶ – There was also a degree of uncertainty at ministerial level at this time, because so much was happening; in 1856, for example, the election of the historian Johann Baptist Weiss as dean was confirmed on the condition that there would be no changes to the laws concerning the academic authorities.⁶⁷

In the 1858/59 academic year the zoologist Oskar Schmidt and the Germanist Karl Weinhold, both Protestants, wrote a letter to the ministry to plead for the “eligibility”⁶⁸ for election as dean. Finally, on 17 June 1860, Weinhold was elected dean of the philosophical faculty and confirmed by the ministry.⁶⁹

Habilitation procedure: In the 1850s, the habilitation procedure was rarely conducted in accordance with the prescribed rules. The ministry itself also contributed to this state, for example when it declared to the university in October 1850 that the pay corps official Anton Richter, a long-serving lecturer at the university, would from now on be a private lecturer in the subject of state accounting.⁷⁰ – Apart from such cases, each of the procedures suffered from formal defects, not least the lack of a desirable number of specialists. In addition, the habilitation standard, which applied from 1848 until 1878, provided for exceptions: “In the case of scientific celebrities, the teaching staff can be satisfied with the presentation of scientific works, without demanding a colloquium or probationary lecture. Furthermore, a probationary lecture is not required where the competence in oral lectures is already sufficiently known to the teaching staff.” “The teaching staff may dispense with the presentation of a doctoral diploma in the case of men who enjoy an excellent reputation as a result of their scientific achievements, or who otherwise meet the requirements of the teaching staff that cannot easily be satisfied.”⁷¹ In the period until 1865/66, 14 habilitation procedures were conducted at the philosophical faculty, half of which were attributable to the natural sciences and mathematics, and the other half to the humanities.⁷² There were repeated deviations from the standard procedure: the

⁶⁴ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 897, ZI 903 ex 1854/55. Cf. also a letter from Johann Baptist Weiß to Leo Thun. Graz, 8 August 1855, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D347. Weiß reports therein about the tensions among colleagues and the public sensation caused by the election of Weinhold.

⁶⁵ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 67, ZI 76 ex 1855/56.

⁶⁶ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 149 ex 1855/56.

⁶⁷ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 886 ex 1855/56.

⁶⁸ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 574 ex 1858/59.

⁶⁹ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 752, ZI 918 ex 1859/60.

⁷⁰ KRONES: Geschichte, p. 175.

⁷¹ Ministerial decree of 19 December 1848 ZI 8175.

⁷² Brigitte PRUTTI: Die Habilitationen an der philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Graz 1848–1890/91, in: Walter HÖFLECHNER (ed.): Beiträge und Materialien zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Österreich. Klassische Philologie in Graz – Habilitationen an der Grazer Philosophischen Fakultät – Einrichtung der

historians Franz Krones and Josef Zahn were exempted from colloquiums, while two candidates, Josef Zahn and the classical philologist Maximilian von Karajan⁷³, had not yet completed their doctorates at the time of habilitation. From the beginning of the 1860s the procedures increasingly followed the standard, initially in the faculty of law.

The nationality question in Graz: § 93 of the “Draft”: As already mentioned, the population of the Duchy of Styria was two-thirds German-speaking and one-third Slovenian-speaking. With the formation of the Academic Legion, the nationality question became acute on academic soil. The Slavic students in the Academic Legion wanted to stand beneath their own Slavic flag, and wear the Slavic cockade, while the Germans opposed this decisively. On 9 and 10 May 1848, Franz Miklosich, graduate of the University of Graz and already becoming an important linguist, came with a delegation from Vienna to Graz, to a conciliation mission that was not going well; on 11 May the Graz council got involved, suggesting that the unity of the university should be preserved in the Academic Legion with two equal flags, and appealing for mutual tolerance.⁷⁴

A reconciliation celebration, organised by a mediation committee, took place in the auditorium on 14 May, at which the Germans accepted the Slavic flag, but the very next day the Slavs announced they were leaving the Academic Legion, once they had learned of the ongoing preparations for a petition to the emperor in the context of the new regulation of the state structure, suggested by František Palacký, to create a Kingdom of Slovenia, which would not belong to the German Federation. There were no further developments, since the university closed at the end of June, reopening only at the beginning of November, after members of the Graz Academic Legion had returned from Vienna.

The professors did not get involved in national questions, although the proportion of academic teachers who spoke Slovenian as their native language was 20 percent.⁷⁵ Slovenian courses had already been offered since 1811, and in the 1850s parallel Slovenian lectures on “Austrian civil and criminal law”⁷⁶ were established, which were given by Josef Krainz. Furthermore, Johann Kopatsch gave lectures on criminal law and Michael Skedl on finance law in Slovenian. Demand, however, was limited. After Kopatsch, Krainz also ceased these lectures in 1854 for “lack of students”, as he reported, and Skedl’s lectures also had a short lifespan.

Germanistik-Lehrkanzeln – Briefe Adlers an Meinong – Zur Grazer Studentengeschichte (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 11) Graz 1981, p. 323–358.

⁷³ Peter TROPPEL: Maximilian Theodor Ritter von Karajan (1857–1904), in: HÖFLECHNER (ed.): Beiträge und Materialien, p. 57–65, here p. 57–58.

⁷⁴ KRONES: Geschichte, p. 539.

⁷⁵ KERNBAUER: Slowenen als Professoren, p. 39–59.

⁷⁶ KRONES: Geschichte, p. 549.

This might surprise at first, especially since the proportion of Slovenian students⁷⁷ cannot have been small; but it probably can be explained by the fact that the Slovenian students considered the German language to be more advantageous for their future careers, just as, in turn, German native-speaking students availed of the Slovenian lessons offered at the university for the purpose of attaining an additional qualification.

The question of the language of instruction became topical in the 1860s when it came to the establishment of a professorial chair for Slavic studies, which was eagerly desired by philologists under the aspect of comparative linguistics. The German speakers obviously feared a similar development to that in Krakow, Prague and the Kingdom of Hungary from 1861. Gregor Krek, the first Graz professor for Slavic studies, was scrupulous in avoiding being seen as a follower of a bilingual University of Graz.⁷⁸

Until the beginning of the 1860s Austria's position in the German federation played a significant role and was visible in the regulation of detailed matters. For example, in 1861 the ministry announced to the universities of Vienna, Prague and Innsbruck that the university qualifications of those of their students intending to enter the service of the Prussian state would be recognised.⁷⁹

The appointments procedure: § 62 of the "Draft": Many of the professorial chairs were created or occupied in quick succession from 1850. This led to a change in the personal composition of the juridical and philosophical faculties in a very short space of time, with not a few newly-appointed foreigners.

It is often not easy to follow each of the faculty proposals and thus the behaviour and the criteria of the scientific requirements, due to the poor state of the records, especially in the law faculty. This means that the university policy of Thun and his ministry often cannot be examined in detail using those sources.

It was necessary to continue using those professors who met the new requirements, and the procedure was pragmatic in the case of those scholars who had lost their domains as a result of the structural changes to the university landscape, for example due to the suspension of the University of Olomouc or the introduction of lessons in the national language from the 1860s.

⁷⁷ A detailed examination exists only for the second decade of the 19th century. Gernot KOCHER: „Man‘ studiert die Rechte in Graz“ – Nationalität und Herkunft von 1810–1820, in: Ludwig KARNIČAR, Vincenc RAJŠP (ed.): Graz und Slowenen. Gradec in Slovenci. Sammelband zum gleichnamigen Symposium vom 20.–21.V.2010 an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Wien, Graz, Ljubljana 2011, p. 73–80.

⁷⁸ Alois KERNBAUER: Gregor Krek in Začetki Slavistike na Univerzi v Gradcu, in: Gregor Krek (1840–1905). Filologija in Slovanstvo, Ljubljana 2006, p. 83–97.

⁷⁹ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 442 ex 1860/61.

The number of new appointments, and thus the innovation in personnel, was large. It is worth highlighting the much-cited case of the appointment of the “world historian” Johann Baptist Weiß, who cannot be found in the faculty proposal and whose appointment is seen to have been paradigmatic for Thun’s Catholic-conservative objections. – However other, political motives must also be considered in this context, above all the role attributed to history as an academic-scientific subject. According to Joseph Alexander Freiherr von Helfert, the national historiography was particularly pronounced in the nation states⁸⁰ and such a thing should be operated on a scientific basis, i.e. source-based, also for the multi-ethnic entity of the Habsburg state, whose formation and cohesion was not down to national motives, which had reached their height around 1850, but rather an abundance of other, common socioeconomic and cultural factors, including and above all religious denomination. – It could therefore be nothing but advantageous to have a Catholic historian with a “worldwide” view in the monarchy.

The appointments to other subjects also demonstrated the radical will to promote those scientists who represented new scientific endeavours and currents, who were also expected to have a positive effect on the state. One of these subjects was chemistry. After Justus Liebig had refused an appointment in Vienna at the beginning of the 1840s, no other professor was appointed who had not been educated by him in organic elementary analysis, who had not experienced his laboratory lessons, or who had not studied with another famous representative of the subject, such as Dumas or Bunsen.⁸¹ This had extraordinarily significant consequences for the cultivation of the chemical sciences in the Habsburg monarchy, admittedly not immediately, due to a frequent lack of infrastructure, but certainly within a few decades.

In the area of the humanities, philologists were ascribed a central role alongside history, in particular classical philology as the leading philological discipline and communicator of neo-humanist thinking. In 1850, Emanuel Hofmann⁸² was called to Graz on the recommendation of the Breslau professor Friedrich Haase, who corresponded robustly with Hermann Bonitz about the poaching of young academics from abroad from 1848⁸³, and worked there for six years.

Subsequently, concentration was placed on the rapid creation, where possible, of philological chairs for modern languages, most importantly those of the nationalities of the monarchy. The appointment of Germanist Weinhold was like a dam-burst in Graz; he soon had a large and

⁸⁰ Alexander Freiherr von HELFERT: *Über Nationalgeschichte und den gegenwärtigen Stand ihrer Pflege in Österreich*, Prag 1853.

⁸¹ KERNBAUER: *Emanzipation der Chemie*, p. 11–44.

⁸² Alois KERNBAUER, assisted by Gerhard E. STEYER: Emanuel Hoffmann, in: HÖFLECHNER (ed.): *Beiträge und Materialien*, p. 52–57.

⁸³ Alfred SCHNEIDER (ed.): *Briefe österreichischer Gelehrter 1849–1862. Beiträge zur Geschichte der österreichischen Unterrichtsreform. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen*, in: *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte* 113 (1936) p. 167–304, here p. 181–199.

grateful audience that turned to German philology with delighted interest. In 1859 he organised a university Schiller celebration.⁸⁴ Schwarzenberg's Central European concept as a pragmatic reply to the German national sentiment was obviously able to partially dispel the previous concerns, and in its political structure Germany was at least still "Austrian-federalist" until it became "Prussian-centralist" in 1866.

These few examples should suffice. By all accounts, with his reform and above all his appointment policy, Thun was pursuing not only state and power-political interests, but in particular the objective of promoting those scientific disciplines that were considered at the time to have the greatest benefit for the state as a whole.

Thus, the framework for a new understanding of university and scholarship was created, scientific research was finally recognised by all, alongside land, labour and capital, as the fourth productive force, and the University of Graz put forward this argument in favour of the continuation and completion of the university: "The wealth of a people does not lie merely in money and land, but also in knowledge and morality."⁸⁵

Continuity and change: The subjects and their representatives

Theological faculty

Contrary to the original intention, the theological faculties were excluded from the reform in some decisive points. In 1849, with their decision to reform the monastic and diocesan schools, the bishops had created the prerequisite for the highest resolution of 23 April 1850, according to which the theological faculties were granted the status of diocesan schools, whose curriculum was set primarily by the conference of bishops. One faculty was to comprise at least six professorial chairs and also "associate" subjects: Christian archaeology, apologetics, the history of the Revelation, synodology, dogma history and symbolism. In addition, doctoral studies in Semitic languages and higher exegesis were also planned.

At least the character of a university faculty was preserved, for the general ordinances of 1 October 1850 also applied to theology students⁸⁶, but the control of the faculties remained with the bishops. The final regulation was passed on the basis of the Concordat of 1855⁸⁷ and the resolutions of the Austrian conference of bishops of 1856, in the ministerial order of 29 March 1858.

⁸⁴ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 173 ex 1859/60.

⁸⁵ UAG Rektorat: Denkschrift für die Vervollständigung der kais.kön. Karl-Franzens-Universität zu Graz, April 1861.

⁸⁶ Ministerial decree of 16 September 1851. – UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 13 ex 1851/52.

⁸⁷ Articles VI and XVII of the Concordat were taken as the foundation.

The selection procedure, which after the decree of 11 December 1848 was considered to be only a subsidiary possibility for appointments and which was abolished the next academic year, 1849/50, for the three secular faculties, remained in place for the theological faculties. For professorial appointments, a doctorate was not necessarily a *conditio sine qua non*, but it was expected of candidates. With the highest resolution of 29 December 1850 a separate chair was created for the obligatory subject of “canon law”, which students had previously attended at the law faculty.⁸⁸

From 1851, Church history and canon law were united under one hand at the Graz theological faculty, and continued to be occupied by Matthias Robitsch.⁸⁹ The subjects Old Testament and New Testament also continued to be represented by Friedrich Wagl and Michael Fruhmann, just as prior to 1848. In 1852 dogmatism received its own representative in the person of Josef Tosis, while in pastoral theology, Johann Riedl was followed in 1854 by Heinrich August Lehmann. There was greater fluctuation only in the subject of moral theology: The Piarist Ehrlich Ninaus was succeeded as professor, after two substitutions by Anton Klementsich and Franz Schweitzer, by the Vorau Augustinian, Canon Marcellinus Schlager.

Legal and political science faculty

As well as the state guidelines for law studies, basic legal thinking changed, whereby the legal historical approach was increasingly supplemented by a philosophical perspective.

The doctorate was regulated by the highest resolution of 23 April 1850, the provisions for the three state examinations were set by the highest resolution of 27 April 1852⁹⁰ and in the supplementary provisions of 20 March 1856 and 10 March 1858. An overall study regulation was made with the highest resolution of 25 September 1855.⁹¹

In 1850 the Belgian Heinrich Ahrens became the first foreigner to join the faculty; after his departure in 1860 his subject, legal philosophy and encyclopaedia of law, was divided into two chairs. German imperial and legal history, which was connected to criminal law, was taken on from 1857 by the Hesse native, Georg Sandhaas.

Professors Gustav von Schreiner, political science, Franz Wiesenauer, Austrian private law, and Johann Blaschke, commercial and exchange law and legal proceedings, already took office in the Vormärz, as did Adalbert Theodor Michel, who was moved in 1855 from the dissolved

⁸⁸ Ministerial decree of 26 Januar 1851.

⁸⁹ Friedrich RINNHOFFER: Grazer theologische Fakultät vom Studienjahr 1827/28 bis 1938/39. Das literarische Schaffen aller Lehrenden und die Entwicklung der einzelnen Disziplinen, 2 vols (Dissertationen der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, vol. 82), Graz 1991.

⁹⁰ Ministerial decree of 1 May 1852.

⁹¹ Ministerial decree of 2 October 1855.

University of Olomouc to Graz. After the early death of August Chabert⁹², who had made a name for himself in the field of Austrian legal history, Roman law and Church law was represented by one professor, namely by Johann Kopatsch, who had been appointed from Innsbruck, and thereafter by the German, Gustav Demelius. Thus Demelius was the third foreign professor in the faculty.

Following the decree of 26 November 1873, seminars began in Roman law, criminal law, civil law, economics, civil procedure and exchange law, Austrian legal history and Church law.

Philosophical faculty

The creation of the eight-grade secondary school caused a shock in the philosophical faculty. It feared for its basis of existence, at its meeting of 19 May 1848 it spoke out against moving propaedeutic philosophical studies to secondary schools⁹³ and organised a common approach with philosophical courses, such as those in Klagenfurt, Linz, Brno, Gorizia, Olomouc, Ljubljana, Kremsmünster, Prague, Krems and Tarnow.

The impact of the changes on the number of students of the faculty was dramatic: Where 91 full and 11 associate students had still enrolled in the outgoing model in 1850 – at the same time the number of students in the theological faculty was 111, in the juridical 210 – by the 1850/51 winter semester the faculty had only 9 students. The later so successful Germanist Karl Weinhold began with only one student. It is therefore not surprising that the faculty repeatedly started initiatives for its expansion, for example in 1852, when it suggested the creation of state stipends for philosophical studies, which was rejected by the minister “with regret”.⁹⁴

The philosopher Lorenz Gabriel and the mathematician Josef Knar had already started teaching in the Vormärz and continued under the new conditions. In 1862 Gabriel was succeeded by Johann Nahlowsky, and Knar by Karl Hornstein. The chemist Franz Hruschauer had also already been appointed in the Vormärz for the subject of preparatory sciences in the medical-surgical course; after 1848 both he and the laboratory of the medical-surgical school were moved to the philosophical faculty.⁹⁵

Most of the professors came to Graz at the beginning of the 1850s, the physicist Karl Hummel, the natural historian Ludwig Schmarda, the classical philologist Emmanuel Hoffmann in 1850,

⁹² Hermann BALTL: August Chabert und die österreichische Rechtsgeschichte, in: Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Germanistische Abteilung 103 (1986) Heft 1, p. 276–293.

⁹³ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 285 ex 1848.

⁹⁴ KRONES: Geschichte, p. 179.

⁹⁵ Alois KERNBAUER: Das Fach Chemie an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 17), Graz 1985.

the representative of world history Johann Baptist Weiß⁹⁶ and the neo-Germanist Karl Weinhold in 1851, who was succeeded after his departure to Kiel by the Schiller scholar Karl Tomaschek. The proportion of Germans among the newly-appointed professors was large: Weinhold, Weiß, Hoffmann and the zoologist Oskar Schmidt, who was appointed in 1857. At the same time as the appointment of the important zoologist Schmarda, the subject of natural history became independent; to that point, natural history had been taught in the framework of the preparatory sciences for future surgeons. Schmarda was called to Prague in 1852, but took up the post only after his return from a world trip.⁹⁷ There subsequently began a period of substitutions in the three sub-disciplines zoology, botany and mineralogy; proper lessons could only be provided in conjunction with the facilities of the comparatively well-equipped Joanneum, the precursor institution to the present-day Technical University. While Johann Czermak was appointed professor of zoology in February 1855, the lectures in mineralogy remained with Benedict Kopecky, and those in botany with Georg Bill.⁹⁸ The zoologist Oskar Schmidt, appointed in 1857, and the mineralogist Victor von Zepharovich, appointed in 1861, also had to rely on the teaching materials of the Joanneum.

Since a pharmaceutical course had been established in 1853 at the universities of Graz, Innsbruck and Lviv, these subjects were indispensable. The study regulations of 1859 also anchored this course in the philosophical faculty.⁹⁹

The reforms in the philosophical faculty after 1863

It was only after the foundation of the medical faculty that those decisive measures were taken that transformed the University of Graz, whose existence was now secured, into a research university, in line with the basic principles of the Thunian reforms. New subjects were institutionalised, professors appointed, seminars and institutes established.

In the period of neo-humanism, the creation of a seminar for classical philology had priority. Shortly after his appointment as professor in 1863, Karl Schenkl introduced seminars

⁹⁶ Walter HÖFLECHNER: Das Fach „Geschichte“ an der Philosophischen resp. Geisteswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Graz. Vertretung und Institution von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 44/1), Graz 2015. Alois KERNBAUER: Das historiografische Werk Grazer Historiker. 150 Jahre Institut für Geschichte an der Universität Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 44/2). – Alois KERNBAUER: Geschichtsstudium. Autobiografische Berichte. Die in Graz verfassten Dissertationen. 150 Jahre Institut für Geschichte an der Universität Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 44/3), Graz 2015.

⁹⁷ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 281 ex 1854/55.

⁹⁸ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 366 ex 1854/55.

⁹⁹ Alois KERNBAUER: Zwischen Zunft und Wissenschaft. Der österreichische Apotheker- und Pharmazeutenstand in der Krise. Von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in das Jahr 1922 (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 14/2), Graz 1989.

provisionally, and the institution was approved the following year by the ministry.¹⁰⁰ The programmatic title of Schenkl's inaugural lecture, "On the value of linguistic comparison for classical philology" itself revealed the importance given to linguistics. Apart from the political educational considerations in terms of national and study matters¹⁰¹, the objective of the philologists was to have those subjects represented at the university that were necessary for Indo-Germanic linguistic comparison. Classical philology, German and a representative for Italian language and literature were the subjects institutionalised in Graz at this time, which were joined in 1870 by Slavic studies under Gregor Krek¹⁰², in 1873 by comparative linguistics¹⁰³ under Johannes Schmidt, in 1876 by Romance studies under Hugo Schuchardt and in the late 1880s and early 1890s by English under Karl Luick. In 1893 Luick applied for the creation of a seminar. At this time, seminars for English philology existed in the German Empire only in Strasbourg, Halle, Göttingen, Erlangen and Leipzig, and in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy only in Vienna.

In the late autumn of 1865, the newly-appointed professor for Austrian history, Franz Krones, suggested the creation of a seminar for history.¹⁰⁴ The seminar for German philology was established in 1873, and that for Slavic philology in 1892.¹⁰⁵ The establishment for art history was called "institute" from the very outset.

For the natural science subjects the existing institutes were equipped to meet the new requirements; and the following new subjects were added: physics, chemistry, botany, phyto-palaeontology, zoology and zootomy, geology, and geography. Not all of the other institutions – phyto-palaeontological museum, archaeological museum, epigraphical-numismatic cabinet, mathematical-physical cabinet and university observatory – developed to become "institutes". In 1865, in other words two years after the "completion" of the university, the teacher training examination commission was created. The classicist Emmanuel Hoffmann had applied for its establishment already in 1851¹⁰⁶, but the ministry wanted to wait for the clarification of certain,

¹⁰⁰ Alois KERNBAUER: Karl Schenkl, in: HÖFLECHNER (ed.): Beiträge und Materialien, p. 65–98, here p. 65–66.

¹⁰¹ Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Die Einrichtung der Lehrkanzeln für deutsche Philologie in Österreich nach der Universitätsreform der Jahre 1848/49, in: HÖFLECHNER (ed.): Beiträge und Materialien, p. 359–406.

¹⁰² KERNBAUER: Gregor Krek und die Anfänge der Slavistik an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, in: Anzeiger für Slavische Philologie XXXIII (2005), p. 53–70. KERNBAUER: Gregor Krek in začetki slavistike, p. 83–97.

¹⁰³ Fritz Freiherr LOCHNER VON HÜTTENBACH: Das Fach Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft an der Universität Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 5) Graz 1976.

¹⁰⁴ HÖFLECHNER: Das Fach „Geschichte“. KERNBAUER: Das historiografische Werk. KERNBAUER: Geschichtsstudium – Autobiografische Berichte – Die in Graz verfassten Dissertationen.

¹⁰⁵ Erich LEITNER: Die neuere deutsche Philologie an der Universität Graz 1851–1954. Beitrag zur Geschichte der Germanistik in Österreich (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 1) Graz 1973, p. 212–217.

¹⁰⁶ UAG Phil. Fak. Zl 570 ex 1850/51.

unrevealed matters before deciding.¹⁰⁷ Two years later the application was renewed by the second classicist Karlmann Tangl¹⁰⁸, however without success.

At the end of the 1850s student initiatives showed just how disadvantageous the lack of a teacher training examination commission was. The activities of the students were sure to have the backing of the professors. Thus Mathias Vadusek¹⁰⁹ sought ministerial support to sit the teacher training examination, while at the same time an associate teacher at the Graz Gymnasium prepared for the examination.¹¹⁰ Another student, Konstantin G. Hodobay, requested a report on his “use” to date¹¹¹ – obviously as a scientific assistant – and announced his intention to sit the teacher training examination in Graz.¹¹² Hodobay also secured the support of the Hungarian governor.¹¹³ At the end of the 1861 summer semester, reports by numerous professors testified to his diligence and talent, which brought him funding.¹¹⁴ None of these initiatives amounted to anything, and the teacher training examination commission, like many other institutions associated with the restructuring of the university under the Thunian reforms, was created only in the years after 1863.

Medical-surgical course and medical faculty

The semester examinations continued in the medical-surgical course,¹¹⁵ the admission requirements to the strict examinations for the patronage of surgery on the basis of frequentation certificates were explained in 1851¹¹⁶. There were minor changes to the canon of subjects in 1855: Ophthalmology, which had previously been taught by surgeons and therapists, was declared obligatory and its occupation with its own specialist representative was announced. There were no structural changes to the medical-surgical school, which was now institutionally separate from the university; the new regulation of the assistant system also did not apply to the medical-surgical course.

¹⁰⁷ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 635 ex 1850/51.

¹⁰⁸ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 76 ex 1853/54.

¹⁰⁹ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 957 ex 1859/60.

¹¹⁰ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 86 ex 1860/61.

¹¹¹ Professors Weiß, Tangl and Karajan were asked to write reports. UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 352 ex 1859/60; ZI 357 and 366 ex 1860/61.

¹¹² UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 351 ex 1860/61.

¹¹³ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 365, ZI 368 ex 1860/61.

¹¹⁴ UAG Phil. Fak. ZI 588, ZI 589, ZI 591 ex 1860/61.

¹¹⁵ KERNBAUER: Leitlinien und Besonderheiten der medizinisch-chirurgischen Ausbildung in Graz. Eine Skizze, in: Petra SCHEIBLECHNER: Die neuen Wundärzte. Die Absolventen des Grazer Medizinisch-chirurgischen Studiums 1782–1863 (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz 6/6), Graz 2014, p. xi–xlvi.

¹¹⁶ Ministerial decree of 11 March 1851. Ministerial order of 5 November 1852.

The composition of the professors changed with the appointment of Lorenz Rigler, who came to Graz in 1855 after many years in Constantinople.¹¹⁷ Chemistry was represented by Hruschauer, professor in the philosophical faculty, who also held lectures for future surgeons in 1856 after the appointment of Eduard Schäfer and the establishment of a small laboratory¹¹⁸, when Schäfer fell ill. In 1862 Richard Heschl came to Graz as professor of “pathological anatomy”; he had left Krakow after the introduction of Polish as the teaching language.

New lectures beyond the standard subjects started to be offered, and gradually the courses on offer began to resemble those of a medical faculty: From 1857 Franz Brunn taught dentistry, from 1858 Alois Reßl taught ophthalmology and Donat August Lang taught forensic medicine and psychiatry. Severe changes in connection with the establishment of a medical faculty took effect only with the completion of the University of Graz.¹¹⁹

A commission led by the Viennese physiologist Ernst von Brücke developed a spatial concept for the newly-created faculty and listed the other scientific and practical “requirements”. All of the young professors had come from the Vienna school of medicine; three of them had already taught at the medical-surgical school, namely Karl von Rzehaczek, who worked in Graz from 1850 and who enjoyed an excellent reputation as a surgeon, Franz Clar, who began lectures on paediatrics in 1851, and the Rokitansky pupil Richard Heschl, who had been in Graz since 1861. Moritz Körner came to the medical-surgical school in spring 1863 as professor for special medical pathology, therapy and clinic, and a short time later was appointed professor for internal medicine at the newly-founded faculty. The other professors were newly appointed: The Rokitansky pupil Julius von Planner for topographical and descriptive anatomy, the Brücke pupil Alexander Rollett for physiology, Karl Blodig for ophthalmology, Karl von Helly for obstetrics and gynaecology and Adolf von Schauenstein for forensic medicine. The newly appointed associate professors included Bartholomäus Dreschnigg for pandemic diseases and Karl Folwarczny for pathological chemistry.

Already one year after the foundation of the faculty, in 1864, Eduard Lipp habilitated for dermatology and syphilis, and was appointed professor of this subject ten years later.¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ Alois KERNBAUER: Lorenz Rigler, Istanbul und die „medizinische Geographie“, in: Arslan TERZIOGLU, Erwin LUCIUS (ed.): Türk – Avusturya tibbi ilişkileri. Österreichisch-türkische medizinische Beziehungen. Berichte des Symposiums vom 28. und 29. April 1986 in Istanbul, Istanbul 1987, p. 121–132.

¹¹⁸ Anton HOLASEK, Alois KERNBAUER: Biochemie in Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 35), Graz 1997, p. 18–19.

¹¹⁹ The changes in personnel in connection with the foundation of the faculty can be found in: Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Die Gründung der medizinischen Fakultät im Jahre 1863. Eine Fallstudie österreichischer Bildungs- und Wissenschaftspolitik in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, vol. 19), Graz 1986.

¹²⁰ The attempt at habilitation in 1863 by Franz Petry did not have a positive outcome. Elisabeth ORTNER: Dermatologie und Venerologie an der Universität Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz vol. 37), Graz 1998, p. 33–48.

The newly-created institutes included those for general and descriptive anatomy, physiology, pharmacology, histology and embryology, pathological anatomy, applied medical chemistry and state pharmacology, as well as the medical clinic, the surgical clinic, clinics for ophthalmology, for obstetrics and gynaecology and, some years later, those for the mentally ill, for dermatology and for paediatric diseases.

Summary

After an initial boom, the reforms of the Thun era stalled for many reasons: On the one hand there was a lack of funding for a rapid implementation, on the other hand, the reservoir of candidates who met the new requirements profile was not sufficiently large. All of those involved were aware of the high costs of the restructuring. Therefore, the reform of the University of Graz had only been implemented in part by 1860, when Thun left office.

There was a lack of scientific institutes and seminars, there was no teacher training examination commission, the existing institutions for physics and chemistry were by no means equipped to the latest standard, there were no institutes for the natural history subjects, i.e. botany, zoology and mineralogy, which could only be taught with the help of the facilities of the Joanneum, the precursor institution to the Technical University. In none of the subjects was there any differentiation, which was already considered necessary at the time. – The first step in this direction was taken in 1862 with the creation of a second chair for classical philology, when Max von Karajan joined Karlmann Tangl. There was no competition in research and teaching, for which there was a material incentive with the financial compensation for the courses. Thus – to use the language of the time – no academic “schools”¹²¹ existed, i.e. circles of students and researchers intent on engaging in scientific activity. In the filling of chairs the appointments procedure got going only gradually, for a long time appointments were significantly controlled by the ministry. The habilitation procedure took off only after 1860 in the intended form, initially in the law faculty.

Nevertheless, the reform era also brought an enormous transformation to the University of Graz, which shows itself in the following parameters: In the changes to and renewal of the personnel structure, the scientific profile of the candidates played an increasingly important role, against which previously decisive criteria such as length of service or religious denomination drew into the background.

¹²¹ Michael G. JAROSEVSKIJ: Die Logik der Wissenschaftsentwicklung und die wissenschaftliche Schule, in: Semen R. MIKULINSKIJ, Michael G. JAROSEFSKIJ, Günter KRÖBER, Helmut STEINER (ed.): Wissenschaftliche Schulen, vol. 1, Berlin 1977, p. 13–81.

It was decisive that the new organisational structures stimulated the members of the university to undertake independent initiatives and awoke in them a new awareness of their position and mission. Already immediately after the Revolution of 1848 there was joyous participation in the collegial decision-making processes, and strengthened connection with, indeed integration into the network of German-speaking universities was welcomed. A new corporate identity emerged, a new understanding of university and a new opinion of the career of a member of the university, whose main focus was research as a core task.

On the occasion of the celebrations of the completion of the University of Graz, Rector Richard Heschl presented to the public the new self-perception of science and university, and did not fail to point out that the universities of Germany had preceded them in their formation. Heschl's theoretical position, which corresponded with his time, was the assumption of the possibility of "objective" knowledge. In addition to the task of training academic specialists to make a practical impact on the community, the university also assumes, as a central mission, the search for scientific truth and the attainment of knowledge, and in the process follows three approaches: the philosophical method, according to which knowledge is logically apparent *per se*, the humanist method, which bases its theoretical knowledge on empirical findings, and the natural science method, which is associated with empirical-experimental research. Since this form of gaining knowledge sometimes contradicts the common assumption of everyday experience or of the senses, an academic education only makes sense by means of communicating the method of scientific knowledge production, which leads the young academics to the relevant insight into scientifically correct knowledge. Only this insight into scientific truth guarantees the greatest effectiveness in practice. Accordingly, purpose-free research has the greatest practical effect. In Heschl's words:

"Science must be conducted for its own sake. Only by these means can the concealed relationships of the body of nature, upon which knowledge the practical application of science depends, be gradually uncovered and brought to our understanding."¹²² The practical living environment is directed towards the future and the implementation of these principles, while scientific research appears to be backward-looking, starting from the basics, which indeed must always precede implementation. To Heschl, this was the essence of the university:

Es ist freilich längst anerkannt, daß die Hauptaufgabe der Hochschule die Forschung nach Wahrheit im weitesten Sinne ist, aber es ist unendlich wichtig, diese Aufgabe nach allen Richtungen hin klar zu machen; es erübrigt also jetzt, nach Feststellung der Anforderungen der Praxis zu zeigen, daß dieselbe aus dem Wesen der Wissenschaft hervorgeht, dass das subjective Bedürfniß des sich mit der Wissenschaft Beschäftigenden organisch aus der Praxis

¹²² Richard HESCHL: Ueber die Aufgaben der Hochschule. Festrede zum 15. November 1864, gehalten vom Rector Magnificus Prof. Dr. Heschl in der Aula der Universität Graz, Graz 1864.

hervorgewachsen ist; endlich den Einfluß zu zeigen, den die so gestellte Aufgabe der Hochschule auf diese selbst und ihre äußere Stellung ausübt. [...] Wissenschaft ist Reichthum. Jede Vermehrung der Bildungsstätten eines Landes trägt in der Hebung der geistigen und sittlichen Zustände ihre Zinsen, aus denen sich von selbst die Steigerung auch des äußeren Wohlstandes ergibt.¹²³

¹²³ HESCHL: Aufgaben. “Indeed it has long been recognised that the main task of the university is the search for truth in the broadest sense, but it is endlessly important to make this task clear in all directions; there is therefore no need now, after establishing the practical requirements, to show that this emerges from the essence of science, that the subjective need of the person occupied with science has grown organically out of the practice; finally to show the influence exerted by the mission thus set for the university on itself and on its external position. [...] Science is wealth. Each increase in the educational institutes of a country yields interest in the elevation of the intellectual and moral conditions, which also leads inevitably to an increase in welfare in general.”

Aspects of the Thunian Reforms at the University of Innsbruck¹

Introduction

This essay considers some aspects of the implementation of the Thunian reforms at the University of Innsbruck. First we take a look at the year 1848 and the measures in the first reform phase² and examine here in particular the question as to how the reforms and reform ideas were perceived by different university groups, but also by other parts of the population. Different conflicts and debates both within the university and between university and non-university actors will be examined. The central interest is to analyse which ideas of the function of the university existed. The starting point is the assumption that the reform phase represented an (open) process of negotiation, in which different functions of the university were discussed, and that these discussions allow us to conclude the expectations placed on the university. The core of the study is the philosophical faculty, as this initially formed the focus for the reformers. In the second part the analysis is then extended to the whole university, and a further line of discussion that is characteristic of the history of the University of Innsbruck in the 1850s is illuminated, namely the question as to what extent the Innsbruck university, as a particularly Catholic institution, was able to assume a special mission within the Habsburg monarchy, indeed the entire German federation. Since this debate is, at the same time, often combined with the discussion on the foundation of a Catholic university for Germany, it is suitable for closer analysis for a number of reasons: on the one hand, essential debates from the period on university policy can be discussed and placed in relation to the much-discussed ideas of Leo Thun on scientific policy and his views on the relationship between religion and science. This is interesting because precisely these ideas have shaped the often negative evaluation of Thun.³ Furthermore, the study also provides the opportunity to discuss the (competing) relationship between Austrian and German universities. Not least, the discussion provides an insight into the different social expectations placed on a/the university.

¹ The essay is based on the author's dissertation: Christof AICHNER: Die Umsetzung der Thun-Hohensteinschen Reformen an der Universität Innsbruck (1848–1860), phil. Diss. Innsbruck 2014.

² I consider this first phase to be the period from the March Revolution of 1848 to the Silvesterpatent of 1851. The beginning of the reform is clearly marked by the revolution, a number of turning points suggest themselves for the end of this phase. It is possible to end it with the provisional approval of the reforms by Emperor Franz Joseph in September/October 1849. However a later end, namely with the Silvesterpatent, appears justifiable to me, especially as Thun briefly considered resigning during the course of the discussions on the patent, which might have put an end to the university reforms. Yet Thun sat more securely on his perch after 1851 and now began, especially by means of his personnel policy, to conduct a targeted university policy.

³ Cf. also the essay by FILLAFER/FEICHTINGER in this volume.

Finally, in the third part, I examine the extent to which a very particular functional expansion of Austrian universities, namely the definition of the universities as scientific institutions and thus the integration of research into the universities, can already be proven for Thun's era. To this end, different conflicts between the professors and the head of the library will be examined. The library is particularly suitable as an object of study because the aforementioned functional expansion of the universities also meant that the role of university libraries, as essential aids to research, was redefined, and the university library was fundamentally revalued.

No specific examination is made in this essay of Thun's personnel policy, which has always played a central part in the research on Thun. However the subject areas addressed will enable multiple cross references to be made to Thun's personnel policy.⁴

The University of Innsbruck was opened in 1669, and gradually lessons were given in all four faculties. However, the celebratory foundation took place only in 1677, by means of imperial and papal deeds of foundation.⁵ As with other university foundations in this era, the Society of Jesus also played a central role in Innsbruck: for instance, the philosophical course derived seamlessly from the Jesuit school, and the order provided professors also for the other faculties, especially the theological faculty. More significant, however, is the fact that the university, like the Jesuit order itself, was named in the letter of foundation as a bulwark against Protestantism, or as a reaction to the foundation of numerous "heterodox universities"⁶ in the Empire.

The subsequent history of the university was not without setbacks, and twice it was downgraded to a lyceum: During the rule of Emperor Joseph II the university was downgraded for the first time between 1782 and 1792, in accordance with the emperor's educational programme. In the process, both the medical and the theological faculties were also withdrawn. The university also experienced brief adjustments to the Bavarian educational system during the Bavarian rule in Tyrol, and in addition was downgraded for the second time to a lyceum in 1810.⁷ In 1826, the

⁴ Cf. for details AICHNER: *Umsetzung*, p. 135–278. There, all appointments made at the University of Innsbruck during the Thun era are analysed and each appointments network is described. In particular, the question of the tension between the university's right to supplement itself and the ministerial regime is examined.

⁵ Cf. on the foundation of the university in Gerhard OBERKOFER, Peter GOLLER: *Geschichte der Universität Innsbruck (1669–1945)* (Schriftenreihe des Ludwig-Boltzmann-Instituts für Internationale Kultur- und Wirtschaftsbeziehungen. Rechts- und sozialwissenschaftliche Reihe, vol. 14), Frankfurt, Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, Wien 1996, p. 11–30. The work provides the best overview of the history of the university. See also, particularly as source for the early development of the university, the works by: Ignatz DE LUCA: *Versuch einer akademischen gelehrten Geschichte von der Kaiserl. Königl. Leopoldinischen Universität zu Innsbruck* (*Journal der Literatur und Statistik*, vol. 1), Innsbruck 1782; Jakob PROBST: *Geschichte der Universität Innsbruck seit ihrer Entstehung bis zum Jahre 1860*, Innsbruck 1869.

⁶ Cf. a facsimile of the foundation letter from Emperor Leopold, printed in: ÖSTERREICHISCHE HOCHSCHÜLERSCHAFT (ed.): *300 Jahre Universitas Oenipontana. Die Leopold-Franzens-Universität zu Innsbruck und ihre Studenten*, Innsbruck 1970, pasted between pages 20 and 21.

⁷ OBERKOFER et al.: *Geschichte*, p. 83–97.

University of Innsbruck was finally restored, and since then has borne the name of its two founders, Emperor Leopold I and Emperor Franz I.

Despite its more recent title of university, on closer inspection there is much to suggest that the university should still be seen as a lyceum even after 1826, not least because it consisted of only two faculties – legal and philosophical – and an attached medical-surgical course. In 1848 a total of twelve professors taught at these two faculties, six in each. In addition there were three teachers for modern languages and special skills such as fencing and gymnastics. The Leopold-Franzens University of Innsbruck was one of the smallest in the group of universities of the Habsburg monarchy and, in contrast to the more prestigious universities in Vienna and Prague, had above all a regional attraction. The number of enrolled students in the Vormärz was on average around 250.⁸

The Revolution of 1848 in Innsbruck

In 1848, as described by Hans Heiss and Thomas Götz in 1998, Tyrol was “at the edge of the Revolution”⁹. When news of the upheaval in the capital, of the protests of the Viennese students, and of the first concessions by the emperor reached Innsbruck in March 1848, the students staged celebratory demonstrations and torch-lit processions. They also formed an Academic Legion.¹⁰ There were no violent conflicts like those in Vienna. While it is implied in different accounts that some of the students in the Jesuit college broke windows, which is interesting for its symbolism, the sources in this case are so contradictory that it cannot be said with certainty whether this actually happened.

In general the students restricted themselves to celebrating the achievements of their Viennese colleagues. In a note by the Innsbruck students to the students in Vienna, the former expressed their admiration for the students in the capital and assured them that they would “live and die [together] for rights and freedom”¹¹. The increasing German national¹² feelings of the Innsbruck students were embedded in a loyal attitude towards the House of Habsburg. This

⁸ On student numbers see Peter GOLLER: Die Matrikel der Universität Innsbruck. Abteilung: Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Fakultät, vol. 1 (1849–1918), Innsbruck 1998; Peter GOLLER: Die Matrikel der Universität Innsbruck. Die Matrikel der Theologischen Fakultät, vol. 1 (1857–1900), Innsbruck 1995; Peter GOLLER: Die Matrikel der Universität Innsbruck. Philosophische Fakultät.

⁹ Hans HEISS, Thomas GÖTZ: Am Rand der Revolution. Tirol 1848/49, Wien, Bozen 1998.

¹⁰ Cf. Matthias EGGER: „Für Gott, Kaiser und Vaterland zu Stehen oder zu Fallen ...“. Die Aufzeichnungen Joseph Hundeggers aus dem Revolutionsjahr 1848 (Erfahren – Erinnern – Bewahren), Innsbruck 2012.

¹¹ Gruß an die Studenten Wiens von den Studenten Innsbrucks, in: Bothe für Tirol und Vorarlberg, 27 (03.04.1848), p. 138.

¹² Cf. Gottfried Giovanelli to his parents, Innsbruck 22 March 1848, Abschrift in der Giovanellischen Familiengeschichte, Microfilm 1231, Tiroler Landesarchiv; and the diary records by Hundegger in Matthias EGGER: „Für Gott, Kaiser und Vaterland zu Stehen oder zu Fallen ...“.

loyalty can be seen especially in the fact that the Academic Legion was involved in the suppression of the Upper Italian national uprisings.¹³ The military campaign of the academic company passed without any great conflicts and the students returned to their place of study at the end of June 1848, where they were received by the jubilant population and by the emperor, who was present in Innsbruck at the time.¹⁴ The news of the October events in Vienna met with rejection in Innsbruck and, in contrast to Vienna, the University of Innsbruck reopened its doors for a new semester – albeit belatedly – in the autumn of 1848.

Despite the generally quiet progress of the revolutionary year in Innsbruck, several events that would appear important for an understanding of the reform era can be registered: First, the students and their political views emerge clearly for a short while, before again becoming less tangible for more than a decade, until the foundation of the first student fraternities in the 1860s. However, the students in Innsbruck expressed their views primarily on the acquired citizens' rights, and ultimately we learn nothing about their perception of the incipient university reform. Later there are also only a few reference points that indicate the attitude of the students to the university reform. Second, and this derives directly from the first point, the view of the authorities and the professors regarding the students is particularly shaped by the activities in 1848. Even though the Innsbruck students – compared to their fellow students in Vienna – behaved tamely, the impression of the Revolution of 1848, in which the students abandoned their previous passive existence, appeared actively in public and got involved politically, influenced the perception of the students in the long term and the actions of those in political power: An event like 1848, a protest by young men, the future intellectual elite of the country, had to be averted at all costs. In this regard, the students repeatedly also became objects of negotiation in the reform debates after 1848, for ultimately the educational system was considered to be a key factor in the political education of the students, and therefore the reform of the educational systems should also always serve to prevent a new revolution.¹⁵

Third – and here I would like to lead into the implementation of the reforms in Innsbruck – it can be seen in the case of Innsbruck that the conduct of the students in 1848 during the course of the reform process was instrumentalised in very different ways. For on the one hand the professors highlighted the loyalty and fidelity of the Innsbruck students and thus testified to the moderating power that both they and the Catholic environment of the state had on the students. On the other hand they referred to the potential dangers posed by the students and thus

¹³ Cf. Matthias EGGER: Die I. Akademische Kompanie der k. k. Universität zu Innsbruck. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Tiroler Landesverteidigung im Jahre 1848, in: *Tiroler Heimat* (2010), p. 181–207.

¹⁴ On the course of the campaign and the return to Innsbruck see in particular EGGER: *Akademische Kompanie*.

¹⁵ Cf. for more detail AICHNER: *Umsetzung*, p. 129–132.

underlined the demand for more surveillance of the students by means of a new disciplinary order, in which the professors would be granted the key role in monitoring the students.

The first reforming steps at the university

The return of the students after the Italian campaign for the 1848/49 winter semester meant, at the same time, starting at a new university, for while the university that they had left euphorically and speedily in the spring of 1848 might have looked the same on the outside, there had already been significant changes “internally”. The first preparations had also been made in summer, which were necessary for the extension of the secondary school and the upgrading of the philosophical course to a full faculty. Equally important was also the decree of 11 April 1848, which placed the universities under the direct control of the newly-created Ministry for Education and transferred management of the universities to the professors. A step that delighted the Innsbruck professors, who stressed:

Indem sie [die Universität, C. A.] sich durch dasselbe als eine freie selbstständige Corporation fühlt, erkennt sie in dieser Selbstständigkeit die Bedingung des günstigen Fortschrittes aller wissenschaftlichen Entwicklung, und hofft zuversichtlich, daß aus diesem ersten Keime des neuen konstitutionellen Lebens für sie die Kräfte der Gesinnungstüchtigkeit und Wissenschaft angetrieben werden.¹⁶

Inspired by the new powers, the senate then decided to ask the ministry to exclude the academic directors as “heterogeneous”¹⁷ elements from the running of and involvement in university panels. However the ministry curbed the zeal of the professors and stressed that the self-administration applied only to study matters, and the academic directors remained in office formally until autumn 1849. In Innsbruck, however, Academic Director Daniel von Mensi resigned as early as February 1849, the professors having veritably ousted him from office. The dispute that preceded this resignation was actually quite trivial: Mensi had accepted a decree from the ministry that had been intended for the professors. But the professors saw this as a restriction of their new freedoms and feared, they wrote, a return to the old conditions. They saw in this act an attempt by the governor

die alte drückende Herrschaft über die Universität wieder zu bekommen. [...] Die mannigfaltigen Unannehmlichkeiten, die sie die früheren Jahre vom Präsidium und Gubernium erhalten hatte, und wodurch die Würde der Lehranstalt, die Freude und der frische Muth am

¹⁶ Academic Senate to MCU (concept), Innsbruck 15 April 1848, Senatssitzungsprotokolle 3, ad 134 ex 1847/48, Universitätsarchiv Innsbruck. “By considering itself to be a free and independent corporation, [the university, C.A.] recognises in this independence the condition of the beneficial progress of all scientific development, and confidently hopes that the powers of competence and science will grow in its favour from this first seed of new constitutional life.”

¹⁷ Academic Senate to MCU (concept), Innsbruck 15 April 1848, Senatssitzungsprotokolle 3, ad 134 ex 1847/48, Universitätsarchiv Innsbruck.

Berufe so herabgedrückt worden war, machten es ihnen obendrein zur Pflicht, sich gegen den leisesten Versuch des Guberniums, den alten bürokratischen Einfluß über sie wieder zu gewinnen, entschieden zu verwehren.¹⁸

The implied dispute and the two quotations above are of particular interest for the perception of the first reforming steps in Innsbruck, for they illustrate many key aspects of the first reform phase: First, they show that the professors of the upgraded philosophical faculty in particular regarded the reform of the university also as a personal, social promotion in rank, and thus it was accompanied by increased confidence on the part of the professors. The dispute also demonstrates different views on the role of the professors during the events of 1848: While the professors describe their participation in political debates, the foundation of political associations and the involvement in the parliamentary work of the Frankfurt National Assembly¹⁹ as civic obligations, Academic Director Mensi interpreted the political engagement of the professors as “imitatio puerilis”²⁰ of the Vienna auditorium.

Ultimately, the accusations against Academic Director Mensi reveal the dissatisfaction with the university system of the Vormärz and the paternalism by a state supervisor, which was seen as impermissible. The management of the university by non-university or non-scientific persons was perceived negatively, and in contrast, the (apparent) restoration of a corporative constitution of the university was presented as a return to the ideal of a university.²¹

We encounter similar ideals of the university in other partial debates of the years 1848/49, whereby – in contrast to the dispute with the academic director, which concerns in particular the question of the management of the university, or of its rules and its position in relation to regional offices and the state – there were also thoughts in the role of the university as an educational institution. Some sources on two episodes are named here as examples that will illustrate this. First, the debate about the completion of the University of Innsbruck will be addressed briefly, and then the problems in transferring the philosophical course to the secondary school is discussed.

¹⁸ Georg Schenach i.a. to MCU, Innsbruck 3 October 1848, Gubernium, Studien, 8 F 1, 1849, Tiroler Landesarchiv. “...to regain the old, oppressive rule over the university. [...] Furthermore the manifold inconveniences that they had experienced in early years from the presidency and governor, which had so suppressed the dignity of the school, the joy and fresh boldness of the profession, made it their obligation to defend themselves decisively against even the smallest attempt by the governor to regain the old bureaucratic influence over them.”

¹⁹ Professors Alois Flir and Johann Kerer had been elected to St. Paul’s Church as members of their constituencies.

²⁰ Daniel Mensi to Cajetan Bissingen (concept), Innsbruck 29 August 1848, Akten der Philosophischen Fakultät 15, 3702/PH ex 1848/49, Universitätsarchiv Innsbruck.

²¹ On the question of the legal position of the universities, see in particular Waltraud HEINDL: *Universitätsreform – Gesellschaftsreform. Bemerkungen zum Plan eines „Universitätsorganisationsgesetzes“* in den Jahren 1854/55, in: *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 35 (1983), p. 134–149, here p. 138–142; Günther WINKLER: *Die Rechtspersönlichkeit der Universitäten. Rechtshistorische, rechtsdogmatische und rechtstheoretische Untersuchungen zur wissenschaftlichen Selbstverwaltung* (Forschungen aus Staat und Recht, vol. 80), Wien, New York 1988, p. 255–266, which shows that the question remained unclear until well into the 20th century.

We recall that the university had only two faculties in 1848. While the medical-surgical course was associated with the university in many ways, it did not have the character of a faculty.²² The connection could be seen by the fact that medical student had to matriculate, and that the professorial college of the medical course provided the rector of the university in rotation.²³ The completion of the university with a theological and medical faculty had been a concern of the Tyroleans for a long time. Moreover, the “Draft of the main features of the public educational system in Austria” by Franz Exner stated that in future there should only be full universities (i.e. with four faculties).²⁴ Both the universities and the local authorities wanted to exploit this circumstance, as well as the general revolutionary mood of 1848, to advance the completion of the university. Therefore, the newly-appointed state parliament proposed the completion of the university in one of its first sessions – the arguments in favour were provided primarily by the professors, who were represented in the state parliament by the rector.²⁵ The “project” began in July 1848, but dragged on until 1849. Since autumn 1848 the debate had received an additional impulse from the rumour that a new university was to be founded in Salzburg.²⁶ It was believed in Innsbruck that a completion was all the more necessary because the university could not otherwise prevail against such competition nearby. While the rumour soon proved to be untrue, it fuelled the debates in Innsbruck, which provide revealing insights into the perception of the university in Tyrol, and reveal numerous ideas of educational policy that testify to an occupation with the concerns underlying the reform of the universities. While the first argument in the petition for the completion of the university generally refers to the historical right of the university to have all four faculties, which it had been granted upon foundation, the second displays an awareness of general debates at the time on university policy. One reads, for example:

Den Hochschulen liegt eine Idee, die Idee der Einheit aller Wissenschaften zum Grunde, denn eine Hochschule ist eine dieser Idee entsprungene Lehranstalt, ein Verein von Lehrern, unter

²² Cf. in general on the history of the medical course Heinz HUBER: *Geschichte der Medizinischen Fakultät Innsbruck und der medizinisch-chirurgischen Studienanstalt*, Wien 2010.

²³ Franz HUTER: *Hundert Jahre Medizinische Fakultät Innsbruck 1869 bis 1969 (Forschungen zur Innsbrucker Universitätsgeschichte, vol. 7)*, Innsbruck 1969.

²⁴ Cf. Entwurf der Grundzüge des öffentlichen Unterrichtswesens in Österreich, in: *Wiener Zeitung*, 197–200 (18.–21.07.1848), p. 169–171; 177–179; 187–189; 195–197, § 93.

²⁵ The university received a seat in parliament only upon the establishment of the new state parliament by the constitutional draft by Clemens Brandis. The university was represented by the rector (or a substitute nominated by the university) and had to vote along with the clergy. See Richard SCHÖBER: *Geschichte des Tiroler Landtages im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (Veröffentlichungen des Tiroler Landesarchivs, vol. 4)*, Innsbruck 1984, p. 104–105. However the senate of the university demanded in June 1848 that Albert Jäger, as representative of the university, should sit on the citizens’ seats. Cf. Senatssitzungsprotokoll, Innsbruck 23.06.1848, Senatssitzungsprotokolle 3, Nr. 179, Universitätsarchiv Innsbruck.

²⁵ See also Franz HUTER: *Salzburg oder Innsbruck? Ein Gerücht von der Verlegung der Universität aus der Inn- in die Salzachstadt*, in: *Tiroler Heimat* (1969), p. 33–51, here p. 35–36.

²⁶ Cf. HUTER: *Salzburg*, p. 33–51.

welche das gesammte Gebieth des verschiedenen Wissens so vertheilt ist, wie es die Verschiedenheit und die Verwandtschaft unter den Wissenschaften fordert. Nach dieser Idee richten sich die Grundregeln für die Organisation solcher Lehranstalten.²⁷

The “dismemberment of the whole”, it continued, has a negative effect on the universal claim of the university, ultimately leads to small-mindedness and pedantry, and reduces the university “to the most expedient”: And particularly in this “higher principle of expedience lies the reason for the current lack of ingenuity and civic virtue.”²⁸ Thus here too we find a connection made between the misery of the state, the protests of the students in the revolution, and the condition of the educational system in the Vormärz. As one way out of this situation, the author suggests the universal spirit of science. The unnamed and unknown author of the thoughts also had a clear idea of the tasks that the philosophical faculty should have, namely those that hold other faculties together and which form an antithesis to the expedient studies. A development which we know progressed differently, but which recalls Kant’s paper *Der Streit der Fakultäten*.

The position of the philosophical faculty was then also discussed in detail, in particular by the professors of the philosophical faculty themselves, when it came to regulating – and thus we come to the second example – the transfer of the philosophical course to the secondary school. In principle the professors welcomed the upgrading of the faculty, but at the same time they feared the loss of an intermediate institution of general education between the secondary school and the university. They therefore petitioned to maintain the “middle position between secondary and university studies”.²⁹ One reason given by the professors was that “attendance at a higher school and less restricted movement [could] stir a sense of honour and awaken male self-assurance”³⁰ and thus also signalise outwardly the transition from a boy to a young man. One of their key arguments against the merging of the former philosophical course and the secondary school was the different nature of these institutions; where memory was trained in the secondary school, the philosophical studies should educate the mind. The philosophical subjects would sink to school level and degenerate into mere memory studies, which utterly ran contrary to the purpose of philosophy.

²⁷ Bitte um Wiederherstellung der Universität mit allen vier Fakultäten, Innsbruck Juli 1848, Akten des Rektorats 17, 217/R ex 1848/49, Universitätsarchiv Innsbruck. “The university is based on an idea, the idea of the unity of all sciences, for a university is a school that has sprung from this idea, an association of teachers, among whom the entire field of varied knowledge is distributed in a manner requisite to the difference between the sciences and their relation to one another. The ground rules for the organisation of such schools are based on this idea.”

²⁸ Bitte um Wiederherstellung der Universität mit allen vier Fakultäten, Innsbruck Juli 1848, Akten des Rektorats 17, 217/R ex 1848/49, Universitätsarchiv Innsbruck.

²⁹ There was a similar initiative in Graz, cf. Manfred BAUER: Eine Reform unter dem Mikroskop. Die Umsetzung der „Thun-Hohensteinschen“ Universitätsreform an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Graz 2012, p. 84–86.

³⁰ Philosophical faculty to MCU, Innsbruck 30 July 1849, Akten der Philosophischen Fakultät 15, 255/PH ex 1848/49, Universitätsarchiv Innsbruck.

Without going into this conflict in any further detail, it would also appear here that the professors were certainly familiar with the debates on the ideal of the universities, as they were described, for example, in the liberal lexica of the age.³¹ Particularly the position of the philosophical faculty was always a central point, and there were frequent references in the contemporary literature to the difference between the Prussian and the Austrian universities in this regard.³² Where in the latter the general educational function of the philosophical faculty was at the forefront, to the followers of the reformed German universities this represented a degrading of the university, since the existence of the preparatory courses mixed school and university together, so to speak, and hampered the development of specialist scientific knowledge.³³ Thus while the professors were much more open to reform in other areas, they were reserved when it came to the reform of the philosophical faculty.

Ultimately, however, the professors had no success with their concerns, and the reform was carried out along the lines drawn by Franz Exner and Hermann Bonitz. But the active confrontation with the reform proposals seems to show clearly that the professors occupied themselves with the contents and objectives of the reforms. The transfer of the philosophical courses to the secondary school was completed in Innsbruck in autumn 1848, although in the first few years the university professors also had to teach in the schools, as there was still a lack of suitable teachers. There were also hardly any students in the philosophical faculty itself, as it was not possible to transfer from school to university due to the extension of secondary school. The philosophical faculty therefore got off to a slow start, also because the permanence of the reform was obviously doubted, especially as the reform had only been approved provisionally, criticism of the reforms came from all sides, and there was much talk of the dismissal of Thun and thus the success or otherwise of the reform.³⁴

As an intermediate result of the first reform phase at the University of Innsbruck, therefore, we can establish: The first reforming steps were received differently by the different university groups. The students particularly welcomed the new civic freedoms. We can only surmise from a few later sources that they were in favour of the university reforms: Worth mentioning here

³¹ Cf. here e.g. Johann-Caspar BLUNTSCHLI: *Lehrfreiheit und Lernfreiheit*, in: Johann-Caspar BLUNTSCHLI, Carl BRATER (ed.): *Deutsches Staats-Wörterbuch*, Stuttgart, Leipzig 1861, p. 367–374; Heinrich MARQUARDSEN: *Universitäten*, in: Johann-Caspar BLUNTSCHLI, Carl BRATER (ed.): *Deutsches Staats-Wörterbuch*. In Verbindung mit deutschen Gelehrten, Stuttgart, Leipzig 1867, p. 677–728; A. HELD: *Universität*, in: Carl ROTTECK, Karl Theodor WELCKER (ed.): *Das Staats-Lexikon: Encyclopädie der sämtlichen Staatswissenschaften für alle Stände*, Leipzig 1866, p. 776–800.

³² Cf. the essay by Mitchell G. ASH in this volume; and AICHNER: *Umsetzung*, p. 60–67.

³³ Cf. MARQUARDSEN: *Universitäten*, p. 700–701.

³⁴ There was frequent speculation about Thun's dismissal, above all in letters. Even in 1860, after the actual resignation of Thun, the fear was sometimes expressed that the reforms might be reversed.

are the homages³⁵ presented by the Innsbruck students to Leo Thun and from which one can certainly discern – apart from the pathos of the poems – that the students regarded the Thunian reforms as the start of a new era in the history of education in Austria.³⁶

It was a similar case with the professors, although we must differentiate more strongly with this group. The professors of the philosophical faculty above all expressed their worries very clearly that the upgrading of the philosophical faculty would lead to a loss of its general educational character. At the same time they regarded the elevation of the faculty also as a personal, ‘social’ advancement (respectively, descent), especially since the new laws made a stronger distinction between professors of the philosophical faculty and teachers at secondary school, and also within the faculty, between professors and teachers of skills and languages. Although the professors endeavoured to also exert an influence on the reshaping of the legal framework conditions of the university, ultimately they were unable to influence the reform process, as this was prescribed by and controlled centrally from Vienna.

There are very few statements by groups outside the university, numerous positions can be identified only in the debate about the possible dissolution of the university, articulating the role of the university. Significantly, the university and the students appear here to be an economic factor on the one hand, while on the other hand it is frequently emphasised that the presence of the university also provides the opportunity to educate the students in the state and thus to an extent in a secure environment. The latter leads to the next aspect, namely to the University of Innsbruck as a particularly Catholic university.

The University of Innsbruck as a Catholic university for Austria

As mentioned in the introduction, already in its deeds of foundation the University of Innsbruck was assigned the task, in counter-reformatory diction, of defending the Catholic faith. This feature, which it shared with other university foundations of the time, was something that was again strived towards, particularly during the reform phase of the Thun era – indeed, a plan was even drafted to establish in Innsbruck a university with an especially Catholic face.

This plan appeared for the first time in a memorandum by Karl Ernst Jarcke, who gave Leo Thun some advice for his new office and thereby suggested a special role for the University of Innsbruck:

Will die Regierung eine Universität schaffen, auf welcher kirchlich und politisch conservative Tendenzen vorzugsweise gepflegt werden, so ist vorläufig Inspruck der einzige dazu geeignete Ort in der Monarchie. Ein Versuch solcher Art, der in Wien und Prag vielleicht höchst

³⁵ In the poems, Thun is hailed as a hero who liberated the universities and led them back to their original purpose.

³⁶ Cf. also the Introduction by AICHNER/MAZOHL.

bedenklich wäre, jedenfalls dort aber schwerlich einen Boden für eine bessere Saat fände, würde in Tirol mit begeistertem Jubel aufgenommen werden und nach dem Süden von Deutschland wie nach Italien hin nur wohltätig wirken.³⁷

Word soon spread publicly that the University of Innsbruck was to become a special Catholic university. In the monthly academic journals the appointment of the ultramontane George Phillips to Innsbruck in 1849 – incidentally, one of the very first appointments by Thun and thus especially symbolic – was seen as a first step towards “Innsbruck [becoming] the Catholic university *κατ’ ἐξοχήν*”³⁸. Jarcke’s plan circulated particularly in ultramontane circles and, thanks to the nuncio in Vienna, Michele Viale Prelà, eventually reached the Vatican. The nuncio stated in his report that the suggestion had been made to the minister some time ago to endow the university with a completely Catholic character (“di dare all’Università d’Innsbruck un carattere del tutto cattolico”³⁹) by appointing excellent Catholic professors. He himself, continued Viale Prelà, had encouraged Thun in this idea and would continue to promote it to the minister. However, the Concordat negotiations began shortly afterwards and the nuncio now tried in this context to codify the Catholic character of all universities. Jarcke also soon died, and thus the project became dormant for the time being.

The idea was taken up again only in 1856. The Catholic Assembly was being held in Linz and the project of a Catholic/episcopal university was eagerly discussed there in the elation of the recently concluded Concordat, with Innsbruck mentioned as a location. It should be said first that the foundation of a Catholic/episcopal university or the re-Catholicisation of formerly Catholic universities had been discussed since the 1830s at the latest in the Catholic Rhine provinces, as well as in Baden, Württemberg and Bavaria. One example, albeit not undisputed, was the Catholic university in Leuven, which was opened in 1834/35. The discussion finally culminated in 1848 in the demand and the plan by the Catholic lawyer Joseph Buß to establish a *free Catholic university* in Germany. 1848 thus marked not only the start of reform in Austria, but at the same time the debate about the foundation of a Catholic university also spread to Austria and soon became pan-German. Initially this debate was conducted both by the episcopate and by the laity, however soon it was mostly the engaged laity and Catholic

³⁷ Reproduced in Hans LENTZE (ed.): *Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein* (Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 239, 2. Abhandlung), Wien 1962, p. 295–299. “If the government wishes to create a university where ecclesiastically and politically conservative tendencies are preferred and cultivated, at present Innsbruck is the only suitable place in the monarchy to do so. Such an attempt, which would perhaps be highly questionable in Vienna and Prague, but certainly where it would be difficult to find soil for better seed, would be received in Tyrol with enthusiastic cheer and could only have a beneficial effect towards the south of Germany and towards Italy.”

³⁸ *Akademische Monatsschrift*. Centralorgan für die Gesamtinteressen deutscher Universitäten, (Juli 1850), p. 300–301.

³⁹ Report of the Nuncio, Vienna 10 May 1851, Arch. Nunz. Vienna, Vol. 323 (IV), No. 567, Archivio Segreto Vaticano.

associations who took up and advocated these demands, especially at the annual Catholic Assemblies that took place after 1848. The generally optimistic mood in the course of the university reforms in Austria, and the negotiations on and then the conclusion of the Concordat in 1855, raised the hopes of the Catholic associations that their plan might be realised. The Fourth Catholic Assembly took place in Linz in 1850, and thus for the first time in Austria. Three more Catholic Assemblies would be held in Austria in the 1850s: 1853 in Vienna, 1856 again in Linz and 1857 in Salzburg.⁴⁰

At the two last assemblies a rivalry arose between Salzburg and Innsbruck as possible locations for a Catholic university, which led to a similar constellation as in 1848, with renewed concerns about the future of the University of Innsbruck. Back then, it was hoped to avoid the dreaded dissolution by means of the completion of the university, and now with the creation of a Catholic university in Innsbruck. But just as the concerns in 1848 were based on rumour, so this later project also lost any chance of actual realisation, and things took a bizarre turn.⁴¹

Nevertheless, the debates at the Catholic Assemblies alone once again triggered numerous fears in Tyrol, both within the university and also among political representatives and the high clergy. That resulted in a public campaign to avoid the danger of the dissolution of the University of Innsbruck, which provides insights into which ideas dominated with regard to the task of the university in Tyrol: In this situation, the Catholic, indeed counter-reformatory character of the University of Innsbruck, which had been codified in its foundation deeds, was excessively emphasised, and the university was construed as a bulwark against the invasion of Protestant science and scholarship and as the fortress of an anti-Catholic Enlightenment. This construction ran parallel to or as part of the discourse on the unity of faith of Tyrol and thus an internal consolidation of the Catholic milieu.⁴²

A speech by Rector Ernst von Moy de Sons in autumn 1855 appears almost programmatic, when he projects the historic mission of the university (“to protect Tyrol also with the weapons of science and scholarship and to fortify it in the old faith” and to act in the “defence of the Catholic faith”⁴³) into his own age. By these means Moy connected the eras of

⁴⁰ On this topic in general see Hans-Jürgen BRANDT: *Eine katholische Universität in Deutschland? Das Ringen der Katholiken in Deutschland um eine Universitätsbildung im 19. Jahrhundert*, Köln, Wien 1981.

⁴¹ Cf. on the discussions in the protocols of the assembly: *Verhandlungen der achten Generalversammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands am 23. 24. und 25. September 1856 zu Linz*, Linz 1857; *Verhandlungen der neunten General-Versammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands am 21., 22., 23. und 24. September 1857 zu Salzburg*, Salzburg 1858; or summarised in AICHNER: *Umsetzung*, p. 284–288.

⁴² Cf. in particular Florian HUBER: *Konfessionelle Identitätsbildung in Tirol. Antiprotestantismus ohne Protestanten (1830–1848)*, in: *Geschichte und Region. Storia e Regione* 19 (2010), p. 28–52; Florian HUBER: *Grenzkatholizismen. Religion, Nation und Raum in Tirol 1830–1848*, phil. Diss. Innsbruck 2015.

⁴³ The speech by Rector Moy on the occasion of the arrival of Archduke Karl Ludwig is reprinted in: *Katholische Blätter aus Tirol*, 41 (10.10.1855), p. 961–968.

confessionalisation and Emperor Leopold with that of Emperor Franz Joseph, who had also made himself a defender of the Church by concluding the Concordat.⁴⁴ At the same time Moy used a rhetoric that was dominant in Tyrol at the time, declaring the land to be a fortress in the defence of the true faith.⁴⁵

In this debate, Leo Thun expressed his opinion privately to Julius Ficker by assuring that he did not wish to dissolve the University of Innsbruck:

Es ist mir nicht bekannt, daß ernstlich daran gedacht werde, eine kirchliche Universität in Salzburg zu errichten. Ich glaube auch nicht, daß irgendwo ein ernstlicher Wille besteht, zu dem Zwecke bedeutend beizusteuern, und doch wäre viel Geld dazu notwendig. Gelingt es der österreichischen Regierung, den Universitäten, die ihrem Einflusse unterstehen eine katholische Richtung zu geben, so wäre es auch wirklich überflüssig. Dahin zu wirken, ist mein aufrichtiges Bestreben, und zu dem Ende ist es immer noch meine entschiedene Absicht die Innsrucker [Innsbrucker] Universität zu heben.⁴⁶

As the quote shows clearly, Thun rather sought to give all Austrian universities a Catholic direction and to consolidate the position of the University of Innsbruck by opening a theological faculty and transferring this to the Society of Jesus. At least the second part of the plan was realised in 1857.⁴⁷ To what extent, however, Thun was pursuing the objective of truly making Innsbruck the aforementioned Catholic university *κατ' ἐξοχήν* cannot be said with certainty, especially since the transfer to the Jesuits was also a cheap solution for Thun in times of scarce resources. But the symbolism spoke clearly. And recently it was Rector Moy de Sons – himself an exponent of the ultramontane mindset – who declared the opening to be an important step with which the emperor was prepared to grant “also to the Catholic Church in his states the full, unreserved deployment of its spiritual weapons”⁴⁸. Here we see again how combative rhetoric was also carried over into the area of science.

In the meantime, the opening of the faculty met with criticism from liberal circles both inside and above all outside Tyrol. The handover of the faculty to the Jesuits was a key reason why

⁴⁴ Cf. also the hypothesis by Olaf BLASCHKE: *Konfessionen im Konflikt. Deutschland zwischen 1800 und 1970: ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter*, Göttingen 2002.

⁴⁵ Cf. HUBER: *Konfessionelle Identitätsbildung*.

⁴⁶ “I am not aware that it is seriously considered to establish an ecclesiastical university in Salzburg. I also do not believe that there is any serious will anywhere to contribute significantly to this purpose, and yet a lot of money would be necessary. If the Austrian government manages to give a Catholic direction to those universities under its influence, it would therefore also be truly superfluous. To achieve that is my sincere aim, and to this end, it is still my decided intention to elevate the Innsbruck university.” Leo Thun to Julius Ficker, Vienna 22 September 1856, Nachlass Ficker, Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung.

⁴⁷ Cf. AICHNER: *Umsetzung*, p. 303–313; Peter GOLLER: *Katholisches Theologiestudium an der Universität Innsbruck vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg (1857–1914)* (Forschungen zur Innsbrucker Universitätsgeschichte 19), Innsbruck, Wien 1997; Emmerich CORETH: *Die Theologische Fakultät Innsbruck. Ihre Geschichte und wissenschaftliche Arbeit von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Veröffentlichungen der Universität Innsbruck, vol. 212), Innsbruck 1995.

⁴⁸ Ceremonial speech given by Rector Magnificus Freiherrn v. MOY DE SONS, in: *Bothe für Tirol und Vorarlberg* 43 (18.11.1857), p. 1172–1173, here p. 1172.

Leo Thun was often negatively judged by contemporaries and historians.⁴⁹ While Grillparzer's famous epigram: "I have a suicide to report/The Minister for Religious Affairs has killed the Minister of Education"⁵⁰ was written earlier, it was frequently applied, particularly in this context.⁵¹ Years later, Walter Rogge also used the Jesuits as a projection surface for backwardness and an ultramontane ethos, calling Thun a partisan of the Jesuits and thus disqualifying him.⁵² He also adopted Grillparzer's imagery and reformulated it by characterising Thun as a modern Penelope who, hand in hand with the general of the Jesuits, Pierre Beckx, at night secretly unravels the work done during the day.

Also just two decades later, Armand Dumreicher lamented Thun's decision at the time to transfer the theological faculty to the Jesuits and thus in a sense "bring rosaries to Tyrol"⁵³ instead of making the university a site of the Enlightenment:

In einem Lande, welches nur an wenig Punkten sich eines entwickelten Städtewesens erfreut und welches erst seit kurzem vom großen Weltverkehr berührt wird, unter einer Bevölkerung, welcher Gebirge den Horizont verengen und die Berührung mit der Außenwelt erschweren, hat diese Universität die stolze aber schwere Mission zu erfüllen, eigensinniger Selbstgenügsamkeit zum Trotze die allumfassende, freie Wissenschaft einzubürgern, den geistlichen geistige Interessen gegenüberzustellen, die Mittelklasse der Gesellschaft in eine weitere und reichere Ideenwelt einzuführen und durch Herstellung und Erhaltung des Contactes mit dem gebildeten Deutschland, das von bäuerlicher Beschränktheit und clerikaler Unduldsamkeit mundtot gemacht und von irreführenden Massen majorisierte städtische Bürgerthum allmählig zu kräftigen, zu ermutigen und zu vergrößern.⁵⁴

The last quotation provides a further important reference that must be noted with regard to the construction of the image of the University of Innsbruck as a special Catholic university, and which relates to the reforms. It is the reference to "Germany" and "free science", for ultimately the emphasis on the Catholic tradition of the university in the transition phase of the reform era seems also to be a reaction to the fact that the conception of the university reform was oriented particularly towards the Prussian universities, or took Prussia as its model. Precisely these

⁴⁹ Cf. for example Paul MOLISCH: Die deutschen Hochschulen in Österreich und die politisch-nationale Entwicklung nach dem Jahre 1848. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Wiener Hochschulen zumeist nach urkundlichen Quellen dargestellt, München 1922, p. 17.

⁵⁰ Franz GRILLPARZER: Sämtliche Werke. vol. 1 (Gedichte – Epigramme – Dramen I), München 1960, p. 550.

⁵¹ In contrast, the commentary in the complete edition of Grillparzer connects the epigram directly with the opening of the faculty and the transfer to the Jesuits. See *ibid.*

⁵² Cf. Walter ROGGE: Österreich von Vilàgos bis zur Gegenwart, vol. 1. Das Dezennium des Neoabsolutismus, Leipzig, Wien 1872, p. 150.

⁵³ Armand Freiherr DUMREICHER: Die Verwaltung der Universitäten seit dem letzten politischen Systemwechsel in Österreich, Wien 1873, p. 41.

⁵⁴ DUMREICHER: Verwaltung, p. 41. "In a land that enjoys a developed urbanity in only a few places and which has encountered great international traffic only recently, among a population whose horizon is limited by mountains, impeding contact with the outside world, this university must fulfil the proud but difficult mission, despite stubborn self-containment, to naturalise free science, to confront the clergy with intellectual interests, to introduce the middle class of society to another and richer world of ideas and, by creating and maintaining contact with educated Germany, to strengthen, encourage and enlarge the urban bourgeoisie, which has been muzzled by agricultural parochialism and clerical intolerance, and dominated by the misguided masses."

universities were generally regarded not merely as Prussian, but decidedly as Protestant universities, which is why there were warnings against the adoption of such a supposedly Protestant model in Austria, which was seen as the loss of an independent Catholic university tradition that one tried to counter by stressing the same. It turns out, therefore – as shown in the previous section –, that the reform phase was characterised particularly by an increased confrontation with Austria's own educational tradition and a critical reception of the innovations. It is also significant that reference was made in the debate back to the time of confessionalisation and thus the era prior to the incisive reforms under Joseph II, and that this era was declared to be the ideal of the Austrian/Catholic universities.

Thun's role in this context, as must be stressed with regard to the historically negative assessment of his person, can be described merely as passive. Just as he rejected a confessionalisation of all Austrian universities, for example during the Concordat negotiations, he also stayed out of the somehow strange debate on the foundation of a Catholic university in Austria. He tried to achieve the Catholic character primarily by appointing renowned Catholic scholars.

The functional transformation of the university

The definition of the universities in the course of the reform as scientific institutions strengthened their research mission, broke up their purely training character, and thus set as their foundation an essential characteristic of the modern university as a place of teaching and learning. The music critic and, from 1861, first professor of the history of music at the University of Vienna, Eduard Hanslick, characterised this transformation succinctly in 1854 when he wrote: "The 'system' is gradually giving way to 'research'."⁵⁵ Yet the reorientation of the university described by Hanslick did not happen overnight, but instead needed, as stated also by Mitchell Ash in this volume, at least two decades in order to come to full fruition.⁵⁶ For this reason, Thun's might appear too short to be able to fully understand this transformation, nevertheless it can be shown, for example by the study on the university library, that a certain change could be established already shortly after the reform, or that lines of conflict were revealed that suggest a transformation in this area.

⁵⁵ Eduard HANSLICK: *Vom Musikalisch Schönen. Ein Beitrag zur Revision der Ästhetik der Tonkunst*, Wiesbaden 1980 (1854), p. 2.

⁵⁶ Cf. the essay by Mitchell G. ASH in this volume.

Together with the laboratory and botanical garden⁵⁷, the library can be seen as a central tool of scientific research. This role was significantly intensified with the reform of the universities and their conversion into scientific institutes. This was also emphasised by the reformers themselves, for instance Undersecretary Joseph Alexander Helfert wrote: “due to the new reforms of the higher studies, the libraries, as their principle aids, have also achieved greater significance.”⁵⁸

Furthermore, access to the books in the library had become easier with the suspension of censorship in 1848, and it was now even allowed to borrow books from the library.

Nummehr hat zur Richtschnur zu dienen, daß wissenschaftliche Werke, wenn sie auch bisher verboten waren, unbedenklich auszufolgen sind und nur offenbar unsittliche oder irreligiöse Werke, wie auch jene, welche zur Nichtbeobachtung der Gesetze aufreizen, zu verweigern sind.⁵⁹

The number of users of the university library thus rose significantly in the 1850s. Moreover the new value of the library can be seen also by the numerous special endowments for the purchase of books and donations of entire private libraries, so that the inventory of books in the library also grew disproportionately in the decade after 1850, compared with the previous decades. However, despite these special endowments, there were numerous complaints during Thun's entire era about the poor equipping of the library. These complaints often came from newly-appointed professors or from those appointed to newly-created chairs. An example is provided by the countless complaints by the classical philologist Karl Schenkl, who came to Innsbruck in 1857. He had turned to the librarian of the Royal Library in Munich, Karl Halm, numerous times in order to borrow books from him there, accompanied by complaints about how poorly equipped the library in Innsbruck was: “It is a truly desperate situation here, as masses of books must be bought for every work, and even then there are still not enough.”⁶⁰

There were many similar complaints, and often the restricted presence of the latest research literature was blamed for the fact that one could not really fulfil the actual purpose of the

⁵⁷ Cf. somewhat pithily Marianne KLEMUN: Wissenswandel und botanische Gärten: Eine historische Reflexion, in: Karin STANDLER (ed.): *Der Garten als Wissensraum. Eine Reise zu Gärten der botanischen Sammlungen in Europa*, Budapest, Rom 2013, p. 11–14.

⁵⁸ Joseph Helfert to Karl Ludwig, Vienna 21 April 1857, 6890/365, Statthalterei, Präsidialakten, 1129/1857, Tiroler Landesarchiv.

⁵⁹ “Now it must serve as a guideline that scientific works, even if they were previously banned, must be issued without objection, and only obviously immoral or irreligious works such as those that incite others to disregard the law, may be refused.” Erlass der k. k. Stud. Hof-Commission vom 1. April 1848, Z. 2248/542, printed in: Ferdinand GRASSAUER: *Handbuch für österreichische Universitäts- und Studienbibliotheken sowie für Volks-, Mittel- und Bezirks-Lehrerbibliotheken. Mit einer Sammlung von Gesetzen, a. h. Entschliessungen, Verordnungen, Erlässen, Acten und Actenausügen*, Wien 1883, p. 230.

⁶⁰ Karl Schenkl to Karl Halm, Innsbruck 07 October 1862, Halmiana VIII, Schenkl, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. Similar also in other letters, e.g. Karl Schenkl to Karl Halm, Innsbruck 27 December 1858, Halmiana VIII, Schenkl, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

university, namely to combine research and teaching. As early as 1850, Alois Flir had requested an increase in library funding, with the justification: “without approval for this request it remains almost impossible for the teaching staff of this university to meet the scientific demands of the day.”⁶¹ Or we read from the already much-cited Ernst von Moy: “As long as it [the library, C.A.] remains in its current condition, it is simply impossible to turn Innsbruck into a scientific institution.”⁶²

The functional transformation of the library also gave rise to conflicts between the librarian Martin Scherer and both the students and professors.

Scherer’s protests with regard to the new right of the students to borrow books from the library indicate above all that he was worried about the books:

Der unterthänigst Gefertigte hat im Bücherausleihen eine Menge Erfahrung gemacht, die er zur Ehre der Entlehner und zur Vermeidung des eigenen Schadens lieber nicht gemacht hätte. Das Vertrauen wird nicht leicht in irgend einer anderen Sache so unbedenklich mißbraucht, wie beim Bücherentleihen, wie jeder der selbst eine Bibliothek hat, und davon ausleiht, sich überzeugen kann.⁶³

In contrast, the confrontation with the professors concerning the procurement policy of the library reveals a fundamental conflict, which can also be explained by the functional transformation of the library. As we have seen, the professors complained throughout the decade about the poor stocking of the library and frequently urged the procurement of special works and journals, in order to be able to keep up with the latest state of research and not to lose touch. The lawyer, Ernst Theser, for example, justified his application for a special endowment for the purchase of special works on his subject, Roman law, by saying that a professor “does not remain standing still at that which has learned, but instead endeavours robustly. How can he [the professor, C.A.] manage to motivate the youth to strive scientifically when he himself has already ceased to strive?”⁶⁴ However, this striving, Theser continued, can happen only with the latest scientific works and journals, “by which means the scholar remains in constant, lively contact with the advances in his science. For those who are completely cut off, despite the liveliest eagerness, the inevitable consequence will be that time will leave him

⁶¹ Senatssitzungsprotokoll, Innsbruck 11.08.1850, Senatssitzungsprotokolle 3, 536/XI ex 1849/50, Universitätsarchiv Innsbruck.

⁶² Ernst Moy to Leo Thun, Innsbruck 1 February 1852, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D155.

⁶³ Martin Scherer to the Governor, Innsbruck 14 August 1853, Statthalterei Studien 8623 ad 6845/1853, Tiroler Landesarchiv. “Your servant, the undersigned, has had many experiences in lending books that he would rather not have had, for the honour of the borrower and to avoid damage to himself. Nowhere is trust so carelessly abused than in the borrowing of books, as anyone who himself has a library and loans from it, can testify.”

⁶⁴ Ernst Theser and Friedrich Maassen to MCU, Innsbruck 10 October 1856, Statthalterei Studien Beilage zu 23402/1856, Tiroler Landesarchiv.

behind.”⁶⁵ The librarian rejected the focus on the purchase of the latest works, and especially journals, by urging instead to complete the existing inventory. He also advocated granting professors only a say in the process, but not a determining right.

For Walter Neuhauser, who in the past has conducted numerous studies on the history of the library, the tensions between the university and the library resulted primarily from the fact that the library wanted to preserve its independence as a state library, as it was founded by Maria Theresa in the mid-18th century – while the professors, in contrast, sought to increase their influence.⁶⁶ In the background, however, the new role ascribed to the library seems to have influenced the relationships. For while the professors increasingly became specialists in their disciplines and their subjects, the librarian would remain or become a specialist of the general.⁶⁷ In this regard, Scherer believed symptomatically that the librarian must “ensure the conservation of all subjects, he may not favour one subject primarily”⁶⁸. For this reason he also wanted to counter “the ever increasing special endeavours of individual subjects and branches of knowledge over others”⁶⁹ and therefore viewed more recent forms of publication such as journals critically, causing one to worry “about losing sight of what is special about the general nature of science.”⁷⁰ A fear that, albeit unfounded, reveals how much Scherer was fighting a losing battle with such an idea. These statements also make it clear just how much Scherer still felt obliged to the ideal of systematisation, while the professors mainly sought what was new and innovative. In the words of Eduard Hanslick, who was cited above, one could therefore call the librarian a follower of the ‘system’, who was now being questioned by ‘research’. Interestingly, this provides a reference point to the first part of the essay and the question of the generally educative character of the university: In a certain sense, the librarian namely also embodied the old system of the philosophical faculty or that of a general course of study, both of which aimed at as broad a knowledge as possible. Where the Thun-Hohenstein reform led to the suspension of the general educational element of the philosophical faculty to the benefit of a disciplinary development, the libraries still clung to it, which made conflict inevitable. For in

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Cf. recently in Walter NEUHAUSER: Anton Roschmann als Bibliothekar und Handschriftenforscher, in: Florian M. MÜLLER, Florian SCHAFFENRATH (ed.): Anton Roschmann (1694–1760), Innsbruck 2010, p. 15–24, p. 18–20.

⁶⁷ Cf. also Uwe JOCHUM: Die Idole der Bibliothekare, Würzburg 1995, p. 21; Uwe JOCHUM: Kleine Bibliotheksgeschichte, Stuttgart ³2007, p. 120–122. Cf. also the criticism by the librarian Eduard Kögeler of the procurement wishes of Professor Zingerle for works on a subject (German) that is “quite isolated”, cf. Stellungnahme zum Gesuch von Zingerle, Innsbruck 09.07.1862, Statthalterei Studien 17180 ad 15869/1862, Tiroler Landesarchiv.

⁶⁸ Martin Scherer to the Governor, Innsbruck 24 December 1856, Statthalterei Studien 24188 ad 7602/1856, Tiroler Landesarchiv.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

the *Vorschrift über die Prüfung der Candidaten des Bibliotheksdienstes* from the late phase of Thun's era we read: The first and most essential requirement for librarians was to be able to demonstrate knowledge of the "encyclopaedia of the sciences and humanities".⁷¹ At the same time, however, a certain specialisation gradually occurred also at the level of the libraries, an expression of which is the foundation of seminar and institute libraries in parallel with the establishment of the individual seminars in the course of and as a result of the Thunian reforms. The conflict between the librarian and the professors can also be seen paradigmatically as a generational conflict, especially as Scherer was already more than 80 years old at the time, while many professors were considerably younger. Scherer was forced to retire in 1857. His interim successor was Ignaz Zingerle, a candidate of the professors, and later the first professor of German in Innsbruck.

Conclusion

The aspects thus presented should give an insight into the situation of the University of Innsbruck in the years of the reform and also show the perception of the reforms. It was first shown that the reforms were greeted in principle with goodwill. A look at different groups, both internal and external to the university, shows that statements on the perception of the reform can be found only for the professors. The opinion of the students and of the population of Innsbruck/Tyrol can be discerned only roughly. However, both of these latter groups seem to have welcomed the reform. The professors also praised the reform and considered it to be an important step, in particular in the granting of self-administration rights to the professors. It can also be seen from this that the professors imagined the ideal of a corporative university and a link to its medieval tradition. The discussions on the completeness of the university reveal something similar. At the same time, the professors of the philosophical university, who initially were at the centre of reform endeavours, were critical of the reform of their own faculty, since they also feared the loss of the (general) educative function of the university. Ultimately, however, the professors could not change anything about the reform, and the criticism soon stopped. Interestingly, it was then the librarian of the university library who once again, during the 1850s, addressed this loss of the generally educative character of the university – however, also without success and, significantly, against the professors, who had already come to terms with the reform and where there had been a certain change in personnel. In particular the new

⁷¹ Cf. the „Entwurf einer Vorschrift über die Prüfung der Candidaten des Bibliotheksdienstes“ vom 30.12.1860, § 3 und 4. Reproduced in Salomon FRANKFURTER: Die Qualifikation für den staatlichen Bibliotheksdienst in Österreich. Vortrag gehalten im Österreichischen Verein für Bibliothekswesen in Wien am 19. Februar 1898, Wien 1898, p. 27–31.

and often young professors had already embraced the new, scientific function of the philosophical faculty, and thus became the key supporters in implementing the reforms. It was also shown, based on different conflicts between the professors and the librarian, that the functional transformation of the university – on the path to a research university – was already incipient in the Thun era.

In the middle part of the essay, the debate about the establishment of a Catholic/episcopal university in Austria was outlined, in which the University of Innsbruck played a key role and which is also important for the perception of the reform. During the course of the debate on the establishment of a Catholic university, the image of the University of Innsbruck as a particularly Catholic university was propagated publicly, which forced a link to the foundation phase and an emphasis on the counter-reformatory programme. The transfer of the theological faculty to the Society of Jesus in 1857 fitted this image particularly well. In this sense, Emperor Franz Joseph and his Minister for Education, Leo Thun, were presented as those who had reinforced the university in its historic mission. The emphasis of the Catholic character of the university in Innsbruck (and in Austria in general) can be interpreted in two ways: on the one hand as a reaction to the fact that the reform led to a fundamental orientation towards the German universities, which were seen by many to be Protestant, hence the underlining of the Austrian/Catholic tradition. On the other hand, it can be seen as part of the “battle for the unity of faith”⁷² in Tyrol, “the Papal state of Habsburg”⁷³, and demonstrates how much this ‘battle’ encompassed all areas of society.

Conversely, the stressing of the Catholic character of the university, and in particular the transfer of the theological faculty to the Jesuits, became a central anchor to which criticism of Leo Thun’s policies was attached. This symbolic step was criticised in particular by liberals and German nationalists and it shaped the image of the contradictory Minister Thun in the long term. At the same time, this step conceals the fact that Thun rejected a fundamental re-confessionalisation of the universities. Instead, Thun promoted Catholic science and scholarship and helped to create a counterweight to the Prussian/Protestant dominance in this area by means of his targeted personnel policy.

Furthermore, the transfer of the theological faculty to the Jesuits brought a conflict into the university that would lead in the following years and decades to intensive disputes and confrontations about the rights of the Jesuits and the role of the university. The same can be

⁷² The phrase is contemporary. Cf. on this conflict most recently Florian HUBER: „Kulturkämpfer“. Vinzenz Gasser und der Katholizismus in Tirol 1830–1876, in: *Der Schlern* 84 (2010), p. 39–59.

⁷³ Rupert KLIEBER: *Jüdische, christliche, muslimische Lebenswelten der Donaumonarchie. 1848–1918*, Wien i.a. 2010, p. 131.

seen when one examines the national conflicts in the university, which accelerated during the Thun era and as a result of the decisions made at this time.⁷⁴

Finally, the conflicts about the role of the library were also interpreted as a generational conflict, and generational renewal. The latter can be seen as a characteristic of the reform era in general: A glance at the philosophical faculty in Innsbruck alone shows that by 1860 only one professor, Anton Baumgarten, who in 1848 had been the youngest of his colleagues, still remained. The other professors were appointed to other universities or allocated to other areas of activity. The newly-appointed professors had for the most part (seven out of nine) been born between 1825 and 1830. Only Heinrich Glax and Joseph Kopetzky were each 15 to 20 years older than their colleagues – whereby Kopetzky can be seen decidedly as an opponent of the reform.⁷⁵ The young professors were usually a generation younger than the professors they had succeeded – many of them had been socialised either in the German university system or already at the reformed Austrian universities.⁷⁶ Ultimately, this new generation also bore the reform. Thus in many respects the Thun era at the University of Innsbruck can be seen as a time of transformation, during which the foundation was laid on the one hand for a boom in terms of personnel, infrastructure and science, but on the other hand, also for numerous conflicts.

⁷⁴ Cf. in particular AICHNER: *Umsetzung*, p. 313–334.

⁷⁵ Cf. AICHNER: *Umsetzung*, p. 359–361.

⁷⁶ A precise overview of the personnel situation at the University of Innsbruck can be found in AICHNER: *Umsetzung*, p. 426–428.

Milada Sekyrková

The Thunian reforms at the University of Prague

Introduction

The Thunian reforms represent a significant point in the history of the University of Prague. They are a milestone not only with regard to the organisation of studies, the careers of the teachers and the content of its lectures and seminars, but they were also the starting point for the development of Czech science and scholarship and the ascent of the university to the most important scientific institution in the Bohemian lands. In the first half of the 19th century the University of Prague stood in the shadow of other institutions of the kingdom in terms of scientific research, specifically the Royal Bohemian Society of Sciences and the Patriotic Museum for the Kingdom of Bohemia, the present-day National Museum.¹ Except for the medical faculty, which prospered thanks to several personalities of the so-called Bohemian medical school, there was no significant systematic scientific research to speak of at the university.

The reforms are seen as the beginning of the path towards modern scientific research in the subjects taught at the university – and also of those at the Prague Polytechnical Institute². But the reform can also be seen as the starting point of modern academic organisation from the perspective of the systemisation of the subjects and their associated chairs.

To date, relatively little attention has been devoted to analysing the reform period in Czechoslovak and Czech historiography. The entire reappraisal of the history of the university, including the latest, four-part history of the university at the end of the 1990s, mentions the period of reform only in the overall context.³ In the process, the changes at the University of Prague are treated in a completely positivistic sense, namely only in the sense of a realisation of changes that were brought about by the decrees, announcements and laws of the years from 1848 to 1850. These include, for example, the establishment of the Ministry for Education and Religious Affairs in spring 1848, the disciplinary ordinance of 13 October 1849, the general study regulations of 1 October 1850, and similar. Only the general obligatory effects of these orders on the university are described. Some mention is made of the implementation provisions

¹ Miroslav HROCH: *Na prahu národní existence*, Prague 1999; Jitka LNĚNIČKOVÁ: *Čechy v době předbřeznové 1792–1848*, Praha 1999; Jans JANKO, Soňa ŠTRBÁŇOVÁ: *Vědy Purkyňovy doby*, Praha 1988.

² František JÍLEK, Václav LOMIČ, Pavla HORSKÁ: *Dějiny Českého vysokého učení technického I/1, 2*, Praha 1973, 1978.

³ František KAVKA, Josef PETRÁŇ (ed.): *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy 1348–1990*, 4 vols., Praha 1995–1998.

at the individual faculties, which differed depending on the orientation of the faculties, and local practices and possibilities. The work of Hans Lentze⁴ forms the basis for all discussions of the Thunian reforms in Czechoslovak historiography since the 1960s.

To date, no monograph has been dedicated to any of the protagonists of the reform⁵ – and I am thinking here primarily of Franz Exner (1802–1853)⁶, but naturally also of Leo Thun-Hohenstein (1811–1888), who had a particularly close relationship with the Bohemian lands, both historically and during his lifetime, and not forgetting also Franz von Sommaruga (1780–1860)⁷. Independent partial studies on these persons that also address the educational reform in some manner are also sought for in vain. And there are not even any older works that deal exclusively with this period and subject.

And yet there is such an abundance of archival sources. Official documents about the university in Prague can be found in the National Archive (*Národní archiv*), where for example the inventory of the Bohemian Governor's Office is held⁸. Since the end of the 18th century the governor's office had served as a mediator between the university and the central office in Vienna, in regulating academic and organisational matters. One can also learn a lot about the university from the inventories of the police department, in particular with regard to the tense political times in the years between 1848 and 1850.⁹

In addition, the Charles University has its own archive, which is now connected to the Institute of the History of the Charles University (*Ústav pro dějiny UK*). However, due to losses suffered in the war, when in May 1945 most of the historical archive disappeared with the retreating German Wehrmacht, the source material here is unfortunately not as rich as one might expect. The losses of spring 1945 affected not only the famous cause of the historic insignia of the university, but also in particular documents from the older period of the history of the university, and thus for the 19th century the archive has only 'studentica', i.e. in particular the

⁴ Hans LENTZE: *Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein*, Wien 1962.

⁵ There is only: Ladislav KUBÍK (ed.): *Česká korespondence se Lvem Thunem*, Praha 1970; Jan Matěj ČERNÝ, Jan MATOUŠ (ed.): *Boj za právo. Sborník aktů politických u věcech státu a národa českého od roku 1848 s výklady historickými*, I., II., Praha 2007; Hana FOŘTOVÁ, Doubravka OLŠÁKOVÁ (ed.): *Lev Thun – Alexis de Tocqueville*, Praha 2012; Ivana MADLOVÁ: *Hrabě Leo Thun a revoluce 1848*, bakalářská práce FF UK Praha, 2012.

⁶ Franz Friedrich[sic!] Exner, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, Vol. 8, Praha 1894, p. 954.

⁷ Zdeněk V. TOBOLKA: Franz Ser. Vincenz Emanuel von Sommaruga, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, Vol. 23, Praha 1905, p. 671–672.

⁸ Národní archiv, 2nd department, Inventory České místodržitelství.

⁹ Národní archiv, 2nd department, Inventory Policejní ředitelství Praha.

student lists of all faculties, but also protocols of the meetings of the professorial colleges, the academic senate, and other diverse file material.¹⁰

The University of Prague had a long and varied history from its foundation in 1348 to the mid-19th century. At its foundation under Charles IV, and in part also under his son, Wenzel IV, it was the most important centre of education in Central Europe, with its four faculties, the four university nations, and the growing number of colleges. That changed somewhat with the issuing of the Decree of Kuttenberg in 1409¹¹. Wenzel changed the weighting of votes in the committees of the university in favour of the Bohemians, so that the other nations represented could be outvoted. As a result, most of the non-Bohemian students and professors left the university, and its influence from that point was limited primarily to the Bohemian lands, also because only the philosophical faculty remained in Prague. A new, gradual upswing began from the mid-16th century, initially in competition with the Jesuit College in the Clementinum¹², which was founded at the time, the first in the land. However this rivalry was removed by state intervention in 1654, with the unification of both institutions into the Charles-Ferdinand University. This name remained until February 1919, when the so-called Lex Mareš was passed, which contained a reorganisation of the university; already after the university division of 1882 there had been a Czech and a German Charles-Ferdinand University. Since the aforementioned unification into the Charles-Ferdinand University, it once again had four faculties, by official order of rank: the theological, legal, medical and philosophical faculty. From the Middle Ages to the Theresian and in particular to the Josephinian Reform in the second half of the 18th century, the university was essentially organised as an autonomous community that had its own jurisdiction and property. Until 1773 the Jesuit order supervised the intellectual orientation of the teaching.

The greatest changes to the running of the university came with the reforms of Joseph II. The new study regulations of 1784 led to a fundamental reorganisation of university studies. The university was subordinated to the state and its de facto fraternity organisation, which had

¹⁰ Karel KUČERA, Miroslav TRUC: *Archiv University Karlovy. Průvodce po archivních fondech*, Praha 1961; Václav VOJTÍŠEK: *O archivu University Karlovy a jeho ztrátách*, in: *Archivní časopis* 1, 1951, p. 86–98.

¹¹ Blanka ZILYNSKÁ (ed.): *Universitäten, Landesherren und Landeskirchen: Das Kuttenberger Dekret von 1409 im Kontext der Epoche von der Gründung der Karlsuniversität 1348 bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden 1555. Acta Universitatis Carolinae–Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis Tomus XLIX, Fasc. 2*, Prag 2010.

¹² Ivana ČORNEJOVÁ, Alena RICHTEROVÁ: *The Jesuits and the Clementinum*, Prague 2006; Ivana ČORNEJOVÁ: *Kapitoly z dějin pražské univerzity 1622–1773*, Praha 1992; IBID: *Pražská univerzita v letech 1654–1773: příspěvek ke správním a organizačním dějinám*, Praha 1986; Ivana ČORNEJOVÁ, Anna FECHTNEROVÁ: *Životopisný slovník pražské univerzity. Filozofická a teologická fakulta 1654–1773*, Praha 1986.

existed until then, was suspended. From that point on it was answerable, like the other universities in the monarchy, to the Imperial Commission on Education in Vienna.¹³

Latin was replaced as the official teaching language by German. The most important and most frequently attended faculty until then was the theological faculty. The reason for this was probably that it offered graduates, despite the specific restrictions (for example celibacy) the prospect of lifelong security. The law faculty was considered to be the wealthiest faculty. The medical faculty also had a specific feature, as most of the Jewish students were enrolled there, having received access to higher state education with the Patent of Toleration. The two-year philosophical faculty became de facto a preliminary educational institute for further study, and its completion was a prerequisite for admission to the other faculties.

From the beginning of the 19th century, the Prague Polytechnic, which had been reorganised from 1803 to 1806 into an independent technical college, attracted numerous students from the University of Prague. For the demand for technical occupations was becoming ever greater in the state agencies (and, over time, also in private institutions, such as the manorial administration), and graduates of mechanical engineering, construction, chemical and agricultural subjects found a very good place there. The polytechnic poached most students from the theological faculty. That might appear surprising, but closer examination suggests that the reasons for opting for the polytechnic were primarily due to the good professional prospects for graduates of such courses. Until the end of the 18th century the Church had provided almost all theological graduates with a position that corresponded with their skills and origin. The beginning of the Industrial Revolution brought with it a rapidly expanding labour market for technicians, which also offered social upward mobility and economic security.¹⁴

The Revolution and the reforms

From the beginning of the 1840s, movement gradually came into the relative calm, indeed standstill, which had dominated at the University of Prague until the mid-19th century. One reason for this was the foundation of the Association for the Encouragement of the Industrial Spirit in Bohemia (*Jednota pro povzbuzení průmyslu v Čechách*) at the beginning of the 1830s.¹⁵ The association was reformed already at the start of the 1840s and furnished with new,

¹³ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Wien, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Unterricht und Kultus, Bestand Studienhofkommission bis 1848.

¹⁴ Carl JELINEK: Das Ständisch-polytechnische Institut zu Prag, Prag 1856.

¹⁵ Alexandra ŠPÍRTOVÁ, *Jednota k povzbuzení průmyslu v Čechách*, in: *Paginae Historiae* 3 (1995), p. 9–23; Marie POSPÍŠILOVÁ, *Výstavní činnost Jednoty k povzbuzení průmyslu v Čechách ve 30. letech 19. století na Pražském hradě*, in: *Průmysl a technika v novodobé české kultuře*, Praha 1988, p. 59–85; Bedřich MANSFELD (ed.): *Sto let Jednoty k povzbuzení průmyslu v Čechách 1833–1933*, Praha 1933.

democratic statutes, which opened up this originally very aristocratic institution to a wider circle of Bohemian intellectuals. Connected with this were numerous impulses for a reorientation of research. Furthermore, the Association for the Encouragement of the Industrial Spirit in Bohemia is also known as the school of Czech parliamentarism, since most of the dominant personalities of public life, including numerous professors of the university and the polytechnic, were members of this association. It must also be stressed that the association was not limited only to technical subjects, but also, significantly, engaged with political science, a subject that was cultivated at the law faculty, or with public health matters, which in turn had an effect on the quality of the medical faculty. However there is no evidence that Leo Thun or Franz Exner, who at the time was a professor of philosophy in Prague, were members of the association. Nevertheless, the association is an example of the general optimism felt by broad sections of Bohemian business and society.

There were also increasingly louder calls in the faculties for new specialisations and subjects, and as a result, there was a change in the teaching body of the university. As well as the “k. k. public and full and the associate” professors and adjuncts, i.e. assistants (or their substitutes, which was common practice in all faculties), there were also, for the first time, “associate lecturers” for subjects that had been ranked until then beneath the scarce but traditional chairs. We encounter the very first title of this kind in the medical faculty in 1843. The staff list, *Personal-Stand des akademischen Senates und der Fakultäten-Lehrkörper*¹⁶ introduced eleven associate lecturers to the medical faculty for the first time. A comparison with the staff numbers of 1842 shows that it affected all eight of the “associate chairs” of the previous year: specifically, seven of them¹⁷ from 1843 became lecturers and one – Professor Vinzenz Bohdalek (1801–1883)¹⁸ – became an associate professor. Thus while the teaching body of the faculty did not change that much, the change in titles (without there yet being any habilitation)

¹⁶ Personal-Stand des akademischen Senates und der Fakultäten-Lehrkörper an der k. k. Universität zu Prag, dann Ordnung der öffentlichen, ordentlichen und außerordentlichen Vorlesungen, welche an derselben im Schuljahre 1843 gehalten werden, p. 6–8.

¹⁷ Franz Nessel (1803–1876) for dentistry, Franz Ramisch (1798–1859) for dietetics, Karl Lumbe (1807–1885) for surgery, Joseph Quadrat (1809–1868) for paediatrics, Franz Reiss (1808–1861) for pharmacology, Joseph Gottfried Riedl (1803–1870) for psychiatry and Eduard Kratzmann (1810–1865) for paediatrics. The next associate lecturers in 1843 were Alois Kraus (1793–1847) for skin diseases, Anton Jaksch (1810–1887) for chest diseases, Franz Piřha (1810–1875) for surgery and Joseph Wilhelm Löschner (1809–1888) for therapeutic bathing.

¹⁸ Eduard WONDRAK: Český anatom a patolog Vincenc Alexandr Bohdalek. 100 let od smrti, in: Časopis lékařů českých 122 (1983), No. 43, p. 1334–1337.

indicates an incipient transformation of the system, which had already been completed in other countries.¹⁹ But it would take a number of years until the complete reform was implemented.²⁰

The curriculum also experienced certain changes. A comparison of the curricula of the medical faculty of 1842 and 1843 shows that there was a greater proportion of practical exercises from 1843: thus students of internal medicine had exercises in analytical chemistry and lectures in experimental chemistry already in the second year of their five-year medical studies. These subjects were taught by Josef Redtenbacher according to the textbook by Justus Liebig (Heidelberg 1841).²¹ The previous year, the same professor in the same semester had taught only general chemistry according to Ignaz Gruber (Vienna 1836). The use of a new textbook is not so much interesting because of the fact that it was more up-to-date, but rather because it was a foreign, German textbook. This also illustrates the expanding possibilities in teaching.

A special, and much more important innovation prior to 1848, however, was the newly-created possibility to offer so-called extraordinary (1842) or free lectures (1843) (see Annex). From an initial nine lectures in 1842, the number grew to 15 just one year later, and did not decline in subsequent years. The new associate lecturers were particularly heavily represented in these lectures. Worth mentioning, especially in view of the imminent reforms, is the fact that for these lectures the lecturers were not bound to obligatory textbooks, from which speakers usually read or paraphrased.

For 1847, the staff list also added an associate lecturer to the law faculty (Augustin Schönauer)²² and two associate lecturers to the philosophical faculty (Wolfgang Wessely and Wilhelm Volkmann)²³, alongside those in the medical faculty.

It should however also be mentioned that the number of teachers in the individual faculties was not especially high: In 1842 – before the first lecturers were employed in the medical faculty – the staff numbers were as follows (excluding the academic directors at the head of each faculty):

The theological faculty had five full professors, two substitutes and a chaplain.

The law faculty had seven full professors, one associate professor and an adjunct.

¹⁹ Ludmila HLAVÁČKOVÁ, Eva ROZSÍVALOVÁ: *Studium a přednášky na lékařské fakultě pražské univerzity v letech 1690–1848*, Praha 1984; Ludmila HLAVÁČKOVÁ, Petr SVOBODNÝ: *Dějiny pražských lékařských fakult 1348–1990*, Praha 1993.

²⁰ Václav Vladivoj TOMEK, for example, refers to the new lecturers in his memoirs (*Paměty I.*, Prague 1904, p. 333–334) somewhat misleadingly when he links this “nomination” system of the Vormärz to the state reform that took place only after the revolutionary events: “[...] If, immediately after the March events of 1848, all kinds of new things took place at the Prague University due to generally formulated principles of the freedom of teaching, namely that, along with professors, several lecturers started to give lectures, and I did not know when exactly the right to lecture was granted also to the full members of the Royal Bohemian Society of Sciences, I also played with the idea of applying to the philosophical faculty to hold lectures on Bohemian history.”

²¹ *Personal-Stand 1843*, p. 14.

²² *Personal-Stand 1847*, p. 7.

²³ *Personal-Stand 1847*, p. 10.

The medical faculty had the most teachers, with 15 full professors. There were also eight associate chairs, ten assistants in medicine surgery (and one unoccupied assistant post).

The philosophical faculty had 13 full and three associate professors, and one adjunct.

Ten years later, in the 1851/52 academic year, the numbers were as follows:

The theological faculty had five professors, three unspecified teachers and one trainee adjunct.

The law faculty had five full and seven associate professors, as well as four private lecturers.

Once again, the medical faculty had the largest personnel numbers in this comparative year, with twelve full professors, six associate professors, 14 private lecturers (plus one habilitation underway) and ten assistants (plus one unoccupied position).

The philosophical faculty also showed growth; in 1851/52 there were 14 full professors and four associate professors, and nine assistants. There were also five unoccupied assistant posts.

There was great fluctuation in student numbers at the university in the first half of the 19th century. Until the beginning of the reform the 1825/26 academic year saw the most students, with the 1,906 students in total divided among the individual faculties as follows: 321 students were enrolled in the theological faculty, compared to 687 in the law faculty and 119 in the medical faculty. The philosophical course had the most students, at 779.²⁴

After 1848, the number of students sank to under 1,000 for a decade. For example, in 1855/56 there were only 137 theologians, 485 jurists, 182 medical students and 120 philosophers, i.e. 924 students in total.²⁵ The strong decline in students at the philosophical faculty was also experienced by other universities: first the extension of the secondary school by two years was a decisive break, and at the same time this 'new' faculty first had to prove its attractiveness. Another reason in Prague's case was the continued growth in interest in technical studies and thus the competition with the polytechnic.

A comparison is provided by the year 1875/76: Student numbers had recovered by then, and a total of 1,676 students (109 + 794 + 289 + 484) were enrolled. After the division of the university ten years later, there were already 2,001 students at the Czech university, across three faculties (law faculty 966, medical faculty 767, philosophical faculty 268); the theological faculty was split into a Czech and a German faculty only at the beginning of the 1890s.²⁶

²⁴ Geschichte der Karlsuniversität III, p. 357.

²⁵ Geschichte der Karlsuniversität III, p. 359.

²⁶ Geschichte der Karlsuniversität III, p. 359.

Student numbers at the Czech university increased continuously until the First World War (in 1913/14: theological faculty 144, law faculty 2,154, medical faculty 1,103, philosophical faculty 1,339 students: in total 4,740 students).²⁷

The events of 1848 drew public attention to both the University of Prague and the Polytechnic, and in particular to their students.²⁸ During the course of the political events in the Bohemian lands, academics played the main role not only in Prague. The students were seen as radical and dangerous by conservative and loyal sections of society. 1848 was also a decisive experience for Leo Thun, not least because he was imprisoned by students in the Clementinum during the unrest of June 1848. Following this experience, Thun, who up to that point had been regarded as an advocate of Bohemian culture and an apologist for the Czech language, distanced himself from student radicalism and started – at least according to Czech historiography – to view national emancipation with less enthusiasm.²⁹

His personal experiences during the Revolution obviously also contributed to his endeavours to reform the universities. The aim was to reshape the universities into scientific institutions. By emphasising the scientific nature of university studies, the students were to be challenged more so than before, so that they would have neither the time nor the energy to once again intervene violently in public life.

For Prague and the Bohemian lands, the reforms began immediately in spring 1848 with a key, wide-ranging innovation. On the basis of a petition by the university, Czech was placed on an equal footing with German as the language of instruction at the university and in the polytechnic.³⁰ These measures were never reversed – in contrast to other provisional achievements of the revolutionary period –, even though by the 1850s, especially the second

²⁷ *Geschichte der Karlsuniversität III*, p. 365.

²⁸ František JÍLEK: *Pražská polytechnika a její studenti v revolučním roce 1848*, in: *Sborník Národního technického muzea v Praze/Acta Musei Nationalis Technici Pragae* (1965), Jg. 4, p. 268–366; IDEM.: *Účast studentů na přípravách revoluce v Čechách roku 1849*, in: *Sborník Národního technického muzea v Praze/Acta Musei Nationalis Technici Pragae* (1968), Jg. 5, p. 337–508; Jiří PŘENOSIL: *Pražští univerzitní studenti v revolučním roce 1848*, in: Jana RATAJOVÁ (ed.): *Pražský student. Univerzitní studenti v dějinách Prahy*, Praha 2008, p. 59–68.

²⁹ Jiří ŠTAIF: *Revoluční léta 1848–1849 a české země* (Práce Historického ústavu ČAV. Opera Instituti Historici Pragae. Monographia A–3), Praha 1990; František ROUBÍK: *Český rok 1848*, Praha 1948; Karel KAZBUNDA: *České hnutí roku 1848*, Praha 1929; Karel SCHELLE: *Význam roku 1848 pro vytvoření moderního státního aparátu*, Ostrava 2008.

³⁰ Thus, specifically, it has been passed down in Czech historiography that one of the demands of the student petition of 14 March 1848, namely the placing of Czech on an equal footing with German as a language of instruction, was never again repealed. Quite the contrary: The governmental decree of 28 March 1848 promised to concede to all of the demands made by the students at that time. The only exception was the demanded merging of the Prague University with the polytechnic.

half, neither students nor teachers had any interests in Czech-language lectures, for fear of police persecution.

For the most part, the implementation of the reforms went smoothly at the University of Prague. The enforcement of the reforms did not trigger any serious discussions, nor does there seem to have been any protests. The professorial college and the academic senate discussed the announcements and ordinances that were passed, and the faculties then followed the prescribed path. It was also important that the systemisation of professorial chairs provided numerous professors and new lecturers with existential security, allowing them to devote more of their efforts to teaching and research.

For, as can be seen from examples at other universities, the reform created the need also in Prague for new chairs, and changes in the professorial college. In the philosophical faculty alone, almost half of the teachers had been replaced in the 1850/51 academic year – of the original 37 teachers from the 1848/49 academic year, only 20 remained.³¹ Václav V. Tomek judges this as follows:

Der Aufschwung der Universitäten durch die Berufung führenderer Kräfte für die verschiedenartigen Zweige der Wissenschaft, die bisher teilweise ungenügend berücksichtigt waren, war von Anfang an einer der Hauptgegenstände seiner [Thuns, M. S.] Sorge. Zu diesem Ziele wurde als nötig befunden, für einige Fächer Professoren von ausländischen Universitäten zu berufen; doch zum Prinzip machte es sich Graf Leo Thun, als fähig anerkannten Einheimischen den Vorzug zu geben [...]³².

Probably the most famous instance of the appointment of professors from abroad to the University of Prague is the return of Johann Purkyně (1787–1869) from Breslau.³³ Although by that stage Purkyně had already reached the climax of his research activities, he still contributed significantly to the organisation of scientific and national life in the fifties and even in the first half of the sixties. For example, he was involved in the foundation of the natural science department of the national museum, in the foundation of the journal *Živa*, and in the *Committee for natural scientific research in Bohemia (Komitét pro přírodovědecký výzkum Čech)*.³⁴ However, the main focus of Purkyně's activities after his return from Breslau was without doubt the expansion of the Institute for Physiology at the medical faculty of the

³¹ Dějiny UK III, 1802–1918, p. 156.

³² “The upturn of the universities due to the appointment of leading staff for the different branches of science, some of which had been neglected to date, was one of his [Thun's, M.S.] main worries from the very outset. To this purpose it was deemed necessary to appoint professors from foreign universities for some subjects; but Graf Leo Thun made it a principle to give preference to locals who were recognised as capable [...],” and Václav V. Tomek concludes his comments in his memoirs with the words “... and so, before I knew it, I was also considered” (Paměti I, Praha 1904), p. 334.

³³ Václav ŽÁČEK: Jan Evangelista Purkyně, Prague 1987; Eliana TRÁVNÍČKOVÁ (ed.): Jan Evangelista Purkyně – život a dílo. Sborník, Praha 1986.

³⁴ Milada SEKYRKOVÁ: Komitét pro přírodovědecký výzkum Čech, Praha 1992.

University of Prague. We learn of his idea of the importance of the subject from a letter to Leo Thun:

Die Physiologie, als die Wissenschaft des organischen Lebens, steht mit allen specielleren Naturwissenschaften, der Physik, Chemie, Zoologie u. a. in den engsten Beziehungen und ist am meisten geeignet, die einzeln erworbenen besondern Doctrinen im Geiste zu einer höheren Einheit zu verbinden und sich von der Einseitigkeit derselben zu einem universelleren Standpunkte zu befreien, was für die Entwicklung des künftigen Lehrens zu wissenschaftlicher Reife, für die richtige Bemessung des Speziellen im Vortrage, für die Weckung eines allgemein wissenschaftlichen Geistes von hoher Wichtigkeit ist.³⁵

For this reason he also demanded better equipment for his laboratory and described to Leo Thun the requirements he had for his new workplace. This gives us a concrete insight into practical research and teaching.

A prominent example of Thun's appointment policy at the University of Prague, which also underlines Thun's political and scientific programme, is the appointment of the historian Constantin Höfler. Thun started negotiations on the latter's appointment already at the beginning of his term in office, and finally appointed him in 1851, after the Bavarian government had once again attempted to keep Höfler in the Kingdom by offering him a salary increase and a higher rank.³⁶ In Prague Höfler received a full chair in history, thus joining other historians appointed to Austria by Thun from neighbouring German-speaking countries, such as Julius Ficker to Innsbruck, Johann Baptist Weiß to Graz, and Johann Aschbach to Vienna. Thus Thun followed the goal, as he himself wrote to Karl Buol-Schauenstein in 1858, of

unpartheiische[r] Geschichtschreibung die Wege [zu] bahnen und dafür [zu] sorgen, daß an den österreichischen Hochschulen Männer lehren, welche nicht nur von ächt patriotischer Gesinnung erfüllt, sondern auch am Geist und Wissen jenen Verfechtern kleindeutscher Tendenz ebenbürtig und den Einfluß ihrer Lehren und Schriften zu paralysieren befähigt sind.³⁷

At the same time, Höfler was close to the Catholic revival movement of Joseph Görres in Munich and, in terms of his world view, can be positioned in this environment, similar to other prominent former Munich professors such as George Phillips or Ernst Moy de Sons, who were

³⁵ "Physiology, as the science of organic life, is very closely related to all of the special natural sciences, physics, chemistry, zoology, etc. and is best suited to combine the individually gained special doctrines to a greater unity, and to free itself from the one-sidedness of these doctrines towards a universal position, which is of great importance for the development of future teaching on scientific maturity, for the correct assessment of what is special in lectures, and for the awakening of a general scientific spirit." Johann Purkyně to Leo Thun. Wrocław, 22 October 1849, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D9.

³⁶ Cf. Constantin Höfler to Leo Thun. Bamberg, 7 December 1851, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D133.

³⁷ "preparing the way for impartial historiography and ensuring that those teaching at Austrian universities are not only filled with a patriotic mentality, but are also equal in spirit and knowledge to those advocates of little German tendencies and are capable of paralysing the influence of its teachings and writings." Leo Thun to Karl Buol-Schauenstein. Vienna, 29.08.1858, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, MCU, Akten des Präsidents 1085 ex 1858.

also called to Austria by Thun.³⁸ In addition, Thun wanted to provide a counterweight to Czech historiography, which led, not least, to confrontation with František Palacký, for example concerning the interpretation of the person and role of Jan Hus. In Palacký's work on Hus, he makes specific reference to Höfler's work on Jan Hus, and accuses Höfler of

mit seltenem Fleisse und unverdrossener Beharrlichkeit alles zusammengetragen und wiederholt, was je irgend ein Gegner von Hus und den Hussiten [...] vorgebracht hatte, und hat, mit Ignorirung des gegentheiligen Sachbestands, diesen Wusst von Anklagen durch eigene Combinationen, welchen im Allgemeinen grosse Belesenheit und Scharfsinn nicht abzusprechen ist, zu einem umfangreichen künstlichen Bau verarbeitet, zu dessen innerer wie äusserer Vollendung, nach meiner Ueberzeugung, nichts mehr fehlt, als – die Grundlage der Wahrheit, Unparteilichkeit und Gerechtigkeit.³⁹

It is therefore not surprising (and may well have been due to Höfler's obviously complicated character), that Höfler soon found himself in conflict with several of his colleagues within and outside the faculty. The letters he wrote to Leo Thun contain indications of this. And other letters from professors at the University of Prague to Leo Thun also mention differences within the college, frequently with Constantin Höfler at their core. The disputes concerned both the implementation of the reform, to which Höfler, as a newly-appointed professor, obviously felt particularly obliged, but also ideological positions.⁴⁰ The appointment of Höfler therefore also symbolises the multiple, often disparate and overlapping fractures within the University of Prague, between liberal and conservative, or between German and Czech professors.

While, as mentioned, the reform proved for several scientists to be a springboard for their scientific careers, others were not equally blessed. A key role was played in particular by the political situation and the fear on the part of the Viennese government of Czech nationalism. One example is František Ladislav Rieger (1818–1903). The son-in-law of František Palacký, he had been a member of the National Assembly in Prague during the revolutionary year, and a deputy in the parliament at Kremsier. Furthermore, in 1849 he became involved in a somewhat obscure scandal about an allegedly anti-Austrian meeting with Prince Adam Czartoryski in

³⁸ Incidentally, Höfler had been dismissed from the University of Munich in 1847 after the affair concerning Lola Montez, and now, like his former colleagues in Munich, Moy de Sons and Phillips, received a new position in Austria.

³⁹ "bringing together and repeating with rare diligence and undaunted stubbornness everything that was ever said by an opponent of Hus and the Hussites [...], and, ignoring the facts to the contrary, developing this tangled mass of accusations into a comprehensive artificial structure by means of his own combinations, which in general cannot be said to lack great erudition or acumen, for whose internal and external completion nothing is missing, I believe, except – the foundation of truth, impartiality and fairness." František PALACKÝ: *Die Geschichte des Hussitentums und Prof. Constantin Höfler*, Prag 1868, p. 3.

⁴⁰ Cf. Georg Curtius to Hermann Bonitz. Prague, 27 December 1853, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D254; Ludwig Lange to a ministerial councillor at the Ministry for Education and Religious Affairs. Prague, 1 May 1859, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D504.

Paris.⁴¹ Therefore his attempt to complete his habilitation in political science at the law faculty was not accepted.⁴²

The reform of the philosophical faculty initially took centre stage. It can also be seen that, while student numbers declined in total after 1848, this faculty even saw a growth in the number of students. One key reason for this was that the reform of the secondary schools also led to a great demand for teachers, which meant that an education at the philosophical faculty was very attractive for the rapidly increasing number of middle schools with German and, since the beginning of the 1860s, also Czech as languages of instruction. Only gradually did the faculty become an important research centre for the humanities and natural sciences taught there.

The 1850s can therefore be described both as a phase of transition and of stabilisation of the subjects and the teaching staff, which then formed the basis for the upturn of academic life in subsequent decades. At the same time, the intellectual prerequisites for a general social departure were also consolidated, which occurred at the beginning of the 1860s in the context of the emergence of constitutionalism and liberalism. In the fifties, numerous scientific works were written, whose authors then in the 1860s, as a result of the authority thus attained, entered into regional and state politics as famous personalities, or founded professional associations.

New seminars and institutes were created in the 1850s, which first required considerable state support. This is true, for example, of the aforementioned physiological institute: After a series of negotiations on more suitable premises, Purkyně⁴³ was given rooms in a building in Spálená Street for the development of a new physiological institute at the medical faculty of the University of Prague. This was located between the Karolinum – the centre of the university – and Charles' Square, the site of the general hospital, which was closely connected to the university. He lived in this building and the rooms were redesigned specifically for the institute.⁴⁴

In contrast, the establishment of a history seminar at the University of Prague failed, despite the fact that it was advocated frequently by the aforementioned Václav V. Tomek. Tomek had completed his education in Paris with the considerable financial support of the Viennese government, where he had become familiar with the methods taught there, especially at the

⁴¹ Cf. for example the protocols of the ministerial council from that year: *Die Protokolle des österreichischen Ministerrates 1848–1867, II. Abteilung. Das Ministerium Schwarzenberg*, vol. 1, Wien 2002, p. 646 and 693.

⁴² Robert SAK: *Rieger: konzervativec nebo liberál?*, Praha 2003.

⁴³ Johann Purkyně to Leo Thun. Wrocław, 22 October 1849, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D9.

⁴⁴ *Dějiny UK III*, p. 141–142; Ludmila HLAVÁČKOVÁ, Petr SVOBODNÝ: *Dějiny pražských lékařských fakult 1348–1990*, Praha 1993.

École des Chartes.⁴⁵ After his return from France he attended – with state support – the important German universities in Berlin (Ranke’s seminar), Göttingen and Breslau, where he once again became familiar with the activities of the history seminars. Then he became one of the first professors at the University of Prague to complete their habilitation under the new law, and was appointed professor for Austrian history. However, he failed in his attempt to found a history seminar according to the western European style in Prague. One reason was his unpopularity among the students, which was due to his conservative political views and his cooperation with the pro-Habsburg nobility, which in turn made him, in Thun’s view, a suitable candidate for the important chair of Austrian history.

While the assessment of the Thunian reforms has been mostly positive from the perspective of the scientific development, the reform phase was perceived much more negatively by followers of an emancipation of the Czech people. But even some residents of Bohemia, who considered themselves to be German and who were pro-Austrian, also saw some reform measures in a negative light. Since the 1850s the growing gap between those parts of the population who considered themselves to be Czech and those who saw themselves as German was becoming ever clearer. It is true that neo-absolutism managed to limit this drifting apart by means of political suppression. However in industry, and in economic life in general, the increasing gap was already playing an important role. Numerous branches of industry started to develop in which the Czech element was predominant (for example in the sugar industry), and there was growing demand for Czech specialists.⁴⁶ By the beginning of the 1860s the pent-up conflicts between the Czechs and the Germans then erupted in all areas of life, including in academia. Therefore, after an Utraquist transitional period in the years 1864–68, the strict separation of the polytechnic into a Czech and a German college, each of them independent, was completed.⁴⁷ This meant that the Czech technical college and the subjects taught there soon took a leading

⁴⁵ “However in order to gain such a chair, the Minister wished that I first get to know similar institutes at foreign universities. To this end he was prepared to give me the support of the government, so that I could visit some of the most important universities for the purpose of learning their methods in that area of research.” Václav Vladivoj TOMEK: *Paměti I*, Praha 1904, p. 335.

⁴⁶ Drahomír JANČÍK, Eduard KUBŮ (ed.): *Nacionalismus zvaný hospodářský: střety a zápasy o nacionální emancipaci/převahu českých zemích (1859–1945)*, Praha 2011; Jan HÁJEK, Drahomír JANČÍK, Eduard KUBŮ: *For Economic National Possessions: Reflections and Studies on Modern Czech and German Economic Nationalism in the Bohemian Lands: Tribute to the XIV. International Economic History Congress in Helsinki*, Prague 2006; Ágnes POGÁNY, Eduard KUBŮ, Jan KOFMAN (ed.): *Für eine nationale Wirtschaft: Ungarn, Die Tschechoslowakei und Polen vom Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg*, Berlin 2006; Vlastislav LACINA: *Hospodářství v českých zemích 1880–1914 (Práce Historického ústavu ČAV. Opera Instituti Historici Pragrae. Monographia A–2)*, Praha 1990. František DUDEK: *Vývoj cukrovarnického průmyslu v českých zemích do roku 1872*, Praha 1979.

⁴⁷ Albert Vojtěch VELFLÍK: *Die k. k. Deutsche Technische Hochschule in Prag. Festschrift zur Hundertjahrfeier*, Prag 1906, p. 45–103.

position in teaching and research, while the German college attracted ever fewer students. Not even the illustrious names among the graduates of the college could compensate.

The university went through a similar development from the beginning of the 1880s – however without a preceding Utraquist period. From 1882/83 onwards, teaching was carried out in each independent Czech and German philosophical and law faculty. In 1883/84, the independent medical faculties in both universities commenced operation. The division of the theological faculty was completed only at the beginning of the 1890s.⁴⁸ Individual scientific schools were established at the Czech university in the context of the seminars. In addition, professors who could teach in Czech were appointed from abroad.⁴⁹ Numerous Czech college textbooks were also written, and a specialist terminology was created in many disciplines. Like with the polytechnic, the interest of students in the German university declined. Nevertheless, subsequent famous researchers, such as Ernst Mach⁵⁰ or Albert Einstein⁵¹ worked in this university.

The academic freedoms gained during the course of the reforms, the improvement to the material situation of the university, the growing interest among students and the targeted promotion by the Czech political system contributed to an upturn of the university. Ultimately, therefore, the young Czech elite mostly emerged from this university, so that the university also significantly shaped Czech society at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century. Thanks to the Charles Ferdinand University, society in the Bohemian lands was prepared to successfully manage the tasks connected with its independent national existence, right up to the First World War.

⁴⁸ Václav VANĚČEK: „V Praze budou ...dvě univerzity ...“, in: *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* XXII, Facs. 1, (1982), p. 7–14; Ferdinand SEIBT (ed.): *Die Teilung der Prager Universität 1882 und die intellektuelle Desintegration in den böhmischen Ländern*, München 1984; Jaroslav GOLL: *Rozdělení pražské univerzity Karlo-Ferdinandovy roku 1882 a počátek samostatné university české*, Praha 1908.

⁴⁹ Jaroslav OPAT: *Filozof a politik T. G. Masaryk 1882–1893: příspěvek k životopisu*, Praha 1990; *IBID*, *Průvodce životem a dílem T. G. Masaryka: česká otázka včera a dnes*, Praha 2003; Milan MACHOVEC: *Tomáš G. Masaryk*, Praha 2000; Tomáš G. MASARYK, *Univerzitní přednášky I: praktická filozofie*, Praha 2012.

⁵⁰ Petr DUB, Jana MUSILOVÁ (ed.): *Ernst Mach – fyzika – filozofie – vzdělávání*, Brno 2010; Rudolf DVORÁK: *Ernst Mach: fyzik a filozof*, Praha 2005; Ivana HOLZBACHOVÁ: *Ernst Mach a vědecké poznání*, in: *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. Studia Minora Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Brunenses, Studia Philosophica B* 48 (2001).

⁵¹ Jan HORSKÝ: *Albert Einstein: genius lidstva*, Praha 1998; https://www.natur.cuni.cz/fakulta/o-fakulte/galerie/vystava-90let/albert-einstein-v-praze/image_view_fullscreen, retrieved 31.08.2016.

Annex

Overview of the first free lectures⁵²

Medical faculty

1842: Extraordinary lectures

(Director: Ignaz von Nadherny, Dean: Leopold Wander von Grünwald)

Dentistry (according to his own handbook of dentistry, Prague 1839) by Operator Nessel

Means of rescue in cases of apparent death, and in sudden risks to life, according to Bernt's lectures on rescue during apparent death, 2nd ed., Vienna 1837 by Professor Popel

Pharmaceutical goods according to Professor M. Ehrmann's handbook, Vienna 1826 and Professor Kosteletzky's allgem. mediz. pharmaz. Flora, Prague 1831–36, by Dr. Kratzmann

Surgical anatomy by Dr. Hyrtl

General and special pathology of surgical illnesses by Dr. Lumbe

Childhood diseases according to Meissner's handbook of childhood diseases, Leipzig 1838 by Dr. Quadrat, lecturer

Pathological anatomy by associate Professor Dr. Bohdalek

The art of prescriptions and exercises in the same by Dr. Reiss, lecturer

Psychiatry by Dr. Riedl, primary doctor

1843: Free objects of teaching

(Director: Ignaz von Nadherny, Dean: Leopold Wander von Grünwald)

Means of rescue in cases of apparent death, and in sudden risks to life, according to Bernt's lectures on rescue during apparent death, 2nd ed., Vienna 1837 by Professor Popel

Surgical anatomy by Professor Hyrtl

Comparative anatomy and physiology by Professor Hyrtl

Physiological and pathological chemistry by Professor Redtenbacher

Pathological anatomy by associate Professor Dr. Bohdalek

Dentistry (according to his own handbook of dentistry, Prague 1839) by Operator Nessel, lecturer

⁵² From: Personal-Stände des akademischen Senates und der Fakultäten-Lehrkörper an der k. k. Universität zu Prag, dann Ordnung der öffentlichen, ordentlichen und außerordentlichen Vorlesungen, welche an derselben im Schuljahre 1842, 1843 gehalten werden.

General and special pathology of surgical illnesses by Dr. Lumbe, lecturer and prison surgeon
Childhood diseases according to Meissner's handbook of childhood diseases, Leipzig 1838 by
Dr. Quadrat, lecturer
The art of prescriptions and exercises in the same by Dr. Reiss, lecturer
Psychiatry by Dr. Riedl, primary doctor
Pharmaceutical goods according to Professor M. Ehrmann's handbook, Vienna 1826 and
Professor Kosteletzky's allgem. mediz. pharmaz. Flora, Prague 1831–36, by Dr. Kratzmann,
lecturer
Pathology and therapy of syphilitic and impetiginous illnesses by Dr. Krauss, lecturer and
primary doctor
Diagnostics of chest illnesses, auscultation and percussion by Dr. Jacksch, lecturer and doctor
Surgical instruments and dressings by Dr. Pitha, lecturer
History of medicine by Dr. Löschner, lecturer

Maria Stinia

The Jagiellonian University in the era of Minister Leo Thun (1849–1860)

Prerequisites

The rapid development of science and scholarship and the growing importance of the universities in the Europe of the 19th century came at a time where there was no statehood in the Polish territories. A fundamental problem at this time was the contrast between the interests of Polish society and the objectives of the partitioning powers. Already in Enlightenment ideology the demand for the immediate applicability of science had already been an important part and evidence of the cultural forces of the nation.¹ In the 19th century, when science and scholarship exerted an increasing influence on political conceptions and on the formation of a national identity, the awareness of its weighty role became an obligatory paradigm. The positivistic idea of the world changed the form of scientific research decisively, and influenced the professionalization of science.²

In Krakow the conditions of university education and research were different to those in other Polish territories. The Republic of Krakow, baptised in 1815 at the Congress of Vienna, had retained a certain degree of independence as a Free City, despite the control of the partitioning powers.³ This also meant that the university could continue to operate more or less undisturbed, despite the changed financial and organisational conditions (restriction of autonomy and monitoring by the partitioning powers). The shifts in borders robbed the university of its economic basis, since the income from the assets that it owned, but which lay outside of the Free City, were taken from it.

The integration of the Krakow Republic into the Habsburg Empire in 1846 then introduced a new period in the history of the university. Initially the Damocles sword of closure swung above it, but in 1847 a decree by Emperor Ferdinand I confirmed the continued existence of the university. At the same time, a process of adaptation to the organisational schemas of the other Habsburg universities was introduced. The solutions tested at the University of Lviv were to serve as a model, particularly for the law faculty.⁴ The languages of instruction, previously

¹ Jerzy MICHALSKI: Warunki rozwoju nauki polskiej, in: IBID. (ed.): Historia nauki polskiej, Vol. 3, 1795–1862, Wrocław i. a. 1977, p. 3–354, here p. 4.

² Jan SURMAN: Uniwersytety Galicyjskie w Monarchii Habsburskiej: Nacjonalizacja nauki i internacjonalizacja wiedzy, in: Prace Komisji Historii Nauki PAU 9 (2012), p. 39–52.

³ Especially prior to 1833, when the so-called organic statutes greatly restricted the autonomy of the university.

⁴ Kamilla MROZOWSKA: Okres ucisku i darennych prób wyzwolenicznych, 1833–1850, in: Mirosława CHAMCÓWNA, Kamilla MROZOWSKA (ed.): Dzieje Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w latach 1765–1850, Vol. 2, Kraków 1965, p. 182–235, here p. 209.

Latin and Polish, would now be Latin and German. The Polish language was retained only for the courses of the extraordinary subjects (Polish literature, French law) and for the courses for surgeons and midwives.

In the March Revolution of 1848 the academics campaigned above all for the Polonisation of the university and demanded influence on the appointment to professorial chairs and the return of the assets of the university. The senate of the university was actively involved, above all under the rectorate of Józef Majer.⁵ Already by November of the same year, the gubernatorial government had consented to the recognition of Polish as a language of instruction, and to the personnel suggestions that had been made by the Poles (for example those professors who had been removed in 1833 were reappointed). However this process was accompanied by an expansion of bureaucratic structures, which subjected the university to ever more rigid controls. These were eventually specified by the *Provisorisches Gesetz über die Organisation der akademischen Behörden*, which had been devised by Franz Exner⁶ and introduced by the Minister for Education and Religious Affairs, Leo Thun, along with the accompanying decrees of 30 September 1849. The Act aimed to level out the differences in the field of science between Austrian and other German states. It also formed the basis for other subsequent regulations introduced in the Habsburg Empire relating to organisational matters in the area of the university. The Act thus shaped the next seventy years of the Jagiellonian University.

A key innovation was that the universities were granted a certain degree of autonomy. Nevertheless, the state retained the possibility of central control and extensive decision-making powers by means of the right to confirm elected dignitaries, budget decisions, provisions of the study and examination regulations, and the right to appoint professors suggested by the faculty.⁷ Leo Thun's basic idea behind this regulation was to provide the government with the opportunity to regulate access to the university for unwelcome professors, without completely excluding the freedom of teaching and learning.⁸ In this respect, Thun took on the entire responsibility for the appointment of new professors.⁹ However, he always took advice from trusted experts, which is also documented in his estate for some cases in Krakow. Members of the university also frequently tried to exert influence on the minister unofficially. An important

⁵ MICHALSKI: *Warunki rozwoju*, p. 246.

⁶ Christoph THIENEN-ADLERFLYCHT: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein als nachjosephinischer Vorkämpfer eines aufgeklärten Konservatismus, in: Ulrich ZELLENBERG (ed.): *Konservative Profile. Ideen & Praxis in der Politik zwischen FM Radetzky, Karl Kraus und Alois Mock*, Graz, Stuttgart 2003, p. 103–168, here p. 140.

⁷ Werner OGRIS: *Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Leo Graf Thun-Hohenstein*, Wien 2000, p. 14.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁹ Walter HÖFLECHNER: *Nachholende Eigenentwicklung? Der Umbau des habsburgischen Universitätssystems nach der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, in: Rüdiger VOM BRUCH, Elisabeth MÜLLER-LUCKNER (ed.): *Die Berliner Universität im Kontext der deutschen Universitätslandschaft nach 1800, um 1860 und um 1910*, München 2010, p. 93–108, here 102.

example is a letter from the rector, Józef Majer, who made appointment suggestions to Thun for many chairs in his university in August 1850.¹⁰ He justified his action as follows:

Zwar gelangen die Bedürfnisse unserer Hochschule durch officiële Denkschriften zu Eurer Excellenz Kenntnis. Aber leicht ersehen Eure Excellenz aus dem Inhalte dieses Schreibens, daß solche Details, welche ich hier mit aller Offenheit darzulegen wagte, unmöglich auf amtlichem Wege sich mittheilen ließen.¹¹

The letter from Majer also gives a good insight into the situation at the University of Krakow at the beginning of the reform era and into the numerous difficulties it faced at the time.

Like the other universities of the monarchy, the university in Krakow had its own legal identity, albeit restricted in matters of assets, where it was subordinate to the Ministry of Finance.¹² The new university laws confirmed the right to elect the academic authorities (rector, deans and pro-deans), regulated the study regulations and obligations of the students, as well as the functioning of the library, the bursary, and the university chancellery.¹³

Changes in the organisation

After a brief liberal phase at the beginning of the reform process, some significant changes were made to the University in Krakow at the beginning of the 1850s. Essentially, control over the university by the state increased, since the Ministry for Education and Religious Affairs made rigid use of its authority in filling professorial chairs, which did not remain uncontested. As a sign of their independence, the Krakow professors appeared gowns on the occasion of the visit of Emperor Franz Joseph in 1851, and not in the prescribed civil service uniforms. The following year, after reports of political activities at the university, autonomy was finally suspended, some of the professors were removed (Antoni Zygmunt Helcel, Józefat Zielonacki, Wincenty Pol and Antoni Małecki), and control of the university was given to a curator. This curator was the professor for Roman law, Piotr Bartynowski, who held office from 1853–1860. This intervention into the rights of the university was accompanied by the introduction of German as the language of instruction, which took effect with the decision of 29 October 1853.

¹⁰ Józef Majer to Leo Thun. Kraków, 12 August 1850, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D67.

¹¹ Ibid. “While the needs of our universities have reached Your Excellency by means of official memorandums. But Your Excellency can see easily from the content of this letter that such details that I dare to reveal openly here cannot possibly be communicated by official means.”

¹² Kazimierz Władysław KUMANIECKI: *Zarys prawa administracyjnego na ziemiach polskich*, Kraków, Warszawa 1921, p. 119. Zob. Leszek HAJDUKIEWICZ: *Wydziały i zakłady Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1849–1939* (1954), in: Jerzy MICHAŁEWICZ (ed.): *Inwentarz akt wydziałów i studiów Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1849–1939* (1954), Kraków 1997, p. 7–25, here 7.

¹³ Excerpt from the ministerial decree of 11 October 1850, in: Georg THAA (ed.): *Sammlung der für die österreichischen Universitäten gültigen Gesetze und Verordnungen*, Wien 1871, p. 82.

The first list of personnel and lectures in the German language was already published for the winter semester of the 1853/54 academic year (with effect from 1 January 1854)¹⁴ and demonstrates an alternating juxtaposition of German and Polish lectures, which also applied for the following semester, as the overview below will show. In the meantime, Latin continued to be used for lessons at the theological faculty. Some courses at the law faculty were taught in Polish in the winter semester: encyclopaedia of law, philosophy of private law, public canon law, Galician tabular instance, mortgage law in the Kingdom of Poland and the City of Krakow, old Polish civil law, and French civil and commercial law.¹⁵ In the summer semester, the courses in the general principles of public law, the European law of nations, and French civil law were taught in Polish. All other subjects were taught in German.¹⁶ Only a few lectures were held in German at the medical faculty in the winter semester: those by Wenzel Treitz in pathological anatomy¹⁷ and Antoni Bryk's lecture on forensic medicine.¹⁸ The situation was reversed in the summer semester, with Polish lectures given only by Antoni Kozubowski (histology and microscopic exercises in anatomy), Józef Majer (physiology), Józef Kwaśniewski (obstetrics for midwives) and Wawrzyniec Domański (two lectures on veterinary science)¹⁹. At the philosophical faculty, lectures in German were given in winter by Maksymilian Weisse, mathematics and astronomy, Bernard Jülg²⁰, classical philology, and František Tomáš/Franz Thomas Bratranek, German. In the summer semester only two people offered lectures in Polish: Karol Mecherzyński from the history of Polish language and literature, and Franciszek Aubertin in the foundations of French grammar.²¹ In the following years, there were also lectures in Polish at the theological faculty, in pastoral theology and the catechetical and methodology of religious instruction (from summer semester 1854/55). From the 1856/57 academic year, the Polish language was used in the summer semester in lectures on liturgy, pastoral theology and church rhetoric. From 1859/60, catechetical and methodology were once again taught in Polish.²² There were no Polish courses at the law faculty in the

¹⁴ Personal-Stand und Ordnung der Vorlesungen an der k. k. Jagellonischen Universität zu Krakau im Winter-Semester des Schuljahrs 1853/1854, Krakau 1853.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 2–3.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁷ Treitz was a student of Joseph Hartel. He returned to Prague as early as 1855. Josef DOBIÁŠ, J. MAREK: Dr. Václav Treitz (1819–1872). On the 110th Anniversary of his Death and the 125th Anniversary of the Founding of the Pathologic Anatomy Institute in Prague, in: *Časopis lékařů českých* 122 (1983), p. 405–407.

¹⁸ Personal-Stand und Ordnung der Vorlesungen, p. 4.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 11–12.

²⁰ Bernhard Jülg taught in Krakow until 1863 and then taught at the University of Innsbruck.

²¹ Personal-Stand und Ordnung der Vorlesungen, p. 12–13.

²² Personal-Stand und Ordnung der Vorlesungen an der k. k. Jagellonischen Universität zu Krakau im Sommer-Semester des Schuljahrs 1859/1860, Krakau 1860, p. 13.

1855/56 or 1856/57 academic years. From 1857/58 Michał Koczyński taught Polish law²³, and in 1859/60 there were once again lectures on French civil law (Piotr Burzyński). At the medical faculty, the courses on obstetrics for midwives, anthropology and physiology, osteology of humans and animals, and the veterinary sciences were taught in Polish throughout the whole period. The subjects in which the Polish language was used had the status of extraordinary lectures. This designation therefore also implies the primacy of German as the language of instruction.

Changes to the teaching programme of the theological faculty

Apart from the changes to the organisation, which affected the entire university system in the monarchy, the regulations on the state examinations also had an influence on the lecture programme of each faculty. In addition, the earlier legal norms and the resolutions of the Concordat were also of importance to the theological faculty. With the imperial decision of 1847, the right to grant a theological doctoral degree was withdrawn from the faculty.²⁴ The number of chairs was limited to four, in accordance with the laws of 1833: These were the professorial chairs of bible study and Oriental languages, church history and patristics, dogma and moral theology, and pastoral theology with homiletics and liturgy. The theological faculty was closely connected to the Krakow diocese and to the diocesan seminar, whereby the teachers from the latter supported the teaching staff of the faculty as assistant professors.²⁵ The faculty's main problem was the limited number of chairs, which is why it approached the Emperor in 1850 with a request to increase this number.²⁶ However, the petition was not granted, since the plan was to regulate the question of priest training for the entire empire. With the imperial decree of 23 April 1850, and ultimately with the Concordat of 1855 and the regulation of 8 March 1858, the question of the number of professorial chairs and subjects at the theological faculties and institutes was regulated uniformly for the whole monarchy.²⁷ Accordingly, patristics was allocated to the extraordinary subjects. Liturgy and homiletics were attached to the lectures in pastoral theology.²⁸ In 1852, lectures in canon law, which previously formed part of the law faculty, were added to the theological faculty. In 1856 the chair for bible study was

²³ Personal-Stand und Ordnung der Vorlesungen an der k. k. Jagellonischen Universität zu Krakau im Sommer-Semester des Schuljahrs 1857/1858, Krakau 1858, p. 13.

²⁴ Marian KANIOR: Dzieje Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w latach 1780–1880, in: *Analecta Cracoviensia* 25 (1993), p. 195–203, here p. 200.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Archiv der Jagiellonen-Universität [hereafter: AUJ], Wydział Teologiczny I 3, Liber Sessinorum. Protokoły posiedzeń Wydziału Teologicznego, Kart. 148, 149.

²⁷ Bolesław KUMOR: Ustrój i organizacja kościoła polskiego w okresie niewoli narodowej 1772–1918, Kraków 1980, p. 414.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

divided into a regular chair for the Old Testament and an extraordinary chair for the New Testament.²⁹ From 1856 the bible study of the Old Testament and Oriental languages became a chair in its own right, with languages Hebraic (annually), Arabic, Chaldean and Syrian being taught alternately. However the chair for the bible study of the New Testament, which was established in 1856, remained unoccupied. Pastor Aleksander Schindler assumed this chair only two years later, and held it until his death in 1874.

Changes to the teaching programme of the law faculty

There were also significant changes at the law faculty. Already the report by the ministerial inspector Joseph Reiner in 1850 indicated the necessity of reorganising the faculty and of introducing the German language for some of the lectures.³⁰ Above all, Reiner's report pointed to the shorter period of study, compared with the German-speaking universities (three years), the lack of consideration for Austrian law, and the dearth of possibilities to learn valid juridical terminology. He therefore demanded the establishment of extraordinary chairs, with German as the language of instruction, especially in the area of the practical subjects that were necessary for a career in the civil service.³¹ These changes finally led to the regulation of legal studies, which took effect in 1855, and which made the historical juridical subjects (Roman law, canon law, the newly introduced German constitutional and legal history, and German private law) the theoretical foundations of legal studies. The consequence was an increasing development of the historical-juridical tradition in Krakow.³² However the number of chairs in the second half of the 19th century was lower than the number of compulsory subjects. These compulsory subjects were prescribed, and even the order in which the individual subjects were to be learned was defined throughout the whole empire. Due to the small number of professors, teachers had to offer lectures from several different subjects. The specific role of the faculty as a training institute for future civil servants also meant that the state regularly intervened with regulations. The German language was first introduced as a language of instruction in this faculty, and survived the longest here. Also characteristic of Leo Thun's period in office were the numerous re-designations of and new appointments to chairs at the law faculty of the Jagiellonian

²⁹ Stanisław DOBRZANOWSKI: Wydział Teologiczny Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1849–1880, in: *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 10 (1972), No. 2, p. 67–104, here p. 70–73.

³⁰ In a letter to the ministry, the university made reference to the report: AUJ, Akta Senatu, S I 72, Posiedzenie Senatu Akademickiego z dnia 23 lutego 1850 r., Kart. 225–226.

³¹ Organizacja Uniwersytetu, statuta i ustawy 1848–1914, uwagi z wizytacji Josepha Reinera: AUJ, Akta Senatu, S II 526, Posiedzenie Senatu Akademickiego z dnia 23 lutego 1850 r. (not paginated).

³² Michał PATKANIOWSKI: *Dzieje Wydziału Prawa Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego od reformy kołłątajowskiej do końca XIX stulecia* (Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego LXXIX, Prace Prawnicze, H. 13), Kraków 1964, p. 225.

University. Subjects were frequently combined anew. For example, in 1850 the chair for legal philosophy and constitutional law was founded, which arose from the chair for natural and constitutional law. In the same year, a chair for civil proceedings, commercial and exchange law was created, which was held until 1888 by Edward Fierich. In 1851 a chair for criminal law and criminal proceedings was founded (1851–1865 Michał Koczyński). In 1855 the chair for political science and statistics became the chair for political science, statistics and general political law. The chair for Polish law, established in 1848, was held until 1853 by Antoni Zygmunt Helcel. After a one-year vacancy, the Habsburg administration combined it with the chair for French law, thus creating a chair for Polish and French law. This combination is explained by the fact that the Napoleonic Code civil had been introduced in parts of the Polish territory (Duchy of Warsaw), and was later kept. The new chair was assumed by Piotr Burzyński, who had taught French law since 1850. In 1855 a chair was also established for German law, encompassing German imperial and legal history, as well as general German private law. Edward Buhl was appointed to this chair, where he remained until 1870.

There were frequent changes in personnel above all in the chair for Roman law, which was so important to Thun. In the 1850s, this chair had been held by Józefat Zielonacki (1850–1853), Karol Esmarch (1855–1857) and finally Gustav Demelius (1857–1861); the intermediary deputies were Aleksander Cukrowicz (1849/1850), Wincenty Waniorek (1854/1856) and Udalryk Heyzmann (1861/1862).³³

Changes to the teaching programme of the medical faculty

Nor did the medical faculty remain untouched by the changes. As early as 1848 a chair for descriptive anatomy was separated from that for physiology, and made autonomous. Christian August Voigt was appointed to this chair in 1854, and held it until 1861. In 1851 a chair for pathological anatomy was established, thus providing the possibility of determining cause of death by means of autopsy.³⁴ Ophthalmology was also established during this time as an independent discipline – in Krakow, the first representative of this discipline was a student of Johann Georg Beer, Antoni Sławikowski, who held the chair from 1851–1870.

In 1849 Józef Majer was appointed to the chair for physiology. Once he had assumed the chair, Majer applied for the establishment of a physiological cabinet, with a fixed annual

³³ Przemysław ŻUKOWSKI: *Corpus professorum Facultatis Iuridicae Universitatis Jagellonicae*, T. II: 1780–2012, ed. by Dorota MALEC, Kraków 2014.

³⁴ Janina KOWALCZYKOWA: *Historia Katedry Anatomii Patologicznej w Krakowie*, in: *Sześćsetlecie medycyny krakowskiej*, t. 2: *Historia katedr*, Kraków 1964, p. 415–432, here p. 417.

endowment.³⁵ However, when Majer refused to hold his lectures in German, Johann Nepomuk Czermak was appointed to the chair; he finally managed to get special rooms for the cabinet. He also introduced obligatory practical exercises for students. He was succeeded in 1857 by Giuseppe Albini, who was followed one year later by Gustaw Piotrowski. The latter ran the physiological cabinet as an associate professor from 1860 until 1884. Only in 1861, following the Polonisation of the university, did Majer once again receive the full right to teach, and ran the lecture programme together with Piotrowski until 1877.

In the 1850/51 academic year the chair for pharmacy was part of the philosophical faculty, but it was reintegrated into the medical faculty already one year later. This was accompanied by a separation of the subject into a chair for chemistry under Emil Czyrniański and a chair for pharmacy under Florian Sawiczewski. The latter had earned great merits as a long-term head (since 1825) with the expansion of the pharmaceutical and chemical cabinet and its elevation to the level of the University of Vienna. Sawiczewski was succeeded in the chair for pharmacy in 1857 by Fryderyk Skobel, whose chair was renamed, however, to a chair for pathology, general therapy, pharmacognosy and pharmacology.³⁶ Clinics were also established alongside the theoretically-oriented professorial chairs. The existing clinics (general medicine, surgery and obstetrics) were joined by an additional clinic for ophthalmology, and prosector positions were set up in the existing cabinets for anatomy and pathological anatomy. In addition, a physiological, an anatomical-surgical, and a veterinary cabinet were established. The appointment of Józef Dietl as head of the chair and of the clinic for internal medicine also allowed a transfer of knowledge from the recent Vienna Medical School to Krakow.³⁷

There were also pharmaceutical courses at the Jagiellonian University that were reorganised according to the regulations issued by the Ministry for Education and Religious Affairs in 1850.³⁸ The course lasted two years, one of which was to be completed at the philosophical faculty, the other in the medical faculty. Pharmacy was also the first independent vocational training at the University of Krakow.³⁹

³⁵ Jerzy KAULBERSZ, Ryszard BILSKI: *Historia Katedry Fizjologii Wydziału Lekarskiego Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego i Akademii Medycznej*, in: *Sześćsetlecie medycyny krakowskiej*, Vol. 2: *Historia katedr*, Kraków 1964, p. 392–432, here p. 399.

³⁶ PERKOWSKA: *Studia i kursy zawodowe*, p. 7, see also Zbigniew BELA (ed): *225 lat Farmacji na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim*, Kraków 2008.

³⁷ Tadeusz TEMPKA: *Józef Dietl, profesor chorób wewnętrznych*, in: J. GROCHOWSKI (ed.): *Złota Księga. Wydział Lekarski Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, Kraków 2000, p. 77–107, here p. 79–81.

³⁸ Wjciech ROESKE: *Dzieje katedr farmaceutycznych w Krakowie*, in: *Sześćsetlecie medycyny*, Vol. 2, p. 631–674, here p. 660–661; Irena HOMOLA: *Kwiat społeczeństwa*, Kraków 1984, p. 246–270; Robert REMBIELIŃSKI: *Historia farmacji*, Warsaw 1963, p. 78–81; Krzysztofa MICHAŁEWSKA: *Wstęp do inwentarza akt Oddziału Farmaceutycznego*, Typoskript, Archiwum UJ.

³⁹ Urszula PERKOWSKA: *Studia i kursy zawodowe na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim w latach 1868/69–1938/39*, Kraków 1995, p. 7.

Changes to the teaching programme of the philosophical faculty

In the first years of reform, the main concentration in the philosophical faculty was on managing the newly defined tasks of the faculty, in other words the training of teachers and the integration of research. This is made clear, for example, in the foundation of a second chair for classical philology. Antoni Małecki was appointed to the newly-created chair, who taught in Krakow from 1850–1853 and who was then removed for political reasons. Thereafter, Bernhard Jülg and Gustav Linker were the professors for classical philology. Bernhard Jülg came from Baden. As a strict Catholic and follower of Bishop Hermann Vicari, who had argued with the government of Baden, Jülg did not rate his chances for a career at a university in his homeland very highly. He therefore applied for a position in Austria, which was successful due to the mediation of Hermann Vicari and Cardinal Schwarzenberg. Subsequently he was also a well-utilised source of information for Leo Thun in terms of the mediation and recruitment of secondary school teachers from Baden.⁴⁰ Jülg remained in Krakow until the 1862/63 academic year, before returning to Innsbruck. Linker, on the other hand, was moved to Lviv in 1861, since he could continue teaching in German there. A chair for German language and literature was established as early as 1850/51, and occupied by Karl Weinhold, who had been an associate professor in Breslau. However Weinhold remained only a few months in Krakow and was moved to Graz at his own request.⁴¹ After him, the chair was then assumed by the Moravian František Tomáš/Franz Thomas Bratranek, initially from 1851 as an associate professor, and then from 1853 as a full professor. Bratranek stayed in Krakow until 1882.⁴² His lectures were very popular among students due to their high scientific quality. The chair for Polish language and literature, established in 1854, arose from the chair for general literature and was granted to Karol Mecherzyński, who held it for 17 years. During this time, chemistry⁴³ and botany⁴⁴ were also established as independent disciplines and granted professorial chairs. By the conclusion of the reform, the philosophical faculty comprised 14 chairs in total: philosophy,

⁴⁰ Cf. Christof AICHNER, Tanja KRALER, Brigitte MAZOHL: Einleitung in die Auswahledition der Thunschen Korrespondenz (in preparation).

⁴¹ Olga DOBIJANKA-WITCZAKOWA: Historia katedry Germanistyki w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim, in: Witold TASZYCKI, Alfred ZARĘBA (ed.): Wydział Filologiczny Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Historia Katedr, Kraków 1964, p. 349–365, here p. 350–351.

⁴² Cf. Eugeniusz KLIN, Jaromir LOUŽIL: František Tomáš Bratranek – ein polonophiler Mittler zwischen den Nationen – mit dem ungedruckten Kommentar zu Mickiewicz's „Totenfeier“ („Dziady“), Zielona Góra 1987.

⁴³ Zdzisław WOJTASZEK: Zarys historii katedr chemicznych Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego (1 X 1783–31 VIII 1939), in: Stanisław GOŁĄB (ed.): Studia z dziejów katedr Wydziału Matematyki, Fizyki, Chemii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 1964, p. 133–219, here p. 158.

⁴⁴ Alicja ZEMANEK: Historia botaniki w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim. History of Botany at the Jagiellonian University (1780–1917), Kraków 1989.

general history, Polish literature, two chairs for classical literature, one chair for bibliography⁴⁵, German language and literature, astronomy (together with the observatory), higher and elementary mathematics, physics (with a physical cabinet), chemistry (with a chemical cabinet), botany (with a botanical garden), mineralogy and zoology, and a chair for general, physical and comparative geography.⁴⁶ This list corresponds generally with the subjects that formed the foundation of secondary school education.

The first seminar was established at the Jagiellonian University in 1851, a philological seminar. It was developed by Antoni Małecki and was based on the model of the seminars in Prague and Vienna.⁴⁷ The Krakow seminar had a Latin and a Greek department. Initially and in the first instance, the seminars served to train teachers in the classical languages and thus those subjects that dominated in the secondary schools at the time. In the second half of the 19th century they also became important places for cultivating the sciences and humanities. Bernhard Jülg, who taught in Krakow from 1853, gives us an insight into the situation of the seminar at the University of Krakow in the mid-1850s:

Es geht langsam, aber aller Anfang ist eben schwer. Von Jahr zu Jahr wird es besser werden. Ich muß noch immer mein Hauptaugenmerk auf grammatisches Wissen richten, wozu das philologische Seminar Gelegenheit genug bietet. Es wird schon noch einige Zeit vergehen müssen, bis ich dasselbe auf die Höhe der philologischen Seminarien in Deutschland bringen kann, bis größere wissenschaftliche Arbeiten und Forschungen unternommen werden können.⁴⁸

He identified the greatest problem for successful work to be the lack of good books:

Die Universitätsbibliothek ist in den zwei letzten Decennien, weil kein Mensch sich darum kümmerte, in der Philologie fast ganz vernachlässigt. Die Bedürfnisse zur Vorbereitung eines Gymnasiallehrers sind durch die durch Ersparnisse an Seminarstipendien ermöglichte Anlegung einer Seminarbibliothek noch nicht einmal gedeckt, die Studirenden haben kaum zu ihrer Vorbereitung das Nothdürftigste, an Behelf zu größern philologischen Arbeiten fehlt es aber völlig.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ The professor of bibliography conducted exercises in library science and managed the collection of books at the university. The chair, which had been established in Krakow since the beginning of the 19th century, was transferred later to the function of the director of the Jagiellonian Library and dissolved.

⁴⁶ Kazimiera MICHAŁEWSKA: Wydział Filozoficzny Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego (1849–1945), in: Inwentarz akt wydziałów i studiów, p. 227–284, here p. 230.

⁴⁷ Małecki was appointed to the chair with the obligation to run the seminar. AUJ, S II 76, Protokoły posiedzeń Senatu Akademickiego, posiedzenie z dnia 19 lipca 1851 r., k. 61.

⁴⁸ "It is going slowly, but all beginnings are difficult. It will get better from year to year. I must still focus on grammatical knowledge, for which the philological seminar provides enough opportunity. It will take some time before I can take it to the level of the philological seminars in Germany, before greater scientific work and research can be conducted." Bernhard Jülg to Leo Thun. Krakow, 8 January 1855, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D323.

⁴⁹ "Philology has been almost completely neglected in the university library in the last two decades, because nobody took care of it. Not even the requirements for the preparation of a secondary school teacher are covered with the establishment of a seminar library, which was facilitated by savings in seminar stipends, the students have barely that which is necessary for their preparation, and there is a complete lack of material for greater philological works." Ibid.

The fact that the situation in the seminars improved only slowly in many cases also illustrates that the establishment of an undergraduate seminar ultimately appeared necessary for the successful implementation of the seminar exercises in the 1870s and 1880s. Grammatical foundations were consolidated there, and students were introduced to the research and interpretation of important works. For this reason, no new cabinets were established during this time, and the existing ones continued, so that in the second half of the 19th century the university had a mineralogical, a zoological, a chemical and a physical laboratory, as well as an astronomical observatory and a botanic garden. While the university library was accessible to students, the requirement of a deposit for the loaning of books made its use difficult.

Personnel policy and appointment to chairs

A key interest of the university was the occupation of its chairs. Already in October 1848 the ministry approved changes in personnel that had been suggested by the academic senate, and even allowed the appointment of some persons who had previously been excluded from occupying a chair for political reasons. In addition, lecturers were allowed to offer unpaid lectures. The introduction of the new university law in September 1849 also resulted in amendments to the statutes of the university. Despite the new rights for the university, the required confirmation of all personnel decisions by the central government meant that the ministry in Vienna nevertheless retained its decisive influence on the occupation of chairs in Krakow. At the law faculty, provisional attempts were made to defuse the poor personnel situation by occupying vacant chairs temporarily with deputies from Krakow: Thus Wincenty Szpor represented the chair for political science, commercial and exchange law, while Aleksander Cukrowicz took on the chair for Roman law. However they were not confirmed in their positions due to their insufficient competence, as demonstrated during this deputising phase. In 1850 Józefat Zielonacki (Roman law), who had completed his habilitation in Breslau, and Antoni Zygmunt Helcel (history of Polish law), whose abilities were greatly appreciated by Thun, were appointed.⁵⁰ Edward Fierich was appointed to the chair for civil law. Julian Dunajewski deputised in political science and statistics in 1852. Against the wishes of the university, Michał Koczyński from Lviv was nominated as professor for criminal law, who later – despite the expectations of the government – proved to be less than loyal.⁵¹

At the medical faculty, some applications for appointments were rejected by the ministry: Adam Raciborski for internal medicine, Nikodem Bętkowski for the chair in pathological anatomy,

⁵⁰ MICHALSKI: Warunki rozwoju nauki, p. 253.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 254.

which had been established in 1850, and Wincenty Szokalski for the chair, established in the same year, in ophthalmology. Most of these scholars were associated with the independence movement, which was a significant reason for not confirming their nomination.⁵² Ludwik Gašiorowski, proposed for the chair in the history of medicine, also failed to find favour with the government.

For the philosophical faculty, the appointment to the chair in Polish and general literature was the most important. Apart from the less than realistic candidacy of the Polish national poet Adam Mickiewicz, the literary historian Lesław Łukaszewicz and the writer and translator Lucjan Siemieński were also suggested by the faculty. The latter was employed only for the summer semester of 1849.⁵³ The newly nominated minister, Leo Thun, then got involved in the ongoing appointment process. He was familiar with the special Galician situation from his time as gubernatorial councillor in Lviv (1846–1848). In Vienna he first negotiated with the poet and geographer Wincenty Pol and with the Slavic philologist Henryk Suchecki. Wincenty Pol decided to take the chair in geography,⁵⁴ while Suchecki declined. The academic senate therefore sought new candidates and concentrated on persons who were important for Polish literature. The poet Seweryn Goszczyński and the writer Józef Ignacy Kraszewski were suggested. Despite Thun's basic goodwill towards Kraszewski, both of these candidates also failed in Vienna.⁵⁵ The case of Kraszewski was particularly volatile, as the Russian government refused to issue him with a passport, thus making his appointment impossible. Ultimately, Karol Mecherzyński was nominated, who had previously worked as a deputy.

Nevertheless, the University of Krakow owes its gratitude to the often arbitrary decisions by Vienna for the appointment of some outstanding personalities, such as Antoni Małecki for classical philology and Józef Dietl for medicine. The introduction of German as the language of instruction meant that important researchers also came into question for chairs. However, its precarious material situation made the university unattractive, which meant that luminaries often remained only for a short time. At the philosophical faculty this is true, for example, for the zoologist Eduard Oskar Schmidt (he stayed in Krakow for two years), Carl Bernhard Brühl (half a year), Camillo Heller from Vienna, who reorganised the zoological cabinet, and the mineralogist Viktor Zepharovich (in Krakow 1857–1861). Also worth mention are the classical

⁵² MROZOWSKA: *Okres ucisku*, p. 219.

⁵³ Henryk BARYCZ: *U świtu nowoczesnej polonistyki uniwersyteckiej*, in: Renata DUTKOWA, Julian DYBIEC, Leszek HAJDUKIEWICZ (ed.): *Studia z dziejów oświaty i kultury w Polsce XVIII–XX w. Księga ofiarowana Janowi Hulewiczowi*, Wrocław 1977, p. 109–125, here p. 116–117.

⁵⁴ After Berlin it was the second chair in geography in Europe. See Antoni JACKOWSKI, Izabela SOLJAN: *Wincenty Pol jako geograf*, in: Krystyna GRODZISKA, Adam KOTARBA (ed.): *Wincenty Pol (1870–1872). W służbie nauki i narodu*, Kraków 2010, p. 25–47, here p. 26.

⁵⁵ BARYCZ: *U świtu nowoczesnej polonistyki*, p. 117.

philologists Bernhard Jülg and Gustav Linker, the Germanist Karl Weinhold from Breslau and František Tomáš/Franz Thomas Bratranek. At the law faculty the professors for Roman law, Karl Esmarch from Göttingen, and Gustav Demelius, who habilitated in Prague, were considered to be important researchers; at the medical faculty these were the anatomist Christian August Voigt and a pupil of Johann Purkyně, the physiologist Johann Czermak. Among the newly-appointed professors of the time, some were considered to be particularly loyal to the government: Eduard Buhl, Wincenty Waniorek, Antoni Walewski and Antoni Bryk.⁵⁶

The ordinances regarding private lecturers were also of considerable importance for the shaping of the teaching staff in Krakow. During his time as rector, Józef Majer enquired of the gubernatorial commission in the 1848/49 academic year about the possibility of granting a *venia legendi* for candidates who came into question for vacant chairs. After the commission conceded to the request by the university, it soon received some applications for permission to teach, which however were no longer considered upon the introduction of the new regulation on habilitations of 19 December 1848. Two applications were already rejected by the faculties at the preparatory stage. The candidacy of Teofil Żebrowski for descriptive geometry was approved by the philosophical faculty, together with his application to be released from the formalities of habilitation, the prescribed colloquium and a trial lecture, but the application was rejected by the ministry.⁵⁷ Despite the successful completion of a colloquium, confirmation was also refused to the pathological anatomist Nikodem Bętkowski.⁵⁸ There were no further habilitations at the University of Krakow before the end of Thun's time in office, in 1860.⁵⁹ After Thun's resignation, Józef Dietl called on Polish scholars to habilitate at the university, thus triggering a wave of habilitations there.⁶⁰ Already two years later, seven such applications were confirmed.

The students

The political event of the mid-19th century (from the Krakow Uprising in 1846 to the March Revolution of 1848), the reforms of the educational system of the Habsburg monarchy, and the

⁵⁶ Walewski's influence was also related to the removal of four professors in 1853. MICHALSKI: Warunki rozwoju nauki, p. 254, 256. Cf. the essay by Jan SURMAN in this volume.

⁵⁷ Krzysztofa MICHAŁEWSKA: Habilitacje w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim 1848-1918, in: Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego LXXI, Prace Historyczne, H. 12, Kraków 1963, p. 79–133, here p. 84.

⁵⁸ No reason was given for this. Ibid.

⁵⁹ Urszula PERKOWSKA: Kształtowanie się zespołu naukowego w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim (1860–1920), Wrocław 1975, p. 39–40.

⁶⁰ Józef DIETL: O instytucji docentów w ogóle, a szczególnie na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim, in: Czas, 31.10.1861, p. 1–2.

change in language of instruction, all had a significant influence on the number of students at the University of Krakow. There were 239 in 1850/51, declining to 175 students by 1854. At the end of Thun's period in office, in the 1859/60 academic year, numbers rose again to 282, due to progressing Polonisation and the introduction of university entrance examinations.⁶¹ The faculties of law and medicine had the most students. The resolution of 29 September 1850 on the general structure of faculty studies prescribed attendance at lectures for at least ten hours a week as a prerequisite for the successful completion of the semester. Language lessons or similar courses could not be counted.⁶² Semester and annual examinations were abolished, professors were free to decide how and whether to test the knowledge and skills of their students. Only the formal confirmation of lecture attendance was necessary. Rules of discipline and conduct were regulated by the provisional disciplinary order of 1849.⁶³ After the events of the March Revolution, student corporations were officially prohibited. To circumvent this prohibition, student educational associations were founded in Krakow. One such association was the *Biblioteka Słuchaczy Prawa Uczniów Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego* (Library for students of law at the Jagiellonian University). The association was founded as a reaction to an ordinance of 1849, which demanded a financial deposit from students for the loaning of books from the university library.⁶⁴ The first statutes of the association were written in 1851.⁶⁵

The financial provision of the university

After the dissolution of the Krakow Republic, the central government assumed the maintenance costs of the university – at the Jagiellonian University, and incidentally at all other Habsburg universities of the time. The proportion of other sources of income or donors was miniscule until the beginning of the Galician autonomy. As a result, the university was underfunded, which was due especially to the focus on elementary schools in the educational system.⁶⁶

⁶¹ Zbigniew TABAKA: *Analiza zbiorowości studenckiej w latach 1850–1918 (studium statystyczne)*, Kraków 1970 (*Studia z dziejów młodzieży Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego od Oświecenia do połowy XX wieku*), Vol. 2, T. 1 (*Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, Bd. CCXXVIII, *Prace Historyczne H. 29*), [dodatek], tab. 1.

⁶² For changes to the definition of the teacher, see *Rozporządzenie Ministra Wyznań i Oświaty z 31 maja 1899 r. O nauczycielach w ścisłym znaczeniu. Zmiana w wykonaniu rozporządzenia z 12 lipca 1850 roku*, in: Jerzy PIWOCKI (ed.): *Zbiór ustaw i rozporządzeń administracyjnych*, Vol. 6, Lwów 1913, p. 718.

⁶³ *Rozporządzenie Ministra Wyznań i Oświaty z 13 października 1849 roku. Tymczasowa Ustawa Dyscyplinarna*, in: *Zbiór ustaw uniwersyteckich*, Lwów 1881, p. 53.

⁶⁴ A deposit was necessary in the years 1849–1852. *Sammlung der für die k. k. österreichischen Universitäts-Bibliotheken giltigen Verordnungen, z[u]s[ammen]gest[ellt] im Auftr[age] des akademischen Senats der k. k. Jagiellonischen Universität zu Krakau von Hilary Hankiewicz*, Krakau 1871, p. 69, 79.

⁶⁵ Stanisław ESTREICHER: *Czterdzieści lat istnienia biblioteki słuchaczy prawa Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, Kraków 1891, p. 4; AUJ, *Wydział Prawa II 382*, *Biblioteka słuchaczy prawa 1851*.

⁶⁶ Karl LEMAYER: *Die Verwaltung der österreichischen Hochschulen von 1868–1877*, Wien 1878, p. 38; see also: Walter HÖFLECHNER: *Zum Einfluß des deutschen Hochschulwesens auf Österreich in den Jahren 1875–1914*, in: Bernhard VOM BROCKE (ed.): *Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Wissenschaftspolitik im Industriezeitalter: Das*

The provision with suitable rooms was insufficient in these years. Four colleges were available to the university: The first was the Collegium Maius (ul. Św. Anny 8), which also housed the university library and the librarian's residence (in need of renovation). Part of the library also took up space in the Collegium Minus (ul. Gołębia 11).⁶⁷ The Collegium Iuridicum (ul. Grodzka 53) comprised two buildings that had been purchased in the 15th century as residences for the professors of law. In the second half of the 19th century lectures were also held there by professors from the law and theological faculties. This building also contained the rector's office and the chambers of the academic senate, the law faculty and the university printer. The medical and philosophical faculties were housed in the Collegium Physicum (ul. Św. Anny 6). Several cabinets were also located there: the anatomical and veterinary cabinets of the medical faculty, and the physical, zoological, mineralogical cabinet and the chemical laboratory of the philosophical faculty.

The astronomical observatory in Kopernikus Street 25, in the former summer palace of August Czartoryski, also belonged to the university. The palace had been gifted to the university in 1779 by Primate Michał Jerzy Poniatowski. The building also contained the residences of the director and of the adjunct of the observatory, as well as those of the director and inspector of the botanic garden. From 1825–1861 the director of the observatory was the professor of astronomy, Maximilian Weisse. It was also he who suggested the renovation of the buildings of the observatory in the 1850s with a report on the condition of the observatory to the Ministry for Education and Religious Affairs. Thanks to the support of the regional president in Krakow, Franz Mercandin, the renovation plans were in fact carried out. Between 1858 and 1859 the building and the observatory were converted, so that the working conditions were soon considered to be better than those at the observatories of Prague, Breslau or Vilnius. From a scientific point of view, however, the observatory was only second-rate, but certainly well-known, primarily due to Weisse, who maintained close contact with other observatories.

Thanks to the efforts of Ignacy Rafał Czerwiakowski, the condition of the botanic garden also improved fundamentally. The plant collection was re-categorised and renewed, and in 1849 a palm house was built. Furthermore, since 1850 Czerwiakowski had been trying to tempt the famous research expedition leader, plant collector and intimate of Alexander von Humboldt, Józef Warszewicz, to Krakow, who was a friend from the time of the November Uprising. Warszewicz had brought knowledge of several thousands of tropical plants from his travels to

„System Althoff“ in historischer Perspektive, Hildesheim 1991, p. 155–183; Julian DYBIEC: *Finansowanie nauki i oświaty w Galicji 1860–1918*, Kraków 1979.

⁶⁷ *Kronika Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego od r. 1864 do r. 1887 i obraz jego stanu dzisiejszego wraz z rzeczą o rektorach od czasów najdawniejszych*, Kraków 1887, p. 9.

South America, including 300 orchid species alone, thus contributing significantly to the cause of European botany.⁶⁸ The efforts to employ Warszewicz in Krakow finally came to fruition in 1854. The garden benefited immensely from his work, and especially from his plant collection. The catalogue of 1864 already listed 9,470 plant species.⁶⁹ In 1856 the pond in the botanic garden was also redesigned, an artificial island was installed, and the pond was given the form that it still possesses today. A new Alpine garden was also established.⁷⁰ Czerwiakowski, who had been appointed to the chair, had a lecture theatre and a practice room in the pavilion of the gardens, which created favourable research conditions.⁷¹

The scientific and experimental foundations of the medical faculty were provided by the clinics, which were connected organisationally with the existing hospitals, Holy Ghost and St. Lazarus. The tradition of the Hospital of the Holy Ghost stretched back to the 13th century. In 1855 it was integrated into the structures of the St. Lazarus Hospital, which had been established in 1788, and which had formerly been located in the buildings belonging to the Carmelite Order [ul. Wesoła]. Opposite to this, the academic hospital, which had existed in the St. Barbara Church since 1773, was moved to the St. Lazarus Hospital. The sick were cared for by the nuns of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul. In this hospital, some of the beds were kept separate and acted as part of the clinic, which was controlled directly by the university.⁷² But this strange division led to conflicts of competence, so that the academic authorities ultimately looked for an extra premises for the clinic, in order to subject it exclusively to the control of the university.⁷³ Only in 1866 was a building, attached to the clinical hospital, purchased from Professor Józef Brodowicz for the departments of obstetrics and ophthalmology.

The university also owned the residences of St. Barbara [Mały Rynek], in a building that once belonged to the Jesuits, which was transferred to the university after the dissolution of the order.

⁶⁸ Alicja PIEKIELKO: *Historia Ogrodu Botanicznego Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w Krakowie*, Warszawa, Kraków 1983, p. 23.

⁶⁹ See Ignaz Raphael CZERWIAKOWSKI, Joseph WARSZEWICZ: *Catalogus plantarum quae in C. R. horto botanico Cracoviensi anno (1864–) ab erecta C. R. Universitate studiorum Jagellonica quingentesimo a fundato vero horto octogesimo educantur*, Cracoviae 1864; PIEKIELKO: *Historia Ogrodu Botanicznego*, p. 24.

⁷⁰ Alicja PIEKIELKO: *Dzieje Krakowskiego Ogrodu Botanicznego w latach 1809–1917*, in: *Kwartalnik Historii Nauki i Techniki* 26, 1981, No. 1, p. 111–136, here p. 122.

⁷¹ Marianne KLEMUN: *Der Botanische Garten*, in: *Europäische Geschichte Online (EGO)*, Leibniz-Institut für Europäische Geschichte (IEG), Mainz 2015-06-22. [URL: <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/klemunm-2015-de> URN: urn:nbn:de:0159-2015062221], retrieved 31.08.2016; Alicja ZEMANEK: *Historia botaniki w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim*, Kraków 1989, p. 23–24; IDEM.: *Dzieje nauczania botaniki w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim 1793–1917*, Kraków 1991, p. 30–32; IDEM.: *Historia Ogrodu Botanicznego w Krakowie*, Warszawa 1993, p. 63–65.

⁷² Of a total of 200 hospital beds, 24 were provided for the clinic: twelve for internal medicine, eight for the surgical clinic, and four beds for the obstetrics clinic.

⁷³ There were similar conflicts in Prague, cf. the correspondence between Leo Thun-Hohenstein and Anton Jaksch, *Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D373*.

It was used for student apartments, after the Jerusalem residence [ul. Gołębia] burned down in 1842. However the building did not have a regulated ownership status, and also housed an elementary school.

The great fire of Krakow, which broke out on 18 July 1850 and destroyed almost half of the centre of the city, also threatened the buildings of the university.⁷⁴ Thanks to the endeavours of the professors and students it was possible to save the historical university building of the Collegium Maius, together with the collection of the Jagiellonian library that was held there. However, the fire attacked the university printing house⁷⁵ and the eighth volume of Michał Wiszniewski's "Historia literatury polskiej" (History of Polish literature), some of which had already been printed.⁷⁶ Some of the professors of the university also experienced bitter losses, including Karol Mecherzyński and Feliks Radwański, whose apartments and libraries burned down, and the mediaevalist Karl Weinhold, who lost all of his research work and manuscripts.⁷⁷

The library of the university

The reform also resulted in significant changes to the university library, above all in terms of the right to borrow books. The premises were also redesigned. The transfer of the collections to the renovated rooms began in 1850, and the categorisation work of the library continued. In 1856 six smaller rooms were added. The books were now ordered by topic and not, as previously, by book format.⁷⁸ From 1859 the library was run by Franciszek Stroński, who above all endeavoured to increase the posts at the library, so that the personnel had grown already one year later, now comprising a librarian, a curator, a scribe, an amanuensis and two servants.⁷⁹ As in other university libraries, there were also repeated complaints by professors in Krakow about the poor provisioning of the library. This affected in the first instance those subjects that were upgraded in the course of the reform. For example, the philologist Bernhard Jülg complained about the insufficient provision of books in his subject.⁸⁰

⁷⁴ Janina BIENIARZÓWNA: *Od Wiosny Ludów do powstania styczniowego*, in: Janina BIENIARZÓWNA, Jan M. MAŁECKI (ed.): *Dzieje Krakowa*, t. 3: Kraków w latach 1796–1918, Kraków 1979, p. 177–224, here p. 194.

⁷⁵ *Czas*, No. 164, 20.7.1850, p. 3.

⁷⁶ Juliusz DEMEL: *Pożar Krakowa 1850 roku*, in: *Rocznik Krakowski*, 32, 1852, H. 3, p. 59–97, here p. 75.

⁷⁷ Jan SURMAN: *Habsburg Universities 1848–1918. A Biography of Space*, phil. Diss. Vienna 2012, p. 186.

⁷⁸ Franciszek MATEJKO: *Dzieje Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej w Krakowie*, in: *Zakłady Uniwersyteckie w Krakowie. Przyczynek do dziejów oświaty podany i pamięci pięciuset letniego istnienia Uniwersytetu krakowskiego poświęcony przez c. k. Towarzystwo Naukowe Krakowskie*, Kraków 1864, p. 13–69, here p. 67.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 68. Jeszcze w 1852 roku obsadę biblioteki stanowili tylko bibliotekarz i jego pomocnik. Karol ESTREICHER: *Kronika Biblioteki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego od 1811 roku*, Kraków 2012, p. 54.

⁸⁰ Cf. Bernhard Jülg to Leo Thun. Krakow, 8 January 1855, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D323.

Changes in the administration and in the archive of the university

The reform also had a decisive impact on the work of the university administration. The archives were maintained by the secretary of the university and the staff of the senate chancellery. The instruction issued in 1851 transferred the full responsibility for the archive to the secretary, who thus at the same time became the university archivist. In fact the work was carried out by the chancellery clerk, as under-archivist. The entire university administration was run by a very small number of staff at the time. The reform also coincided with a gradual awareness for the importance of the archive and the foundation of the Polish archive system.⁸¹

Summary

Of particular significance for the development of the university in the decade of Thun's ministry, and for the long-term effect, was the collision of the central principle of the freedom of teaching and learning with the political reality of neo-Absolutism. The interventions of the government in the composition of the teaching staff are difficult to estimate clearly, and have not yet been researched enough – however, from a scientific perspective, both positive and negative consequences can be discerned. The newly appointed German-speaking professors included some personalities of European renown and great scientific reputation, but their stay in Krakow was often merely a brief episode in their career. Without any doubt, the failure to conduct habilitations and the extensive use of substitutes was a negative element, since this delayed the development of the teaching body by years. The switch in language of instruction to German had a negative impact on student numbers, but at the same time it extended the recruitment possibilities to the whole of Galicia. It should also be emphasised that the ministry endeavoured, despite the change in language, to consider candidates with knowledge of Polish for its appointments – that applied above all to the practical subjects at the medical faculty. With the increase in the number of chairs and the foundation of seminars and cabinets, the reform years created an important prerequisite for the subsequent positive development of the university. The efforts to improve the material situation of the university were not insignificant (albeit insufficient). These processes formed the foundations for the blossoming of the University of Krakow in the then changed political situation of the monarchy in subsequent years.

⁸¹ Józef ZIELIŃSKI: Archiwum w okresie 1849–1900. Czasy austriackie 1849–1900, in: Henryk BARYCZ (ed.): Historia Archiwum Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 1965, p. 77–92, here p. 77.

Attila Szilárd Tar

The Hungarian law academies in the 1850s

In her decree of 1777, *Ratio Educationis*, Maria Theresa founded six royal academies of law in Hungary. These were located in Nagyszombat, Győr, Kassa, Nagyvárad and Zagreb. Although the lyceum of Kolozsvár already existed at the time, it can certainly be counted among these institutions. The academy at Nagyszombat was moved in 1784 to Bratislava, while that of Győr was located in Pécs between 1785 and 1802.

The academies were positioned between the secondary schools and the university. In their design there were certainly similarities with the university education of the time. In general they consisted of four years: two years of philosophy and two years of law studies. The curriculum of the academies was strictly prescribed and, as in the universities, there was no freedom of learning. The selection of teaching staff was also regulated in a similar manner to the universities. This structure remained without any great changes until the revolutionary year of 1848. While the *II Ratio Educationis* under Emperor Franz II/I in 1806 provided for a three-year law course, the academies could not implement this for financial reasons.

There has been little research to date on the history of the academies of law. At first, in the second half of the 19th century, there was a wave of studies and anniversary works, when most of these academies celebrated their hundredth anniversary.¹ Even the Hungarian government commissioned a work at the time.² However this initial flurry of interest was followed by a long break. The reasons for this can be found above all in the fact that many of the academies were gradually closed down, leading to decreased historiographical interest in the subject. It also appeared to be more attractive to write about the history of the ambitious university in Pest. Apart from some sporadic works in the 1970s and 1980s, the field of history have started examining the law academies only in the last 25 years. The “Higher Education Historical Publications. New Series”³, published by the then director of the university library of the Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest, László Szögi, played an important role. In their works, the authors of the individual volumes concentrated in the first instance on the students (numbers of

¹ See Alajos BOZÓKY: *A nagyvárad királyi akadémia százados múltja*, Budapest 1889; or: Tivadar ORTVAY: *Száz év egy hazai főiskola életéből*, Budapest 1884.

² *A FELSŐ OKTATÁSÜGY Magyarországon. Az 1896-iki ezredévi országos kiállítás alkalmára*, Budapest 1896.

³ Hungarian title: „Felsőoktatástörténeti Kiadványok. Új sorozat“. Seven volumes were published in the series from 2000 to 2007, including: Júlia VARGA: *A Kolozsvári Királyi Líceum hallgatósága 1784–1848*, Budapest 2000; IBID: *A Nagyváradai Jogakadémia (1780–1848) és a Püspöki Szeminárium (1741–1848) hallgatósága*, Budapest 2006; Veronika M. NOVÁK: *A Pozsonyi Jogakadémia hallgatósága 1777–1849*, Budapest 2006; Júlia VARGA: *A Kolozsvári Jezsuita Gimnázium és Akadémia hallgatósága 1641–1773 (1784)*, Budapest 2007.

enrolments, origin of the students, social status, native language, religion, etc.) of the law academies. Furthermore, in the case of some cities, certain events gave rise to a historical review, such as the new foundation of the University of Trnava (1992)⁴ or the resumption of law studies in Győr.⁵

Leo Thun in the Hungarian historiography

Crucial to the perception of Leo Thun-Hohenstein in Hungary was primarily the fact that Thun's reform programme was seen in Hungary as an imposition. The phase after the defeat of the Hungarian struggle for freedom was generally considered to be a bitter period in the history of Hungary, especially since the desire of the Hungarian for independence was deliberately countered by means of numerous initiatives that were issued with a view to creating a centralised overall empire. In a monograph about the Calvinist law academy in Debrecen we therefore read, for example: "[...] at the time the total monarchy was on the rampage, the semblance of the unity of the empire [...] Ordinances replaced the muted laws."⁶ The imposed laws were also mentioned, for example when it is emphasised critically: "One had to adopt the Vienna study regulations."⁷ The greatest point of dispute, however, was the question of the language of instruction. In the interpretation of Ferenc Balogh, the law academy in Debrecen was closed down due to the planned introduction of German as the language of instruction.⁸ Condemnation of neo-Absolutism intensified during the period of communist rule in Hungary, and Leo Thun was not spared. The Austrian "reaction" was spoken of critically, while Leo Thun was called, among other things, "the clerical aristocrat".⁹ This title comes from a collection of documents from 1979, in which, alongside this negative attribution, numerous critical comments about Thun can be found.¹⁰

In this same phase, the renowned legal historian, Pál Horváth, also examined Thun's model of the freedom of teaching and, while he criticised Thun's conservative attitude, he also spoke of a flexible, adaptive conservatism.¹¹ In this respect, Horváth concurred to some extent with

⁴ Alžbeta HOLOŠOVÁ: *Die Tyrnauer Universität im Licht der Geschichte*, Kraków, Trnava 2012.

⁵ Zalán BICZÓ (ed.): *A győri jogászképzés évszázadai*, Győr 2011.

⁶ Ferenc BALOGH: *A Debreceni Jogakadémia keletkezése, fejlődése és a jogászfűjság*, Debrecen 1905, p. 13.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ BALOGH, *A Debreceni Jogakadémia*, p. 14.

⁹ Sándor KÖTE, János RAVASZ (ed.): *Dokumentumok a magyar nevelés történetéből*, Budapest 1979, p. 11.

¹⁰ KÖTE, RAVASZ, *Dokumentumok*, p. 12.

¹¹ Pál HORVÁTH: *A porosz-német, ill. az osztrák-magyar Lehrsreiheit modell mibenléte a Leo Hohenstein-féle reformok alapján*, in: Kálmán KOVÁCS (ed.): *A jogalkotás és a jogalkalmazás egyes kérdései Magyarországon a 19–20. században. (Jogtörténeti értekezések)*, Budapest 1986, p. 7–22, here p. 15.

the judgement of his German-speaking colleagues, above all the assessment by Christoph Thienen-Adlerflycht, who had already researched Thun's conservatism in detail in the 1960s. Thun's image became more balanced after the political shift of 1989/90. In an edition of sources from 1990 the contributing authors analyse the Thunian system without political prejudice¹² and highlight the innovations, whereby they specifically stress the introduction of capable school councils and the promised flexible and adaptable secondary school structures.¹³ The publication shows clearly that Thun was beginning to be seen not only as a loyal Habsburg politician, a centralist, but also as an expert in education. However, familiar points of criticism were also revived in this publication. This brings us, for the most part, to the latest state of research. In a current school book, for example, one can read:

Der Neoabsolutismus hat die Standesverwaltung aus der Zeit vor 1848 abgeschafft, und hat – entsprechend den Erwartungen des Zeitalters – mit der Gestaltung des modernen bürgerlichen Staates begonnen. Das österreichische, bürgerliche Gesetzbuch trat in Kraft, und sowohl die Maßeinheiten als auch das Unterrichtswesen wurden vereinheitlicht: damals sind das achtklassige Gymnasium und die Matura entstanden.¹⁴

General changes

The first independent Hungarian government was established after the March Revolution of 1848. Among the numerous initiatives that were planned in the tumultuous months after the Revolution, there were also plans to reform the university system. Numerous drafts landed in the Ministry for Religious Affairs and Education, most of which however were concerned with the redesign of the University of Pest, mostly ignoring the academies of law. Due to the battles during the Hungarian Uprising, the plans remained on paper and were never realised.¹⁵

After the defeat of the Hungarian struggle for freedom, the reorganisation of the law academies and their study programmes were then driven from Vienna, whereby the main focus was on the overall interests of the empire. The new, eight-grade secondary school had also made significant reform necessary, since it meant that the first two years (philosophy) at the academies were now taught at secondary school.¹⁶ The academies first received a new name and were now

¹² Nándor HORÁNSZKY, Endre ZIBOLEN, Ferenc SCHAFFHAUSER: *Az ausztriai gimnáziumok és reáliskolák szervezeti terve*, Budapest 1990, p. 11–15.

¹³ HORÁNSZKY, ZIBOLEN, SCHAFFHAUSER: *Az ausztriai gimnáziumok*, p. 11.

¹⁴ “Neo-Absolutism abolished the state authority of the period prior to 1848 and began – in accordance with the expectations of the age – to shape the modern civic state. The Austrian Civil Code took effect, and both the units of measure and the educational system were standardised: the eight-grade secondary school and the Matura examination were created at this time.” Miklós SZÁRAY: *Történelem III.*, Budapest 2009, p. 223.

¹⁵ István SINKOVICS (ed.): *Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem története 1635–1985*, Budapest 1985, 158–160.

¹⁶ RGBl 380/1850. Leo Thun's decree of 4 October 1850. Cited in Oszkár SASHEGYI: *Iratok a magyar felsőoktatás történetéből 1849–1867 (Felsőoktatás történeti kiadványok, Bd. 3.)*, Budapest 1974, p. 202–205. Comments: SASHEGYI: *Iratok*, p. 25. These became the seventh and eighth grade of secondary school.

called *kaiserliche und königliche Rechtsakademien* (Imperial and royal academies of law). However, the loss of the first two academic years meant that they were no longer professional qualification institutions. Attending an academy was no longer sufficient for practical activities, and after the remaining two-year course of study at the academy of law, students now had to spend two further years at a law faculty of a university in order to attain a law degree.¹⁷ Such a degree was necessary to become a civil servant. In addition, an internship and a state examination of local laws were prescribed as prerequisites for civil service.¹⁸

As a liberal achievement, the decree of 4 October 1850 on the freedom of teaching and learning was also introduced to the law academies. Accordingly, the curriculum stipulated that students should attend fifteen or ten freely chosen lectures per week. If ten hours per week were chosen, the course would last longer, with an overall study period of three years. Students who wanted to enter public service or to become lawyers or notaries had to sit certain obligatory examinations at the end of the semester or academic year (§ 31).

The general directorates of the school districts were dissolved, the status of the academies became freer, even the director could be appointed from the body of professors. This represented similar reforms to those in the universities. In principle the academies had four chairs, plus an associate teacher and an assistant. The language of instruction was changed in most of the academies, and German was taught instead of Hungarian. However, Slovakian correpitations can also be found in the curriculum of the law academies in Bratislava and Kassa.¹⁹ These organisational measures were taken in particular with a view to the interests of the empire as a whole.²⁰ However the people in Hungary saw these measures as punishment for their attempts at independence in 1848. While the creation of a uniform educational system in the Habsburg Empire, with a uniform language of instruction (German), was the declared programme of neo-Absolutism, and was certainly seen as a modernisation and reform of the empire, it was experienced in Hungary above all as an imposition.

These organisational interventions also had an impact on the network of law academies. The law school of Győr was dissolved, the academy in Kolozsvár was also closed, while the law academy in Zagreb experienced only reorganisation. Thus only the law academies of Bratislava, Kassa, Nagyvárád, Zagreb and the academy in Nagyszeben, recently taken over by the state from the Transylvanian Saxons, remained. One significant consequence of the reorganisation of the academies was that the number of students sank drastically. The main reason for this was

¹⁷SASHEGYI: *Iratok*, p. 25.

¹⁸Andor CSIZMADIA: A közigazgatási képesítés és képzés Magyarországon (1918 előtt), in: *Állam és Igazgatás* Jg. 21. (1971), No. 7, p. 610–616, here p. 612.

¹⁹SASHEGYI: *Iratok*, p. 26.

²⁰Imre MADZSAR: A magyar közigazgatás az abszolutizmus korában, in: *Magyar Pedagógia*, 31 (1922), p. 72–77.

the aforementioned circumstance that attendance of a law academy alone was no longer sufficient for a professional qualification, and that fact that in many places the language of instruction was no longer the native language of the students, but instead German.

The ecclesiastical law academies and law lyceums were also faced with a difficult situation after 1848. They were forced to meet strict conditions in order to maintain the status of a “public law academy”. Only after meeting state requirements, which stipulated in particular an alignment of subjects with those of the other academies and placed special value on the qualification of the professors (§ 6), could studies at such an institute be recognised for admission to the state examinations and graduation. However, as the following overview shows, the willingness of the institutions to reform was limited:²¹ in the 1850/51 academic year, the law lyceum in Pécs closed its doors. The lyceum in Erlau also closed down in 1851. The lyceum in Prešov was abandoned between 1852 and 1861. In 1852 the law courses in Kecskemét, Késmárk, Nagykovács, Pozsony, Selmecbánya, and Sopron ceased operation. In contrast, the Calvinist law academy in Debrecen met the state criteria in 1853, and thus secured its continuation. As far as the reform of the lyceums is concerned, their conversion into secondary schools had been completed for the most part by the 1854/55 academic year.

Although the academies had already been reformed to a certain degree by 1850, the greatest changes occurred only in 1855. On 29 June 1855 Minister Thun-Hohenstein presented his plans for reshaping the law academies to the emperor. He began with the conditions that existed at the time, describing them as follows: “These academies are isolated schools that lack the conditions which are hoped to bring about a scientific upturn in the universities, namely: the cooperation of a large number of outstanding teachers [...]”²². Thun identified a central problem of the law academies in the fact that they had neither outstanding professors nor sufficient scientific resources, such as good libraries. In Thun’s view it was therefore necessary to redefine the function and objectives of the academies. The target to be reached should be to serve “the practical needs of the formation of feasible candidates for the civil service in those regions that are far away from university cities, while the need for trained civil servants is extraordinarily great”.²³ Thun believed that a three-year curriculum was required, which would enable young men to gain the knowledge necessary for civil service.

For this plan, and the education of loyal servants of the state, Minister Thun took the Austrian law courses prior to 1810 as a model: “A law course must be maintained at the law academies in Hungary, Transylvania and Croatia that corresponds with that which was common in the

²¹ SASHEGYI, *Iratok*, p. 27.

²² Cited in Hans LENTZE: *Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein*, Wien 1962, p. 361.

²³ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 361.

Austrian half of the empire before 1810.” The length of study was set at three years. Students had to attend 20 hours per week.²⁴ The studies were limited to positive law. In addition, students were expected to have knowledge of Austrian history. In this respect, Thun placed similar emphases as for the general law curriculum, without however adopting the historical foundation subjects. The annual examinations were to be retained, and were joined by a state examination in Austrian law. Yet these studies alone did not lead to the granting of a doctor of law. For this it was necessary to complete two years of complementary studies at a university.²⁵

The reorganisation of the law academies clearly separated the education of civil servants and jurists. The task of the law academy was not to educate scholars or to provide detailed theoretical training for students; instead the focus was practical. This is also clear from the list of subjects (see below). Further evidence is provided by the subsequent reforms (after the Compromise of 1867), in which context new subjects, such as Roman law, were introduced.²⁶ The retention of the Hungarian law academies was only a temporary solution. They were to remain in existence only until – in line with a general increase in the level of education – each law student had to complete a full course of university studies in order to fulfil the necessary requirements for a successful career in the service of the state.²⁷

The imperial order of 27 September 1855 set the following curriculum for the law academies: 1st year, winter semester: history of Roman law and institutions, Austrian criminal law, Austrian history. Summer semester: canon law, criminal procedure, Austrian history.

2nd year, winter semester: Austrian civil law, political economics. Summer semester: Austrian civil law, Hungarian Transylvanian law, Austrian statistics, mining law.

3rd year, winter semester: civil procedure, Austrian administrative law. Summer semester: proceedings other than litigation, commercial and exchange law, financial law.²⁸

Lessons were to be held each day for four hours, except on Thursdays and Sundays. Examinations were held in each subject at the end of each year. To conclude the course of study it was necessary to pass the state examination in Austrian civil and criminal law.²⁹

The introduction of this rigid curriculum meant that the freedom of teaching and learning was once again restricted. Students were free to attend other subjects, assuming these were offered at all. The number of full professorial chairs was increased gradually from four to six. A state

²⁴ Sándor VARGA: A pozsonyi jogakadémia az abszolutizmus és a dualizmus korában (1850–1914), in: *Jogtörténeti Tanulmányok*, vol. 3, Budapest 1974, p. 237–251, here p. 243.

²⁵ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 242.

²⁶ Tivadar ORTVAY: *Száz év*, p. 40–41.

²⁷ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 242.

²⁸ Allerhöchste Entschliebung vom 27. September 1855 über den juridischen Studienplan, reprinted in LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 365.

²⁹ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 365.

examination committee was established at each law academy to hear the magistracy examination. While this later reform once again made the law academies institutions of professional qualification, the career opportunities of the graduates were nevertheless low. Moreover, Thun had already announced in his presentation to the emperor, which was then included in the highest resolution, that the law academies would not be granted a long future. Thus we read: “With regard to the law academies, the suitable time must be chosen at which to either expand one or the other into a university, or to dissolve it.”³⁰

Consequently, numerous non-Hungarian teachers came to the law academies – because of the official language, or out of loyalty to the neo-Absolutist state. Some of them remained in the memory due to their excellent work, or created lasting scientific achievements, for example at the law academy of Bratislava, where the journal *Zeitschrift für Gesetzeskunde und Rechtspflege* was published.³¹ However, the number of students declined continuously, and the level of 1848 would never be reached again.³²

Ultimately, however, the reform of 1855 also did not last, since the next political watershed in 1860 represented another break, also for the law academies. Educational policy was now once more an agenda of the Hungarian parliament, with a departure from the path of the total state. An important factor was the return of Hungarian as a language of instruction. In many places this led to a complete replacement of teaching staff. One good example is provided by Bratislava, where the Bohemian and German professors were removed from office in spring 1861, and placed in disposition for one year.³³ An insightful example of the existential fear of the teaching staff is provided by a letter from Josef Slaviček to Leo Thun of 25 October 1860.³⁴ The letter was prompted by Thun’s resignation, which Slaviček, professor for civil and criminal law, considered to be a decisive turning point in the development of the Austrian educational system and which would lead to the complete eruption of the “language battle” in Hungary. As a German professor he could therefore no longer imagine continuing to teach in Bratislava: “A principle fell on 20 October, and with this fall I, like many others, live as a foreigner in a land, where my work is soon likely to end.”³⁵ In addition, some of the traditional academies were reopened, and the independence of the law academies was once again expanded.³⁶

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ SASHEGYI: *Iratok*, p. 47.

³² SASHEGYI: *Iratok*, p. 47.

³³ VARGA: *A pozsonyi jogakadémia*, p. 245. The teachers placed in disposition continued to receive their full salary for one further year. Then new teachers were appointed to the academy at the end of 1861.

³⁴ Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D623a.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ István HALMAI: *Az egri érseki akadémia a jogi felsőoktatás rendszerében a századfordulóig*, in: *Az Egri Ho Si Minh Tanárképző Főiskola Tudományos Közleményei* Jg. 18. (1987) No. 5, p. 135–153, here p. 138.

Now, after this general introduction, the various law academies are examined separately.

The law academy of Bratislava (Pressburg)

The academy of Bratislava was considered to be one of the most renowned in Hungary. It was originally founded in Nagyszombat (as a replacement for the university, which had been moved to Buda), and was established in Bratislava only in 1784. The names of prominent teachers of law and history are associated with the law academy, such as Ádám Brezanóczy, Pál Hajnik, Antal Faber, Pál Szlemenics and Antal Virozsil. Some of them also enjoyed an academic career at the University of Pest.³⁷ The law academy of Bratislava was reformed between 1850 and 1855. János Baintner was also appointed director at that time.³⁸ One important event during this reform period was the relocation of the academy into a new building, a former Jesuit premises.³⁹ Worth mention, and revealing with regard to the quality and position of the law academy, is the fact that students who had graduated from a law academy (three years) often managed to attain the same positions as graduates with a four-year university qualification. This favoured the law academies, where it was cheaper to study.⁴⁰ Admittedly, scientific activity in the academies was pushed into the background, and the academy became purely a training institute for civil servants. The academy provided students with a qualification, but at the same time the chances of employment had been restricted.⁴¹

The law academy of Győr (Raab)

The law academy of Győr had existed since 1802 without any great interruptions. In May 1848 however, it was closed for a year after the outbreak of the revolution and the Hungarian struggle for freedom. It resumed its activities in autumn 1849, initially only in the philosophical faculty, since the professors of the law faculty either didn't exist or had been relieved of their office.⁴² Lessons were conducted in Latin. However, just one year later, this philosophical course was integrated into the Benedictine secondary school, and the law academy closed its doors for two decades.⁴³ After the end of Thun's ministry the city (it was and is a traditional seat of education)

³⁷ VARGA: A pozsonyi jogakadémia, p. 239. From 1784 to 1884, 21 of the 97 teachers went to Pest or Buda. See ORTVAY: Száz év, p. 115–192. Also Attila Szilárd TAR: Die königlichen juristischen Akademien in Ungarn, in: Márta FONT, László SZÖGI (ed.): Die ungarische Universitätsbildung und Europa, Pécs 2001, p. 223–235, here p. 230.

³⁸ VARGA: A pozsonyi jogakadémia, p. 241.

³⁹ ORTVAY: Száz év, p. 32.

⁴⁰ ORTVAY: Száz év, p. 39.

⁴¹ ORTVAY: Száz év, p. 39.

⁴² BICZÓ: A győri jogászképzés, p. 56.

⁴³ Ambrus NÉMETH: A győri királyi tudományakadémia története. Vol. III, Győr 1904, p. 18; BICZÓ: A győri jogászképzés, p. 56.

and the Catholic Church applied for the reopening of the academy in 1860, which was at first rejected. Only in 1866 did the former section council in the ministry of education and current Bishop of Győr, János Simor, manage to effect the reopening in Vienna. The academy was the opened in July 1867 as a state law academy with three classes.⁴⁴

The law academy of Kassa (Kaschau, Košice)

The law academy of Kassa had its heyday between 1808 and 1848. During this time, around 300–400 students attended the academy annually.⁴⁵ Lessons were interrupted due to the wartime events in the 1848/49 academic year. The academy was reopened at the end of 1849, after the numerous Russian casualties who had been treated in the buildings of the academy had been taken away.⁴⁶ However in the years of Thun's ministry, the number of students declined steadily. In the first year after the fight for freedom, 158 philosophy and 16 law students were still enrolled. After the removal of the philosophical classes, student numbers fell to 41, the lowest since the end of the 18th century.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, the academy remained in existence.

Attendance increased only with the turning point in 1860. The main reason was the return of Hungarian as the language of instruction. At the time of the Compromise there were around 130–150 students at the academy. This made it the third-largest in the country, ahead of Győr and Nagyvárad.⁴⁸ The law academy of Kassa even survived the First World War, and was closed only in 1922.

The law academy of Nagyvárad (Großwardein)

The Royal law academy in Nagyvárad had existed since 1780 and developed positively in the first half of the 19th century, so that it was one of the most highly-attended academies. One reason for this, however, was that lack of alternatives in the region.

Like other academies, however, it was also closed temporarily in 1848. Upon its reopening in 1850 it lost the philosophical courses, but retained the subject of law.⁴⁹ However both teachers and students had to subject themselves to political directives that strictly regulated clothing, conduct, and even the wearing of beards that recalled the Revolution of 1848. Furthermore,

⁴⁴ NÉMETH: A győri királyi, Vol. IV, p. 92.

⁴⁵ Attila Szilárd Tar: Az állami jogakadémiák szerepe a magyar felsőoktatásban és jogászképzésben. Diploma thesis, Budapest 1996, p. 46.

⁴⁶ A FELSŐ OKTATÁSÜGY, p. 753.

⁴⁷ A FELSŐ OKTATÁSÜGY, p. 753.

⁴⁸ Barna MEZEY: A jogakadémiák 1874. évi reformja, in: Kálmán KOVÁCS (ed.): A jogászképzés a magyar felsőoktatás rendszerében, Budapest 1984, p. 103–116, here p. 106.

⁴⁹ BOZÓKY: A nagyvárad királyi akadémia, p. 164–166.

religious instruction was promoted and compliance with religious practice was monitored more closely; for example, the tradition of compulsory Sunday exhortations was introduced to the academy. Both certificates and membership of the library were – like in other law academies – subject to a fee.⁵⁰ The support of the police authorities was even required for the granting of a stipend. The teachers at the academy were controlled politically. One reason for this was probably the fact that Nagyvárád was one of the most important bases in the struggle for freedom. When the Hungarian government was forced to leave Pest in 1848 and flee to Debrecen, all of the weapons factories were housed in nearby Nagyvárád.

Those subjects that were relevant to the Austrian civil service were particularly promoted, e.g. Austrian financial law, the Austrian Civil Code and criminal law. This was combined with the requirement to teach these subjects in German. In 1854 even the official seal of the academy was in German.⁵¹ With the reform of 1855, lessons were switched to three years also in Nagyvárád. The later reform in the 1860s and 1870s then brought “fresh wind” into the academy, with the introduction of new subjects and a more liberal atmosphere.⁵²

The law academy of Kolozsvár (Klausenburg)

The history of the academy of Kolozsvár differs from the other academies insofar as it arose from the university founded by Maria Theresa in 1776. However, this university did not last long, with her son Joseph II downgrading the university to a lyceum in 1784. It thus suffered the same fate as other Austrian universities.⁵³ Until 1849 only philosophical and law courses were taught at the lyceum. During the revolution, only the philosophical courses were continued, with great effort.⁵⁴ At the same time there were intensive endeavours to reconvert the lyceum into a university. József Eötvös, the first minister of education in the Hungarian government of 1848, also supported this plan, but its implementation failed with the defeat of the Hungarians.⁵⁵

The law classes were closed in 1849, and in 1851 the philosophical classes were integrated into the main Catholic secondary school. Between 1851 and 1863 there were no law courses in Kolozsvár.⁵⁶

⁵⁰ A felső oktatásügy, p. 747. On the fees see the decree of 4 October 1850, § 39, in: RGL 380/1950.

⁵¹ BOZÓKY: A nagyváradi királyi akadémia, p.164–166.

⁵² BOZÓKY: A nagyváradi királyi akadémia, p.167.

⁵³ Gyula BISZTRAY: Az erdélyi egyetemi gondolat, in: Gyula BISZTRAY, Attila SZABÓT, Lajos TAMÁS (ed.): Erdély magyar egyeteme. Az erdélyi egyetemi gondolat és a m. kir. Ferenc József Tudományegyetem története, Kolozsvár 1941, p. 29–138, here p. 101.

⁵⁴ BISZTRAY: Az erdélyi egyetemi, p. 108.

⁵⁵ Sándor MÁRKY: A Magyar Királyi Ferenc József Tudományegyetem Története 1872–1922, Szeged 1922, p. 27–30.

⁵⁶ Ödön HORVÁTH: Jogakadémiák és jogi vizsgálatok, Budapest 1903, p. 24.

The law academy of Nagyszeben (Hermannstadt, Sibiu)

The tradition of legal instruction in Nagyszeben goes back to the initiatives of the Lutheran Saxons. In the main Protestant secondary school of Nagyszeben, various legal subjects had been taught in the higher classes since 1817.⁵⁷ After the revolution and civil war, these lecture recommenced only on 22 November 1849. However the number of teachers – only two professors – was low and the lack of classrooms/auditoriums made the situation even more difficult. Since the law of 1850 had stipulated that each academy should have at least four chairs, but the Saxons could not finance them, it was soon clear that the academy could not be maintained as a private institution.⁵⁸

Therefore, in 1851/52 the state took over the academy with the mission of educating local civil servants, lawyers and notaries. Like at other academies, this course lasted three years, until 1859/60. A four-year course was established the following academic year. The subjects taught changed in accordance with the political situation. Subjects focussing on the Hungarian legal traditions were introduced gradually in the 1870s.⁵⁹

The number of students in Nagyszeben was strongly affected by the closure of Kolozsvár, since many students switched to Nagyszeben after 1851 in order to study law. Where there were only 41 students in Nagyszeben in 1850, with little change the following year, the figure rose rapidly thereafter, so that there were soon almost 200 enrolled students.⁶⁰ This made Nagyszeben the most visited institute of higher education in the country, at times with twice as many students as Bratislava, which lay second in terms of student numbers. The number of teachers was correspondingly high, at six to eight professors.⁶¹

Summary and outlook

In summary we can establish that the phase from the Revolution of 1848 to the Compromise of 1867 was shaped by several reforms in rapid succession. After the defeat of the struggle for freedom, some of the previous law academies were forced to close their doors, such as those in Győr and Kolozsvár. The other three (Bratislava, Kassa and Nagyvárád) first had to settle for two-year courses. With the later reform of 1855, they were run with three instead of four years.

⁵⁷ A magyar királyi jogakadémiák, p. 227.

⁵⁸ A magyar királyi jogakadémiák, p. 229.

⁵⁹ A magyar királyi jogakadémiák, p. 231.

⁶⁰ In the 1865/66 summer semester: 170 enrolments. See: József BARSÍ: Magyarország felső tanintézetei és középtanodái 1870–1872-ben, Budapest 1874, p. 14–17.

⁶¹ SASHEGYI: Iratok, p. 91.

The only exceptions were Zagreb (four-year course) and Nagyszeben (new from 1850/51, three-year course). There were also decisive changes as a result of the changes to subjects and the focus on the formation of a legal tradition for the state as a whole, and the switch in the language of instruction, which was now primarily German.⁶²

There are different views on Thun's plans for the law academies, whereby some researchers suspect that the partial maintenance of the law academies was planned as an interim solution until the actual plan could be realised, namely obligating all law students to undergo scientific, i.e. university studies.⁶³ Other historians tend to emphasise the closure of and lack of support for the law academies, arguing that this was due to the large number of lawyers and the backwardness of the legal education in the academies.⁶⁴ Ultimately, both arguments are partially correct. We can at least establish that Thun pursued an increase in quality in the law academies, and did not dissolve them completely. On the other hand, no new university was founded until 1871, so that the desired scientification of legal education never occurred, especially as there is no real evidence of any increased scientific level in the law academies. However, we should consider – while also bearing in mind how long it took to implement the reforms in the western half of the empire –, that the timespan for the reform of the law academy was simply too short to achieve any great success.

We should also note that there was very little willingness in Hungary to accept reforms imposed by the Viennese government, due to the generally negative attitude towards Vienna. The law students considered the Austrian and Bohemian professors at the law academies to be just as foreign as the population regarded the non-Hungarian civil servants with whom they were confronted, and who awakened bitter memories of the lost struggle for freedom. We must also remember that the law academies in the Vormärz were the educational institutes of the Hungarian intelligentsia and the liberal nobility, who had played a leading role in the revolution.⁶⁵ The reorganisation of the law academies and their partial closure therefore looked like a political intervention in these traditional educational institutes of the Hungarian intelligentsia, and nothing more than the political arbitrariness of Vienna. In this political-social environment it was obviously difficult to foster an identification with the educational reforms. Hungarian autonomy in the educational system was partially restored only in 1860, with the beginning of the restructuring of the two halves of the empire. Hungarian was immediately restored as the language of instruction. At the same time there was much change among the

⁶² A good example is the situation in Nagyvárad, see BOZÓKY: *A nagyvárad királyi akadémia*, p. 164–166.

⁶³ SASHEGYI: *Iratok*, p. 46.

⁶⁴ Alajos DEGRÉ: *Ügyvédképzés Magyarországon a polgári korban*, in: Kálmán KOVÁCS (ed.): *A jogászképzés a magyar felsőoktatás rendszerében*, Budapest 1984, p. 57–70, here p. 57–58.

⁶⁵ TAR: *Diploma thesis*, p. 71–75.

teaching staff, as many professors – often in the country for only a few years – once again left. A new heyday of the law academies can be identified only after the Compromise of 1867. The academies were now subordinate to the Hungarian Ministry for Religious Affairs and Education. The upturn can be seen clearly from the increase in student numbers and the number of academies (see Annex). In 1874, therefore, there was wide-scale reform, with courses at the law academies once again extended to four years. The subjects were almost identical with those at the universities, but the academies did not have the right to grant doctorates, which created its own problems. As a result, students stormed the universities and abandoned the smaller law academies.⁶⁶

In Bratislava, this led to a permanent upturn, which can be seen from both the number of students and the quality of teaching.⁶⁷ This development continued until the end of the First World War. In 1912 the Hungarian parliament expanded the law academy in Bratislava and elevated it to the rank of a university.⁶⁸

The law academy of Győr was reopened in the year of the Compromise, 1867, and comprised three years, but the number of students began to sink drastically in the 1880s. The academy was abolished in 1890/91.⁶⁹ The development of the law academy in Nagyszében did not run in parallel to that in Győr, but ultimately its end is comparable. Here the fault lay with the increasing attractiveness of the University of Kolozsvár, which was founded in 1872 and which suddenly stopped the rising fortunes of the academy, so that it was forced to close in 1887.⁷⁰ Without such competition, however, it was possible for academies to flourish, such as that in Kassa. It was even able to move to a larger building in 1894, and was active until 1922.⁷¹ It was a similar case with the academy in Nagyvárad, which was attended above all by students from East Hungary.⁷²

Yet the development in the 20th century shows clearly that the general trend was towards the creation of universities. For, after the First World War, only those academies that had been expanded into universities were able to continue their activities, such as in Kolozsvár and Bratislava. The academies thus represent an historically unique development in the history of education in Hungary, and contributed significantly both to the training of civil servants and to the formation of an intellectual elite.

⁶⁶ MEZEY: A jogakadémiák 1874. évi reformja, p. 110.

⁶⁷ VARGA: A pozsonyi jogakadémia, p. 149.

⁶⁸ FELKAI: Neveléstörténeti dolgozatok, p. 98.

⁶⁹ NÉMETH: A győri királyi, Vol. IV, p. 92.

⁷⁰ SASHEGYI: Iratok, p. 91.

⁷¹ A FELSŐ OKTATÁSÜGY, p. 753.

⁷² BOZÓKY: A nagyvárad királyi akadémia, p. 171.

Annex

The number of students at the academy of Nagyvárád 1850–1858⁷³

Year	Number of students	Academic years
1850/51	26	Year I–II
1851/52	45	
1852/53	42	
1853/54	42	
1854/55	35	
1855/56	35	Year I–III
1856/57	36	
1857/58	49	

The number of students at the academy of Nagyvárád after 1858⁷⁴

Year	Year I	Year II	Year III	Total
1858/59	24	17	12	53
1859/60	20	23	17	60
1860/61	43	19	21	83
1861/62	40	33	14	87
1862/63	44	42	28	114
1863/64	44	39	38	121
1864/65	44	47	37	128
1865/66	60	43	50	153
1866/67	87	57	44	188

The number of students at the imperial law academies before the Compromise (winter semester 1865–66)⁷⁵

SITE	ACADEMIC YEARS	PROFESSORS	STUDENTS
Kassa	3	7	170
Nagyvárád	3	7	151
Bratislava	3	7	241
Erlau– Catholic lyceum	3	8	78
Pécs – Catholic lyceum	1	4	22
Eperjes, A.C. lyceum	2	6	94
Debrecen, H.C.	3	8	74
Kecskemét, H.C.	3	8	66
Pápa, H.C.	3	6	31
Sárospatak, H.C.	3	7	64
Kolozsvár *	3	5	116
Nagyszében *	3	9	170

*summer semester 1865/66

⁷³ BOZÓKY: A nagyváradi királyi akadémia, p. 252.

⁷⁴ BOZÓKY: A nagyváradi királyi akadémia, p. 252.

⁷⁵ József BARSÍ: Magyarország felső tanintézetei és középtanodái 1870–1872-ben, Budapest 1874, p. 14–17.

László Szögi

Changes in the foreign university attendance of Hungarian students at the time of the Thunian reforms 1849–1860

Since the 14th century Vienna had always played an important role in the *peregrinatio academica* of the Hungarian students, not only because of the distinguished University of Vienna, but also due to the large number of other educational institutions that were located in the city.¹ Vienna's significance for the university attendance of Hungarian students stands out in all historical eras, especially in the first half of the 19th century. Vienna's pull was also strong during the twelve years of the period known as neo-Absolutism.²

The university reform associated with the name of the Minister of Education, Graf Leo Thun, modernised the Austrian university system, had an extraordinarily positive impact on the university systems of other countries, and also led to a positive development at the University of Pest.³ However, the Germanisation tendencies connected with the reform, which can be seen as an attempt to rebuild the empire into a unified state, was doomed to failure *ab ovo* in the multinational monarchy of the second half of the 19th century. In addition, the slower development of the Hungarian and Transylvanian institutions forced students to continue their studies elsewhere, in this case in Vienna. If we compare Leo Thun's period in office with the previous twelve years we can establish that the destinations of the Hungarian students changed only slightly. Until 1848 the students were barely allowed to study outside the borders of the empire, due to the prohibition of the Holy Alliance. Table 1 shows that the role of Vienna became even more important in the 1850s, and exerted the greatest influence on Hungarian students at this time. 70 percent of all recorded peregrinators attended lectures in Vienna, which represents an increase of five percent on the preceding period of study.⁴

¹ On the subject of Hungarian peregrinatio see: Márta FATA, Gyula KURUCZ, Anton SCHINDLING (ed.): *Peregrinatio Hungarica – Studenten aus Ungarn an deutschen und österreichischen Hochschulen vom 16. bis 20. Jahrhundert* (Contubernium 64. Tübinger Beiträge zur Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte), Stuttgart 2006.

² In contrast to the German-speaking tradition, Hungarian research speaks of the phase of neo-Absolutism in the time from 1848/49.

³ On this history of Hungarian university education in the neo-Absolutist period see in particular: Oszkár SASHEGYI: *Iratok a magyar felsőoktatás történetéből 1849–1867*, Budapest 1974.

⁴ For this period see: László SZÖGI: *Magyarországi diákok bécsi egyetemeken és akadémiákon 1789–1848* (Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, Bd. 20), Budapest 2013.

Table 1: Hungarian students at European universities⁵

Region	1837–1848	Percent	1849–1860	Percent
Viennese institutions	2764	65.57	4102	70.54
Germany	637	15.11	729	12.53
Austrian hereditary lands	435	10.32	472	8.11
Viennese military institutions	293	6.95	376	6.46
Italy	65	1.54	50	0.85
Switzerland	2	0.04	41	0.70
England	10	0.23	21	0.36
Netherlands	1	0.02	11	0.19
Belgium	2	0.04	7	0.12
France	5	0.12	6	0.10
Russia	1	0.02	-	-
Total	4215	100	5815	100

In Hungary, for example, there was no teacher examination commission, so that students turned to Vienna. The *peregrinatio academica* in other regions of Europe was weak, the later German empire proved to be an exception. It is also apparent that Hungarian students rarely visited Switzerland or England for the purpose of study in the first half of the 19th century. That changed slowly in Thun's era, and students increasingly went in larger groups also to these countries. Their numbers exploded between 1890 and the beginning of the First World War. The French university system, which deviated from the Central European universities in key areas, drew very few students to France at that time, although it should be mentioned in qualification that no complete data series are available to date for France, unlike for other countries.

In our decisive period of study, there were twelve universities and academies that had more than 100 persons of Hungarian origin among their students. These included: eight Viennese educational institutions and universities in Graz, Prague, Berlin and Jena.⁶ The importance and preponderance of the position of the University of Vienna exceeds all earlier values. Where in the first and second quarters of the 19th century only 30 percent of Hungarian peregrinators had studied at the University of Vienna, the figure is as high as 43 percent for the Thunian era. In this respect, therefore, the Thunian era represents a completely unique phenomenon.

⁵ All tables in this essay are based on the author's own calculations.

⁶ On the students at the other universities of the monarchy: Andor MÉSZÁROS, László SZÖGI, Júlia VARGA: Magyarországi diákok a Habsburg birodalom kisebb egyetemén és akadémiáin 1789–1919 (Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, Bd. 21), Budapest 2014. On attendance at German universities: László SZÖGI: Magyarországi diákok németországi egyetemeken és főiskolákon 1789–1919 (Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, Bd. 5), Budapest 2001.

Table 2: Universities at which more than 100 Hungarian students were enrolled, ordered by student numbers

Number	1826–1850	1849–1860
1	Vienna University 2312 (29.31 percent)	Vienna University 2524 (43.40 percent)
2	Vienna Polytechnic 1377	Vienna Polytechnic 878
3	Vienna Academy of Fine Art 524	Vienna Prot. Theol. 233
4	Vienna Prot. Theol. 435	Vienna Veterinary Inst. 187
5	Vienna Veterinary Inst. 371	Vienna Academy of Fine Art 159
6	Berlin University 282	Graz University 151
7	Wiener Neustadt Military Academy 230	Vienna Technical Military Acad. 140
8	Graz University 226	Wiener Neustadt Military Academy 132
9	Vienna Technical Military Acad. 221	Prague University 116
10	Prague University 190	Berlin University 112
11	Jena University 172	Jena University 107
12	Halle University 169	Vienna Josephinum 104
13	Zagreb Academy 154	
14	Lviv University 144	
Total	7887	5815

While most leading universities were able to defend their earlier positions, attendance at the University of Berlin fell from sixth place to tenth. However the Thunian era represents only a brief, yet undoubtedly notable slump for this university. In the last quarter of the 19th century, Berlin once again attracted more students, so that in this period 904 students from Hungary were enrolled there, placing Berlin in third place among the most attended universities by Hungarian students. At the beginning of the 20th century (1901–1918) the number grew even further; with 1,474 students from Hungary, the University of Berlin took second place behind Vienna. Zagreb and Lviv experienced decline, the number of those enrolled decreased clearly, and thus the number of students also sank in the period to fewer than 100 Hungarian students.

Distribution of students according to denomination

Table 3 shows us the distribution of the Hungarian peregrinators, ordered by religious denomination. Particularly after 1850 the relevant sources contain a high density of information on the denomination of the students. We can state the religion of around two-thirds of those concerned.

Table 3: Frequency of students according to religious denomination 1849–1860

Religion	Number	Share of total (percentage)	Share of denomination in 1869 (percentage)
Roman Catholic	1456	36.93	45.72
Lutheran	1107	28.08	8.06
Jewish	837	21.23	3.98
Calvinist	266	6.74	14.85
Orthodox	167	4.23	15.23
Greek Catholic	97	2.46	11.59
Unitarian	11	0.27	0.39
No denomination	1	0.02	-
Total known	3942	100	100
Unknown	1873	32.20	
Total	5815	100	

The following can be derived from these figures: The most important finding would appear to be the fact that Protestant and Jewish students were over-represented, compared to their share of the overall population, while the Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Reformist and Orthodox students studied in fewer numbers abroad.

Only the share of Unitarian students corresponds with their share of the overall population. In the case of the Protestants, the share of students abroad is 20 percent higher than their share of the total population. The ratio is even higher among the Jews, here the share is exceeded fivefold, a trend that would continue later. The largest difference between the share of students and the share of denominations in the total population can be seen with the Orthodox Christians and Greek Catholic students. They belong to those minorities that sent disproportionately few students abroad at this time.

Frequency of Hungarian students according to subject area

If we now compare the choice of subject, it can be seen clearly that medicine attracted the most students. This also includes the group of surgeons and apothecaries, so that around a quarter of all Hungarian students abroad completed studies in medicine. The influence of the Vienna Medical School cannot be ignored here.

In second place are the technical and natural science professions. The actual share of this group is probably even higher, since it is difficult to discern for this period exactly what the students studied, particularly in the philosophical faculty. The largest group by numbers in the first half of the 19th

century, namely the theologians, is only the third most important professional group by this time. Catholics and Protestants are compiled together in this section.

In contrast, significant growth can be identified among jurists, who took fourth place in this period. During Minister Thun's period of office, many students from Hungary even studied imperial law. This is probably connected with the reform of the law academies in the Kingdom of Hungary and their uncertain situation.⁷ The number of philosophy students remained constant at seven percent, reaching around the same share as in the first half of the century. Around five percent of students chose agricultural science or veterinary medicine. These figures also correspond for the most part with those of the previous period. However it is important to mention that it was also possible to study the last two disciplines to a comparable level in Hungary.

Table 4: Frequency of Hungarian students in Europe according to subject area

Subject area	1849–1860	Total	Percent
Surgery, medicine, pharmacy, military physician	122+872+399+103	1496	25.72
Engineering, natural sciences, military engineer	1011+41+ 140	1192	20.49
Theology	998	998	17.16
Jurisprudence, finance, diplomatic service	769+7+1	777	13.36
Philosophy	399	399	6.86
Agricultural science, forestry, veterinary medicine	54+73+187	314	5.39
Art, music	200+12	212	3.64
Officer	132	132	2.26
Economics	103	103	1.77
Nautical science	2	2	0.03
Not specified	190	190	3.26
Total	5815	5815	100

Study in Vienna

The entire foreign *peregrinatio academica* of the Hungarian students changed after the French Revolution, partly as a result of the Napoleonic Wars, partly as a result of the restrictions of the Holy Alliance. Austria, in particular Vienna, assumed a monopoly position, and the number of Hungarian and Transylvanian students at the University of Vienna doubled, and increased even four-fold at other Viennese educational institutions (e.g. the Polytechnic, the Academy of Fine Art, etc.).⁸

⁷ Cf. the essay by Attila TAR in this volume.

⁸ See: László SZÖGI: Zur Rolle der Wiener Universität im ungarischen Hochschulwesen von den Anfängen bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg, in: Mensch – Wissenschaft – Magie. Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für

In the first half of the 19th century the 9,566 Hungarians in total who came to study in Vienna between 1801 and 1850 represented 82.7 percent of all Hungarian student peregrinators, taking account of all educational institutions in the Habsburg Empire. No German, Swiss or Dutch data are included in this information, but even if these are included, Vienna’s indisputably leading role in terms of attendance at foreign universities by Hungarians is very clear.

Between 1849 and 1860 we are aware of a total of 4,950 enrolled Hungarian students in the Viennese civil and military institutions, and in the universities of the hereditary lands.⁹ That represents 85.12 percent of all Hungarian students. This shows that the *peregrinatio* experienced a certain centralisation within the borders of the Empire in the Thunian era, even without political pressure, and that – temporarily – fewer students went abroad.

Table 5: Viennese higher-education institutions according to the number of Hungarian students

	1826–1848	1849–1860
1	Vienna University 2088	Vienna University 2524
2	Vienna Polytechnic 1247	Vienna Polytechnic 878
3	Vienna Academy of Fine Art 492	Vienna Prot. Theol. 233
4	Vienna Prot. Theol. 401	Vienna Veterinary Institute 187
5	Vienna Veterinary Institute 352	Vienna Academy of Fine Art 159
6	Wiener Neustadt Military Academy 219	Vienna Technical Military Academy 140
7	Vienna Technical Military Academy 189	Wiener Neustadt Military Academy 132
8	Vienna Josephinum 92	Vienna Josephinum 104
9	Vienna Theresianum 90	Vienna Mariabrunn 64
10	Vienna Mariabrunn 63	Vienna Augustineum 49
11	Vienna Augustineum 51	Vienna Music Academy 7
12	Vienna Music Academy 3	Vienna Consular Academy 1
13	Vienna Consular Academy 2	
Total	5197	4478

Wissenschaftsgeschichte 20/2000, p. 203–208; and László SZÖGI: Humboldt-Rezeption in Ungarn. Das System des ungarischen Hochschulunterrichts in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts, in: Rainer Christoph SCHWINGES (ed.): Humboldt International. Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, Basel 2001, p. 163–178.

⁹ For the period 1849–1860 the data of the Hungarian students studying in Vienna are published in two volumes: József Mihály KISS, László SZÖGI: Magyarországi diákok bécsi egyetemeken és főiskolákon 1849–1867 (Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, Bd. 7), Budapest 2003, and additions in: Gábor PATYI, Simon ZSOLT, Miklós SZABÓ, László SZÖGI, Júlia VARGA: Magyarországi diákok bécsi egyetemeken és főiskolákon 1867–1890 (Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, Bd. 22), Budapest 2015.

Among the Viennese educational institutions, the University of Vienna clearly stands out in terms of the frequency of Hungarian students. In contrast, the number of Hungarian students at the Polytechnic declined by four percent, whereby numbers decreased the most in the subject of trade. The same applies to the Academy of Fine Arts, where enrolments by Hungarian students fell by six percent. We do not have any data for this period for courses in the trades. The proportion of Protestant theologians declined by only 2.5 percent. Many of them elected to study at German universities.

Faculties and subject groups in Vienna

Table 6: Hungarian students at the University of Vienna according to faculty and subject group

Faculty	Subject	1849–1860	Percent
Medical faculty	Medicine	786	31.14
	Surgery	35	1.38
	Pharmacy	387	15.33
Theological faculty		281	11.13
Law faculty	Jurisprudence	640	25.35
Philosophical faculty	Philosophy	200	7.92
	Natural sciences	9	0.35
Other (associate)		186	7.37
Total		2524	100

During the period of Thun's ministry the Vienna Medical School was considered to be one of the best in Europe. Accordingly, the great interest of Hungarian students in the faculty is understandable. One third of the students (31 percent) studied medicine in Vienna. Expressed in figures, this means that between 1849 and 1860, 786 medical and 387 pharmacy students from Hungary enrolled in this faculty, whereby these numbers reflect a very heterogeneous group of students. There was a large number of Jewish students among those studying medicine and surgery, whose precise figures cannot be reconstructed, since the registers only rarely recorded the religious affiliation of the students. The large share of pharmacy students, at almost 15 percent, is also remarkable.¹⁰

Jurists from Hungary and Transylvania comprised 25 percent of all enrolled students. This proportion was therefore much higher than in the time before 1848.

For a long time, the Hungarian Catholic Church educated its seminarians in Vienna's Pazmaneum,¹¹ and after their education there, most of the seminarians enrolled in the theological faculty of the

¹⁰ There were also Hungarian students at the Josephinum: See: Robert OFFNER, Hansgeorg VON KILLYEN: A bécsi orvos-sebészeti József-Akadémia (Josephinum) magyarországi növendékei 1775–1874, Budapest 2013.

¹¹ See István ZOMBORI (ed.): A Bécsi Pázmáneum, Budapest 2002. For the Thunian era: Margit BEKE: A Pázmáneum története az újraindulástól napjainkig (1803–2002), p. 177–241. On the students of the Pazmaneum: István FAZEKAS:

university. But other religious orders also sent some of the novices to Vienna. In the twelve years studied, most – around a fifth – of the students born in Hungary enrolled in the theological faculty. The proportion of seminarians whose native language was Slovakian is likely to have been very high, although students from all Hungarian and Transylvanian dioceses were represented.

Since the Court did not allow the establishment of a technical university in Hungary in 1836, specialist engineering knowledge could be obtained only at the Institutum Geometricum, the geometric training institute at the University of Pest, or abroad.¹² While a commercial middle school was opened in Pest in 1846 and named after Palatine Joseph, which Johann Joseph Prechtel also helped to establish, it could not by any means rise to the demands of the age.

Table 7: Hungarian students at the Vienna Polytechnic according to department

Department	1815–1848	1849–1860
Technical dept.	746	726
Commercial dept.	562	78
Both	147	74
Total	1455	878

It is therefore not surprising that the Polytechnic, which was founded in 1815, took second place among the Hungarian *peregrinatio academica*, with 15 percent of students. 726 students enrolled in the technical department only, 78 in the commercial, while 74 joined both faculties. We have exact figures on the students at the later Technical University, which developed from the Polytechnic, since the university career of the students there can be easily reconstructed from the examination register. In general, the share of Hungarian students in the technical department was greater.

One of the oldest institutions of higher education in Vienna was the Art Academy, which had been founded in 1692. The various subjects of fine arts, crafts and architecture were taught at this traditional academy in the first half of the 19th century. According to the academic statutes of 1812, the academy was divided into four faculties.

A Bécsi Pázmáneum magyarországi hallgatói 1623–1918 (1951). *Matricula Collegii Pazmaniani Viennensis. Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban* 8, Budapest 2003.

¹² László SZÖGI: *Mérmökképző Intézet a Bölcsészeti Karon 1782–1850 (Fejezetek az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem történetéből, Bd. 5)*, Budapest 1980.

Table 8: Hungarian students at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna, according to subject

Subject	1789–1848	Percent	1849–1860	Percent
Fine Arts	253	29.24	120	75.47
Architecture	144	16.64	32	20.12
Crafts/Decorative Arts	151	17.45	-	-
Unknown	317	36.64	7	4.40
Total	865	100	159	100

The schools of painting, sculpture, copperplate and mosaics formed the fundamental branches of the fine arts. The architectural school was already closely connected to the technical sciences. A special area of the fine arts was the school of engraving, while applied arts and the techniques of some handicraft trades were taught at the school of crafts. Beyond the basic course, the academy also offered special courses for experts and master craftsmen, e.g. Sunday courses. However it is very difficult to establish the number and share of Hungarian students in this latter subject area after 1850. For the period after 1849, data is available only for the students of the art academies and architects, with their number corresponding roughly with that of the preceding period. However, in this period interest in the Munich Academy of Arts grew solidly, although the greatest influx to the Munich Academy occurred only in subsequent years.

Distribution of students according to ethnic minority

As well as the parameters examined thus far, the question of the national affiliation of the students is also of interest. However, a qualification must be made here, since allocation is not always possible, especially regarding Hungarians, Germans and Slovaks. Another reason is the large number of assimilated Jews and students of German origin. Those of German origin also include people from Spiš, Swabia, Saxony and other German-speaking areas of the time, who comprised around 37 percent.

The share of those students whose native language was German declined by ten percent. This slump is due above all to the growth in the proportion of other national minorities, and is therefore only a relative decline. The number of Hungarian students rose by five percent in one decade. The reason for this is that higher institutions of education in Hungary could not compete with those in Vienna. Since German was also an obligatory language of instruction in Hungarian institutions, there was even a certain attraction to studying in a German-speaking area. Jewish students were treated as one group, as it is sometimes difficult to determine their national origin. The assimilation of a certain number of Jews increased at this time, but the majority were still German speakers.

Table 9: Enrolled Hungarian students according to (probable) ethnic distribution

Nationality	1789–1848	Percent	1849–1860	Percent
German	4484	46.87	2143	36.85
Hungarian	2381	24.89	1775	30.52
Jewish	1238	12.94	967	16.62
Slovakian	738	7.71	397	6.82
Serbian	141	1.47	172	2.95
Romanian	142	1.48	143	2.46
Czech	25	0.26	28	0.48
Croatian	70	0.73	28	0.48
Ruthenian	19	0.19	23	0.39
Italian	42	0.43	12	0.21
Armenian	24	0.25	9	0.15
Polish	11	0.11	6	0.10
French	33	0.34	5	0.08
Slovenian	7	0.07	3	0.05
English	-	-	3	0.05
Bulgarian	-	-	2	0.03
Irish	4	0.04	-	-
Greek	1	0.01	-	-
Unknown	206	2.15	99	1.70
Total	9.566	100	5.815	100

An important change could also be seen in the teaching and study habits of the native minorities. While the number of Slovakian peregrinators stagnates, a clear growth can be registered for the Serbs and Romanians, which is probably due to the special status of Serbia, Vojvodina and the Banat of Temeswar, which increasingly required native civil servants. Among the other nationalities it is noticeable that many Czech civil servants and experts had come to Hungary at this time, whose children were among this group of peregrinators.

Compared to the information from 1850, the over-representation of students, in relation to their share of the population, is three times higher among the Germans and eight times higher among the Jews. The share of Hungarian students is eleven percent smaller than their actual share of the population. Similar is true of Slovaks and Romanians, who are eight, respectively 17 percent behind their actual share of the population. Less distinctive is the imbalance among the Serbs, where the deviation is around two percent.

Distribution of students according to place of origin

Apart from its general attractiveness due to the reputation of its university, Vienna was traditionally strongly frequented by inhabitants of the western Hungarian territories. For these territories, mostly present-day Burgenland, and for many families from the counties of Moson, Sopron and Bratislava, it was only natural to send their sons ‘to the high school’ in Vienna.

Table 10: Distribution of Hungarian students according to place of origin (more than 25 students) 1849–1860

Rank	Place	Students	Rank	Place	Students
1.	Buda and Pest	436	21.	Pécs	37
2.	Bratislava	207	22.	Levoča	36
3.	Braşov	164	23.	Spišská Nová Ves	35
4.	Sibiu	142	24.	Miskolc	34
5.	Sopron	83	25.	Novi Sad	34
6.	Timișoara	73	26.	Banská Bystrica	34
7.	Bistrița	72	27.	Eisenstadt	33
8.	Sighișoara	63	28.	Târgu Mureș	32
9.	Cluj	61	29.	Modra	31
10.	Győr	60	30.	Kőszeg	31
11.	Arad	57	31.	Râșnov	30
12.	Szeged	47	32.	Vršac	30
13.	Mediaș	46	33.	Nové Mesto nad Váhom	29
14.	Nitra	45	34.	Sombor	28
15.	Zrenjanin	44	35.	Székesfehérvár	27
16.	Oradea	42	36.	Kanjíža	27
17.	Pápa	41	37.	Banská Štiavnica	27
18.	Trnava	40	38.	Prešov	27
19.	Komárno	40	39.	Baja	26
20.	Košice	39	40.	Trenčín	25

If we now take a closer look at the distribution according to place of birth, and compare it with previous eras, we can perceive some clear changes. First the share of those students from the Transylvanian cities grows, especially from the areas of Transylvania inhabited by Saxons. The Saxons experienced the defeat of the Hungarian war of independence in 1848/49 as a victory over the Hungarians, which is why they were happy with the new political order. It is a similar case with the Hungarian regions of Bačka and Banat. Considerably more students went abroad from the cities there (Timișoara, Zrenjanin, Novi Sad, Vršac, Sombor, Baja) than in previous times, for the most part non-Hungarians. However, the leading position of Buda and Pest remained unbroken also after 1849, not

least because the capital city exceeded the other cities in terms of size and inhabitants. The leading position of Bratislava and Sopron can be explained by their geographical vicinity to Vienna.

If we look at the social origin of the students, the growing interest of the upwardly mobile social classes in education is particularly noticeable. More than 16 percent of the students came from merchant families. It is also clear that the children of Jewish origin were particularly drawn to the medical professions. The number of students who came from civil servant families is also relatively high (13 percent). A new phenomenon, on the other hand, is the fact that children from artisan families were equally well represented. Fourth place, with 511 students, is taken by sons of pastor families, which represents a share of more than 10 percent. Very high, yet only in fifth place, was the proportion of students from the nobility and land-owning families, whose 459 representatives among the students of the University of Vienna were already of declining significance.

Table 11: Frequency of Hungarian students according to the profession of the father/guardian 1849–1860

Position	Profession of the father/guardian	Number	Percent
1.	Merchant	804	16.42
2.	Civil servant	623	12.72
3.	Craftsman	618	12.62
4.	Priest, clergyman	511	10.43
5.	Landowner	459	9.37
6.	Physician, surgeon, pharmacist	377	7.70
7.	Teacher, lawyer	362	7.39
8.	Manufacturer, gentleman, banker	308	6.29
9.	Farmer	222	4.53
10.	Officer	193	3.94
11.	Tenant farmer, administrator	126	2.57
12.	Peasant	124	2.53
13.	Engineer, architect, forester	102	2.08
14.	Artist, musician, actor	34	0.69
15.	Servant, usher	13	0.26
16.	Higher civil servant, member of parliament	11	0.22
17.	Miner	8	0.16
	Total known	4895	100
	Unknown	920	15.82
	Total	5815	100

It is also a clear trend that especially students of the medical, surgical and pharmaceutical professions usually came from medical or apothecary families. For the period studied, 377 students at the

University of Vienna can be identified as coming from medical families, most of whom themselves studied at the medical faculty. A large number of sons of teachers and lawyers also went abroad to study (7.4 percent). They are followed by students from entrepreneurial families. In ninth place are students from the agricultural professions (4.5 percent). In tenth place are the students from officers' families, comprising around 4 percent. In total, 875 students (18 percent) came from the group that one could call dignitaries, which include higher civil servants, teachers, lawyers, engineers and artists.

Summary and outlook

In autumn 1849, after the suppression of the revolution and the war of independence by the Austrian and Russian armies, the court at Vienna ordered wide-scale cleansing of the Hungarian universities and colleges. Many professors at the University of Pest and other institutions were dismissed in the course of this purge, others emigrated, some were even executed, because they were actively involved in the revolution (e.g. Karl Juhbal, teacher at the Polytechnic). After 1849 many Hungarian scientists, teachers and students fled from the country, of which not a few found a new home in the United States, where they continued their scientific careers. From this time on, Hungarian history is characterised by the fact that the excellent personalities and the promising young academics of Hungarian intellectual life continued their work or studies in the universities and colleges of America and Western Europe.

After the suppression of the revolution and the war of independence in 1848/49, the Viennese government introduced German as the language of instruction in the university system, and endeavoured – ignoring Hungary's special position – to adapt the Hungarian university system to that of the rest of the empire. It should be noted here that the reforms introduced in 1850 were aimed in many respects at specialist advances, and the design of a more modern and contemporary university system, while ignoring or deliberately excluding national aspirations and claims. Above all the placing of the philosophical faculty on an equal footing indicated the contemporary development of the Austrian universities.

The education in German had brought the University of Pest somewhat closer to the other countries in the empire for a decade, especially as a series of professors and students came to Pest from other areas of the monarchy at this time. A contradictory measure was the closure of the institution of the Institutum Geometricum at the university, which was indeed obsolete, though it meant that there was no engineering education at university level in Hungary for seven years. There was a similar case with the institute of veterinary medicine, which existed independently of the medical faculty. These measures also contributed to the fact that the number of Hungarian students enrolled in foreign universities grew. At this time, both the destinations and the structure of the *peregrinatio academica*

of the Hungarian students changed. Where previously theology and law had dominated, there was now a shift towards technical and medical studies. The institutions in Vienna maintained their leading position, followed by the reorganised universities and colleges in Germany. After 1848, interest in the renowned University of Berlin grew continuously, where increasing numbers of Hungarian students enrolled in the natural sciences (physicists, biologists). All of the renowned Hungarian politicians of the late 19th century had spent at least one semester at the law faculties of the universities of Heidelberg or Berlin. The famous physicist Loránd Eötvös studied at the universities of Königsberg and Heidelberg, completing his habilitation at the latter. Around 300 Hungarian engineers attended the renowned Polytechnic in Karlsruhe, in order to gain knowledge there of the modern chemical and electronic sciences. Many Hungarian students enrolled in the agricultural school in Hohenheim before the First World War. After the successive expansion of the Hungarian university system at the turn of the century, the origin of those who studied outside the kingdom also changed. Now, non-Hungarian students increasingly left the country, who could not receive higher education in their native language in Hungary – except in theology or jurisprudence. The reform of the technical university system began in Hungary in 1856 with the opening of the Polytechnic, where higher-level engineering, economics and trade education was situated. In contrast, during the modernising period of the 1850s, the denominational law academies and lyceums closed their doors, because they did not meet the requirements of the government.¹³ In the area of agricultural education, only the institute at Magyaróvár was allowed to continue (with state recognition). The so-called Georgikon, the higher school for agriculture in Keszthely, was closed in 1848, and only reopened as the Royal Hungarian College of Agriculture after the Compromise. These steps also influenced student mobility after 1848. In summary it can be said that the Thunian reforms not only accelerated the reform of the Hungarian university system, but also contributed significantly to the changes in foreign peregrination. From the perspective of an elite that aimed for national independence, the national principle was completely ignored in the process, which led to the failure of the reform measures.

¹³ Cf. the essay by Attila TAR in this volume.

Alessandra Ferraresi

The mixed fortunes of the university reforms in Lombardy-Venetia after 1850

The case of Pavia

On the eve of the 1848 revolutions, the Austrian school system, including that of secondary schools, was essentially part of the Teresian-Giuseppine system. With the Restoration, two Lombardo-Venetian universities were reintegrated into this system. These two institutions were initially regulated in 1817, including measures mostly concerning teaching, and were refined in 1825 in a legal and administrative sense by the *Regolamento generale per le Università del Lombardo-Veneto*¹ (General Regulation for Lombardo-Venetian universities). Considered first class universities on a par with Vienna, Prague, Pest, and Krakow, they housed a faculty of theology (only in Padova, not Pavia, due to the influential Lombardy diocese with respect to a faculty that was a stronghold of Jansenism²), a faculty of political science and law, a medical and surgery faculty, and a faculty of philosophy. Shut down during the period of French rule, the faculty of philosophy was restored and acted mainly as a preparatory faculty for the three higher levels, professional faculties, and real and proper lyceum for the two university cities. In 1817, ‘Studi per gl’ingegneri, architetti ed agrimensori’³ were added in a ‘provvisoria’ manner to the faculty of philosophy; in 1825, the *Regolamento* hinted at the possibility of establishing a ‘Facoltà matematica’ but it was only between 1846 and 1847, after a lengthy process of reforms and partial measures, that a faculty of mathematics was set up at the universities of Padova and Pavia.⁴

¹ Istruzioni per l’attuazione degli Studi nell’I.R. Università di Pavia, pel giorno 15 ottobre 1817, giusta le nuove prescrizioni di S. M. I. R. A. and the Regolamento generale per l’I. R. Università di Pavia, 8 aprile 1825, are published in: Statuti e ordinamenti della Università di Pavia dall’anno 1361 all’anno 1859, Pavia 1825, p. 325–348; see Donatella GIGLIO: I ginnasi e i licei lombardi nell’età della Restaurazione, in: Irene CIPRANDI, Donatella GIGLIO, Gabriella SOLARO (ed.): Problemi scolastici ed educativi nella Lombardia del primo ottocento, vol. II, L’istruzione superiore, Milano 1978, p. 87–192; Irene CIPRANDI: L’Università di Pavia durante la Restaurazione, Ivi: p. 193–316; Emanuele PAGANO: Ginnasi e licei (Lombardia e Veneto, 1802–1848), in: Angelo BIANCHI (ed.): L’istruzione in Italia tra Sette e Ottocento. Lombardia-Veneto-Umbria, vol. 1: Studi, Brescia 2007, p. 269–302; Simonetta POLENGHI (ed.): La scuola degli Asburgo. Pedagogia e formazione degli insegnanti tra il Danubio e il Po (1773–1918) Turin 2012; for the University of Padova, see Giampietro BERTI: L’Università di Padova dal 1814 al 1859, Treviso 2011, p. 11–64 (with many inaccuracies).

² CIPRANDI: L’Università di Pavia, p. 212–217.

³ In Lombardy, the relationship between the university, engineers, and architects started to develop in 1786 with the establishment of a two-year course (that became three-year from 1788 onwards) of study that concluded with the awarding of a ‘licenza’; see, for successive developments, Alessandra FERRARESI: Tra matematica e ingegneria: il caso di Francesco Brioschi, in: Carlo G. LACAITA, Andrea SILVESTRI (ed.): Francesco Brioschi e il suo tempo, 3 voll., I, Milano 2000, p. 251–313; Alessandra FERRARESI: Dalla Facoltà Filosofica alla Facoltà Matematica: la formazione di ingegneri, architetti e agrimensori tra tradizione locale e modelli stranieri, in: Virginio CANTONI, Alessandra FERRARESI (ed.): Ingegneri a Pavia tra formazione e professione. Per una storia della Facoltà di Ingegneria nel quarantesimo della fondazione, Milano 2007, p. 49–130.

⁴ Since 1819 the Faculties of Philosophy at the two Lombardo-Venetian universities were asked by the Austrian government to develop a project for the complete re-organisation of courses in engineering, architecture, and land surveying. In Pavia the project was supervised by the Vice-Director of the faculty, Pietro Configliachi. Despite the

The setting up of a mathematics faculty was a unique event among universities in the Austrian Empire; the faculties of philosophy in Austrian universities included dedicated departments of physics-mathematics but these had not been designed to produce engineers, architects, and surveyors. Such professions were trained at other institutions, namely the Polytechnics of Prague, Graz, and Vienna, established in 1806, 1811, and 1815 respectively. Despite the kinship between them, these differed significantly from the *École Polytechnique* which was concerned with providing the initial theoretical and mathematical grounding ahead of civil and military engineering schools. Austrian polytechnics, on the other hand, were true educational centres for the teaching of applied sciences, for technical instruction, and were also a stimulus for the development of industry and manufacturing. For example, the Polytechnic of Vienna – as well as being a technical museum, conservatory for the arts and crafts, and an organisation for the promotion of national industry – included a *Realschule*. This biennial technical school provided preparation for higher-level courses in the two commercial and technical departments where chemical, mechanical and metallurgical technicians, agronomy, forestry, and land surveyors, as well as hydraulic, civil and architectural engineers were trained.⁵ In Lombardy-Venetia, on the other hand, the mathematics faculty existed as a true engineering and Architectural faculty with an associated but limited course for land surveyors.

It should be recalled that references to a simple ‘faculty’ might be misleading. As stated in the 1825 *Regolamento*, the Austrian universities were considered either as a ‘corpo insegnante’ or ‘corpo accademico’; in the former they were divided into ‘Studi’, on which the teaching of the disciplines depended, and thus constituted the teaching body. In the latter they were made up of faculties, ‘aggregazioni dei dottori nelle relative scienze non addetti al corpo insegnante, centro di unione per conferire fra di essi [...] servendo di pari tempo lo Stato come adunanze di uomini intelligenti’. Any graduate who applied from an imperial royal university could enrol at a faculty and formed part of a university college with a dean elected each year. In the political-legal, medical and surgery faculties, the dean of the university did not necessarily have to be a professor but in the other faculties, he was a professor but only if enrolled; also the chancellor of the university did not necessarily have to be a professor and was elected annually by a group of three faculty graduates who rotated in the role. These graduates were proposed by the academic senate and did not have to be enrolled. The

fact that it had obtained government approval, it was not implemented and this – due to administrative delays, underlying or explicit political tensions – remained the status quo until the late 1830s with the start of a more dynamic economic phase and greater cohesion between Lombardo-Venetian civil society and the government; see FERRARESI: *Ingegneri a Pavia*, p. 87–107; for the political aspects, Simonetta POLENGHI: *Studenti e politica nell’Università di Pavia durante il Risorgimento (1814–1860)*, in: *Storia in Lombardia*, 21(2001), n. 3, p. 5–38.

⁵ The University of Pavia archives hold a guide entitled *Imperiale Regio Istituto Politecnico di Vienna* (Milano, I. R. Stamperia, 1818) that contains the Statutes of the Vienna Polytechnic including all the information regarding its teaching structure: Archivio di Stato di Pavia [ASPV], Archivio dell’Università [AU], Rettorato, cart. 10.

chancellor played an administrative role while the school directors, who were also the faculty heads, had a more important position.⁶

Introduced into Austrian universities in 1809, the directors were nominated by the king on whom they directly depended. They held their positions for life, were not always professors and oversaw the development of the teaching in schools and scientific research. They had the power to assign teaching posts, select substitute lecturers, and supervise competitions for aspiring teaching candidates. They could also censor and check the content of what lecturers taught during lessons and the ‘generalmente prescritti e approvati’ coursebooks. Their monitoring of professors and students extended from the ‘letteraria’ sphere to their ‘morale’ (therefore political) conduct. This position was finally regulated in 1837 and was applied to the Austrian Empire.⁷

In Lombardy-Venetia, as in the rest of the Austrian Empire, universities were essentially professional but not research institutes. They had rigid and outdated curricula while the textbooks used did not keep pace with scientific and cultural developments.⁸

At the end of the 1830s, the Imperial Commission on Education (*Studienhofkommission*) had already outlined reform proposals, either partial or more complete, concerning secondary schools, but according to Mazohl, “ohne dass es jedoch zu entscheidenden Beschlüssen gekommen wäre”⁹. In Lombardy-Venetia, the separation of the mathematics and philosophical schools between 1839 and 1842 and the institution, in 1847, of two autonomous Faculties, Mathematics and Philosophy, were among the few reform measures in universities that had taken place in the 1840s.¹⁰ This was an era that witnessed closer ties between the Vienna-based government and Lombardo-Venetian society through various initiatives promoted or tolerated by Vienna and aimed at favouring the economic and industrial development of the kingdom, especially in Lombardy. These included the birth of *Società d’incoraggiamento di arti e mestieri*, the reorganisation of the Institute of science, letters, the development of technical secondary schools (*Realschulen*), the establishment of the Milan-Venice

⁶ Regolamento generale, part. Titolo I, II, IV, in: Statuti e ordinamenti, p. 331–338, 339–341.

⁷ Istruzioni generali intorno all’ufficio dei direttori sugli Studii nell’Università [1809], and Prescrizioni sui testi da adoperarsi per le lezioni degli studii superiori nei pubblici stabilimenti, in: Statuti e ordinamenti, p. 349–359; 369–371.

⁸ Brigitte MAZOHL: Universitätsreform und Bildungspolitik. Die Ära des Ministers Thun-Hohenstein (1849–1860), in: Klaus MÜLLER-SALGET, Sigurd Paul SCHEICHL (ed.): Nachklänge der Aufklärung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Für Werner M. Bauer zum 65. Geburtstag, Innsbruck 2008, p. 131–149, 135; Christof AICHNER, Brigitte MAZOHL: La riforma scolastica di Thun-Hohenstein, 1849–1860, in: POLENGHI (ed.): La scuola degli Asburgo, p. 179–209, 180–182.

⁹ MAZOHL: Universitätsreform und Bildungspolitik, p. 135; Peter WOZNAK: Count Leo Thun: a Conservative Savior of Educational Reform in the Decade of Neoabsolutism, in: Austrian History Yearbook, 26 (1995), p. 61–81, 69.

¹⁰ FERRARESI: Dalla Facoltà Filosofica, p. 101–106; Statuto della Facoltà Matematica nell’I. R. Università di Pavia, Pavia 1847; Statuto della Facoltà Filosofica nella I. R. Università di Pavia, Pavia 1847. The statutes of the two faculties, edited by a local commission and submitted for government approval, included significant variations from the 1825 Regolamento. There was also the introduction of professional and cultural merit; further, unlike the faculty of political-legal studies and the faculty of medicine and surgery, school professors could be elected as deans.

rail company, the publication of new journals such as the ‘Annali Universali di Statistica’, the ‘Politecnico’, and the ‘Rivista Europea’, and the VI congress of Italian scientists in Milan (1844).¹¹ From 1846 onwards, during a tough economic period made worse by a cholera epidemic, this pragmatism and spirit of collaboration came into stark contrast with the new political climate linked to the election of Pope Pius IX and the expectations of reform that came with it, an election that was well-received by liberal-national exponents.¹² Moreover, as in Austria, there was widespread dissatisfaction with the organisation of education, and not by chance the first response of the civil Lombardo authorities to requests for reform advanced at the central Lombardy congregation in 1848 (a consultative body able to draw ‘sommessamente’ the Emperor’s attention to ‘i bisogni, i desideri e le preghiere della Nazione in tutti i rami della pubblica amministrazione’), was to entrust the preparation of an education reform project that ‘aveva bisogno di molti provvedimenti’¹³ to the Lombardy Institute of Science and Letters. The report to be delivered by the institute’s nominated commission was written by Carlo Cattaneo. However, the discussions which had begun on 27 January were interrupted by the Five Days of Milan and never taken up again.¹⁴

In the meantime, after years of relative calm, apart from a few isolated episodes in which student unrest was interpreted mainly as a form of indiscipline rather than political dissent and in which the authorities’ main concern was over increases in student numbers (1323 enrolled in 1848),¹⁵ the University of Pavia (and Padova) had become one of the protagonists in the revolution with the mobilisation of students and the involvement of new political bodies set up by professors; those

¹¹ Carlo G. LACAITA: *L’intelligenza produttiva. Imprenditori, tecnici e operai nella Società di incoraggiamento di arti e mestieri di Milano (1838–1858)*, Milano 1990; Rupert PICHLER: *L’economia lombarda e l’Austria. Politica commerciale e sviluppo industriale: 1815–1859*, Milano 2001 (ed. orig.: 1996); Tommaso RUSSO: *L’istruzione tecnica a Milano*, in: *Storia in Lombardia* (2003), p. 31–55; Franco DELLA PERUTA: *Il giornalismo italiano del Risorgimento: dal 1847 all’Unità*, Milano 2011; Maria Pia CASALENA: *Per lo Stato, per la Nazione. I congressi degli scienziati in Francia e in Italia (1830–1914)*, Roma 2007; Marco MERIGGI: *Austriaci e austriacanti*, in: Mario ISNENGI, Eva CECCHINATO (ed.): *Gli italiani in guerra, I: Unità e disunità nel Risorgimento*, Torino 2008, p. 226–232.

¹² Marco MERIGGI: *Il Regno Lombardo-Veneto*, Torino 1987 (*Storia d’Italia*, Utet, XVIII), p. 325–332; Franco DELLA PERUTA: *Milano nel Risorgimento. Dall’età napoleonica alle Cinque giornate*, Milano 1992, p. 97–123.

¹³ Franco DELLA PERUTA: *Cultura e organizzazione del sapere nella Lombardia dell’Ottocento. L’Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere dalla fondazione all’unità d’Italia*, in: Adele ROBBIATI BIANCHI (ed.): *L’Istituto Lombardo Accademia di Scienze e lettere, I. Storia istituzionale*, Milano 2007, p. 227–482, to p. 282–283.

¹⁴ Carlo CATTANEO: *Sull’ulteriore sviluppo del pubblico insegnamento in Lombardia*, in: Carlo CATTANEO: *Scritti sull’educazione e sull’istruzione*, ed by: Luigi AMBROSOLI, Firenze 1963, p. 77–152; Luigi AMBROSOLI: *La discussione dell’Istituto Lombardo sul progetto per lo sviluppo dell’insegnamento in Lombardia*, in: *Critica storica*, 4 (1965), 6, p. 781–799, 781.

¹⁵ POLENGHI: *Studenti e politica*, p. 5–38; Marino BERENGO: *Il numero chiuso all’Università di Padova. Un dibattito della Restaurazione*, in: *Quaderni per la storia dell’Università di Padova*, 14 (1981), p. 41–53; David LAVEN: *Liberals or Libertines? Staff, Students and Government Policy at the University of Padua, 1814–1835*, in: *History of Universities*, 11 (1992), p. 123–164.

among them who were born in Austrian areas were considered by the provisional government as ‘antinazionali’.¹⁶

Upon the return of the Austrians in August 1848 it is no coincidence that one of the most effective measures to restore order to the country was not only the state of siege but also the closure of the universities (and high schools). These were only fully re-opened (‘come prima del 1848’, as stated in official documents) in 1852–53.¹⁷ The attitude of the government towards professors and students who had taken part in the revolution was carefully considered and most were re-admitted into university.¹⁸ Professors from the School of Medicine were among the ones most actively involved in the revolution, but only one professor of medicine, Teodoro Lovati, was to lose his teaching post in 1852 for his strong anti-Austrian stance. It should also be highlighted that apart from the siege which lasted until May 1854, an intense air of blackmail, control, and police surveillance prevailed. This favoured the development of nicodemism among professors.¹⁹

¹⁶ Arianna ARISI ROTA: *La gioventù delle università come avanguardia politica: per una fenomenologia dello studente patriota*, in: Alessandra FERRARESI, Elisa SIGNORI (ed.): *Le Università e l’Unità d’Italia (1848–1870)*, Bologna 2012, p. 281–290; POLENGHI: *Studenti e politica*, p. 28–29.

¹⁷ After a complete closure, the first partial re-opening took place in 1850–51, limited to Padova’s faculty of theology and the faculty of medicine in Pavia and Padova, while for the other faculties and the licei, attendance was limited to students resident in the region where the institute was situated; non-residents, though enrolled at university (or at the liceo), continued to study privately – a solution championed by the military bodies to avoid overcrowding – and attended university only to sit examinations. Even after universities had been fully opened, to be taught privately remained a possibility for students of the political-legal studies faculty as the case in Lombardy-Venetia shows: it was introduced in 1818 and regulated in 1837 as individual teaching to students at their home by ‘maestri approvati’ since formal private schools had been prohibited (Regolamento sullo studio privato politico-legale, 29 April 1837, in: *Statuti e ordinamenti*, p. 360–368); Notificazione [Not.] della Luogotenenza Lombarda of 24 October 1850 (in: *Bollettino provinciale delle leggi e degli atti ufficiali per la Lombardia [BPLL]*, 1850, p. 681–687) established, on the other hand, that both for students of Mathematics and Political Legal Studies, specific examinations to obtain the previously unnecessary qualification, private tutors could not “istruire contemporaneamente più di 16 studenti”, thus authorising the founding of private schools; vice versa, in 1852–53 when private teaching was maintained solely for the political-legal studies faculty, with the usual motivation being based on reasons of public order, students were limited to four at a time and the teaching hours to six per day for each teacher. From 1856–57, students were obliged to attend ‘pubblicamente’ the two-year course and to take the so-called History-Law exam; with the Ministerial Decree [D.m] of 6 October 1858, all private teaching was prohibited; vd. infra and Valeria BELLONI: *Gli studi privati politico-legali nella Lombardia della Restaurazione (1815–1859)*, in: *Annali di Storia delle Università italiane*, 13 (2009), p. 333–370.

¹⁸ POLENGHI: *Studenti e politica*, p. 30–33; however, it is a fact that counsellor Cesare Noy wrote to the Minister of Education, Thun, from Verona in September 1852, “non poco a[vesse] influito sul contegno tranquillo a dire anzi potrebbesi lodevole della scolaresca il freno del vigente stato eccezionale” and that the re-opening of the two universities was announced (12 September 1852: BPLL, 1852, p. 1019–1020) by the two lieutenants in the name of Marshal Radetzky but not Thun; see also Brigitte MAZOHL-WALLNIG: *Die österreichische Unterrichtsreform in Lombardo-Venetien 1848–1854*, in: *Römische Historische Mitteilungen*, XVII (1975), p. 103–138, 108–110 and, in general, Marco MERIGGI: *La riorganizzazione del potere asburgico nel Lombardo-Veneto dopo il 1848–49: da Radetzky a Massimiliano*, in: *Verso BELFIORE: società, politica, cultura del decennio di preparazione nel Lombardo-Veneto*, Brescia 1995, p. 29–41.

¹⁹ See the related documentation in: Archivio di Stato di Milano [ASM], Cancellerie austriache [CA], cart. 288, that testifies that, even in schools, tension existed between military and civilian authorities; regarding the three professors from Pavia put under surveillance by the local military unit for their role in the Quarantotto revolt, Lieutenant Strassoldo observed that he had more information on these professors than on others, information that shed a favourable light on their behaviour; this was another reason to begin normal school activities once more but the presumption was, in itself, a form of police (Ivi: Strassoldo to Radetzky, 9 August 1852). Officially, professors generally behaved prudently in formally adhering to government directives (but there were a few convinced

The 1848–49 watershed ‘rimescolò vigorosamente le carte in tavola’ and rendered the previously largely neutral and less showy relationship between the Italian elite and the Austrians increasingly difficult.²⁰ In the meantime, Vienna, adopting some of the liberalisation movement’s requests as its own, intended the educational reforms to become an instrument of social cohesion throughout the empire as well as a means of integrating the varied provinces into a single nation-state.

In Austria, university reform (and that related to secondary school teaching) – drawing inspiration from the Prussian school system – was one of the first requests put forward to the emperor by professors and students in March 1848. The first step in this direction came that same month with the setting up of the Ministry of Public Education (that became the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Education in July 1849, headed by Leo Thun) and the introduction of open teaching and learning as a cornerstone of new universities. The figure of the Director of Studies and the conception of faculties as ‘corporazioni di dottori’ was substituted by the so-called *Ordinarien fakultäten* made up only of professors and autonomous of the government; another important regulation concerned the faculty of philosophy which, thanks to the new eight-year structure of secondary schools, freed itself of the two-year preparatory philosophy course to be replaced by a more autonomous scientific nature that was no longer subordinate to the other faculties.²¹

The extent to which the reform of high schools became part of the programme of political cohesion and of the integration of the empire’s different regions, which appeared to adopt a constitutional form, is evident from the fact that in October 1848 the Extraordinary Envoy Albert Montecuccoli, who worked alongside Radetzky in reorganising the country’s civil administration and who had a reputation for including local actors in his political-administrative programme,²² included professors from the two Lombardo-Venetian universities in the school reform project. These were dictated by the “gigantesco e rapido progresso delle scienze in generale e [dal]le innovazioni che fecero sorgere e sviluppare una condizione pressoché tutta cambiata di metodi e di insegnamenti [...]”, and that

‘Austriaphiles’, individuals like Antonio Volpi, Pietro Baroli, Emilio Briccio, Giovanni Maria Bussedi) and they always tried to cover for the students’ anti-Austrian demonstrations. In private correspondence the awkwardness and diffidence towards government policies can be clearly perceived; for example, the correspondence between the Professor of Applied Mathematics Francesco Brioschi (who took part in the Five Days) with his student Luigi Cremona: referring to the Minister of Education, Brioschi wrote in 1856: “Con quella gente ho imparato anch’io ad andare cauto e circospetto”; in 1857: “Credo di conoscere abbastanza bene il sagacissimo governo che ci regge [...] non saprei se vi convenga andar contro alle idee del ministro, avuto riguardo all’isolamento in cui vi trovereste [...]”: Nicola PALLADINO, Anna Maria MERCURIO, Franco PALLADINO: *Per la costruzione dell’Unità d’Italia. Le corrispondenze epistolari Brioschi-Cremona e Betti-Genocchi*, Firenze 2009, p. 5–6; FERRARESI: *Tra matematica e ingegneria*, p. 251–259; Report from Thun to the emperor, 4 July 1853, in: *Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Wien [AVA], Unterricht-Allg.*, Sign. 5, Fasz. 1117.

²⁰ MERIGGI: *Austriaci e austriacanti*, p. 231; MAZOHL-WALLNIG: *Die österreichische Unterrichtsreform*, p. 105.

²¹ See the essays cited in note 8.

²² For Montecuccoli’s position, from which Radetzky distanced himself later, concerning a future constitutional involvement of the realm in the empire on a federal and corporate basis see Brigitte MAZOHL-WALLNIG: *Il Regno Lombardo-Veneto ‘Provincia’ dell’Impero Austriaco*, in: *Il rapporto centro-periferia negli stati preunitari e nell’Italia unificata (Atti del LIX Congresso di Storia del Risorgimento italiano)*, Roma 2000, p. 95–118.

contributed to the development of “una popolazione illuminata ed eminentemente agricola ed industriosa”.²³

In Pavia, the *Progetto di riforma nel piano generale degli studi per le province lombarde e venete*, set out by directors of the various schools, was only sent to FML Karl Schwarzenberg in March 1850. Regarding middle-secondary education, there were some interesting proposals, for example the introduction of a chair in Classics and Italian Literature and one in Chemistry and Natural History as part of the compulsory schooling in the two-year philosophy course. Regarding recruitment, the proposal was to replace the competition system for exams with a teaching ‘licence’ and a call for assistantships as a gateway into the profession, or having positions filled based on reputation; the government was also asked to provide new guidelines in order to improve the organisation and nature of faculties ‘ora popolate di tante mediocrità’. However, the proposals did not take full account of reforms realised in Austria, especially the freedom of teaching and learning. There was one small hint at a reform in the study of philosophy, a reform if also adopted in Lombardy-Venetia would have elevated ‘a più alta missione’ the faculty of philosophy at each university.²⁴

Meanwhile, the initiative had returned into the hands of the Viennese government, one that wished to normalise the relationship with the academic and educational world in general. It also wanted to have general knowledge of the state of education in Lombardy-Venetia in order to calibrate any eventual intervention.

Minister Thun, who in September 1849 had presented his reform project to the emperor, obtaining a provisional authorisation for its implementation, acted on two fronts: he tried to reach a consensus with the Lombardo-Venetian élite while also introducing the first reforms.

Regarding the first act, of the ‘uomini di fiducia’ (trusted men) called to the Austrian capital in April and July 1850 to discuss the future constitution of Lombardy-Venetia, (*Länderverfassung*), Minister Thun selected an even smaller group of experts and functionaries to whom the reforms were outlined: they would then be applied to the rest of the empire and soon be extended to Lombardy-Venetia.²⁵

More important – during the period in which constitutional solutions were permitted, and which ended with the *Silvesterpatent* that led to neo-Absolutism²⁶ – was a commission that convened in Vienna

²³ ASPV, AU: Rettorato, cart. 202.

²⁴ Chancellor Alberto Gabba wrote: “Negli altri Stati della Monarchia austriaca pare si pensi ad incorporare nei Ginnasi le scuole filosofiche che nel Lombardo Veneto costituiscono i Licei e nelle due Università di Pavia e di Padova fanno parte della facoltà Filosofica [...]”; see also FERRARESI: Tra matematica e ingegneria, p. 269–272; Alessandra FERRARESI: Progetti e riforme universitarie nel Lombardo-Veneto dopo il 1848, in: Alessandra FERRARESI, Elisa SIGNORI (ed.): *Le Università e l’Unità d’Italia* p. 85–104, 90.

²⁵ Stefan MALFÈR: Una costituzione per il Regno Lombardo-Veneto. Speranze e fallimenti, 1848–1850, in: Alba LAZZARETTO ZANOLO (ed.): *La ‘primavera liberale’ nella terraferma veneta, 1848–1849*, Venezia 2000, p. 113–129, 123; on this first debate that saw Italians somewhat perplexed at the new proposals offered, vd. MAZOHL-WALLNIG: *Die österreichische Unterrichtsreform*, p. 111–113.

²⁶ Brigitte MAZOHL-WALLNIG: *Governo centrale e amministrazione locale. Il Lombardo-Veneto, 1848–1859*, in: Franco VALSECCI, Adam WANDRUSZKA (ed.): *Austria e province italiane, 1815–1918. Potere centrale e amministrazioni*

between February and April 1851. Thun saw the commission as a ‘consulta delle intelligenze [...] persone distinte per scelta e cultura e che gode[ssero] della fiducia del paese’ that would work to stir public opinion in favour of the reforms²⁷, formulating proposals that ‘non si allontanassero troppo dalle viste del governo’ and without ‘prendere alcuna deliberazione in qualsiasi riguardo obbligatoria per il governo’.²⁸ Even though Thun wanted to introduce some elective procedures, entrusted to the universities and Lombardo-Venetian academies, owing to Radetzky’s diffidence these members were appointed from above, though admittedly based on competence, merit, and political reliability.²⁹ This was all overseen by Thun’s assistant, Giovanni Battista Bolza; he was the imperial administration’s brilliant Lombardian functionary who constantly strived to mediate between German and Italian cultures.³⁰ The commission was composed of 16 members, divided equally between Venetia and Lombardy: these included university professors, high school teachers, members of institutes of science and letters in Lombardy and Venetia, and the bishops of Verona and Brescia; among these the jurist from Padova, Alessandro Racchetti, and Francesco Ambrosoli, the Latin, Greek, and Aesthetics professor from Pavia, represented the continuity with the previous Viennese commission.³¹

The commission symbolised the period of maximum collaboration between the local intellectual elite and the Austrian government in the years of siege; the following summer, Ambrosoli was given authorisation to publish a report of the work and the conclusions reached.

locali, Bologna 1981, p. 13–46; Georg WALDENEGG: L’Austria e l’Italia dopo la Rivoluzione del 1848, in: *Rassegna storica del Risorgimento*, 88 (2001), p. 65–76, 66; Marco MERIGGI: Alcune osservazioni sul neoassolutismo nel Lombardo-Veneto, Ivi: p. 213–216.

²⁷ Regarding the expectations created among the public, see “L’Educatore, giornale della pubblica e privata educazione” – founded in 1850 by moderate Catholic (and tracked by the police due to his participation in the Five Days) Vincenzo de Castro to provide a ‘riforma pedagogica fondamentale’ in Lombardy-Venetia – concerning the Verona commissione: “Le basi di una vera educazione nazionale non possono essere gettate che da coloro, i quali abbiano studiato a fondo i bisogni, le tendenze, i desideri, il passato e l’avvenire della propria nazione. A questo vero riconosciuto dovremo in breve l’esistenza tra noi di una commissione italiana ordinatrice degli studi, la quale, giova sperare, sarà composta d’uomini che alla pratica dell’istruzione congiungano la conoscenza di quanto si fece nelle più colte nazioni d’Europa onde migliorare i metodi educativi e metterli in armonia colle esigenze dei tempi”. In order to initiate the discussion, the newspaper published an extensive article on the Cattaneo report to the Istituto Lombardo, which ‘porgeva al Potere i dati ufficiali per una riforma completa della pubblica istruzione’ (p. 30–55); the “Annali Universali di Statistica” also hoped ‘che questi uomini dotti e coscienziosi vorranno fare di pubblica ragione i loro studi, giacché in un tema di così vitale importanza è necessario consultare la pubblica opinione’ and highlight some of the sections of the report; vd.: *Annali universali di Statistica*, 26 (1850), s. III, p. 52–54.

²⁸ ASMI, CA, cart. 291, Istruzioni [Thun’s] pel commissario ministeriale dott. Bolza, 3 December 1850.

²⁹ It was expected of the commission members that “abbiano la volontà di assistere con rettitudine e sincerità il Governo nel regolamento di questo importante affare” (Ivi); on the hypothesis of partially elective procedures, see the documentation preserved in the same folder and FERRARESI: *Progetti e riforme*, p. 92.

³⁰ Alberto DESTRO: Bolza, Giovanni Battista: in: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 11, Roma 1969, p. 362–364.

³¹ The other members, apart from the bishops Giovanni Pietro Mutti and Girolamo Verzeri, were Girolamo Venanzio and Giacinto Namias (also a professor of Medicine in Padova) members of the Istituto Veneto, Giuseppe Bernardi, prefect of the Ginnasio of Padova, Luigi Alessandro Parravicini, Director of the Scuole tecniche of Venice, Padova University professors Ludovico Menin and Giovanni Santini; Giuseppe Balsamo Crivelli and Antonio Odescalchi, professors from high schools in Milan, and University of Pavia professors Giuseppe Belli, Alberto Gabba, Giambattista Pertile, and Luigi Porta.

The themes to be tackled were identified for universities in the

posizione della Facoltà filosofica quale studio preparatorio, od invece qual facoltà propriamente detta per le scienze generali (filosofia, filologia, storia, matematica e scienze naturali); il trasferimento della facoltà matematica nell'istituto tecnico; fino a qual grado sarebbe ammissibile la libertà d'insegnamento (testi per le lezioni, docenti privati) e di studio (piano d'istruzione, esami annuali); introduzione di tasse scolastiche; direzione delle singole facoltà e di tutta l'Università (direttori nominati dal governo ovvero decani per elezione); rapporto delle due università italiane colle altre università dell'Impero qualora le prime avessero una istituzione essenzialmente diversa (riguardo al passaggio da quelle a queste e viceversa); mezzi perché si proceda con maggior rigore negli esami; [...] la congiunzione dei licei con i ginnasi [...]; l'opportunità di istituire uno stabilimento tecnico per entrambi i domini, ad esempio a Verona. [...] A questo istituto sarebbero da congiungersi le Facoltà matematiche dell'Università per quella parte però che riguarda l'insegnamento sull'applicazione della matematica alle arti tecniche, mentre la matematica pura verrà in seguito insegnata presso le Facoltà filosofiche.³²

The report – though censored³³ – brought to the surface certain 'delicate' topics, such as the freedom of teaching and learning and the re-organisation of the faculty of philosophy and, consequently, of middle schools as well as the tensions that accompanied them. Some commission members were to comment on these tensions in their private correspondence, for instance Ambrosoli³⁴ and Alberto Gabba³⁵. Once the report was finalised, the reflections on the freedom of teaching (with the

³² ASM, CA, cart. 291, Thun to Bolza, 3 December 1850.

³³ Francesco AMBROSOLI: Notizia delle conferenze tenute in Verona dalla Commissione per l'ordinamento degli studi, Milano [1851]. Authorisation for the publication in July 1851 'coll'esplicita avvertenza dell'ottenuto permesso ministeriale' with the request to make some changes to the original text, in: ASM, CA, cart. 291.

³⁴ Ambrosoli wrote to his brother on 28 February 1851: "[...] Ogni giorno, tranne il giovedì e la domenica, abbiamo conferenza dalle 10½ alle 2; e per la verità si esce stanchi, perché le materie sono molte e sottili e non di rado fortemente contese. Prevalle il principio del libero insegnamento, il quale non è la stessa cosa colla istruzione privata; e consiste in ciò, che uno (purché provi la sua abilità e moralità) può venire a Pavia, montare sulla mia cattedra, insegnare quello che insegno io, e, se piace più di me, portarmi via tutta la scolaresca, giacché il suo certificato ha lo stesso valore del mio. Oltracciò si vorrebbe che il giovane abbia *libertà di imparare* con quell'ordine che più gli aggrada, studiando per esempio la procedura prima del codice, la meccanica prima del calcolo sublime. Il mondo va a sbalzi: dall'estrema pedanteria alla vera licenza. Non più appelli, non più esami annuali: studia e impara chi vuole, salvo poi pentirsi troppo tardi, quando si fanno gli *esami di stato* per l'esercizio di qualche professione o per abilitarsi ad impieghi. [...] Questo è alla fin fine il sistema della Prussia e della Germania liberale: perciò sono di parere che mentre una parte del Ministero vuol trasferirlo tra noi, un'altra parte (la più potente) ne scaldi le fondamenta anche dove è originario"; writing on 28 March to the university rector, he emphasised that "i più che parlano e stampano conoscono troppo imperfettamente quello che sia *libero insegnamento* e lo confondono *coll'insegnamento privato*. Non vi è quasi paese in Europa dove la libertà di insegnare sia intesa a questo modo" and noted "quante restrizioni ha sancite il Piemonte [e che] noi avremo maggior libertà che non hanno i Francesi"; see Francesco AMBROSOLI: Scritti letterari editi ed inediti, I, Firenze 1871, p. 362–364.

³⁵ On 21 March, Gabba informed the Director of the faculty of philosophy, Bussedi: "I nostri lavori andavano con un certo buon accordo fino ad un certo punto, ma arrestammo poi ad uno scoglio che ci ha fatto sostare circa una settimana intera. E lo scoglio fu la facoltà filosofica la cui sistemazione ci condusse naturalmente alla grande questione dell'insegnamento medio, che in Austria si compendia o si crede di compendiare tutto in un corso ginnasiale di otto anni ne' quali tutti vengono per così dire sparpagliati gli insegnamenti della matematica, della fisica, della storia naturale e solo si destinano 2 ore per settimana nell'8° anno per l'insegnamento della filosofia ristretta alla psicologia empirica ed alla logica". This led to 'due partiti' being formed, one in favour of the ministerial solution and the other which insisted on maintaining the Liceo's scientific studies distinct and later reaching a compromise by sub-dividing the curriculum not into two parts (upper ginnasio and lower ginnasio), like in Austria, but into three: lower ginnasio, upper ginnasio, two-year secondary school, an organisation that seemed more conducive 'allo sviluppo successivo delle varie facoltà intellettuali dei giovanetti' (BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSITARIA DI PAVIA: Autografi, cart. 7).

conclusion that professors should only teach in public universities to “raggiunge[re] quella duplice utilità di addestrar sé medesimi al pubblico insegnamento e di eccitare a maggior diligenza i professori stipendiati”), on the organisation of philosophical faculty and its relationship with middle schools, on the recruitment of professors and on new academic bodies, basically corresponded to the government indications. However, alternative proposals were presented regarding the freedom of learning (that required “temperament”, with the identification for each degree course of a “nucleo della scienza”, that is certain “strictly compulsory” disciplines for which annual “esami di corso”³⁶ were foreseen) and concerning the overall organisation of schools and universities. The government was to take these proposals into consideration in successive years³⁷. Of these, the most significant was related to the mathematical faculty, one that the minister wanted to abolish in order to transfer the Schools of engineering to a new polytechnic in Lombardy-Venetia while pure mathematics would become part of the philosophical faculty. The commission, on the contrary, pressed for the maintenance, even strengthening, of the mathematical faculty. It was viewed as a centre of “vera istruzione scientifica” both for the engineers (who would, if anything, have completed their studies in the future polytechnics) and those conducting theoretical scientific research.³⁸

The initial reform measures were launched in 1850,³⁹ starting a process that was, for many reasons, fragmented and difficult. Opposition to the reform in Austria itself was certainly a factor (the reform was definitively approved for secondary schools in 1854).⁴⁰ In Austria criticism came from Catholics, professors faithful to the Giuseppine traditions and Thun’s colleagues in the council of ministers. These groups were all suspicious of free teaching and learning and of the cultural and scientific liberty that the new philosophical faculties promised;⁴¹ perhaps even more crucial was the siege situation in Lombardy-Venetia, worsened by Radetzky’s despotic politics and a public opinion that was hostile or indifferent towards the reform. In 1851, the Commission of Verona’s *Relazione* spoke of the “i

³⁶ AMBROSOLI: Notizia, p. 10, 13.

³⁷ For secondary school studies, the Commission’s proposal was the division into three ‘classes put forward by Gabba, while, like in the Ministerial project, it introduced scientific subjects into the lower ginnasio curriculum that, until then, had been absent. This was to allow the passage from lower ginnasio to a specialist technical school and to share the aim of extending the knowledge of “studi positivi”, alongside classic disciplines, in the “formazione di un carattere nobile e colto”; see MINISTERO DEL CULTO E DELLA PUBBLICA ISTRUZIONE: Progetto di un piano d’organizzazione dei Ginnasi e delle Scuole Tecniche nell’Impero Austriaco, Vienna 1850 (It. trans. by G. Battista Bolza), p. 9; AMBROSOLI: Notizia, p. 21.

³⁸ Ivi: p. 41–43; see. FERRARESI: Progetti e riforme, p. 92–94.

³⁹ In the face of the extensive discussions to be had and given the condition of teaching in Lombardy-Venetia these were regulations whose “utilità” was recognised and which did not prevent “ulteriori miglioramenti”: as stated in the Ordinanza ministeriale [O. m.] 8 January 1850 n. 8, in: BPLL, 1850, part II, p. 9–11.

⁴⁰ See the O. m. 16 December 1854, n. 315, in: BPLL, I, II semester, 1854, p. 779–780.

⁴¹ WOZNIAK: Count Leo Thun, p. 67–76; MAZOHL: Universitätsreform und Bildungspolitik, p. 138–139.

vizi di un sistema contra il quale è così manifesta già da gran tempo la pubblica opinion”⁴² but whose application rendered evident the contradictions that existed between its undoubted liberalism and the empire’s political condition. This meant that continual attention was paid to Lombardy-Venetia’s “circostanze particolari”, leading to specific measures that limited the reform’s liberal aspects.

The regulations certainly conceded greater autonomy and liberty to the universities, something that had occurred in the rest of the empire. In January 1850, monthly meetings between professors were established to consult and make proposals on teaching and disciplinary issues.⁴³ Another regulation regarded the renewal of competitions for teaching posts (even though the final decision rested with the minister): in fact, these were no longer run with exams but with qualifications based on the opinion of the college of professors of the faculty in question. This body could put forward other candidates, Italian or foreign, based on criteria of scientific and teaching excellence, to which, however, was added the “piena sicurezza pel loro carattere morale e politico”⁴⁴.

However, when it came to essentially transforming academic bodies, abolishing the schools, and transforming the faculties into *Ordinarienfakultäten*, the governments ambivalence became obviously: On the one hand there was a strong will for a reform, on the other hand the government had serious concerns about the political reliability of most of the professors. Abolishing the colleges of faculty professors, a move supported by Italian universities that underlined the limited if not non-existent scientific and teaching role of colleges, was put into practice in December 1852.⁴⁵ It was not a smooth process as political worries came to the fore: in Padova, a year earlier, politically suspect individuals⁴⁶ had been elected as faculty deans. Radetzky wrote to Thun in October 1852: „die Staatsverwaltung [entbehrt] jeglicher Garantie über die politische Denkungsart und Haltung der betreffenden, besondere Körperschaften bildenden, Mitglieder“⁴⁷. Given the deteriorating political situation (1853 was the year of the Belfiore martyrs and the ‘Barabba’ Mazzinian revolt) and even

⁴² AMBROSOLI: Notizia, p. 4; MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Die österreichische Unterrichtsreform, p. 122–125, with an extensive citation from Franz Exner’s 1852 report, Thun’s principal collaborator, on the state of the educational system in Lombardy-Venetia, in which the condition of the ginnasi was described as ‘desolanti’.

⁴³ O. m. 8 January 1850; the ginnasi prefects and School directors (nominated by the government) were not bound by decisions taken by the professors’ ‘conferences’ but had to justify any eventual divergences. In Verona it was said that these regulations “mette[vano] in tutta l’istruzione un più libero movimento e concede[vano] alle Università una ragionevole autonomia” (AMBROSOLI: Notizia, p. 46).

⁴⁴ O. m. 13 January 1850, n. 9, in: BPLL, 1850, part II, p. 12–15. Only if the Board of Professors could not put forward a ‘persona soddisfacente’ was the competitive exam announced.

⁴⁵ The University of Padova (ASM, CA, cart. 289), and the University of Pavia both expressed an opinion on their abolition. The Director of Mathematics clearly favoured abolition (ASPV, AU, Rettorato, cart. 29, 16 January 1852); as for Philosophy, Director Bussedi expressed his confusion at having to provide a definitive opinion due to the fact that the set up of the faculty, that had to be ‘sopra nuove e più ampie basi’, was still ‘incerta’, (Ivi: Facoltà Filosofica, cart. 119, 15 January 1852). Faced with the two options – abolition or reform – Lieutenant Strassoldo ‘abbraccia[to] il primo parere’ (Ivi: Matematica, cart. 230).

⁴⁶ Radetzky himself raised the issue in December 1851 in Padova after annulling the election of four deans and a chancellor by confirming the incumbent, Luigi Configliachi; see FERRARESI: Progetti e riforme, p. 97.

⁴⁷ Radetzky to Thun, Verona 21 October 1852, in: AVA, Unterricht-Allg. Sign 5, Fasz. 1117; ivi also Radetzky’s previous report to Thun, 6 June 1852.

though Thun kept repeating that it was only a provisional and exceptional situation, he thus had to accept that the faculties maintained a head nominated by the minister, who was also responsible for nominating the chancellor,⁴⁸ as desired by the Lombardo-Venetian governor.⁴⁹ This was contrary to the elective principle in force at other Austrian universities. The only margin of self-rule was the faculty professors' ability to choose the group of three professors from which the Lieutenant (a political position!) could identify the dean that Thun wanted to maintain as an intermediary figure between the faculties and the government.⁵⁰ This figure would have some of the previous dean's responsibilities – such as representing the faculty and the maintenance of students and graduates' university registration numbers.

It should be noted that from 1851, “in attesa della completa riforma degli studi superiori”, the circulation of students between the empire's universities was encouraged, as was any work carried out in universities where free teaching⁵¹ was in place, even in Pavia and Padova: this was not so much to give students from Austrian universities the chance to come to Lombardy-Venetia, even for a short study period, but to encourage students from Italian universities to go abroad. This was effected not only to decrease student numbers at Italian universities, which were the most frequented after Vienna, but also to favour the acquisition of what Thun referred to as “richtigen österreichischen Geist”⁵². The University of Pavia archives still preserve the testimonies of the many students involved, something that, sooner or later, should be further explored.

October 1851 was also the time when middle and high schools were reorganised into a single, eight-year programme: the ministerial dispatch referred to the “determinazioni prese nelle conferenze che ebbero luogo in Verona” but the Italian commissioners' main request that the curriculum should be

⁴⁸ “Die Motive, welche diesen Anträgen zu Grunde lagen, sind überwiegend politische, indem einerseits die besonderen politischen und sozialen Verhältnisse nach der Ansicht des General-Gouverneurs es unumgänglich nothwendig machen, daß dortlands die Funktion des Rektorates einem Manne zukomme, welchem die Regierung ihr volles Vertrauen schenken kann, und andererseits die bisher nur zu oft vorgekommenen Umtriebe und Ränke bei den Wahlen der Rektoren einen Fingerzeig geben, daß dieser Modus der Einsetzung eines Rektors sehr leicht zur Beeinträchtigung der Würde und des Ansehens des Amtes führe, was den Interessen der Regierung so gut, wie jenen der Universität zuwider sei” (Ivi: report by Thun to the emperor, 8 August 1853).

⁴⁹ Radetzky's proposals were radical: the abolition of both colleges and deans, the maintenance of School directors, and the nomination of the chancellor reserved to the emperor from a list of three candidates chosen by the lieutenants and governor. The criteria for inclusion on the list would be based on scientific and cultural excellence, preferably between individuals outside the university to avoid conditioning the chancellor (Ivi: Radetzky to Thun, 21 October 1852).

⁵⁰ ASPV, AU, Facoltà Matematica, cart. 121, Lieutenant Burger to the Chancellor of the University of Pavia: Disposizioni [...] che debbono essere attivate pel nuovo anno scolastico 1853–54, Milano, 1 November 1853.

⁵¹ As in D. m., 19 January 1851 in: BPLL, 1851, vol. V, p. 534–536.

⁵² MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Die österreichische Unterrichtsreform, p. 118; FERRARESI: Progetti e riforme, p. 92; nel 1852–53 the movement of students between the two Lombardo-Venetian universities, for which no problems were envisaged; on the contrary, usually they would be more “in confronto dei veneti a Pavia, [...] i lombardi a Padova”, a much less “pericolosa” city than Pavia, on the border with Piedmont; the two universities also re-opened to “studenti del Tirolo, della Dalmazia e del Littorale”, as the majority would, for reasons of convenience, choose the closer (and safer, politically) Padova (the Lombardo-Veneto Governor general, sez. civ., to the lieutenant of Innsbruck, Trieste, Zara, 8 September 1852, ASM, CA., cart. 288).

divided into three sections, the last of which – two-year – known by the name “liceo”⁵³ was not accepted, if not formally by its title “ginnasio liceale”⁵⁴.

At the same time, technical education was reorganised. The restructuring was based on social, cultural, and economic considerations: to offer to the lower-middle classes an alternative to the ginnasio with the transformation of the Scuole tecniche di Milano, as well as in Venice, into “modello” Scuole reali superiori (“destinate a servire di modello a tutte le altre simili da erigersi in Lombardia”). The six-year course was based on a “generale cultura fondata sul moderno sapere”; among the objectives was also that of preparation for technical institute courses at Austrian polytechnics. However, the following year, upon a proposal put forward by the mathematics faculty at the University of Padova, a route was opened up via the sitting of an examination, from the Scuole reali superiori to the university mathematics faculties.⁵⁵

In November 1852 the transfer of the two-year philosophy course to the ginnasio liceale was the premise for the “provvisoria” reorganisation of the faculty of philosophy. The previous summer, professors had considered a true leitmotiv in their conference minutes that finally requested that “*Studii filosofici venissero stabilmente ordinati in Facoltà Filosofica, affinché in tal guisa pareggiata alle altre dell’Impero*” served those aiming for a “*carriera delle scienze e delle lettere*” and, in particular, to public teaching”⁵⁶.

The new regulations were a step in this direction, that is a vision of a faculty with open and clear attendance⁵⁷ even though its main target was, as in the rest of the empire, the training of ginnasio teachers. Thanks to the introduction of teaching by subject and no longer by class, these teachers

⁵³ AMBROSOLI: Notizia, p. 35.

⁵⁴ Circular and Not. by the Lombardy Lieutenancy, 3 and 23 October 1851, in: BPLL, 1851; on the theme see the essay Valentina CHIERICETTI and Simonetta POLENGHI in this volume. Ambrosoli, who was in Vienna over the same period, wrote to Strassoldo that, despite outlining to Thun the various difficulties concerning the activation in Lombardy of ‘new education systems’, the minister intended to promote it “*efficacemente*” and would consider “*ogni sospensione temporanea [...] quasi come un impedimento perentorio*”. For Ambrosoli the nomination of the new directors of the ginnasi liceali, which would take place fairly soon, would have solved many problems, especially logistical ones, in the act of bringing together all under one roof ginnasi and secondary schools (ASM, Autografi, cart. 107, Vienna 1 November 1851). Regarding Ambrosoli’s future role in the General Management of Lombard ginnasi, see CHIERICETTI, POLENGHI in this volume.

⁵⁵ Lombardy Lieutenancy not. 14 October 1851 and Decree 13 October 1852 n. 437 “*portante la disposizione ministeriale relativa al passaggio degli scolari della Scuola Reale superiore alla Facoltà matematica*”. In 1850, the Lombardy Lieutenancy asked the Pavia mathematics faculty about the possibility of accessing university from technical school if the curriculum was extended; the negative response was delivered by Director Antonio Bordoni who focused on the “*scopo tutto speciale*” of a technical education while only a classical-philosophical education was fit for preparing future engineers, who, like others, were “*professionisti liberali*”. The Decree of 13 October 1852 (BPLL, 1852, p. 1068–1069) cited the new regulations as a provisional solution “*in attesa dell’ulteriore sistemazione delle Scuole Reali*” and ensured that aspiring students taking the faculty admission exam were suitably prepared. By November 1852 the first requests for admission to the mathematics faculty came from Scuola Reale students; see FERRARESI: Tra matematica e ingegneria, p. 274–275, 283–284.

⁵⁶ ASPV, AU, Facoltà Filosofica, cart. 124, Protocollo della Conferenza dello Studio Filosofico, 28 August 1852.

⁵⁷ As well as their own, students from other faculties who had one or more philosophy-based subjects in their curriculum, and those who wanted to broaden their culture in any of the disciplines taught at the faculty.

would specialise in specific disciplines defined by the *Regolamento* (even this was ‘provvisorio’!) *per gli esami degli aspiranti ad una cattedra ginnasiale*.⁵⁸

Political uncertainty had an impact on the application of the reforms that were never completed.⁵⁹

The key issue that characterised its drafting was never resolved, that is the fact that most of the science-related subjects derived from the mathematical or medical faculty, and that the subjects the school produced itself were entrusted to substitute teachers.⁶⁰ In 1850, Thun adopted this solution for “cattedre vacanti” while waiting to proceed with the general reform of education, but the situation remained unchanged, especially in secondary schools and in faculties of philosophy, owing to difficulties in recruiting well-trained and politically reliable personnel.⁶¹

However, the changes related to the disciplines taught could not be ignored: firstly, “istruzione religiosa” was transferred to the ginnasio liceale, removing the link between religion and pedagogy and philosophy, and moving it into the direction of scientifically-based autonomous research.⁶²

New subjects were also introduced: in 1852, advanced geometry (thanks to the transfer of basic mathematics to the ginnasio) and Italian language and literature; the latter also became part of the ginnasio programme⁶³ because Thun argued in favour of a multi-linguistic policy despite opposition from the Council of Ministers. He believed that controlling national literature openly was strategically useful for a pluri-national state like Austria, thus avoiding that such writing would become clandestine.⁶⁴

The presence of new subjects at university level elevated the Lombardo-Venetian universities to the level of the University of Turin. Here, the traditional Chair of Italian Eloquence dedicated to the study

⁵⁸Notification by Lombardy Lieutenantcy, 12 November 1852, in BPLL, 1852, II semester, p. 1160–1161; there is an explicit reference to the *Regolamento per gli esami* published in the *Supplemento straordinario* of the “*Gazzetta ufficiale di Milano*”, 8 November 1852.

⁵⁹ASPV, AU, Facoltà Filosofica, cart. 49, *Rapporto generale sullo stato della Facoltà*, 10 March 1858, in which Director Bussedi “ripete[va] rispettosamente il voto già espresso in altre simili occasioni che siano presto stabilite e recate in atto le norme definitive per l’ordinamento generale degli studi universitari”; and the call for a “definitiva riorganizzazione della Facoltà” in the following year’s *Rapporto*, 26 March 1859, Ivi: cart. 50.

⁶⁰The subjects attributed to the faculty of philosophy in 1852 were: Philosophy and History of Philosophy, General Methodological and Didactic Pedagogy, History, Austrian History, Auxiliary Sciences of History, Latin Philology, Greek Philology, Classical Literature and Aesthetics, German Language and Literature, General Natural History, Rural Economics, Physics, Italian Language and Literature, Advanced Geometry; Special Natural History, Chemistry (faculty of medicine); Introduction to Sublime Calculus; Sublime Calculus; Rational Mechanics (faculty of mathematics); as cited in a note in *Prospetto delle lezioni e loro frequentazione* from 1857, courses from other faculties were for ‘Disposizione Ministeriale destinati a servire anche di sussidio alla Facoltà Filosofica’.

⁶¹Note from Lombardy Lieutenantcy regarding the re-opening of the University of Pavia, the University of Padova and Lombardo-Venetian secondary schools, 24 October 1850, n. 312: “Alle cattedre vacanti sarà provveduto mediante supplenti, finché in seguito alle consulte da incamminarsi sulla organizzazione della pubblica istruzione verrà stabilito qual forma e natura debbano avere queste cattedre”, in: BPLL, 1850, II part, p. 681–682.

⁶²MAZOHL: *Universitätsreform und Bildungspolitik*, p. 142–143.

⁶³In ‘ginnasi-liceali’, the curriculum, from the fifth year onwards, also included the study of Italian literature from its origins until the end of the XVIII century, according to the guidelines noted in the *Progetto di un Piano provvisorio d’organizzazione dei ginnasi*.

⁶⁴WOZNIAK: *Count Leo Thun*, p. 70–74.

of elocution and style, was transformed into Italian Literature⁶⁵ in 1847, adopting a historical-cultural perspective on literary culture. This was the same set up established at Pavia by Antonio Zoncada⁶⁶, recruited from a permanent position at a ginnasio cittadino in 1853 to take up a supply role that never developed into a permanent post.

In some cases Thun intervened directly by employing the strategy of training a new generation of scientifically-minded competent professors⁶⁷ as a way to make the Philosophical Faculties less dependent on other ones. In 1857, Guglielmo Gasparrini was summoned from Naples to take up the post of advanced botanics (incidentally, Gasparini had been in a tricky political position in Naples for supporting the constitutional government for 1848). The content of this new programme differed from the one taught in the medical faculty as it was concerned with the study of the anatomy and physiology of plants while the existing course was dedicated to more traditional subjects.⁶⁸ A similar process of differentiation was witnessed for chemistry when, in December 1858, Angelo Pavesi was nominated associate professor at the youthful age of 28. After completing a law degree, he turned to chemistry, training first in Milan at the Società d'incoraggiamento di arti e mestieri. He then moved to Heidelberg to work with Bunsen before becoming his assistant at the University of Vienna in 1858.⁶⁹

Another significant step was made in 1855 with the institution of the philological-historical seminar based on the Viennese model. Its statute was adopted “provvisoriamente”⁷⁰: effectively opened in January 1856 with sections in philology and history it allowed a limited number of undergraduates and graduates employed as supply teachers in secondary schools the benefit of scholarships to receive specialist training in their chosen field before taking the tough qualification exams.⁷¹ This was a brief but important page in the history of Italo-Austrian culture. Under the form of ever more obsequious official reports, it is possible to decipher a substantial adhesion on the part of Pavia professors to the

⁶⁵ Umberto LEVRA: *Organizzazione istituzionale e ordinamento didattico (1792–1862)*, in: Italo LANA (ed.): *Storia della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Torino*, Firenze 2000, p. 79–80.

⁶⁶ Examples of Zoncada's courses: *Italian literature in the 500s and 600s (1857–1858)*; *Letters in Italy in the XVIII century (1858–59, I semester)*; *Letters in Italy in the XIX century (1858–59, II semester)*; the course titles can be found in: *Prospetto degli Studi dell'Imp. Regia Università di Pavia MDCCCLVI–MDCCCLVII e MDCCCLVIII–MDCCCIX, I and II semester*, in: ASPV, AU, *Rettorato*, cart. 202; *Filosofia*, cart. 119.

⁶⁷ AICHNER, MAZOHL: *La riforma scolastica*, p. 193–194.

⁶⁸ Maurizia ALIPPI CAPPELLETTI: *Guglielmo Gasparrini*, in: *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 52, Roma 1999, [<http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/>], retrieved 31-08-2016.

⁶⁹ ASPV, AU, *Facoltà Filosofica*, cart. 50: appointment letter of Angelo Pavesi; Angelo MENOZZI: *Commemorazione di Angelo Pavesi*, in: *Annuario della Società chimica di Milano*, I (1896), p. 72 ss.

⁷⁰ Dispatch m. 2 August 1855, see: *Rivista ginnasiale*, II (1855), p. 601; in the first Seminar, professors decided to temporarily conform to the Viennese model (ASPV, AU, *Facoltà Filosofica*, cart. 122); for an Italian translation of the Viennese Seminar Statute, see: *Rivista ginnasiale*, I, 1854, p. 544–548.

⁷¹ In 1856, the definitive law on qualifying examinations for ginnasio posts came into effect throughout the empire (D. m., n. 143, 14 July 1856, in: BPLL, 1856, p. 393–411).

introduction of the new teaching methods and an effort to make it succeed.⁷² Academics like Giuseppe Müller and Franz Hochegger were invited to Pavia and they brought with them German philology, not only in the form of cultural competence but also in library collections.⁷³ After 1859 Müller remained in Italy, in Padova before ending his career, in Turin after having been granted Italian citizenship. In 1872, in collaboration with colleagues from Turin, he founded the first Italian journal of philological studies, the *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione classica*.⁷⁴

The above-mentioned establishment of the Chemistry post in the philosophical faculty was one of the last measures taken in the 1856–1858 period. This was characterised by extensive government intervention for the “completa” adoption of the reforms in Lombardy-Venetia. In Austria, the reform process had gathered speed in 1855 with the conclusive reorganisation of the political-legal faculty that not only introduced a teaching role on the history of rights but also on the science of rights as “storicamente orientata”⁷⁵. The reform brought with it a distinct freedom of learning (the application of which came in for severe criticism in both academic and ministerial circles) with a plan based on a blend of compulsory and optional courses and with the opportunity to choose between competing professors.⁷⁶

Between October 1856 and October 1858, the Political-Legal Faculties in Lombardy-Venetia began to change.⁷⁷ In Italian regions, conformity to the curriculum (from the year of its inception in 1856 to 1858–59 when it should have been fully implemented) adopted in other Austrian universities was not

⁷² In the 1857–58 report, the Seminar Steering Committee (Andrea Zambelli, Professor of Science and Political Law, Girolamo Turroni, Professor of History, Franz Hochegger, Latin Philology professor and Joseph Müller, Professor of Greek Philology and German Language and Literature) was “ben lieta di attestare che si provvida istituzione [era] già in via di notevole progresso per corrispondere allo scopo suo special” and, based on the work they produced, for the following year it proposed five students as paid members for the Philology section and four for the History section; even “semplici uditori” were admitted to the Seminar. (ASPV, AU, Facoltà Filosofica, cart. 122, 22 August 1858).

⁷³ In September 1856 Thun wrote to the Seminar’s Steering Committee that he would try to “rimediare secondo la possibilità alla deplorata mancanza di molte opere necessarie nella biblioteca dell’Università”; the following year, ministerial finance amounting to a thousand florins allowed numerous editions of critical classical editions to be purchased, especially from publisher Teubner from Lipsia. (Rapporto all’Ecc. I. R. Ministero intorno all’acquisto dei libri pel Seminario, Ivi).

⁷⁴ Emilio GABBA: Giuseppe Müller, in: *Bollettino della Società Pavese di Storia Patria*, 96 (1996), p. 75–77; Gian Franco GIANNOTTI: Gli studi classici, in: LANA (ed.): *Storia della Facoltà di Lettere*, p. 229–231. Hochegger (1815–1875) who had studied in Innsbruck and had already been professor at the Theresianum in Vienna, moved to Prague after 1859; during his time in Pavia, he was the author of the successful anthology: *Iliade, Homeri Iliadis Epitome in usum scholarum*, edidit Franciscus Hochegger, Vindobonae 1857. See *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon (1815–1950) Band 2*, Wien 1959, p. 343).

⁷⁵ Franz WIEACKER: *Storia del diritto privato moderno*, 2 voll., II, Milano 1980 (trad. it), p. 11. as MAZOHL wrote (Universitätsreform, p. 143–144) the reform was „unverhohlen konservativ“, and had the objective to train jurists „im Sinne einer historisch-rechtlichen [...], die allein die Gewähr dafür bieten könne, dem ‘revolutionären’ Potential des Naturrechts entgegen zu wirken“.

⁷⁶ D. m. n. 172, 2 October 1855, in: BPLL, I, 1855, p. 181–193.

⁷⁷ See the d. m. 8 October 1856, n. 184; 18 October 1857, n. 199, 6 October 1858, n. 178; Hans LENTZE: L’insegnamento della storia del diritto nella riforma degli studi universitari promossa dal ministro austriaco von Thun e l’istituzione di una cattedra a Pavia e a Padova, in: *Archivio storico lombardo*, LXXVIII–LXXIX (1953), p. 291–306; Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Graf Thun und das Rechtsstudium an den oberitalienischen Universitäten Padua und Pavia. Ein Beitrag zur Bildungs- und Wissenschaftspolitik im Alpen-Adria-Raum, in: Herwig EBNER, Paul W. ROTH, Ingeborg WIESFLECKER-FRIEDHUBER (ed.): *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Alpen-Adria-Raumes*, Graz 1997, p. 107–118.

complete, especially in the first two years. This was due to the fact that, as Thun wrote to the emperor in July 1858, Germanic rights should not be taught in Lombardo-Venetian universities, nor should history of the empire; they were to be substituted by courses in Austrian history and philosophy. The History of Rights course ought to be taught “in un modo particolare, adatto alle usanze locali” in the second year, after Roman law.⁷⁸

Table 1: Curriculum at the Political-Legal Faculties at Austrian Universities and Universities in Lombardo-Venetia

Teaching	Austrian universities	Lombardo-Venetian universities
Year 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>For the whole year</i>: History of the empire and Germanic Rights; - <i>For the whole year</i>: Roman Rights and History. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>For the whole year</i>: Roman Rights and History; - <i>For the whole year</i>: Austrian history; - <i>For the whole year</i>: Philosophy (<i>first semester</i>: Logic and Metaphysics; <i>second semester</i>: Ethics).
Year 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>First semester</i>: Germanic Common Rights; - <i>Second semester</i>: Philosophy of Rights and, studied separately, Encyclopedia of Legal Sciences; <i>In the first or second semester or in both</i>: Canonical Rights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>For the whole year</i>: History of Rights; - <i>For the whole year</i>: Canonical Rights; <i>Second semester</i>: Philosophy of Rights or Encyclopedia of Legal Sciences.

Between 1857–58, the main elements of the reform were gradually introduced in the political-legal studies faculty. There was the establishment of competition between professors – initially between the two professors of Roman law – and lessons were held contemporarily with students free to decide which to attend.⁷⁹ Half-yearly and annual exams were abolished and they were replaced by

⁷⁸ Report from Thun to the emperor, 26 July 1858, in: AVA, Unterrichts-Allg., Sign. 5, fasc. 1117. Among the voluntary subjects the ‘deutsches Bundesrecht’ was cancelled; see also the report sent by Helfert to the emperor on 26 August 1857, ed. in: LENTZE: L’insegnamento, p. 299–306.

⁷⁹ D. m. 18 October 1857 n. 199.

compulsory and voluntary lessons, which students had to attend regularly. Students were also given a personal “libretto di insinuazione”⁸⁰ and were to be checked by professors with examinations, and *in itinere* tests (“esami, ripetizioni disputazioni, elaborate”) and challenging degree exams; the first of which, the history-law exam, was taken at the end of the two-year course.⁸¹ The close teaching links with the faculty of philosophy – that should have been resolved in “piena armonia” and in “vera collegialità”⁸² – led to the abolition of half-yearly and annual exams, from 1858–59, here too.⁸³

In 1857, the university teaching structure was defined: full, associate (*straordinari*), private (*free*), masters, assistants, auxiliary. “*Straordinari*” professors were selected from “*giovani di belle speranze*” who were given the chance to “*dar prove in posizione sicura della loro capacità scientifica*”⁸⁴. Pavesi was one of these but, in 1857, Thun nominated the young Filippo Serafini from Trentino to teach Roman Rights in competition with full professor Barinetti, and the first History of Rights professor, the Brescian Gian Maria Bravo. Both newcomers were trained in Vienna⁸⁵ and, again in the political-legal studies faculty, Luigi Cossa, who graduated from Pavia in 1853 and took up the Chair in Political Economics after a brief stint in state administration.

Full professors were also invited to hold free courses⁸⁶ and the ideas of competition, freedom, and responsibility were positive criteria to which both professors and students were called to adhere to. As Thun wrote to the Director of the political-legal faculty in 1857, it came down to “*passare ad uno stato di più libero movimento intellettuale e scientifico*”⁸⁷ leaving professors the “*diritto di trattare la*

⁸⁰ O. m. sent to the academic senates in Pavia and Padova, 25 February 1858, first draft in Italian: AVA, Unterricht-Allg., Sign. 5, fasz. 1117. The ‘libretto’ accompanied the student through his studies even when this involved a transfer to another institution.

⁸¹ Helfert commented in the report dated 30 August 1857: „Mit der Einführung dieser Prüfung, sowie mit dem Bestehen concurrirender Lehrvorträge, welche schon im Studienjahre 1857/58 wenigstens bezüglich des Römischen Rechtes stattfinden werden, ist das fernere Fortbestehen der Annual- und Semesterprüfungen in den ersten beiden Jahrgängen nicht vereinbar. Sie werden aber auch insoferne völlig entbehrlich, als das Ablegen einer commissionellen öffentlichen und die Hauptfächer der zwei Jahrgänge zusammenfassenden Prüfung unter den für derlei Prüfungen festgesetzten Sanktionen ein mehr als genügender Ersatz derselben und hinreichend ist, um den Studierenden einen nachhaltigen Impuls zu geben, mit Ernst und Eifer ihre Studien zu betreiben” (Ivi: Fasz. 1116).

⁸² As stated in the Istruzioni of 24 October 1857 to d. m. 18 October 1857, Ivi: fasz. 1117, also first draft in Italian.

⁸³ The disposition is contained in the above-mentioned d. m. 6 October 1858.

⁸⁴ O. i. 23 October 1857, n. 224 in: BPLL, I, 1857, p. 617–623; FERRARESI: Progetti e riforme, p. 99.

⁸⁵ These were choices that fell perfectly under Thun’s ‘recruitment policy’, aimed at introducing young, scientifically-minded and politically uncompromised people into the new historical-legal sector. These candidates would have spent time training in German institutions. Bravo died in 1860, but Serafini is considered the founder of the Italian school of the History of Roman Rights (he would become Professor of Roman Rights at the University of Rome in 1871); Antonio Pertile went on to teach History of Rights in Padova, an academic on a par with Serafini in terms of the History of Italian Rights. See Maria Rosa DI SIMONE: Gli studi giuridici all’Università di Roma nella transizione tra Stato pontificio e Regno d’Italia, in: FERRARESI, SIGNORI (ed.): Le Università e l’Unità d’Italia, p. 200–202.

⁸⁶ They could teach free courses, use materials already employed in lessons, or teach subjects that “*alla loro materia d’obbligo sono analoghi od omogenei* (§ 21 dell’O. i. 23 October 1857): so as to obtain “*ohne Belastung der Studienfonde eine größere Konkurrenz von Lehrvorträgen zu erzielen*” (report sent by Helfert to the emperor, 8 August 1857: AVA, Unterricht-Allg., Sign. 5 A–H, Fasz. 1116).

⁸⁷ Dispatch to the committee of the Political-Legal Studies faculties in Pavia and Padova, 25 October 1857, AVA, Unterricht-Allg., Sign. 5 A–H, fasz. 1116, text in German and first draft in Italian; vice versa, in other empire universities, as a consequence of the 1848 revolt, there was the complete reversal of each and every ‘preceding order’; therefore the objective of the new laws was that of “*trarre a poco a poco dalla illimitata libertà un conveniente ordine*”.

propria materia nel modo che stimano più opportuno per promuovere e favorire l'istruzione", to encourage students' inclination 2a fare studi più estesi e profondi².

Once again, however, the 'particular condition' of Lombardy-Venetia had an influence as can be clearly seen by the regulations that governed the qualifications of private professors.

It was only in Italian regions that such professors were first evaluated by the director of the faculty in question for their "carattere e [...] condotta politica" and only here that the faculties – once the exam process was concluded – made proposals on which the minister had to decide. In other places, the faculties decided and the minister either confirmed or refused the teaching license.⁸⁸ The imposition of textbooks that were "inconciliabile con la dignità di una università scientifica"⁸⁹ were abolished also in Lombardy-Venetia and the "tenore" of lessons was left to the professors; however, it was only in Lombardy-Venetia that the minister reserved the right, at any time, to enquire about their teaching and request lesson notes from professors.⁹⁰

Thun had set the years 1859–60 as the deadline for the completion of the reform. Pavia also had to undertake a project of building expansion to create new university sites but in January 1859 the university was closed due to the worsening political situation. As well as lacking a definitive structure for the philosophical faculty, the medical faculty and mathematical faculty had not been fully reformed (though mathematics had been partially reorganised in 1856 with the introduction of technological-industrial courses and substantial investment in creating new offices and laboratories). Despite a large swathe of public opinion, especially in Milan, in favour of a polytechnic, it seemed as though the government was keen – as indicated by the Verona commission – on keeping the study of engineering at the university, a choice that was unique among Italian universities and those in the rest of the empire.⁹¹

With the Kingdom of Sardinia's annexation of Lombardy in the summer of 1859, thoughts turned immediately to the framework law regarding the re-organisation of education. This was known as the *legge Casati* (Casati law), taking its name from the Minister of Public Education Gabrio Casati⁹²; the law was gradually extended throughout the territory subsequently annexed.

Recent research has shown that even though it was a fully legal norm the preliminary project circulated among academics and was debated in Turin by two panels of experts: one for higher and the other for secondary education. The only Lombard on the higher education panel that met between

⁸⁸ With these 'limitations', according to Helfert, private teaching, "mit Recht als die beste und verlässlichste Pflanzschule für künftige Professoren", could be applied without problems in Pavia and Padova (report by Helfert, 8 August 1857).

⁸⁹ *Ivi*.

⁹⁰ O. i. 23 October 1857 § 23.

⁹¹ FERRARESI: *Dalla Facoltà Filosofica alla Facoltà Matematica*, p. 112–120; FERRARESI: *Progetti e riforme*, p. 102–103.

⁹² On Gabrio Casati, already podestà of Milan from 1837, in exile in Piedmont after the 1848 revolt, he became a citizen of the Kingdom of Sardinia in 1853, see the Luigi Ambrosoli entry, in: *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 21, 1978.

August and September 1859 was the professor of Applied Mathematics Francesco Brioschi. In the closing report, reference was made to the university reforms that had just been enacted in Lombardy with the affirmation that, if freedom of teaching was *also* (our italics) introduced by the Austrian government, this proved that it “era altamente domandata dalla ragione dei tempi”⁹³.

In effect, the Casati law, asserting state monopoly over higher education, introduced a version of free teaching – competition between open and official courses at public universities – which reflected the one already adopted in Lombardy-Venetia. The only difference was that the forms of monitoring were delegated to the Minister and to Ministerial commissions which, leaving aside the different constitutional setting, were not much more liberal than those found in Austrian law.⁹⁴ The same could be said for freedom of learning. Academic bodies, chancellors, and faculty deans in Italian universities were approved by royal appointment. The years immediately after this period highlight the extent of the fragility of academic freedom under the Casati law, one that was further undermined by the Minister Matteucci 1862 law regulating university fees and professors’ salaries in favour of a system of higher education oriented around identical study plans, curricula, and organization.⁹⁵

The French-influenced Piedmont model prevailed, especially when it came to the organization of the faculties with the dismantling of the faculty of philosophy in favour of a faculty of literature and philosophy and of a faculty of physical, mathematical and natural sciences, with teaching being more profession-oriented. Engineering was organised in a hybrid form that, in part, resembled the French model (*scuole di applicazione*), and, in part, the German with the institution (provided for by the Casati law and adopted in 1863) of the Istituto Tecnico Superiore in Milan. This was supported by Francesco Brioschi, who articulated the views of Milan’s economic circles in Turin, as well as his own conviction that universities should privilege ‘*scienza pura*’. Pavia, in particular, was harmed by the new arrangement because, as well as losing its faculty of engineering, the faculty of literature and philosophy was established in Milan under the title of *Accademia scientifico-letteraria*.⁹⁶

However, Brioschi wanted to maintain the faculty of philosophy as a faculty of general sciences supported by an autonomous research programme: like other Lombardy intellectuals in the 1850s, he

⁹³ Cit. in Mauro MORETTI, Ilaria PORCIANI: *Da un frammento a un testo. Estate 1859, la discussione preparatoria sulla legge Casati*, in: FERRARESI, SIGNORI: *Le Università e l’Unità d’Italia*, p. 15–31, here p. 23.

⁹⁴ On the subsequent decline of free teaching in post-Unification universities, see: Mauro MORETTI: *I cadetti della scienza. Sul reclutamento dei docenti non ufficiali nell’Italia postunitaria*, in: Ilaria PORCIANI (ed.): *Università e scienza nazionale*, Napoli 2001, p. 151–203.

⁹⁵ Simonetta POLENGHI: *La politica universitaria italiana nell’età della Destra storica*, Brescia 1993; a critique of contemporary Italian University on behalf of the “*libertà germanica di insegnamento*”, in: Carlo CANTONI: *sull’Università. Saggi e discorsi dal 1874 al 1905*, Milano 1991 (*Fonti e studi per la storia dell’Università di Pavia*).

⁹⁶ Pavia maintained only a few courses in general culture and regained a faculty of literature and philosophy in 1879. On the *Accademia scientifico-letteraria* di Milano, see Enrico DECLEVA: *Una facoltà filosofico-letteraria nella città industriale. Alla ricerca di un’identità (1861–1881)*, in: Gennaro BARBARISI, Enrico DECLEVA, Silvia Morgana (ed.): *Milano e l’Accademia scientifico-letteraria*, Milano, 2001, 2 vol., I, p. 3–196.

on more than one occasion envisaged this as a solution to the weakening of post-Unification Italian universities.⁹⁷

⁹⁷ See, for example, Brioschi's letter to chemist Stanislao Cannizzaro, dated 12 February 1869, in which he proposed the abolition of the faculty of physical, mathematical and natural sciences ("che sono un cadavere"), in favour of a faculty of philosophy to which should be added "qualche cattedra di Matematica", entrusted to "matematici veri" (ed. in: Giovanni PAOLONI: Brioschi e la questione dell'Accademia nazionale, in LACAITA, SILVESTRI, (ed.): Francesco Brioschi e il suo tempo, p. 389–390; in 1885, in the Senate Brioschi would go on to support Luigi Cremona, another Pavia Mathematics graduate (1855) who went on to become Director of Rome's Scuola di applicazione per gli ingegneri, in the presentation of a university reform project (later withdrawn) that had the "ripristino [del]la grande facoltà filosofica" as one of its features (cfr. Mauro MORETTI: L'istruzione superiore fra i due secoli: norme, strutture e dibattiti, in: Antonio CASELLA, Alessandra FERRARESI, Giuseppe GIULIANI, Elisa SIGNORI (ed.): Una difficile modernità. Tradizioni di ricerca e comunità scientifiche in Italia. 1890–1914, Pavia, 2000, p. 351–388; Philosopher Carlo Cantoni (see n. 95) also studied at Pavia in the same period.

Valentina Chierichetti, Simonetta Polenghi

The Thun-Hohenstein reform and the Lombardy-Venetian *ginnasi*.

Aspects and problems¹

Preliminary remarks

While the Theresian reforms and the policies of Joseph II have formed the focus of various studies on the history of education, there has been little work to date on the age of restoration. Where Italian research is concerned, this can be explained in particular by the language barrier. In addition, however, ideological motives have also played a significant role in this delayed scientific examination. For many years the view of the Austrian rule in the post-Napoleonic period was accompanied by nationalist prejudices, which meant that the attention of Italian researchers was not directed towards Vienna, but rather at Italian educationalists. By these means it was hoped to highlight the existence of an autonomous Italian educational approach. At the same time, when evaluating the Austrian school policy, there were accusations of confessionalisation and religious restoration.² Research conducted by scholars of the Catholic University in Milan, in contrast, show that Austria stood out not only due to its school policy, which led to an increase in the literacy rate,³ but also due to the quality of elementary school teacher training.⁴

Compared with this, the image we have of the secondary school is much more limited. Very few studies are available on this area. After the excellent pioneering work of Donatella Giglio on *ginnasi* and lyceums (1974)⁵ one had to wait until 2007 before a study on the teaching career⁶ in Lombardy-

¹ This essay is the result of the joint research and considerations of both authors. S. Polenghi is responsible in particular for pp. 226–228, 232–242 and 246–248, V. Chierichetti for pp. 226–231 and 243–247.

² On the historical reconstruction of this topic, see Simonetta POLENGHI: Die Österreichische Schulreform in der habsburgischen Lombardei, in: *History of Education & Children's Literature* (2011), 1, p. 77–91; Simonetta POLENGHI: Introduzione in: Simonetta POLENGHI (ed.): *La scuola degli Asburgo. Pedagogia e formazione degli insegnanti tra il Danubio e il Po (1773–1918)*, Torino 2012, p. 1–16. German-language research has not addressed Lombardy or Venetia, not even more detailed works such as that by Helmut ENGELBRECHT: *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens, Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs*, vol. III–IV, Wien 1982–1988.

³ Xenio TOSCANI: *La politica scolastica nel Regno lombardo-veneto: scuole elementari*, in: Luciano PAZZAGLIA (ed.): *Chiesa e prospettive educative in Italia tra Restaurazione e Unificazione*, Brescia 1994, p. 317–353.

⁴ Simonetta POLENGHI: *La formazione dei maestri nella Lombardia austriaca*, in: Simonetta POLENGHI (ed.): *La scuola degli Asburgo*, p. 45–89; Mario GECHELE: *Maestri e formazione nelle province venete (1814–1866)*, in: Simonetta POLENGHI (ed.): *La scuola degli Asburgo*, p. 113–148; Simonetta POLENGHI: *Elementary school teachers in Milan during the Restoration (1814–59): innovations and improvements in teacher training*, in: *History of Education & Children's Literature* (2013), 1, p. 147–166.

⁵ Donatella GIGLIO: *I ginnasi e i licei lombardi nell'età della Restaurazione*, in: Irene CIPRANDI, Donatella GIGLIO, Gabriella SOLARO (ed.): *Problemi scolastici ed educativi nella Lombardia del primo Ottocento*, vol. II, Milano 1977–1978, p. 87–188.

⁶ Emanuele PAGANO: *Ginnasi e Licei (Lombardia e Veneto, 1802–1848)* in: Angelo BIANCHI (ed.): *L'istruzione in Italia tra Sette e Ottocento. Lombardia – Veneto – Umbria*, vol. I. Studi, La Scuola, Brescia 2007, p. 269–302; now also Emanuele PAGANO: *I professori di liceo nel primo Ottocento. Nascita di una professione moderna*, in: Giovanni VIGO, Emanuele PAGANO (ed.): *Maestri e professori. Profili della professione docente tra Antico Regime e Restaurazione*, Milano 2012, p. 125–190.

Venetia and an analysis of Austrian legislation on school matters appeared (for the first time in Italian).⁷ The latter examined the impact of Austrian legislation – which replaced that of the Napoleonic era – on the Lombardy *ginnasi*. An analytical work on the public *ginnasi* and lyceums of Milan from 1818 to 1851 was also published, which not only reconstructed 107 teacher biographies, but also examined data on 17,119 pupils, providing information on, among other things, their family origin and their grades.⁸ Some data on Venetia can also be found in the work by Mario Gecchele, published in 2013.⁹

However all of these papers restrict themselves to the years prior to the Thunian reforms. The only work on the implementation of Thun's reforms is an essay by Brigitte Mazohl¹⁰, which however has not been widely received, due to a lack of translation into Italian. Yet the language barrier and national prejudices were not the only obstacles that explain the lack of Italian research on the period after 1848. There were also difficulties with regard to sources. For example the sources on school administration after 1848, which were held in the Milan state archive, were destroyed by Allied bombing in 1943. These also included the files that returned to Italy after the end of the Habsburg monarchy, so that there are only a few files on this subject in the archives of the Austrian chancellery ("Cancellerie Austriache") in the Milan state archive, which Mazohl studied for her work. There are very few documents in the general administrative archive in Vienna on the policies affecting the *ginnasi* and lyceums in Lombardy-Venetia. These mostly contain reports on the political attitudes of individual teachers. The Venetian state archive, which holds sources from the Ministry of Education in its inventory on the island of Giudecca, was closed during the research for this essay. It reopened only in 2016, but the relevant collections (Direzione generale dei ginnasi 1819–1857) still are not accessible. With the exception of the municipal *Ginnasio* Santa Marta and the Collegio Longone, the archives of the Milan *ginnasi* and lyceums also hold no documents from the period of the 1850s. Thus the destruction or inaccessibility of government sources present a great obstacle to research. For this reason, the *Rivista ginnasiale* (Journal of the *ginnasi*) has been used for this paper, which

⁷ Simonetta POLENGHI: La riforma del *Gymnasium* austriaco dall'età teresiana al 1819 e la sua applicazione nella Lombardia della Restaurazione (1818–1835), in: Angelo BIANCHI (ed.): L'istruzione in Italia tra Sette e Ottocento, p. 15–63; Simonetta POLENGHI: From Vienna to Milan: the Austrian Reform of the *Gymnasium* and its Implementation in Lombardy and during the Restoration, with some Data on the *Ginnasio di Brera*, in: History of Education & Children's Literature (2007), 2, p. 101–126.

⁸ Valentina CHIERICHETTI: I ginnasi e i licei di Milano nell'età della Restaurazione. Professori, studenti, discipline (1814–1851), Lecce, Rovato 2013.

⁹ GECHELE: Maestri e formazione nelle province venete (1814–1866), p. 113–148.

¹⁰ Brigitte MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Die Österreichische Unterrichtsreform in Lombardo-Venetien 1848–1854, in: Römische Historische Mitteilungen (1975), 17, p. 104–138.

corresponds with the *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, together with glimpses at the newspapers of the reform era.¹¹

The educational system of the secondary classical schools in Lombardy-Venetia in the Vormärz

In 1814 a commission was set up under Giovanni Scopoli with the task of reforming the school system. Scopoli, the capable and – also in pedagogical terms – highly educated General Director for the educational system of the Napoleonic Kingdom¹², recommended the introduction of a technical school, as well as the Austrian six-grade *ginnasio* instead of the four-year Napoleonic *ginnasio*. In his concluding report of 1816, the court councillor and advisor on the academic and censorship system in Vienna, Joseph Alois Jüstel, who was charged with investigating the matter in the imperial territory, highlighted the differences between the Napoleonic and the Austrian *ginnasi*, emphasising the superiority of the latter. He justified this with the outstanding role of the subjects of religion, Latin and Greek there – none of which subjects were included in the Napoleonic curriculum.¹³

Therefore, in 1817 the Imperial Commission on Education introduced the Austrian *ginnasio* curriculum (Codice ginnasiale). This corresponded with that by Franz Innozenz Lang from 1806.¹⁴ In 1819 the form teacher system was also introduced to Lombardy-Venetia. According to this order, only one teacher for catechism taught in all classes, while the teacher of the first grade accompanied his pupils to fourth grade, after which a new teacher took over the next two grades. However this measure meant that the natural science subjects were disadvantaged, since the teachers in Lombardy and Venetia, who were generally clergymen, had very little knowledge of these subjects. The reintroduction of Greek, which had been abolished at the Napoleonic *ginnasio*, also led to problems, as there were no qualified teachers for this subject.

We learn something about the situation in the *ginnasi* from the secret reports written by the *ginnasi* prefects, which were sent to the general director of the Lombardy *ginnasi*, Carlo Giuseppe Londonio. The reports revealed deficiencies in the pupils' knowledge of Greek, not least due to the fact that the

¹¹ Fabiana DI BRAZZÀ, Claudio GRIGGIO: Appunti su Giovanni Battista Bolza e la „Rivista ginnasiale“ (1854–1859) in: Claudio GRIGGIO (ed.): *Incontri di discipline per la didattica: raccolta di studi dedicati a Pierluigi Rigo*, Milano 2006, p. 133–160.

¹² Giovanni Scopoli (1774–1854), physician, prefect, was the general director for the educational system from 1809 to 1817. Based on his enlightened attitude and his comprehensive education, which also included pedagogy, Scopoli disseminated the so-called ‘normal method’ and demanded national education and lessons for girls and women. See the biography by Mario Gecchele with numerous bibliographic notes: Mario GECCHELE: *Giovanni, Scopoli*, in: Giorgio CHIOSSO, Roberto SANI (ed.): *Dizionario biografico dell’educazione 1800–2000*, vol. 2, Milano 2013 (hereafter DBE), p. 494–495.

¹³ GIGLIO: *I ginnasi e i licei lombardi nell’età della Restaurazione*, p. 93–124. Cf. POLENGHI: *La riforma del Gymnasium austriaco*, p. 15–63.

¹⁴ Gerald GRIMM: *Elitäre Bildungsinstitution oder „Bürgerschule“? Das österreichische Gymnasium zwischen Tradition und Innovation, 1773–1819*, Frankfurt a. M., New York 1995, p. 423–567.

vast majority of teachers did not have sufficient mastery of the language. The reports also claimed that the teachers had great difficulty teaching mathematics. Londonio therefore developed an examination that would also test the knowledge and capabilities of the teachers. Almost all teachers thus felt compelled to study the subjects that they did not yet master, in order to be able to keep their position.¹⁵

The length of time it took to implement the reform can be seen from the several complaints by Londonio. In 1833, for example, he drew the attention of the government to the fact that numerous teachers, despite the requirement (Art. 71) to use only textbooks in lessons, tended to dictate their own comments.¹⁶ He also wrote that some teachers did not even observe the timetable, and limited the teaching of those subjects they considered to be less important to just a few hours at the end of the school year. The preparation of pupils in Latin proved to be rather average, which Londonio explained by the fact that the *ginnasi* were also attended by pupils who were not sufficiently qualified, and that there were in general too many subjects in the curriculum.¹⁷ Finally, in 1835, Londonio found that not only were there too many subjects, but their content was also too complex for children aged eleven and twelve. He therefore suggested making Greek an optional course, and abolishing arithmetic and algebra completely (or to make them optional).¹⁸ Another teaching obstacle was the fact that classes contained too many pupils, due to a lack of teachers.

In 1816 the Napoleonic lyceums, which were proud of their highly-qualified lecturers, were placed on an equal footing with the Austrian philosophical courses. The new curriculum for lyceums took effect in 1817.¹⁹ It reversed all of the innovations introduced in the Napoleonic era. Five subjects were abolished completely: general foundations of the fine arts, law, chemistry, botany and agricultural science.²⁰ In 1824 the Imperial Commission on Education in Vienna extended the reform that had been drafted for the philosophical courses to the lyceums of Lombardy-Venetia.²¹ The new study regulations reduced the lyceum education to 2 years and abolished the subject of Greek.

The teachers at the lyceums were civil servants, who were better paid and enjoyed a better reputation than teachers at the *ginnasi*, and were mostly laymen (two-thirds in 1821). They were often able to

¹⁵ POLENGHI: La riforma del *Gymnasium* austriaco, p. 52–53; POLENGHI: From Vienna to Milan, p. 114–115.

¹⁶ POLENGHI: La riforma del *Gymnasium* austriaco, p. 46–47; POLENGHI: From Vienna to Milan; CHERICHETTI: I ginnasi e i licei di Milano, p. 110–112.

¹⁷ Archivio di Stato di Milano [hereafter ASM], Studi, p.m., Kart. 636, Milano, 11 August 1833, Londonio to Gubernium. Londonio had retired two years previously for health reasons, but the government continued to value his opinion and asked his advice on various matters.

¹⁸ ASM, Studi, p.m., Kart. 639, Milan, 25 March 1835, Londonio to Gubernium.

¹⁹ Istruzioni per l'attuazione degli studi nei Regi licei, 15 October 1817, ASM, Studi, p.m., Kart. 667.

²⁰ See PAGANO: Ginnasi e Licei (Lombardia e Veneto, 1802–1848), p. 269–302.

²¹ Nuovo piano di studi filosofici per il Regno Lombardo-Veneto, in: Raccolta degli atti del Governo e delle disposizioni generali emanate dalle diverse autorità in oggetto sia amministrativi che giudiziari divise in due parti, Vienna 1824, vol. 2, II, p. 336–354; Maria Clara EMANUELE: L'evoluzione degli studi secondari superiori a Pavia dalle riforme teresiane all'Unità d'Italia, in: Annali di storia pavese (1981), p. 6–7, p. 23–37.

occupy a university chair at a later stage.²² There was therefore a clear difference between *ginnasi* teachers and lyceum teachers in terms of education, competence and social position.

In the years 1815–1816 there were 20 public *ginnasi* in Lombardy, ten in Venetia, including imperial (*ginnasi imperiali*) and communal (*ginnasi comunali*) schools. In Lombardy 112 teachers taught a total of 3,903 pupils, in Venetia 70 teachers taught 2,043 pupils.²³ The share of pupils in relation to the overall population was 0.11 %.²⁴ In Venetia the lyceums of the cities of Venice, Verona, Vicenza and Udine remained in existence, while those in Padua, Belluno and Treviso were dissolved, since the pupils could also continue their philosophical education at the University of Padua. There were lyceums in the Lombardy cities of Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Cremona, Mantua, and two in Milan. In summary, there were 795 pupils in lyceums in Lombardy-Venetia.²⁵

Table 1: Lyceums and *Gymnasien* in the individual imperial territories (1817)²⁶

Land	Lyceum	<i>Gymnasium</i>	Inhabitants per <i>Gymnasium</i>
Austria below the Enns	-	8	130,000
Austria above the Enns	1	2	307,000
Salzburg	1	1	150,000
Styria	1	5	153,000
Carinthia	1	2	135,000
Carniola	1	2	188,000
Austrian Littoral	-	2	173,000
Tyrol and Vorarlberg	1	8	90,000
Bohemia	-	24	130,000
Moravia	1	9	154,000
Silesia	-	4	87,000
Galicia	1	8	475,000
Bukovina	-	1	201,000
Dalmatia	-	3	102,000
Lombardy	7	20	81,174
Venetia	4	10	136,000

²² PAGANO: I professori di liceo nel primo Ottocento, p. 125–190.

²³ PAGANO: Ginnasi e Licei (Lombardia e Veneto, 1802–1848), p. 286.

²⁴ The share of school pupils attending *ginnasi* in Lombardy-Venetia is calculated on the basis of a population figure of 5,024,117. Adolf FICKER: Die Österreichische Monarchie in ihren wichtigsten Momenten statistisch dargestellt, Gotha 1860, p. 6.

²⁵ PAGANO: Ginnasi e Licei (Lombardia e Veneto, 1802–1848), p. 300.

²⁶ Adolf FICKER: Geschichte, Organisation und Statistik des österreichischen Unterrichtswesens, mit statistischen Tabellen von Gustav Schimmer, Wien 1873, p. 130. The population figures for Lombardy-Venetia can be found in Mario ROMANI: Un secolo di vita economica lombarda. 1748–1848, Milano 1950, p. 44

Seen absolutely, therefore, Lombardy had the largest number of lyceums in the entire empire in 1817, and took second place behind Bohemia with regard to *ginnasi* (Table 1). In the years 1824–1825 the 20 *ginnasi* in Lombardy were attended by 4,345 pupils (0.19 %). In the seven lyceums, 633 pupils (0.02 %) ²⁷ were taught. In the same year, the state and communal *ginnasi* in Venetia educated 1,532 pupils, a number that rises to 5,195 if we include the pupils at private *ginnasi*. There were 896 pupils in the lyceums of Venetia. ²⁸

In 1825 Lombardy, with 30, was the land with the most *ginnasi* (including twelve state *ginnasi*, eight communal, six diocesan institutes and four private *ginnasi*), in Bohemia there were 25, in Venetia 20. ²⁹ However there was a great imbalance between Venetia and Lombardy in terms of the ecclesiastical, state and communal institutes: While the episcopal *ginnasi* educated 50.64 % of the entire pupils in Venetia (1,024), only 13.89 % were educated in the episcopal *ginnasi* of Lombardy in 1830. ³⁰

Between 1825 and 1835 the number of *ginnasio* enrolments declined slightly, which was due in particular to the restrictive measures of the government. This aimed to limit the number of pupils attending *ginnasi*, indeed to reduce it, since it considered an excessive growth in pupils from the lower and middle social classes to be politically dangerous. ³¹

Although the decrees of the Vienna authorities demanded greater strictness from teachers, the number of pupils also grew in subsequent years, since the people's desire for education could not be suppressed. In 1839 there were already 8,306 pupils attending a *ginnasio* in Lombardy, including private schools; by 1848 this figure had grown to 9,000 pupils. ³² The complaints from Vienna about excessive pupil numbers at the Lombardy *ginnasi* did not cease. However if we consider the pupil number in relation to the population it can be seen that the number of *ginnasi* and lyceums was balanced.

The Kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia also had a large number of pupils in primary school. This was especially true of Lombardy, where the share of pupils in public and private primary schools in 1855 had risen to 74 % of male and 69 % of female children, in relation to the overall population. The

²⁷ The percentage of pupils in Lombardy was calculated on the basis of a population figure of 2,260,096. See ROMANI: *Un secolo di vita economica lombarda*, p. 44.

²⁸ Antonio QUADRI: *Atlante di LXXXII tavole sinottiche relative al prospetto statistico delle province venete*, Venezia 1827, p. 153.

²⁹ GIGLIO: *I ginnasi e i licei lombardi*, p. 186.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 290.

³¹ ASM, *Studi*, p.m., Kart. 641.

³² Cf. GIGLIO: *I ginnasi e i licei lombardi*, p. 18; POLENGHI: *From Vienna to Milan*, p. 117–118; FICKER: *Geschichte, Organisation und Statistik*, p. 138. The percentage of pupils attending a *ginnasio* in relation to the overall population in 1845 reached 0.58 % in Lombardy and 0.48 % in Venetia. This meant that the education quota at the *ginnasi* of Lombardy-Venetia were higher than those in Austria below the Enns (0.35 %) and Austria above the Enns (0.21 %); MAZOHL-WALLNIG: *Die Österreichische Unterrichtsreform*, p. 111. The cities with the largest population were Venice and Milan, but Padua and Verona also belonged to the larger cities of the empire. *Rivista ginnasiale* (1855), 6, p. 844.

literacy rate among adults in 1861 was 45 % of the male and 36 % of the female population.³³ This placed Lombardy ahead of the other states in Italy prior to Unification, and ahead of the other lands of the Habsburg Empire.

The implementation of the Thunian reforms

During the course of the Revolution of 1848/49, the reform of the secondary schools and universities, which had been drafted by Franz Exner, professor of philosophy at the University of Prague, as early as 1844, was set in motion, thus also taking account of the profile of the Prussian educational system. Furthermore, on 23 March 1848 a ministry of education was established for the first time. The key change with regard to secondary schools was the extension of the *ginnasi* by two years. Thus the propaedeutic function of the philosophical faculty was transferred to the seventh and eighth grades of the reformed *ginnasi*. This placed the philosophical faculties on an equal footing with the previously higher faculties (law, medicine and theology). During the unsettled revolutionary period and the rapid succession of education ministers, the reform begun by Franz Exner and Hermann Bonitz, who had been called from Prussia, was continued.

Therefore by the time Leo Thun-Hohenstein was appointed Minister of Religious Affairs and Education in July 1848, the reforms had mostly been worked out. The emperor approved the reform in September of the same year. Together with his close advisor Exner, it was now down to Thun to implement the reform. As well as the aforementioned extension of the *ginnasi* by two years, the most important change with regard to these schools was the reduction in Latin and philosophy lessons. In return, Greek and natural science-mathematical subjects were strengthened. This should create a balanced relationship between lessons in the classical languages and other subjects, as Johann Friedrich Herbart had demanded. The introduction of subject teachers to replace the previous form teachers was also a key development. This in turn required improved teacher training.

The Bolza-Ambrosoli Commission

After the tumultuous year of 1848, Thun's reforms in Lombardy-Venetia occurred in a difficult situation. While most of the peasants had not been involved in the revolution of the "signori" (gentlemen), the middle and upper classes, as well as the intellectuals, played an active part in the freedom movement and war of liberation. The lecturers and students of both universities of the

³³ TOSCANI: La politica scolastica nel Regno lombardo-veneto, p. 336. Luciano PAZZAGLIA, Roberto SANI (ed.): Scuola e società nell'Italia unita, Brescia 2001, p. 551.

kingdom played a prominent role. This is particularly clear in the case of the University of Pavia.³⁴ Secondary school pupils also participated actively in the revolution.³⁵

There was also a harsh reaction to the men who agitated politically after 1849: they were arrested and condemned to hard labour or death. One fate of note is that of Amatore Sciesa, craftsman and freedom fighter, who was executed in Milan for hanging up republican posters; also Luigi Dottesio from Como, who was hanged in Venice in 1851 for smuggling revolutionary books, or the fate of the so-called martyrs of Belfiore in Mantova (hanged between December 1852 and March 1853); they included Tito Speri, a follower of Giuseppe Mazzini, and protagonist of the so-called ten days of Brescia (23 March – 1 April 1849), and Don Enrico Tazzoli. The drastic measures taken by the authorities thus contributed to firing anti-Austrian sentiment, instead of deescalating it.

Precisely this climate of mutual suspicion and resentment towards the Italians played a decisive role in the implementation of the reforms and their assessment and understanding. In 1852 Minister Thun wrote to Michele Strassoldo-Grafenberg, brother-in-law of Radetzky and governor of Lombardy:

So sehr die Italiener in stolzer Erinnerung an frühere glänzende Perioden ihrer Geschichte mit Mißgunst und Eitelkeit auf die Deutschen herabsehen, so ist doch die demütigende Einsicht, dass sie in wissenschaftlicher Beziehung hinter den anderen Völkern Europas zurückstehen, unter den Gebildeten ziemlich verbreitet [...] der anerkannt unbefriedigende Zustand der Lehranstalten ist [...] ein Gegenstand begründeten und das Nationalgefühl verletzenden Missvergnügens.³⁶

Thun added that the higher institutions of education “lacked scientific spirit” and that “all kinds of political activities and disorder” had become embedded in them.³⁷

The harsh judgement is interesting because it makes clear the perception of the Viennese authorities and, when examined closely, turns out to be selective: On the one hand, the educational system of the kingdom was not in such a critical condition, and on the other hand – even if it had presented itself so – some of the responsibility for that would have lain with the Imperial Commission on Education in Vienna, and not solely with the Italians.³⁸

³⁴ Cf. also the contribution by FERRARESI in this volume.

³⁵ For further references on the subject, see not least the bibliography in Simonetta POLENGHI: *Studenti e politica nell'Università di Pavia durante il Risorgimento (1814–1860)*, in: *Storia in Lombardia* (2001), 3, p. 5–38.

³⁶ “No matter how much the Italians look down on the Germans with envy and vanity in the proud memory of the former brilliant periods of their history, the humiliating insight that they are far behind the other peoples of Europe in terms of science is quite widespread among the educated [...] the recognised dissatisfactory condition of the schools is [...] a subject of justified displeasure, which injures national feeling.” Cited in MAZOHL-WALLNIG: *Die Österreichische Unterrichtsreform*, p. 196–197.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ A report sent by the teacher Franz Petter to Thun in 1850 also testifies to the climate of deep mistrust that prevailed after 1848: Petter accused the Italian teachers and pupils there of a lack of decency, discipline, diligence and morality. Petter considered the “betrayal in Milan and Venice” in 1848 and the supposed hatred against Austria to be proof of the evil character of the Italians. Petter also wrote that the Italian pupils did not even understand Latin, even though it had considerable similarities to their own native language. The reason for this was their laziness and the climatic conditions of the country. He saw other causes of the poor educational standard in the consumption of wine by adolescents and the strongly spiced meals, which permanently stimulated their sex drive. Petter is equally harsh on the teachers when he writes that they cheated in public tenders and failed to maintain discipline in the classroom:

The Ministry for Religious Affairs and Education in Vienna was also particularly worried about the large number of classical secondary school pupils and graduates, who would overcrowd the lecture theatres of the Universities of Pavia and Padua. The fear of an excess of academics was based on the fact that anti-Austrian sentiment was particularly strong precisely among those academics who did not find employment after their studies, and their agreement with the ideas of the Risorgimento was high.³⁹ This fear was nothing new, and had been expressed in previous decades: The government had demanded greater strictness from lecturers several times, in order to limit the number of graduates, most of whom came from families of the lower middle class. It should be noted in this case, however, that the number of pupils attending *ginnasi* would have been reduced if the technical schools, which had been demanded by various people in Lombardy-Venetia, had been established in the 1820s and 1830s.

After the Kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia was initially excluded for political reasons from the reform endeavours in the educational system, the reform was tackled there from 1850. To this end, the ministerial councillor Franz Exner put together a commission of education experts in 1850, to advise on the reforms. It was led by Francesco Ambrosoli, professor of classical philology at the University of Pavia, and author of a notable handbook of Italian literature (1831)⁴⁰ and various textbooks and translations.⁴¹ Ambrosoli had clear ideas for the reform of the schools and universities⁴² and was also highly valued by Thun.⁴³

Our knowledge about the work of the commission derives particularly from the reports by Franz Exner. Above all we learn that the Italians resisted one key part of the reform, namely the new role allocated to the philosophical faculty, and the associated downgrading of the lyceums, which would no longer be independent, but rather attached to the *ginnasi*. In contrast, the commission members welcomed the introduction of the new school subject “Italian literature” with great enthusiasm. However the first meetings of the education experts in Vienna ended in spring 1850, without the commission having achieved any concrete results.⁴⁴

The draft on the organisation of the *Gymnasium* and technical schools in Austria, which was presented to the emperor for approval in September 1849, was printed in Italian in 1850. The translation had been obtained by Giovanni Battista Bolza, lecturer at the lyceum in Como and since 1848 cabinet

“Italy is the land of betrayal, malice, deceit”. Franz Petter to Leo Thun, Spalato [Split], 14 April 1850, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D45.

³⁹ Marco MERIGGI: *Amministrazione e classi sociali nel Lombardo-Veneto (1814–1848)*, Bologna 1983, p. 317–323.

⁴⁰ Francesco AMBROSOLI: *Manuale della Letteratura Italiana*, Milano 1831.

⁴¹ Valentina CHIERICHETTI: F. Ambrosoli, in: DBE, vol. 1, p. 42–43.

⁴² Pietro ZAMBELLI (ed.): *Scritti letterari editi ed inediti di Francesco Ambrosoli*, Firenze 1871.

⁴³ Achille MAURI: *Studi biografici*, Firenze, 1878, vol. II, p. 108.

⁴⁴ MAZOHL-WALLNIG: *Die Österreichische Unterrichtsreform*, p. 112–114.

archivist in the Ministry for Religious Affairs and Education.⁴⁵ Thun also appointed Bolza chairman of an advisory commission of Italian education experts, who were to discuss this reform plan. A letter to Bolza of 18 December 1850 shows how Thun envisaged this discussion. In it Thun stresses that there was a need to present the reform as “the result of the advice and intelligence of both countries”, and that the meetings should be made accessible to the public.⁴⁶ However in his instructions, Thun warned Bolza: Everyone may express his opinion, but a resolution on the issue is not desired.⁴⁷ The commission members were nominated by Vienna and not by the universities or the *Imperial Regi Istituti di Arte e Filologia* of Milan or Venice (Institute of Philology and Art), as had been requested on the Italian side, and which caused a rift from the very outset.⁴⁸

Of the 16 who were initially proposed, only six were actually accepted by the ministry.⁴⁹ Thun also named the bishops of Venice and Brescia as members of the commission. Radetzky named the selected members on 12 February 1851, eight from Lombardy and eight from Venetia: Alongside the bishops, respected cultural and educational figures were represented, including the aforementioned Ambrosoli. The commission started its work on 17 February and ended it on 10 April 1851. Bolza chaired the commission, Ambrosoli acted as secretary. The commission did not take any minutes, but instead wrote a résumé of 61 pages that summarised the discussions in detail. However the report does not note the names of the commission members whose opinions deviated in various points. The report was then revised and published with ministerial approval, which corresponded with Thun’s aforementioned desire to present the work of the commission as the joint effort of Austrians and Italians. The official author was Francesco Ambrosoli.⁵⁰

There was agreement within the commission that a general school reform was needed: The members of the commission felt it was necessary to improve the *ginnasi* and open technical schools. The latter should be done with the aim of sparing the youth “the hard necessity of learning Latin for many years”, without at the same time losing contact with “all culture”.⁵¹ The principle approval allowed Bolza to hope and assume that the Italians would look positively on Thun’s reforms.

However, when the commission commenced detailed discussions, differences arose. Two unnamed members of the commission found that teaching time in the lower *ginnasio* should be shortened in

⁴⁵ Progetto di un piano d’organizzazione dei ginnasi e delle scuole tecniche nell’Impero austriaco. Dal Ministero del culto e della Pubblica Istruzione, Vienna 1850.

⁴⁶ ASM, CA, Kart. 291. Thun to Bolza, Vienna 18 December 1850.

⁴⁷ Ibid, Thun to Bolza, Vienna 3 December 1850.

⁴⁸ See the correspondence in ASM, CA, 291.

⁴⁹ Ibid, Governor to Minister Thun, Vienna 1850. The poet Aleardo Alardi, for example, was considered, but ultimately he was rejected because of his participation in the national uprisings of 1848. Not a few declined the nomination: Five of those chosen declined the nomination for reasons of health or other activities.

⁵⁰ [Francesco AMBROSOLI]: Notizia delle conferenze tenute in Verona dalla commissione per l’ordinamento degli studi [o. O. 1851?].

⁵¹ Ibid, p. 4.

the first four years to 20/22 hours per week (compared to the 24 stipulated by law) and that Greek should be completely abolished in the lower *ginnasio*. They also demanded housing the lower and upper *ginnasi* in two different buildings, arguing that the control of discipline could be better ensured in this manner, and also that the upper *ginnasio* could then retain the name ‘lyceum’, to which the people were accustomed.

Another commission member interjected that the large number of subjects overextended the receptiveness of the pupils and suggested teaching only the ‘humanities’ in *ginnasi*, while leaving the natural sciences to the lyceums. This illustrated clearly his favoured separation of the *ginnasio* and lyceum. He specifically referenced the Napoleonic lyceum and demanded that the number of subjects be expanded first at this school.⁵²

Other commission members agreed with these objections and demanded that Thun’s reform plan give more consideration to the pedagogical principles of the intellectual development of the pupils: In their view, the intensification of the empirical sciences went too far, and the language subjects also did not benefit the development of the pupils. As mentioned, the report does not identify which participants made which contributions to the discussion. Therefore the criticism of the pedagogical principles of the reform cannot be attributed to specific persons. The only proven pedagogue present was Luigi Alessandro Parravicini, at the time director of the technical school in Venice. Previously Parravicini had been the director of a normal *Hauptschule* in Como, and was also author of the schoolbook “Il Giannetto” (1836), which was oriented on the pedagogy of Vincenz Eduard Milde, Johann Pestalozzi and August Hermann Niemeyer.

On Bolza’s advice, it was agreed that mathematics, natural sciences and physics should be taught at lower *ginnasio*, alongside the ‘humanities’, history and geography. This was in view of the fact that the lower *ginnasio* should also provide access to the higher technical schools. However, controversy arose during the course of the discussions as to how the curriculum should be structured. The division of the course into four plus four years seemed to some members of the commission to be inexpedient from a pedagogical perspective, for in such a case, children aged 14 would attend the same school as youths of 18, which would have a negative effect on the discipline of the pupils. As there were also didactic objections to such a structure, a period of education of five years *ginnasio* and three years lyceum was agreed. Alternatively, it was proposed – in the hope of saving the lyceum – to rename

⁵² It is to be assumed that this position was represented by Antonio Odescalchi, professor of philosophy at the Sant’Alessandro lyceum in Milan. In 1853 Odescalchi had noted in a file to Thun that “the replication of subjects, especially in the lower classes” should be avoided, since the “drawing out of every single subject over many years and its division into small portions [kills] intellectual curiosity”. He was also a decided opponent of the form teacher system and sympathised with the lyceum school form. Comments on the new *ginnasio* plan by A. Odescalchi, in excerpts from different memos on the academic system in Italy by Gustav Heider, location unstated [1853], Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D249.

the last two years of upper *ginnasio* to lyceum. This was an attempt to uphold the tradition of the Italian lyceum, which originated in the Napoleonic era.

Moreover, the objection reveals an important aspect with regard to the economic conditions of the *ginnasi*: Where the reform placed the cost burden for the maintenance of the *ginnasi* on the communes, numerous less wealthy communes would have been forced to reduce their previous six-year *ginnasi* to four years. Also, not all communes would have been able to bear the costs of the stipulated workrooms for physics and the natural sciences. This would cause an enormous imbalance between the state *ginnasi* and those of the communes with regard to financial support, and thus a greater difference in the provision opportunities of the schools (as we shall see in the case of the Santa Marta *ginnasio*).

The discussion in the commission stretched over many days, at the end a compromise solution was agreed, and it was suggested to divide secondary education into three sections: a lower *ginnasio* with three form years, an upper *ginnasio*, also with three form years, and a lyceum with two form years. The commission also developed a proposal for the distribution of the subjects. Latin lessons were reduced to one hour in the lower *ginnasio*, to allow a transfer to the technical school. Greek was completely abolished in the *ginnasio* and moved to the last two years of the upper *ginnasio* and the lyceum. The hours thus freed up should be used for Italian, in particular the study of Italian literature.⁵³ Lessons in this subject should also be expanded in the last year of upper *ginnasio*. Some members of the commission even advocated making Greek a voluntary elective subject, since it was an “unprofitable study”.⁵⁴ The proposal to structure the school system into three + three + two years placed the lower *ginnasio* on the same level as a standard middle school. We can assume with certainty that this corresponded with Ambrosoli’s wish, who had explicitly advocated a single middle school in 1854, which he hoped would limit fragmentation in the school system.⁵⁵

Another difference to the Vienna plan was the suggested increase in hours at the lyceum (quite contrary to the *ginnasio*, where the hours were cut). With this measure it was hoped to strengthen philosophy, while Exner’s plan provided only for two hours in this subject (logic and philosophy) per week for the last school year. In contrast, the commission suggested raising the number of hours for philosophy in the lyceum to three in the first year (theoretical philosophy) and four in the second school year (morals and principles of public and private law). They also suggested increasing the hours for mathematics and the natural sciences. Here the commission oriented itself on the provisions from 1818.

⁵³ [Francesco AMBROSOLI]: Notizia delle conferenze tenute in Verona, p. 28–32.

⁵⁴ Ibid, p. 55.

⁵⁵ Francesco AMBROSOLI: Sulle scuole e sul bisogno di nuovi libri, in: Pietro ZAMBELLI (ed.): Scritti letterari editi ed inediti di Francesco Ambrosoli, p. 23–25.

All members of the commission agreed with the structural proposal (three + three + two), with the exception of one participant. This unnamed member explained his rejection with the desire for more hours of Latin. Lessons in Latin, which were previously given across six years of *ginnasio* with an average of 9.5 hours per week and two further years at the lyceum (in total an average of 7.5 hours per week), was reduced in Thun's reform plan to 5.8 hours per week, and once again by the commission to 5.1 hours. Conversely, the commission's proposal upgraded the subject of Italian, and Greek was clearly diminished, in order to provide room in the last two years for the natural sciences and for philosophy, which also included the legal sciences. By these means, Napoleon's model was restored in part. For Greek had been abolished both in the Napoleonic *ginnasio* and in the Napoleonic lyceum, while law was introduced as a subject to the lyceum (the new Code Napoléon), and the natural sciences and Italian had been expanded.

The commission clearly had great distrust of the liberal position of Thun's plan that families could also transfer the education of their children to persons without a pedagogical and specialist education, which triggered the fear that parents might entrust their children to unqualified persons. The *Politische Schulverfassung* of 1805, which took effect in Lombardy-Venetia in 1818, stipulated a state examination and an examination in pedagogy at the university for all tutors and private teachers: The abolition of this rule therefore caused the commission to fear that there would now be numerous tutors without suitable qualifications.

With regard to the necessity of preparing teachers adequately, the commission recommended to the minister to open Istituti Normali (normal institutes) in the two university towns of Pavia and Padua, whose task would be to train future *ginnasio* teachers. The students would attend university courses that corresponded with the subjects they would later teach. Experienced *ginnasio* and lyceum teachers would lecture at the *Istituti normali*. In addition, the director of the institute should teach pedagogics and didactics. At the end of the three-year course, and after a concluding written and oral examination in all subjects, the students would be approved to teach. They should also start working as substitute teachers already during the third year of their studies, in order to gain practical experience. It was suggested using part of the tuition fees for the *ginnasi* and lyceums from the provinces as one way of financing the institute.

This suggestion by the commission is of great interest, especially as the similarity to the present three-year course of study cannot be ignored. At the time this meant recognising the validity of the norm of the *Politische Schulverfassung* of 1805, which granted the study of pedagogics and didactics an

important position not only in the training of teachers, but also of lecturers at *ginnasi*; a regulation that got lost in the Thunian reform, which would prove to be disadvantageous to teacher training.⁵⁶

In all, the summary of the consultations presented by Ambrosoli show clearly that the Italians did not merely accept the reform passively, but instead discussed it in detail and suggested significant additions and amendments which, regrettably, were not considered in Vienna.

On 17 September 1851 the state *ginnasi* of the Kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia were united with the lyceums; those of the communes and dioceses were allowed to remain in their previous form.

Ministerial Councillor Franz Exner came to Italy in winter 1851 and spring 1852, on the one hand to recover from illness, and on the other hand to personally monitor the introduction of the reform. In his report he particularly emphasised the alienation of the Italian population from the Vienna government: “In recent years the dislike has risen to fanatical hatred; the distrust of the government is unbelievable”.⁵⁷ With regard to the educational system he demanded that the teachers be better paid and the substitute teachers controlled by means of a special test. Furthermore, and in order to convince the Italians of the value of the reform, it was necessary to send state-appointed inspectors to the individual schools and to establish contact with the local teachers.⁵⁸

On 1 October 1852 Thun appointed Francesco Ambrosoli as general director of the *ginnasi* of Lombardy (until then he had held the position provisionally) and Baldassarre Poli⁵⁹ for Venetia. Both had previously been members of the Vienna Commission and that of Verona, and supported Exner in his tasks. In his new position, Ambrosoli especially underlined the necessity for new schoolbooks, in order to convince those families who were critical of the reform and the upgrading of Greek – it was no coincidence that the Verona Commission had suggested reducing the number of hours in Greek. Both directors and Exner were very keen to convince the teachers of the value of the reform, since the teachers at the former lyceums, in particular, felt that their public and social position had been degraded, now that they were teachers at a *ginnasio*.⁶⁰ But Exner died on 22 June 1853. Two months later, Ambrosoli was dismissed. Somebody had denounced Ambrosoli to the emperor and reported the Risorgimento-friendly writings that he had published during the period of revolution. The emperor decided to release Ambrosoli from his professorial chair and from his position as general director of the *ginnasi* in Lombardy and ordered him to Vienna, although the professor was even defended by

⁵⁶ Wolfgang BREZINKA: Pädagogik in Österreich. Die Geschichte des Fachs an den Universitäten vom 18. Jahrhundert bis zum Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts, vol. 1, Wien 2000, p. 65–66.

⁵⁷ Cited in MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Die Österreichische Unterrichtsreform, p. 124.

⁵⁸ MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Die Österreichische Unterrichtsreform, p. 125.

⁵⁹ Valentina CHIERICHETTI: B. Poli, in: DBE, vol. 2, p. 361.

⁶⁰ MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Die Österreichische Unterrichtsreform, p. 135–136. Luigi Gaitier, lecturer in Italian literature in Verona, wrote on 6 November 1851 to Abbot Jacopo Pirona, director of the Udine lyceum and in close contact with Bolza: “The mass murder of our lyceums is a fact”, DI BRAZZÀ, GRIGGIO: Appunti su Giovanni Battista Bolza, p. 147.

Radetzky. Thun, who did not support this decision by the emperor and who valued the work of Ambrosoli, offered him a job editing a Greek-Italian dictionary.⁶¹

Ultimately, however, the emperor's decision, and the disregard of the suggestions of the commission, had disastrous consequences: The reform was seen as being imposed from above. It can be speculated with good reason that the reform would have been successful, and the *ginnasio* system would have been renewed satisfactorily in a manner compatible with the local circumstances, if the suggestions of the commission, which for the most part respected the Thunian reform and which merely proposed minor changes, had been accepted.

Pupils and teachers

Despite a slight decline, Lombardy-Venetia remained the crown land with the highest number of pupils also after the Thunian reform. In 1852 the number of *ginnasi liceali* in Lombardy (43) was twice as high as those in Bohemia (21) and even three times higher if one counts the *ginnasi liceali* in Lombardy together with those of Venetia (21). The number of pupils who visited a *ginnasio liceale* in 1852 was especially high: 9,450 in Lombardy and 6,625 in Venetia. The secularisation of the teaching staff had advanced to a similar degree as in numerous other regions of the empire: 246 of the teachers there belonged to the clergy (55.1 %) and 220 were laymen; in Veneto, in contrast, there were 195 clergy (80.2 %) and only 48 lay teachers.⁶²

If we look at the two universities of the kingdom we can see that the Universities of Pavia and Padua had the highest numbers of students, except for those in Vienna. In 1851, for example, there were 1,619 students at the University of Pavia and 1,574 at the University of Padua, while no other university in the empire, except for Prague, had more than 700 enrolled students.⁶³

Quite in contrast to the developments in the German-Slavic provinces and in Hungary, the Thunian reform did not reduce the number of private pupils in Lombardy-Venetia. In Lombardy, a quarter of all pupils received private tuition, in Venetia the proportion of private pupils was one-third of all pupils in public schools.⁶⁴ In the ministry's view, these figures were too high.

⁶¹ MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Die Österreichische Unterrichtsreform, p. 136–137.

⁶² The share of teaching clergy was e.g. 20.5 % in Silesia, 22.3 % in Galicia, 36 % in Styria, 46.6 % in Carinthia, 48.2 % in Carniola, 52.9 % in Salzburg, 59.7 % in Budapest, 61.5 % in Austria below the Enns, 62.7 % in Hungary, 67.6 % in Austria above the Enns, 76 % in Bohemia. *Prospetto statistico dei ginnasi liceali austriaci alla fine dell'anno scolastico 1852–1853*, in: *Rivista ginnasiale* (1854), p. 40.

⁶³ In 1851 there were 2,416 students at the University of Vienna and 1,390 at the University of Prague. The other universities had the following figures for enrolled students: 699 (Lviv), 457 (Graz), 419 (Pest), 312 (Olomouc), 240 (Krakow), 218 (Innsbruck). See *Statistica Universitaria dell'Impero austriaco*, in: *Annali universali di statistica, economia pubblica, legislazione, storia, viaggi e commercio* (1855) Series 3, vol. 8, Issue 22, p. 99.

⁶⁴ *Rivista ginnasiale*, 1854, 1, p. 114.

In 1855 the number of pupils at the Lombardy *ginnasi liceali* continued to be high (8,381)⁶⁵; a decline in enrolments can only be seen the following year. In 1856, 6,006 pupils (0.20 %)⁶⁶ were enrolled in *ginnasi liceali* in Lombardy⁶⁷, while the enrolments declined further to 5,761 in 1858. Although the new *ginnasio* plan stipulated that each class should have no more than 50 (in the large cities, 80) pupils, this number was “exceeded once in Hungary and twice in Lombardy”.⁶⁸

The high numbers of pupils in individual classes had an inevitable impact on the attainment of learning objectives. In Lombardy the learning progress of the pupils in general was only average. The Ministry for Religious Affairs and Education commented on the results of the Matura examinations of 1854 with the verdict that the educational level was still “far from the goal that was actually targeted”.⁶⁹ The pupils had great difficulties above all with the classical languages.

Table 2: Results of the Matura examinations in Lombardy⁷⁰

Results of the Matura examinations in Lombardy				
Year	1852	1853	1855	1856
Candidates	383 (100 %)	408 (100 %)	338 (100 %)	349 (100 %)
Passed	295 (77.1 %)	254 (77.4 %)	249 (73.7 %)	277 (79.4 %).
Failed	88 (22.9 %)	83 (22.6 %)	89 (26.3 %)	72 (20.6 %)

The Ministry particularly lamented the fact that inconsistent teaching methods were applied in different classes within one subject, and that pupils’ knowledge of Greek was generally weak. In addition, the commission members and the directors of Lombardy *ginnasio* were inculcated to fail those pupils who were unprepared even in only one subject.

This warning was successful, which can be seen by the fact that the number of pupils who failed the exam rose to 26.3 % in 1855, whereas the percentage in previous years had been much lower. Of 349 pupils, 277 passed the concluding examinations in 1856, representing 79.4 % (Table 2).

It is also remarkable to observe the political attitudes of the teachers. As mentioned above, some teachers in 1848–49 made no secret of their agreement with liberal and patriotic ideas. Nevertheless,

⁶⁵ There were 6,831 pupils in Venetia. In Lombardy-Venetia 15,212 pupils were educated in lyceum-*ginnasi*. Ibid (1855), 1, p. 145 and p. 300.

⁶⁶ The percentage of *ginnasio* pupils in Lombardy was calculated on the basis of a population figure of 2,880,723 inhabitants. Stefano JACINI: *La proprietà fondiaria e le popolazioni agricole in Lombardia*, Milano, Verona 1857, p. 42.

⁶⁷ This is how secondary schools were referred to after the Thunian reforms, where *ginnasi* were merged with the former lyceums.

⁶⁸ *Rivista ginnasiale* (1854) 1, p. 114.

⁶⁹ Ibid (1856), 5, p. 49. Circular by the general director of the lyceum-*ginnasi* of Lombardy, 6 August 1856.

⁷⁰ Ibid (1855), 2, p. 299; ibid (1856), 6, p. 939.

no purge was conducted by the Ministry for Religious Affairs and Education, although there certainly were denunciations and suspensions. But for years the teachers were observed by police, and most of those who were under suspicion were ultimately exonerated, since they had either subsequently behaved correctly, or because the accusations proved to be false. This finding eventually led Radetzky to order in 1850 that all accusations against a suspect should be checked with the greatest care, including an obligatory hearing, before sanctions were levelled.⁷¹ Yet there is reason to doubt that all teachers were in fact loyal to the emperor. The investigations against eleven teachers in Lombardy, which lasted many years, are instructive: At the end of the investigations, the police exonerated five of the suspects in 1855, including Paolo Gorini, freemason, teacher of the natural sciences at the *ginnasio liceale* of Lodi, and later famous for his method of mummifying corpses. Gorini had emigrated to Switzerland in 1848, and returned without anything of his patriotic attitude having changed, as can be seen from his relationship with Cattaneo, Mazzini, Garibaldi and other democrats. The other six teachers were pardoned, as their conduct since 1848 had been exemplary.⁷²

Case study: Milan

In the first years of the Napoleonic restoration, the capital of Austrian Lombardy boasted schools with old roots: These included the *ginnasio* of Brera, the *ginnasio* of S. Alessandro, successor institutions of the Jesuits' and Barnabites' *ginnasi*, and the lyceums of S. Alessandro and Porta Nuova, both founded in the Napoleonic era.⁷³ The *ginnasio* of Brera was located in the Palazzo Brera, thus beside the Academy of Fine Arts, the observatory, and a well-stocked library. It had a physics cabinet, a chemistry laboratory, and a workroom for numismatics, and was one of the city's most influential cultural centres. The *ginnasio* and lyceum of Sant' Alessandro was also furnished with a drawing workshop, rooms for ornamentation and architecture, a physics laboratory, and a library. There was also a cabinet for natural history, a botanic garden, and an observatory.

The Milan schools were heavily frequented, so that especially in the first years of the restoration the school buildings could barely hold all of the pupils enrolled. In 1820 there were 2,608 pupils in public or private *ginnasi* in Milan, of an overall population of 137,686 inhabitants.⁷⁴ 1.89 % of the Milan population thus received a *ginnasio* education.⁷⁵ Within the next ten years the number declined to

⁷¹ The documentation of the individual cases can be found in ASM, CA, Kart. 288.

⁷² Ibid, Milan 23 April 1855. See Alberto CARLI: „Non gridava, ammoniva dolcemente“. Il magistero di Paolo Gorini presso il liceo comunale e la formazione del ceto dirigente lodigiano, in: Archivio Storico Lodigiano (2011), 45–89.

⁷³ For the full reconstruction, see CHIERICHETTI: I ginnasi e i licei di Milano. All of the data used here up to 1850 come from this work.

⁷⁴ There were 1,510 pupils in public, 834 in private *ginnasi*, and 264 pupils in lyceums. CHIERICHETTI: I ginnasi e i licei di Milano, p. 255.

⁷⁵ Giuseppe FERRARIO: Statistica medica di Milano dal secolo XV fino ai nostri giorni, Milano 1840, vol. 2, p. 259.

2,000 pupils, which represents 1.52 % of the population of the city.⁷⁶ The smaller pupil numbers in the Lombardy capital resulted above all from the attempt by the Austrian government to limit the influx to the University of Pavia. In 1832, 14.62 % (19,165) of the population attended elementary school (total population of the city: 131,059), while the percentage of *ginnasio* pupils in relation to the overall population was 1.53 % (1,579).⁷⁷ Almost a decade later (1840), the proportion had sunk again, and now the share of pupils attending a *ginnasio* in Milan was 1.03 % of the overall population.⁷⁸ By 1849 the percentage once again increased slightly to 1.2 %⁷⁹, despite the fact that the technical school (*scuola tecnica*) had been opened in Milan in the 1840s. The most-attended *ginnasio* in Milan was the Institute of Sant' Alessandro, which had an average of 476 *ginnasio* pupils and 268 lyceum pupils, while the school with the lowest number of enrolments was the *ginnasio* Porta Nuova, with an average of 154 pupils – there were also the pupils of the Longone boarding school (*Collegio Longone*). The municipal *ginnasio* of Santa Marta differed from the state *ginnasi*, in contrast, due to its poor equipment and unsuitable rooms. It was also considered to be less selective. This was due on the one hand to the fact that the teachers in the municipal *ginnasio* were less strict, and on the other hand, the institute took in a large number of pupils who were either repeating the year or who came from a lower social class.⁸⁰

In general, however, the social origin of the pupils varied greatly, especially in the *ginnasi*. Not only upper-class children had access to the *ginnasi*; so too did those of the petit bourgeois. The reasons for this can be found in the productive and entrepreneurial structure of the flourishing economy that prevailed in Milan prior to the unification of Italy. In the decades of the early industrialisation of the city, the middle classes also aspired to upward social mobility, especially since they, too, were responsible for the economic growth of the city.

⁷⁶ CHIERICHETTI: *I ginnasi e i licei di Milano*, p. 255. ASM, *Atti di Governo, Popolazione*, p.m., Kart. 40.

⁷⁷ Giuseppe SACCHI: *Intorno all'attuale stato dell'istruzione elementare in Lombardia in confronto ad altri Stati d'Italia*, Milano 1834, p. 10. In 1832 the University of Pavia accepted 1,300 students. *Annali Universali di Statistica* (1832), p. 320.

⁷⁸ In 1840 the population of Milan was 164,095 inhabitants. FERRARIO: *Statistica medica di Milano*, vol. 2, p. 259. The number of pupils in public *ginnasi* was 1,239, in private *ginnasi* 463, and in lyceums 435. In total there were 2,137 pupils.

⁷⁹ In 1849 172,327 people lived in Milan, of whom 2,112 were pupils of a *ginnasio* or lyceum. Maristella BERGAGLIO (ed.): *Popolazioni che cambiano. Studi di geografia della popolazione*, Milano 2008, p. 81.

⁸⁰ CHIERICHETTI: *I ginnasi e i licei di Milano*, p. 256.

Tables 3 and 4: Social origin of the Milan pupils (1820–1850)⁸¹

<i>ginnasio</i>	The most frequently represented social classes
Brera	Functionaries and civil servants (25.5 %), landowners (18.6 %) Intellectual professions (12 %) Other professions (9.8 %) Craftsmen (9 %), farmers (3 %)
Sant' Alessandro	Merchants and traders (26.4 %) Landowners (14 %) Intellectual professions (12 %) Other professions (8 %) Craftsmen (9 %), farmers (6 %)
Santa Marta	Civil servants and merchants (20 %) Landowners (15 %) Intellectual professions (12 %) Craftsmen (12 %), farmers (6 %)

Lyceum	Social origin
Porta Nuova	Landowners (43.7 %) Functionaries – civil servants (21.8 %) Intellectual professions (14.4 %) Merchants (10.5 %)
Sant' Alessandro	Landowners (36 %) Merchants (17.1 %) Functionaries – civil servants (15.9 %) Intellectual professions (13.3 %)

An analysis shows that the performance of the pupils and also their behaviour in the first classes was average. Most of the negative grades were achieved in the subjects Latin, Greek and mathematics (according to the grades listed in the extant school registers). In contrast, the grades in the lyceum were much better than those in the *ginnasio*. Two key reasons for the poor performance of many pupils and the lack of discipline were without doubt the large differences in age within classes, and the large pupil numbers. The classes were not composed according to age, but rather based on the pupils' knowledge. At both the lyceum and the *ginnasio*, this practice resulted in the fact that children, adolescents and young men sat together in the same class. Although the minimum legal age for

⁸¹ Ibid, p. 204–231. Based on the analysis of the school register of these schools, 13,530 pupils were taken on by public schools, of which 8,606 were accepted by *ginnasi* and 4,924 by the lyceum, and 3,589 by private schools.

admission to a *ginnasio* was nine, the *ginnasi* of Milan accepted children who were even as young as seven and eight.⁸²

Only the school reforms passed under Minister Thun fundamentally changed the system of the classical *ginnasio* in Milan. Within a short space of time, Brera and Sant’Alessandro, which each had generously-sized premises and were financed by the state, managed to adapt to the prescribed conditions. Due to a lack of financial possibilities, the municipal *ginnasio* Santa Marta resisted the new regulations for a long time. This triggered intensive debate in the municipal authorities from 1851 about the fate of the school. Finally, Santa Marta was also named a *ginnasio liceale*. Beforehand, however, it was necessary to extend the school building, and until its completion the pupils of seventh and eighth grade were forced to complete their education at the *ginnasi liceali* of Sant’Alessandro or Porta Nuova.⁸³

Pupil numbers in the *ginnasi liceali* remained very high also in the last years of Austrian rule (Tables 5 and 6).⁸⁴ Sant’Alessandro *ginnasio* had the highest number, with an average of 508 pupils, while Santa Marta had the lowest number of pupils (324), which – as mentioned – was also due to the fact that for many years it had only six classes.

Table 5: Number of pupils at the Milan *ginnasi liceali* (1852–1859)

	1852	1853	1854	1856	1857	1858	1859
S. Alessandro	638	517	501	474	489	491	450
Porta Nuova	462	436	445	419	436	344	367
Santa Marta	313	338	333	323	314	338	309
Collegio Longone (boarding)	108	116	123	129	146	141	139

The number of private pupils in Milan had always been very high. That did not change after the Thunian reform. In the period from 1852 to 1858 there were never fewer than 350 private pupils (Table 6). Pupils who received a private education had to complete a concluding examination at a school with public status, in order to attain an academic title.

⁸² Ibid., p. 232–244.

⁸³ Archivio Storico Civico di Milano, Istruzione, Kart. 54.

⁸⁴ Prospetto statistico dei ginnasi liceali austriaci alla fine dell’anno scolastico 1852–1853. Rivista ginnasiale (1854), p. 26, 27; ibid, (1857), 1; ibid, (1858), 1, p. 149; ibid, (1859), 2. From here only the data in Table 5.

Table 6: Number of private pupils at the Milan *ginnasi liceali* (1852–1858)

Private pupils at Milan <i>ginnasi liceali</i>	1852	1853	1854	1856	1857	1858
S. Alessandro	209	212	252	238	201	194
Porta Nuova	149	221	205	199	198	158

One important development for the *ginnasi liceali* in Milan were the numerous changes within the teaching staff. However, these were not so much connected, as one might suspect, to the political convictions of some teachers (the cases in which teachers opposed the Austrian government were very rare) but were rather due to generational change. The government tried to improve the quality of lessons and therefore employed only new teachers for mathematics, physics, Italian and Greek – in other words, specifically for those subjects in which previous teachers had little knowledge. In the years 1852/53 alone there were eleven new appointments at the *ginnasio liceale* Sant’Alessandro, while eight new teachers started at the Porta Nuova institute. In contrast to the other schools, Santa Marta *ginnasio* only had a small number of new teachers in the first years of the reform.⁸⁵ The teaching staff was expanded only in 1857, with the opening of the seventh grade.

It must also be said that that introduction of subject teachers to Milan was only partially completed, since the form teacher system was generally preferred, especially for younger pupils. It also seemed more politically prudent to employ new teachers only gradually. In some cases the form teacher was even kept, while in other cases a form teacher was replaced by a teacher who continued to teach several subjects (Italian, history, geography, Latin), thus representing a kind of middle way between form and subject teacher. The subject teacher was only firmly introduced for the natural sciences.⁸⁶

After the Unification of Italy

As a result of the Treaty of Zurich of 10 November 1859, the Kingdom of Sardinia annexed Lombardy. Already on 13 November the La Marmora-Rattazzi government passed a new school law, the so-called *legge Casati*, which remained in effect, albeit with minor changes, until 1923. Interestingly, the Minister of Education for whom it was named, Gabrio Casati, came from Lombardy, but held little political weight in the government,⁸⁷ so that the law was heavily influenced by the law and tradition of Piedmont. It was therefore soon criticised for being excessively Piedmontese.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ Guida statistica della provincia di Milano, Milano 1854, p. 353–359.

⁸⁶ A circular by the royal and imperial general director of the *ginnasi* and lyceums in Lombardy of 3 January 1854 emphasised that not too many teachers should teach in the lower classes, so that the “pedagogical target can be reached”. Instead it was pertinent that one single teacher should command several subjects. *Rivista ginnasiale* (1854), 1, p. 88.

⁸⁷ Simonetta POLENGHI: La politica universitaria italiana nell’età della Destra storica (1848–1876), Brescia, 1993, 62–67.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 91–94.

Various critical voices on the introduction of the law can be found in the newspapers of the time. The *Gazzetta di Milano* criticised the new technical schools (25 and 26 November 1859). *La Lombardia*, a newspaper that was positively inclined towards Savoy rule, defended the law (9 November and 2 December 1859), but suggested – like the Verona Commission at the beginning of the decade – abolishing Greek, thus reverting to Napoleonic tradition. *Il Crepuscolo*, by the patriot and writer Carlo Tenca underlined, even while the law was still under preparation (11 September 1859), that the Austrian school system was better than that of Piedmont: Tenca objected above all to the Piedmontese division of the *ginnasi* and lyceums, thus once again reviving a topic that had been discussed controversially at the time of the Thunian reforms, although Tenca now mourned Thun's reforms. The newly-founded newspaper *Perseveranza*, organ of the moderate Lombards, criticised the *legge Casati* for its lack of technical subjects, but appreciated the reintroduction of the lyceums, “famous in the [Napoleonic] Kingdom of Italy” (17 December 1859). Thus it also reflected the key demand of the Verona Commission. In 1860 the famous patriot and scholar Carlo Cattaneo even advocated in *Politecnico* that the technical subjects, which meant a lot to him, must be strengthened.⁸⁹

In 1862 the city opened a third technical school. After the unification of Italy, the number of those enrolled in the three technical schools in Milan and in the technical institute rose rapidly,⁹⁰ while enrolments in the *ginnasi* and lyceums declined. This went so far that in 1866 the number of pupils in the technical school exceeded those in the *ginnasi*. On the one hand, this confirmed the decades-long demand for an expansion of technical education, but on the other hand this trend also nourished the worry about the crisis in classical education. In 1861 the Santa Marta *ginnasio* in Milan closed down, as its problems became ever more obvious: Compared to the other older and more established *ginnasi*, its scientific provision was poor, and the teachers were not very strict, as can be seen from the registers, so that the quality of the school suffered in the long run.

Amato Amati, lecturer, director, school administrator and author of numerous works on school and culture, was very critical of the *legge Casati* in 1870, comparing it with the Thunian reform. Significantly, it should be mentioned that Amati, while studying the humanities in Pavia, participated in the famous “Five Days of Milan” uprising (Cinque giornate di Milano) in 1848 and then fought in the student battalion of Luciano Manara. In 1849 he first fled to Turin and then to France, before he was able to return to Pavia.⁹¹ Particularly from this perspective, the defence of the Thunian reform by

⁸⁹ Il Politecnico (1860), Vol. VIII, Issue XLIII, p. 115–123.

⁹⁰ There was a total of 477 pupils at all three schools. A municipal commission, led by Carlo Tenca, considered it necessary to double this figure (Atti del Municipio di Milano, Milano 1862, p. 209) and that it would be better to introduce a three-year middle school instead of the technical schools. This suggestion was similar to that of the Verona Commission.

⁹¹ Renzo DE FELICE: A. Amati, in: Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani, Roma 1960, Vol. 2, [[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/amato-amati_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/amato-amati_(Dizionario-Biografico))], retrieved 01.09.2016.

Amati is significant and revealing. In his criticism of the *legge Casati*, Amati emphasised the decline in the number of pupils in the *ginnasi*, illustrating this with figures: While the population of Milan grew between 1857 and 1869 by 37,901 inhabitants, and the number of pupils in the primary schools rose by 1,852 and those in the technical schools by 134, the number of pupils in the classical schools sank by 773. That was a decline of 31 %. Measured against the growth in population at the time, the decline was even greater, at 43 %.⁹² Amati also criticised the higher school fees for the *ginnasi*, compared to those under Austrian rule,⁹³ and the fact that the *legge Casati* provided for fewer opportunities to be exempted from these fees.

Amati also complained about a lack of combination between the primary and secondary schools, and equally the lack of coordination between the *ginnasi* and technical schools: Switching from one school form to another was impossible due to the large differences in curriculum, which meant that pupils' educational paths separated at a much too early stage. It should be recalled here that the Verona Commission had already proposed a single middle school. As well criticising the low number of graduates compared to the Austrian era, he finally also criticised the lower standard of graduates.⁹⁴ At a distance of ten years after the end of Austrian rule, the Thunian reform still seemed, indeed much more so than in 1859/60, to be far superior to the Italian-Piedmontese laws on the secondary schools. If we now look back on the discussions described here and consider the subsequent verdict by patriots such as Tenca and Amati and their positive opinion of Thun's reform, we can see that it was ultimately not so much the reform itself, but rather the political situation and the tensions after 1848 that exerted such a strong influence on the assessment of the Habsburg educational policy in Italy. In this respect we can surmise that under less strained political conditions, Thun's reform of the *ginnasi* certainly could have been accepted in Italy. In addition, the timeframe for the implementation of the reform and thus the generation of acceptance was simply too short.

⁹² Amato AMATI: *Del movimento delle scuole elementari classiche e tecniche in Milano e in altre città lombarde*, Milano, Napoli, Palermo 1870, p. 10.

⁹³ At Parini *ginnasio* (Porta Nuova), for example, of the 439 pupils in the period 1856–57, around 133 were exempted from school fees, while in the period 1869–1870, only nine of the 250 pupils were exempted. *Ibid*, p. 31.

⁹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 35.

Aftermath and reception of the reforms

Jan Surman

Leon (sic!) Thun in Polish historiography: On the tradition of the history

Thun, Leon: Austrian Minister for Education in the years 1849–1860 in Schwarzenberg’s cabinet. Exerted great influence on the universities of the entire monarchy, including the Jagiellonian University. Representing the Austrian reason of state, he often took decisions that were opposed to the interests of the Krakow Academy or its professors. His undoubted achievement was the foundation of the first chair for general, physical and comparative geography, which Thun entrusted to his acquaintance, Wincenty Pol. Incidentally, this was done on the advice of Pol, who rejected the chair in the history of Polish literature that had been offered to him by Thun due to a lack of qualifications. The chair in geography was suspended again in 1853 upon the dismissal of Wincenty Pol, who was accused of a lack of loyalty to the partitioning power.

(Janusz Sondel, *Słownik historii i tradycji Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*)

The translated “biogram” of Thun-Hohenstein above comes from the *Dictionary of the History and Traditions of the Jagiellonian University*, which was published in 2012.¹ It would be easy for an historian to criticise this text, yet it is interesting what one can learn from these six sentences. The author of the dictionary chose a very fitting title for his book: tradition, or to phrase it in modern terms, the narration of the past. Indeed the Polonised version of Thun’s forename even has a history, which comes from the time of the Slavicification of names (Thun is called “Lev” in Czech). Equally historical is the outshining of Thun by Wincenty Pol, to whom half of this dictionary entry is devoted.

Therefore I would like to take this dictionary entry as the starting point for a counter-project to the articles on the commemoration of Leo Thun in Austria.² While the memory of the Minister for Religious Affairs and Education was certainly cultivated in Austria, not one single Polish article bore his name in its title, and he was also barely mentioned in the specialist literature. Numerous publications in German have addressed the reforms named after him – but in Poland, his achievements are reduced to the foundation of a chair in geography (accentuating the idea that it was not even his own idea) and the appointment of Pol.

However this should not imply that Polish historians have deliberately sidelined Thun. First, no history has yet been written on the history of the Jagiellonian University from 1848–1918, and apart from smaller detailed studies on the positively (Wincenty Pol, Józef Dietl) and negatively (Antoni Walewski) connoted ‘heroes’, and longer dictionary entries in professorial overviews published on the occasion of anniversaries, only the period of Galician autonomy has been

¹ Janusz SONDEL: *Słownik historii i tradycji Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, Kraków 2012, p. 1329. Translated from the German translation.

² See the article by Franz Leander FILLAFER and Johannes FEICHTINGER in this volume.

examined in detail.³ We are thus confronted with the phenomenon of the neglect of the 1850s by historiography, which by the way applies to almost all universities of the former Habsburg dominion. Second, the period 1848–1860 is usually seen by historians of Galicia through the prism of neo-absolutism and of Germanisation, and is therefore deemed to be a period of foreign rule and suppression which, as “foreign” history, has no place in the prevailing presentation of national history. The lack of interest in that part of the past seen as foreign, although often associated with Eastern Europe, is however a fixed component of every mainstream historical narrative. Thus the narration here exemplified in the case of Thun can certainly be transferred to other contexts, for example to the mode of sites of the past that are divided into remembering and forgetting. For just like *lieux de mémoire*, *lieux d’oubli* also have much to say about cultural contexts:⁴ In the mode of comparative history, not only is the memory context of the compared cultures placed in the foreground, but also the interpretative freedom of the “lieux” themselves. Particularly in imperial and post-imperial contexts, the question as to why *shared history* does not necessarily include *shared memory*, takes on greater significance.

And yet in this case I regard the forgetting – in contrast to the active functions of memory and repression – rather as something passive, or the lack of memory. This does not mean that I wish to stylise Thun as someone who is ‘unjustly forgotten’, for we are dealing here instead with a different form and intensity of memory in Austria and in Poland, which therefore makes forgetting only one comparative figure to memory. That does not exclude active processes of forgetting – in this case, for example, it means the concentration on appearances that emphasise the narrative of historical materialism, or on anti-German instructions after the Second World War.

In order to process the transformations and continuities of Thun’s image in the historiography, I start with the description and assessment of his person by his contemporaries and in the literature of the 19th century. Although the minister is the primary object of interest, statements will be presented in this essay not only on the reform that bears his name, but also on neo-absolutist university policies. It should also be said in advance that an ever greater generalisation has occurred with the growing chronological distance to Thun’s period in office, which also influenced the evaluation of his person. While the early commemoration is still

³ On the term, see Harald BINDER: „Galizische Autonomie“. Ein streitbarer Begriff und seine Karriere, in: Lukáš FASORA (ed.): *Moravské vyrovnání z roku 1905: možnosti a limity národnostního smíru ve střední Evropě*, Brno 2006, p. 239–266; in the history of the universities the starting point of the autonomy is defined differently, but always begins after 1860.

⁴ Véronique PORRA, Danielle DUMONTET, Thorsten SCHÜLLER, Timo OBERGÖKER (ed.): *Les «lieux d’oubli» de la Francophonie*, Hildesheim 2015; and Matthew GRAVES, Valérie AUDA-ANDRE: *Histoires de l’oubli dans les mondes anglophones et francophones, XXe–XXIe siècles*, in: *E-rea 10* (2012), No. 1 [<http://erea.revues.org/2952>], retrieved 01.09.2016.

characterised by personal memory, there are different narrative patterns after 1945, which will be shown here using research literature and popular overviews. Although the essay considers the latest literature since 1989 only to a limited degree, it is nevertheless clear that the narrations of the Soviet period certainly serve as blueprints for contemporary contextualisation of Thun-Hohenstein.

In the second part, two groups of people are discussed whose work has been associated in the literature with Thun's period in office and who, depending on the historical preference, supplement or even outshine his own biography – as in the opening quote. I then return to the question regarding the benefit of comparative history of remembering and forgetting to historians' findings.

Thun in Galicia: between memory and history

The evaluation of Thun in the Polish media of the early second half of the 19th century, in other words the exact period of Thun's time in office, is difficult to describe due to the censorship that was reintroduced during neo-absolutism. Direct criticism of the ministry was barely to be found, at least in the print media – which however might also mean that his activities proved satisfactory to reporters. At any rate, the university reforms were discussed and commented on at length. In a series of articles from 1851, for example, journalists reached a positive verdict, but complained about the allocation of professorial chairs and the sometimes regrettable appointment policy of the minister.⁵ The conservative, loyalist Krakow newspaper *Czas*, which was close to the government, made similarly apologetic noises about the switch in language of instruction from Polish to German in 1853. Referring to the vocational function of the university and the introduction of German to Galicia as the language of administration and of the legal courts by means of the *Silvesterpatent*, these changes were deemed there to be justified, since they enabled students to remain instead of having to attend other universities. Thus we read at the end of the report:

Wir drücken also unser volles Vertrauen aus in den aufgeklärten und guten Willen des hohen Ministeriums für Cultus und Unterricht, dass es die Bedürfnisse des Staates, der Provinz, der Wissenschaften und des öffentlichen Dienstes was die Änderungen der Unterrichtssprache betrifft, mit dem Wohl der Universität und der Notwendigkeit der Bewohner [der Provinz] zur Erhaltung und Pflege der Sprache und Landesliteratur einhergehen.⁶

⁵ Uniwersytet, in: *Czas* (1851), No. 20, 25.1.1851; No. 22, 28.1.1851; No. 28, 4.2.1851; No. 32, 8.2.1851; No. 43, 21.2.1851; No. 50, 1.3.1851; No. 52, 4.3.1851; No. 58, 11.3.1851; No. 81, 8.4.1851.

⁶ “We therefore express our full confidence in the enlightened and good will of the high Ministry for Religious Affairs and Education, that it meets the needs of the state, the province, the sciences and public service in terms of the change in language of instruction, while taking account of the welfare of the university and the necessity

Due to the greater changes in the state, the newspaper reports at the time of Thun's resignation on 20 October 1860 do not focus so much on the minister himself. However, in the months preceding this event, some individual comments by university professors can be found, which considered a discussed change at the head of the ministry to be unnecessary. In brief reports, *Czas* described the imperial personnel decision without comment. In the articles and brief news items published on scientific matters in those October days, the cautious hope for the (re-) introduction of Polish as a language of instruction to the Galician universities dominated. Important in this context was the letter from Emperor Franz Joseph to the governor, Agenor Gołuchowski, on 20 October 1860, in which the emperor expressed his will to introduce Polish instruction in Krakow, which was published in a prominent position in *Czas*.⁷ The same year, the famous Krakow jurist Antoni Helcel⁸ published a direct reply to the letter. The hopes were also supported by the media in the detailed reporting of the deputations of the Krakow professors to the Court in Vienna, or can be discerned subliminally in the description of the programme of the academic community classes in Lviv, when the publication was delayed there in order to be able to take account of any possible change in the language of instruction.⁹

The highlighting of the year 1860 as the watershed year between dark neo-absolutism and the bright future became clear particularly in publications on educational policy and universities. Above all in the writings of Józef Dietl, who had been elected rector of the University of Krakow in 1861, the atmosphere of the advent of liberalism in politics and, associated with that, the final implementation of university autonomy, was codified, so to speak, for future publications. In his rector's speech, which can be interpreted at the same time as a manifesto of national university policy, the language and autonomy of the university was declared to be a prerequisite for the successful development of science and scholarship. The judgement of the recent past was therefore negative, although Dietl certainly recognised that Thun, in his first years in office, "contributed not a little to elevating the run-down universities restoring certain parts of their autonomy."¹⁰ Also, just beforehand, Dietl had published an appeal to Polish scientists, demanding that they apply for habilitations at the Jagiellonian University, which also

of the inhabitants [of the province] to maintain and cultivate the language and literature of the land." *Czas*, No. 187, 18.8.1853.

⁷ Franciszek Józef w. r., 20 October 1860, printed in *Czas*, No. 247, 27.10.1860, p. 1.

⁸ Antoni HELCEL: Uwagi nad kwestyą językową w szkołach i uniwersytetach Galicyi i Krakowa, osnowane na liście odręcznym Jego C. K. Apostolskiej Mości z dnia 20 października 1860 r., Kraków 1860.

⁹ Korespondencja ze Lwowa, in: *Czas*, No. 243, 23.10.1860, p. 1.

¹⁰ Józef DIETL: Mowa inauguracyjna Rektora Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego dra Józefa Dietla miana na otwarcie roku szkolnego dnia 10 października 1861 r. w sali uniwersyteckiej, Kraków 1861, p. 10.

reflects the idea that the political turning point after 1860 might finally fulfil the hope, which had been nursed since 1849, for the improvement of the university system.¹¹

This hope for a new departure after the end of neo-absolutism can be seen as a *mental map* in terms of the university policy in Poland to the present day, and Dietl's publications are representative of this. At the same time, however, that should not mean that Thun was presented only as a negative figure. Characteristic of this is the assessment by Fryderyk Skobel, who referred to Thun in his memoirs as an "enlightened man, perhaps even well-disposed towards us [i.e. the Galician Poles – J.S.]".¹² A similar view was expressed by Fryderyk Hechel, professor of forensic medicine and dean in 1849/50, when he claimed that the new minister showed himself to be "a great friend of our cause" and was "a real Czech" (i.e. not a German).¹³ Hechel's detailed description of the university was less positive, however, and he highlighted above all the vanity of several professors, the competition among colleagues, and the lack of scientific competence; but he did not judge the professor on their nationality, which was a common practice in later publications.¹⁴

The image of a well-disposed minister who wanted to restore balance for the Galician universities and Polish scientists in a politically precarious situation can also be found in the powerful and canonical history of the University of Lviv by Ludwik Finkel from 1890. Next to the exceptionally brief account about the reforms (with reference to Exner's and Bonitz' contribution), Thun is presented particularly as a supporter of Antoni Małecki. After Małecki had been dismissed from his chair in Krakow for political reasons at the end of 1852 (together with Antoni Helcel, Wincenty Pol and Józefat Zielonacki), the ministry first moved him to Innsbruck and then, on Małecki's own initiative, to Lviv in 1856, as professor of the Polish language. Thun, who, as Finkel writes, "felt that he had been unjust to Małecki"¹⁵, was in favour of the move to Innsbruck and demanded of the scholar, who had originally qualified as a classical philologist, only that he learn the Old Slavic language.¹⁶

¹¹ Józef DIETL: O instytucji docentów w ogóle, a szczególnie na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim, in: *Czas*, 31.10.1861, p. 1–2, in German in: HERDER-INSTITUT (ed.): *Dokumente und Materialien zur ostmitteleuropäischen Geschichte. Themenmodul „Kronland Galizien und Lodomerien“*, processed by Böttger Kuzmany (Vienna), [<http://www.herder-institut.de/resolve/qid/2608.html>], retrieved 01.09.2016.

¹² Fryderyk SKOBEL: *Moje wspomnienia (1812–1876)*, ed. by Adam WRZOSEK, Poznań 1924, p. 33.

¹³ Władysław SZUMOWSKI (ed.): *Człowiek nauki taki, jakim był: pamiątniki profesora Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego Fryderyka Hechela*, Vol. 2, W wolnym mieście Krakowie, 1834–1846, Kraków 1939/1945, p. 205.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 275–320.

¹⁵ Ludwik FINKEL, Stanisław STARZYŃSKI: *Historia Uniwersytetu Lwowskiego*, vol. I, Ludwik FINKEL: *Historia Uniwersytetu Lwowskiego do r. 1869*, Lwów 1894, p. 334.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 335; the source of the report was probably talks with Małecki, who still lived in Lviv at the time. Cf. also the letter by Josephat Zielonacki to Leo Thun. Chwałbogowo, 22 May 1853, Státní Oblastní Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun, Leo Thun, A3 XXI D207. Also the description of the relocation

The removal of these professors in 1852/53, who were accused of political activities, was ultimately the key event that shaped the memory of neo-absolutism. This can also be seen in the work of the Lviv legal historian Bronisław Łoziński, who in his work on Agenor Gołuchowski's activity as Galician governor described in detail Thun's position with regard to the political developments of the time. The aforementioned dismissal of the four professors of the Jagiellonian University, about which the author did not learn from gubernatorial documents, but instead from the oral reports by Małecki, was placed at the centre of the story. Łoziński's book (published in 1901) is the most detailed description of the event that shaped the memory of neo-absolutism. Łoziński regarded Karl Neusser, the police president in Krakow, and not Thun, as the person responsible for the situation, since he had gathered the reports about the professors and had forwarded them to the "chief *alias* Minister of Police"¹⁷, Johann Franz Kempen. Fault was also considered to lie with Antoni Walewski, whom Łoziński – based on Małecki's suspicions – saw as the originator of the police persecution and as a secret informer. Instead of being regarded as the perpetrator, Thun was instead stylised as a victim of the prevailing power of the police, since he not only initially ignored the accusations against the professors and personally supported Małecki and Zielonacki, but he also even earned the hostility of Kempen when he welcomed Zielonacki warmly during an audience in Vienna after his dismissal, "about which all of Krakow spoke"¹⁸. Building on Łoziński's story, Maurycy Mann, Wincenty Pol's biographer, also portrayed the situation in this manner. He too assessed Thun's role positively, but added that he was powerless in such political matters.¹⁹

More precise information about the commemoration of the minister is provided by reports after his death. His demise – as customary for former ministers or famous personalities – was not only noted telegraphically, but was in some cases also supplemented by a detailed obituary. *Czas*, for example, mentioned his achievements in educational reform: Thun was able to "push through higher principles and farsightedness [...] despite the system of reaction and Germanisation."²⁰ He "considered" the Jagiellonian University "with his benevolence", and had appointed patriotic professors against the currents of the time.²¹ In addition, and unsurprisingly for a Catholic-conservative journal, his achievement in concluding the Concordat was mentioned. The *Kurjer Lwowski* even called Thun one of "Austria's most

of Zielonacki and Małecki to Innsbruck in Christof AICHNER: Die Umsetzung der Thun-Hohensteinschen Reformen an der Universität Innsbruck (1848–1860), phil. Diss. Innsbruck 2014, p. 196–200.

¹⁷ Bronisław ŁOZIŃSKI: Agenor hrabia Gołuchowski w pierwszym okresie rządów swoich: (1846–1859), Lwów 1901, p. 103. Emphasis in original.

¹⁸ Ibid, p. 108.

¹⁹ Maurycy MANN: Wincenty Pol: studjum biograficzno-krytyczne, Vol. 2, Kraków 1906, p. 153.

²⁰ *Czas*, No. 291, 20.12.1888, p. 2.

²¹ Ibid.

outstanding political personalities”, whose great achievement was the educational reform, also emphasising: “he was however a stubborn clerical”, who subordinated the elementary schools to the Church in the Concordat.²² The Concordat (this time neutrally) was also the central point of his work in a brief biography in the *Gazeta Lwowska*.²³

Much less attention than to Thun-Hohenstein’s death was given to the unveiling of a monument dedicated to him in Vienna in 1893, even though there was good opportunity, since the *Towarzystwo Nauczycieli Szkół Wyższych* (Society of Teachers of Higher Education) was meeting in Krakow at this time.²⁴ Yet one searches in vain for Thun’s name among the protocols and reports of the assembly. If the unveiling was mentioned at all in the press, then only ever as an aside to the – in itself brief – telegram report of the Assembly of German philologists and schoolteachers in Vienna, on which occasion the ceremony had been held; more attention was given to the brief visit by Franz Joseph to the celebratory dinner of the assembly.²⁵ To compare how the event was valued: already in its evening issue of 24 May, the *Neue Freie Presse* printed detailed fragments of the speech by Wilhelm von Hartel at the unveiling of the monument.²⁶ The unveiling also enjoyed more attention from the journal of the society of teachers of higher education, *Muzeum*. Franciszek Majchrowski, who spoke at length about the assembly and also summarised the speech, welcomed the idea of combining the unveiling with the assembly, for the work of the three reformers professionalised the secondary schools and universities, and shaped them in the following decades.²⁷

One year later, Majchrowski reviewed Salomon Frankfurter’s publication on Thun, Exner and Bonitz. His verdict on the minister was that while the minister was an important personality who promoted educational reform and defended it against conservative politicians, nevertheless he was not very original and was easily influenced. Thus although the review judged Thun positively, the reviewer stressed above all the role of his ministerial staff in drafting and implementing the reforms.²⁸

Therefore Thun was certainly regarded positively, albeit not particularly noticeably, until the First World War. His image as a supporter of Polish scholarship at a time when the Minister for the Interior, Bach, advanced a policy of Germanisation, had already been consolidated by the

²² † Leon Thun-Hohenstein, in: Kurjer Lwowski, No. 353, 20.12.1888, p. 2–3.

²³ *Gazeta Lwowska*, No. 291, 20.12.1888, p. 5.

²⁴ See detailed reports in *Nowa Reforma*, No. 117, 27.5.1893; No. 118, 28.5.1893.

²⁵ *Nowa Reforma*, No. 119, 27.5.1893 p. 3; *Czas*, No. 119, 27.5.1893, p. 3.

²⁶ Philologen und Schulmännertag, in: *Neue Freie Presse*, No. 10.326, 24.5.1903, *Abendblatt*, p. 2–3.

²⁷ Fr[anciszek] MAJCHROWSKI: Sprawy pedagogiczne na ostatnim kongresie filologów i pedagogów w Wiedniu, in: *Muzeum. Czasopismo Towarzystwa Nauczycieli Szkół Wyższych* 9 (1893), p. 547–570, here p. 567–569.

²⁸ IDEM: [review of:] Dr. S. Frankfurter, Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein ..., in: *Muzeum. Czasopismo Towarzystwa Nauczycieli Szkół Wyższych* 10 (1894), p. 4–51.

1860s was common knowledge among historians and journalists. At the same time, the period in which Thun held office as education minister, can be understood as the most negatively-judged period of the Habsburg regime. In popular histories of the universities, such as those by Konstanty Wojciechowski or Wiktor Czermak from the anniversary year²⁹ of 1900, the reform work was clearly overshadowed by the introduction of German as the language of instruction.³⁰ Characteristically, however, the recent history of the universities in Galicia was given little attention at the time – the only exception was the aforementioned work by Finkel/Starzyński on the history of the University of Lviv –, instead research was conducted in Krakow on the heyday of the higher school in the Middle Ages and early modern times, with detailed chronicles published about the university in the anniversary year of 1864.³¹

This trend continued in the period between the wars, and no noteworthy publications appeared on the universities under neo-absolutism. The reforms of 1849 also did not become part of the functional memory: When, in the immediate post-war period the restructuring of the Polish universities was discussed, the Habsburg universities did act as a model, but it was the law of 1873 that was seen as decisive; it was a similar case in 1933; when repressive legislation restricted the autonomy of the universities, the reforms of the *Komisja Edukacji Narodowej* (Commission for National Education, 1773–1794) provided the reference point for writings defending the academic freedom.³² In an atmosphere in which the emancipation from “German influences” – that included also Austrian – was propagated as the guiding principle of scientific renewal,³³ it was hard to find any references to the Habsburg past in any case. Some biographies might have touched on Thun’s period as minister – for example in treatments of the life of Wincenty Pol or Antoni Małecki –, but at most they repeated the aforementioned image of the minister, in very brief comments.

²⁹ The Jagiellonian University celebrates two foundation anniversaries: that of the first foundation in 1364 and that of the resumption of activities in 1400 after a pause of 30 years.

³⁰ Konstanty WOJCIECHOWSKI: *Uniwersytet Jagielloński i jego dzieje. W pięćsetną rocznicę jego założenia*, Lwów 1900, p. 84; Wiktor CZERMAK: *Uniwersytet Jagielloński w czterech ostatnich wiekach*, Kraków 1900, 84–85.

³¹ The description of the university published in 1864 on the 500th anniversary of its foundation also contains comments on the most recent decade, but is very positivist in nature and provides not much more than a list of buildings, publications, etc. *Zakłady uniwersyteckie w Krakowie. Przyczynek do dziejów oświaty krajowej podany w pamięci pięćset-letniego istnienia Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego*, Kraków, 1864.

³² An analysis of the discussion at the time in Urszula PERKOWSKA: *La g n se et la caract ristique de la loi sur les  coles sup rieures du 13 juillet 1920*, in: *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne* 79, (1985), p. 95–107.

³³ See the most important journal to address scientific matters, *Nauka Polska* 1918–1921.

The positive Germaniser? Socialist historiography and Galician memory

The post-war period had a very different impact on the historiography of Galicia and of the Habsburg monarchy. The Iron Curtain made the exchange of literature difficult and considerably hampered visits to archives. This represented a significant disadvantage, particularly for the history of the universities, since most of the files on the Galician universities between 1848 and 1860 from the Vienna State Archive had not been, like those from 1861 onwards, transferred to Warsaw in the interwar period. Any work on the territories of eastern Ukraine now incorporated into Soviet Ukraine, including Lviv, was extremely unwelcome during the entire Soviet period – which incidentally was also true of the other eastern territories of the Second Polish Republic. Therefore Galicia was almost exclusively reduced to the now southern Polish part of the province in historical work.³⁴ Along with the decreed politics of memory, which was not supposed to transcend the new state borders between the Eastern Bloc states, the question of access to the archives in the Soviet Union was also of significance. While there were several works on Galicia, especially on economic history (i.a. Józef Buszko), but also on political and legal history (Stefan Kieniewicz and Konstanty Grzybowski), Galicia only gained in importance as a topic in the 1980s, before veritably blossoming after the fall of the Iron Curtain. With the exception of the history of the Jagiellonian University, the Habsburg educational policy became a subject of intensive historical investigation only in the 1990s; the earlier work was concerned mainly with the 1860s (especially positivism), or followed biographical traces, without examining the institutional conditions in any detail.

Just as serious as the topical restriction were the ideological-political interventions in the historiography and the politics of memory. The Polish-speaking historian turned above all to questions of social history after 1945, in order to understand and establish the history that led to Socialism as a class war. This led to an even more negative interpretation of the Catholic-conservative reactionary period, which had been dominated by the nobility – flanked by the failed Uprising of 1846 and the equally unsuccessful January Uprising of 1863.³⁵ Yet the internationalist ideas of the Soviet Union did not mean the end of national historiography. Quite the contrary, despite frequent criticism of bourgeois nationalism, the nation formed the starting point for the history narrative and blended out the ethnic and cultural diversity. In particular,

³⁴ There were almost no exceptions in modern university historiography. The only notable work in Polish on the history of the University of Lviv was the dissertation by Krzysztofa MICHAŁEWSKA: *Próby utworzenia uniwersytetu ukraińskiego w Polsce 1919–26*, phil. Diss. Krakow 1974, which also contained a section on the Habsburg period. An article from this was published in 1984 (Krzysztofa MICHAŁEWSKA: *Sprawa uniwersytetu ukraińskiego w latach 1848–1918*, in: *Studia historyczne* 27 (1984), p. 35–60).

³⁵ For an overview of the historiography of the post-war years cf. Maciej GÓRNY: „Die Wahrheit ist auf unserer Seite“. *Nation, Marxismus und Geschichte im Ostblock*, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2011, esp. p. 340–353.

the Germanisation after 1848 was highlighted as an adverse occurrence and ultimately the language policy after 1848 was elevated to a general characteristic of the age, so that the liberal period that immediately followed the revolution, for example, was usually not mentioned and instead the reaction was located as early as 1849. The negative image of the Germans, which on the one hand arose from the war experiences of the historians,³⁶ and on the other hand was part of the politics of memory in Soviet historiography,³⁷ also included the Habsburgs. Links were made to the narrative, which already existed in the 19th century, of the violent fragmentation of Poland by the three partitioning powers, and the history after 1795 was represented as a struggle for independence, which was achieved only 123 years later. In addition, commemoration of the Catholic-oriented monarchy did not go down well in an at least officially anti-religious state – which however did not correspond with local memory. Among ordinary people, the imperial name was certainly seen in a positive light, and Krakow historians also regarded the Habsburg monarchy as the most liberal of the three partitioning powers. It should also be noted that the Habsburg monarchy was not generally condemned in official publications, for the idea of progress that was inherent in Marxism was directed at recording an almost linear process of social development and increasing emancipation, which might have been impaired, but could not be prevented by cultural circumstances. Characteristic of this is the history of the national question in the Habsburg monarchy by Henryk Wereszycki, even though it was written in 1975, after the heyday of Marxism and with some innovative approaches. His image of the 1850s was also dominated by the Germanisation policy, but he also saw neo- absolutism as a reform period in the service of the (bourgeois) state, which certainly brought economic and social improvement for the peoples of the monarchy.³⁸

The pattern of placing the Germanisation in the foreground of observation can also be seen in the university historiography: In this area, the patterns that dominate to this day were construed, in which Thun received a fixed place. Therefore I would now like to turn to this historiography of science and scholarship.

³⁶ The most important university historians, whose works are analysed below, were directly affected by the war: Henryk Barycz lost his position as archivist, Kazimierz Lepszy was captured in the *Sonderaktion Krakau* and was held in a concentration camp 1939–1941, Kamilla Mrozowska was active in the home army [Armia Krajowa] and took part in the Warsaw Uprising; Jerzy Michalski and Leszek Hajdukiewicz participated in lessons at the secret university. Cf.: Kazimierz Lepszy (1904–1964), in: Andrzej ŚRÓDKA, Paweł SZCZAWIŃSKI (ed.): *Biogramy uczonych polskich. Część I: Nauki społeczne. Zeszyt 2*, Wrocław 1983, p. 485–486; Julian DYBIEC: *Profesor Kamilla Mrozowska*, in: *Biuletyn Historii Wychowania* 9–10 (1999), p. 39–42; IDEM.: *Leszej Hajdukiewicz (1924–1995)*, in: *Kwartalnik Historii Nauki i Techniki* 41 (1996), p. 141–144; Wojciech KRIEGSEISEN: *Jerzy Michalski (9 IV 1924 – 26 II 2007)*, in: *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 114 (2007), p. 199–201.

³⁷ See Hanna WĘGRZYNEK: *Niemcy – Polacy – Żydzi: jak w PRL powstawał podręcznikowy schemat interpretacji dziejów najnowszych (1943–1952)*, in: Ruth LEISEROWITZ i.a. (ed.): *Lesestunde/Lekcja Czytania*, Warszawa 2013, p. 199–216, esp. p. 200–201, and Zbigniew MAZUR: *Obraz Niemiec w polskich podręcznikach szkolnych do nauczania historii 1945–1989*, Poznań 1995.

³⁸ Henryk WERESZYCKI: *Pod berłem Habsburgów: zagadnienia narodowościowe*, Kraków 1975, p. 142–158.

In the post-war period, the university historiography and the history of science and intellectuals in Galicia was dominated by Henryk Barycz.³⁹ Born in 1901, Barycz studied at the Jagiellonian University and, in his research, first concentrated on the age of humanism. From 1934 to 1963 he ran (with interruptions) the university archive and taught as a private lecturer (1935), associate (1946) and full (1957) professor at the Jagiellonian University. The vast majority of Krakow historians of scholarship and education who conducted active research from the 1970s were his students. Although his research focus remained the early history of the Jagiellonian University, already in the interwar years Barycz also examined the Galician 19th century, continuing this work after the war. For example, he wrote a biography of Wincenty Pol, edited correspondence, such as that of Karol Szajnocha, and wrote popular biographical sketches of several scholars from the period after 1860. He was a member of academic commissions the published textbooks and overviews of the history of Polish science. Furthermore, in 1964 he helped to prepare the 600th anniversary of the university. To this day his book “The Jagiellonian University in the life of the Polish nation”⁴⁰ is the only research-based overview of the history of the university, and its contents are still repeated in popular portrayals and speeches.

The idea of the university as a nation-forming institution clearly formed the core of Barycz’s work: His numerous editions and articles addressed, for example, those personalities who were important for Polish national memory, in his work on a widely understood scientific history of interconnections, the idea of Poland was present as an historical constant.⁴¹ Although he was not a committed Communist (at least according to his students), his work certainly conformed to ideological requirements: They underlined the state character of the university, which amounted to disdain for the importance of the Church, and it was equally characterised by “an exaggerated, albeit fully understandable anti-German attitude”, as Krzysztof Stopka put it.⁴² One could also add here that Barycz, whose career was interrupted by the war (although he was offered library positions in Warsaw), but not stopped, was not alone in holding this attitude in Krakow: The *Sonderaktion Krakau* (6 November 1939), in which 183 Krakow professors were detained and deported to Dachau and Sachsenhausen, whereby some prominent scholars died from exhaustion or were murdered before their release was enforced by means of an

³⁹ On the biography, cf. Julian DYBIEC: Henryk Barycz (1901–1994), in: *Kwartalnik Historii Nauki i Techniki* 40 (1995), p. 135–159.

⁴⁰ Henryk BARYCZ: *Uniwersytet Jagielloński w życiu narodu polskiego*, Warszawa 1948, 2nd edition 1964.

⁴¹ Most of the publications analysed the Polish-Italian contacts, but there was also one publication on Austria, which is also available in German: Henryk BARYCZ: *Die Rolle der Wiener Universität im geistigen Leben Polens*, in: *Österreichische Osthefte* 7 (1965), p. 176–194.

⁴² Krzysztof STOPKA: Henryk Barycz jako dziejopis Akademii Krakowskiej, in: Rita MAJKOWSKA (ed.): *Henryk Barycz 1901–1994. Materiały z posiedzenia Naukowego PAU w dniu 22 czerwca 2001 r.*, Kraków 2001, p. 51–66, here p. 49.

international supporting action, had an immense influence on the collective memory in Krakow; by 1964 at the latest, the slogan of the war years, “Ne cedat academia!” became one of the guiding principles of the university.⁴³ With Barycz, therefore, the anti-German attitude should not be seen only as conformity to the Socialist politics of memory, but rather as a continuation of the national narrative from the interwar period. His negative judgement of the German influences can already be seen in his first publication on university matters: In the article on Józef Dietl’s “struggle for the nationalisation” of Galician universities, published in 1928, he described the 1850s as years of Germanisation and censorship that “suppressed every sign of free thought or criticism.”⁴⁴

The first edition of the book “The Jagiellonian University in the life of the Polish nation”, published in 1948, also followed this narrative, but added new aspects. Barycz embedded neo-absolutism in the period 1831–1861, which he called in general “periods of political and national oppression”. After the November Uprising of 1830/31, the university of the now occupied Free City of Krakow was subjected to Austrian law and, with the involvement of Poles whom he condemned as being loyal to the state, adapted to the standard of the “Austrian universities, probably the worst in all of Europe” – which he described as a clear and deliberate reduction in the standard of the university.⁴⁵ Against this demise he highlighted some Polish professors and underlined their patriotic and scientific achievements. Barycz saw the integration of Krakow into the Kingdom of Galicia above all under the auspices of the possible closure of the university, which ultimately was prevented only by the favourable verdict of Ladislaus Endlicher, who had been sent by the Vienna government to western Galicia. Barycz regarded the year 1848 as a time of hope and renewal. But he did not consider this renewal to be in the reform of the universities, but instead in the introduction of Polish as the language of instruction and the (attempted) appointment of prominent scientists. In his description, however, hope did not last long, for soon the denunciation of the “Austrian Pole” Walewski marked the beginning of the suppression of the university (Germanisation and suspension of autonomy), which however was ultimately unsuccessful and led to the opposite effect, which Barycz illustrated with the appointment and activities of Dietl: born in 1804 as the son of an Austrian-Polish couple in Drohobycz/Drohobyč, eastern Galicia, Dietl had already emigrated to Vienna after

⁴³ In 1964 this slogan was engraved on the entrance to the Green Hall of the Collegium Maius, for a description, see e.g. Klaus ZERNACK: Krakau: Eine Universität als nationales Symbol, in: *Der Tagesspiegel*, No. 17.284, 08.01.2001, p. 27 [<http://www.tagesspiegel.de/weltspiegel/gesundheits/krakau-eine-universitaet-als-nationales-symbol/192242.html>], retrieved 01.09.2016.

⁴⁴ Henryk BARYCZ: Dietl w walce o unarodowienie i zreformowanie szkół galicyjskich (1860–1866), in: Józef Dietl, pierwszy prezydent miasta Krakowa, znakomity lekarz, profesor i rektor Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, patriota polski: w 50-tą rocznicę śmierci, Kraków 1928, p. 121–134.

⁴⁵ BARYCZ: *Uniwersytet Jagielloński*, p. 75.

university. There, however, according to Barycz, he would “soon discard the German varnish and rediscover the lost Polish nationality.”⁴⁶ The university eventually became Polonised, however, above all due to the political activities of the students, their protests, petitions and legations to the emperor⁴⁷, thus introducing the period of the “university as an all-Polish site of scholarship”, which began, according to Barycz, with Dietl’s time as rector.⁴⁸ The second, revised edition of 1964 changed little in this narrative – one of the few exceptions was the comment that the Germanisation and the introduction of German as the language of instruction was initiated by means of a “staged ‘voluntary application’ by a handful of traitors”.⁴⁹ Strikingly, this brief quote is the first and, with a few exceptions in Polish historiography, completely forgotten comment on the fact that the (no longer autonomous) academic senate had submitted a petition for the introduction of German as the language of instruction – although the precise background remains unclear to this day.⁵⁰

In the same year, 1964, Barycz intensified this statement in an abbreviated version of the history of the university, a published a talk at the Commission of Propaganda. In the chapter “In the age of bondage” he wrote that the university created “of its own accord a great plan of reconstruction and restructuring of the university into a large, all-Polish academic site”, which however was hindered by “the brutal suppression” by the resurrected absolutist-police system.⁵¹ Barycz spoke in most detail about Thun in a later publication on Józef Ignacy Kraszewski’s attempts to obtain a chair in Krakow. Here he commented not only on the positive intentions of the minister towards Poles, but also noted that he had worked in the Lviv governor’s office prior to his ministerial period and therefore had good contacts to the Polish aristocracy. From the beginning of his period in office, according to Barycz, Thun endeavoured to find suitable persons for the chairs in Polish language in Krakow and Lviv – whereby he wanted to give

⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 82.

⁴⁷ The emphasis on the role of the students as a constant positive political factor also belonged to the stylisation of the university in the 1940s and 1950s. I thank Błażej Brzostek for this information.

⁴⁸ Hence the title of the following chapter, *ibid*.

⁴⁹ Henryk BARYCZ: *Uniwersytet Jagielloński w życiu narodu polskiego*, Wrocław 1964, p. 96.

⁵⁰ Waltraud HEINDL: *Universitätsreform und politisches Programm. Die Sprachenfrage an der Universität Krakau im Neoabsolutismus*, in: *Österreichische Osthefte* 20 (1978), p. 79–98; Josef BATRON: *Der vergessene Mährische Verehrer Goethes*, Ph. Dr. P. Thomas Bratranek OSA, Professor an der Universität Krakau, Olomouc 1937; The petition is mentioned in Kazimierz LEJMAN: *Zarys Dziejów Wydziału Lekarskiego Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w okresie reformy Kołłątaja do lat sześćdziesiątych XIX wieku*, in: *Sześćsetlecie medycyny krakowskiej*, vol. 2, *Historia katedr*, p. 57–95. 90–1, and Olga DOBIJA-WITCZAK: *František Tomáš Bratranek (1815–1884)*, in: Jan MICHALIK, Waclaw WALEWSKI (ed.): *Złota księga Wydziału Filologicznego*, Kraków 2000, p. 50–58; the files on the petition are not actually available in Krakow, but brief reports were nevertheless published in *Czas*.

⁵¹ Henryk BARYCZ: *Sześć wieków działalności Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego i jego związków z ziemiami zachodnimi i północnymi: 1364–1964*, Warszawa 1964, p. 19.

priority to professional literary scholars over those poet-historians proposed by the university.⁵² Barycz also stresses that Thun was considered by some university professors, such as Józef Kremer, as a bearer of liberal hope, and that his loss of influence at the beginning of the 1850s and the rumours about the dissolution of the ministry were received with concern in Krakow.⁵³ However, the Germanisation and the loss of autonomy meant the end of all hope – though the agents or causes of the changed political situation are not named.

Other publications appeared in the anniversary year of 1964, which dealt with Thun's reform period. The series on the university anniversary, coordinated by the historian of the early modern period Kazimierz Lepszy and comprising more than 20 volumes, followed the party line and highlighted, for example, the contribution made by the university to the formation of the Polish nation, emphasising the role of the progressive and proto-Socialist students. Most of the publications were either contributions to the internal academic history of individual disciplines, or concerned specific institutions of the university.

Three volumes in this series, which provide overviews of the history of the university, are particularly important for the assessment of Thun's period as minister: Two anthologies concern the history from 1364–1850, followed by a study of the social and political countenance of the university, however which starts only in 1869 – thus, two decades were erased from the 600-year history of the university. If these decades were considered at all in the biographical and internal historical studies, then only on the basis of a few individual personalities. More information on this period can be found only on the occasion of the 600th anniversary of the re-founding of the university in 2000, with attempts to replace the persons covered, who were previously usually chosen according to national criteria, with scientific criteria.

The education historian Kamilla Mrozowska analysed the university in a detailed history up to 1850, written for the anniversary year of 1964. She began the section with 1831/33, in other words with the restructuring of the educational system in the Free City of Krakow – which she described as a disappointment after the demands of 1831. The common thread of the article is the constant contrast between professors/students and the government – for instance claiming that Endlicher's positive assessment of the university by stating that his supposed endeavours for the Galician university caused him many problems in Vienna.⁵⁴ She sees the revolution and the developments after 1848 as being characterised by the extensive suggestions by the

⁵² Henryk BARYCZ: Józef Ignacy Kraszewski czterokrotny kandydat do katedry uniwersyteckiej, Kraków 1979, p. 20–24.

⁵³ Ibid, p. 46 and p. 56.

⁵⁴ Kamilla MROZOWSKA: Okres ucisku i daremnych prób wyzwolenicznych, 1833–1850, in: Mirosława CHAMCÓWNA, Kamilla MROZOWSKA (ed.): Dzieje Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w latach 1765–1850, vol. 2, Kraków 1965, p. 182–235, here p. 210.

university to improve teaching, which however were thwarted by neo-absolutism. She describes Thun as “comparatively liberal, who cared for the fate of the schools”, but who could only delay the influence of conservative politics.⁵⁵ When the liberal reforms of 1849 are described, then against the background of the even more liberal demands of the university, just as it is also emphasised, with regard to the personnel policy, that the appointment of patriotic scholars was defeated (although it is certainly recognised that it was usually not the decision of the ministry). The ministerial policies are assessed differently by Mrozowska: Some decisions are highlighted, which increased the scientific quality of the university (mentioning Pol and Małecki), but in contrast she also emphasises the growing conservative tendencies. Although she defines 1850 as the end point in the chapter title, Mrozowska concludes with detailed comments on the years 1852/1853, i.e. the aforementioned dismissal of patriotic professors and the suspension of the self-administration, and sees these years as the final conclusion of all hopes.⁵⁶ In her work we also find the narrowing of the perspective to one group of (Polish) academics on the one hand, and the (German) government on the other, thus ignoring the reports, which were known at the time, about the role of the police.

The second important volume from this time was the monumental history of Polish science from 1795–1862, which was published in 1977 as part of the nine-volume history (1970–1999) of Polish science, edited by Jerzy Michalski. The chapter on Galicia, written by Michalski himself, assigns in principle great significance to the Thun-Exner-Bonitz reforms for the development of the sciences, which is underlined with reference to the optimistic speech by Józef Majer in 1850.⁵⁷ However, according to Michalski, “the immediate future would show that these hopes were merely illusions” – whereby he sees the responsibility for this not only with the political conditions, but also in the lack of strong Polish researchers and the preference of the faculties for local teaching staff.⁵⁸ This statement is somewhat surprising, for in the detailed section on the appointment policy, which he interprets as a conflict between the ideas or demands of the university for the appointment of scientifically competent and nationally aware researchers, and the ministerial policy of depoliticising the university, his judgement of the scientific quality at the university is much more favourable. Even though the majority of those researchers suggested were not appointed, the appointments were nevertheless not only

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 217.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 235.

⁵⁷ The speech mentioned is Majer’s presentation of the role of the university after the reform of 1850 to the Krakauer Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft. Józef MAJER: Zagajenie posiedzenia publicznego Towarzystwa naukowego z Uniwersytetem Jagiellońskim złączonego, w dniu 13 lipca 1850 r. obejmujące Pogląd na znaczenie uniwersytetów w stosunku do państwa i innych naukowych zakładów, Kraków, 1850.

⁵⁸ Jerzy MICHALSKI: Warunki rozwoju nauki polskiej, in: IDEM.: Historia nauki polskiej, vol. 3, 1795–1862, Wrocław i.a. 1977, p. 3–354, here p. 247.

scientifically competent, but certainly also patriotic (Dietl, Pol i.a.).⁵⁹ Other appointments, on the other hand, resulted in his view in severely negative consequences – here the “show crook” Walewski was named, whose denunciations alarmed the police (yet there is no mention of the precise division of competencies between the police and the ministry). His assessment of the appointment policy in the phase of neo-absolutism – probably the best and most detailed in Polish research – was also differentiated, distinguishing between professors who were appointed only for the purpose of Germanisation (such as Antoni Bryk) and several other exemplary scientists (Carl Brühl, Johann Czermak, Gustav Linker, etc.), who certainly did enrich the university, leading to both scientific innovation and infrastructural improvements (laboratory provision, books, exhibits).⁶⁰

A brief description in this volume also deals with the University of Lviv, which is presented as a university dominated by German professors in a Polish-dominated city. Of interest for the assessment of the ministerial policies is the presentation of the same with regard to the establishment of a chair in the Ruthenian language, and that in Polish language and literature. The appointment of Jakiv Holovac’kyj is interpreted as a gesture by the government in order to curry favour with the Ukrainians, also because the anti-Polish Holovac’kyj was favoured ahead of Ivan Wahylevyč, the choice of the Polish public; the fate of the second chair is outlined, with the aforementioned reports on Małecki, underlining Thun’s advocacy for the establishment of the chair.⁶¹

The accounts in these overviews had a great influence on the collective memory of neo-absolutism and Thun’s ministry, even if detailed studies presented a more precise and differentiated picture. In his history of the chair in Polish history, for example, Franciszek Bielak included a longer biography of Thun and assessed him positively.⁶² There was also a positive evaluation of Thun in Henryk Barycz’ study on Wincenty Pol as a professor in Krakow, from 1949 – the narrative followed the aforementioned publications by Mann and Łoziński.⁶³ However the detailed special publications had less influence on the perception of history in public opinion. Even though Barycz’ overviews could be categorised as popular science, I would rather mention here the books and brochures aimed at a broader public, since these reveal a lot more about the ideal image of history that the authors wished to convey. In the style of

⁵⁹ Ibid, p. 251–255.

⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 255–257.

⁶¹ Ibid, p. 284–287.

⁶² Franciszek BIELAK: Katedra historii literatury polskiej Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w latach 1849–1870, in: Mirosława CHAMCÓWNA, i.a. (ed.): *Dzieje Katedry Historii Literatury Polskiej na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim*, Kraków 1966, p. 85–107, here p. 87–88.

⁶³ Henryk BARYCZ: Wincenty Pol jako profesor geografii na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim, in: *Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Prace komisji historii medycyny i nauk matematyczno-przyrodniczych* 3 (1949), p. 43–128.

Ludwik Fleck once could even say that these publications reflect a form of ready-to-use unmediated knowledge (Präsenzwissen) – also among historians, who can make much more differentiated statements in detailed work.⁶⁴ It is also important to note, when examining such publications, that they often formed the basis for overviews of the history of Poland during the period of partition, and thus also shaped lessons both at school and university. Furthermore: Though university history might be somewhat peripheral, the Jagiellonian University was an important national symbol both in Socialist Poland and after the fall of Communism, and thus its history was a key component of the narrative of the past.

I would like to cite only a few brief examples of such accounts: In his speech as rector at the inauguration of the anniversary year of 1964, Kazimierz Lepszy placed the end of the autonomy of the university in 1833 and, apart from the revolutionary events, found only Germanisation worth mention; according to Lepszy, the university could become a modern and leading institution in the country (here, Poland) only with the autonomy of Galicia.⁶⁵ In a brochure published in 1959 on the Polish universities, Zofia Skubała and Zygmunt Tokarski spoke poetically of the “thin German varnish” with which the university had been coated in 1848. They also stressed: “The Damocles sword of Germanisation, and even of liquidation, was to sway above it for almost 20 years.”⁶⁶ Little more than one decade later, the book was also published in a Polish edition and this account was embellished further. About the reforms: In 1849 a temporary university law was passed, which was less liberal than the suggestions by the university, but which was soon disavowed by the reversion to “despotic methods”. With regard to the appointment policy, they judge that it certainly was political in nature, however the scientific quality was also considered, so that some good scientists were appointed – referring to the aforementioned patriots such as Helcel and Dietl.⁶⁷ An official popular account of the university from 1975, written by Leszek Hajdukiewicz, who was director of the university archive 1963–1994, presented the years after 1833 as a battle by the youth and by Polish professors for the Polish character of the university – whereby the latter was equating with a

⁶⁴ Ludwik FLECK: *Entstehung und Entwicklung einer wissenschaftlichen Tatsache – Einführung in die Lehre vom Denkstil und Denkkollektiv*. Mit einer Einleitung herausgegeben von Lothar Schäfer und Thomas Schnelle, Frankfurt a. M. 1980, esp. p. 146–165.

⁶⁵ Kazimierz LEPSZY: *Rola Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w życiu narodu i państwa polskiego: (wykład Rektora na inauguracji Roku Jubileuszowego)*, manuscripts of the Jagiellonian Library Krakow, sign. 584733 III, p. 14.

⁶⁶ Zofia SKUBAŁA, Zbigniew TOKARSKI: *Polnische Universitäten*, translated by Henryka Sierankiewicz, Warschau 1959, p. 88.

⁶⁷ Zofia SKUBAŁA-TOKARSKA, Zbigniew TOKARSKI: *Uniwersytety w Polsce: rys historyczny*, Warszawa 1972, p. 123.

scientific standard.⁶⁸ The following quote is representative of what is only a brief description of the period in this book:

Die gegen die älteste polnische Akademie gerichteten Schikanen, die Versuche, sie zu germanisieren und auf eine provinzielle Hochschule zu reduzieren, aus welcher loyale Untertanen der k. k. Monarchie hervorgehen sollten, vermochten nicht, den tief wurzelnden patriotischen Geist auszumerzen; ein Beweis dafür ist u. a. die aktive Teilnahme vieler Studenten am Januar-Aufstand 1863. Doch erst die politischen Freiheiten, die die polnische Bevölkerung an dem im verlorenen Krieg geschwächten Österreich erkämpfte, öffneten an der Schwelle der sog. Periode der Autonomie Galizien vor der Jagiellonen-Universität neue Entwicklungsperspektiven. Sie ermöglichten im Jahre 1860 die Selbstverwaltung, die Einführung der Landessprache in einigen Disziplinen (1861) und schließlich die Repolonisierung der Hochschule (1870) wiederzugewinnen. Erst danach konnten viele Reformen durchgeführt werden, die in den letzten 50 Jahren der Fremdenherrschaft [sic!] (1870–1918) der ehrwürdigen Akademie den Rang eines Wissenschafts- und Bildungszentrums und einen Ehrenplatz in der Geschichte der europäischen Wissenschaft um die Wende des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts einräumten. Die größten Verdienste in jenem gewaltigen Werk der wissenschaftlichen Umgestaltung der Universität erwarb sich der Professor und eifrige Patriot, unermüdlich auf sozialer Ebene wirkende Józef Dietl [...].⁶⁹

This image of the downfall and defeat, as well as the subsequent rise of the university is sustained: e.g. in Stanisław Dziedzic's brochure *Alma Mater Jagiellonica*, the chapter on the 19th century is entitled "Times of Humiliation and Splendour", for which the attainment of autonomy serves as the watershed.⁷⁰

The official overviews published in the anniversary year of 2000 are much more differentiated, in which the renowned historian of education in Galicia, Andrzej Kazimierz Banach, wrote the section on the university during the period of partition. Banach uses the image of a liberal university – personified, as in Michalski's volume, in the person of Majer, as with Michalski – which was suppressed by the ministry, government and police. Thun is accorded only a secondary role: Thun's reforms, according to Banach, raised hopes that Majer's proposals for

⁶⁸ Leszek HAJDUKIEWICZ, Mieczysław KARAŚ: *Uniwersytet Jagielloński: tradycje, współczesność, perspektywy*, Kraków 1975; the book was translated into German, English, French and Russian.

⁶⁹ "The harassments directed against the oldest Polish academy, the attempts to Germanise it and reduce it to a provincial college, from which loyal subjects of the empire should emerge, did not manage to eradicate the deep-rooted patriotic spirit; evidence of this includes the active participation of many students in the January Uprising of 1863. But it was only the political freedoms that the Polish population fought for against the war-weary Austrians that opened new development opportunities for the Jagiellonian University at the threshold of the so-called period of the autonomy of Galicia. In allowed, in 1860, for self-administration, the introduction of the language of the country in some disciplines (1861) and finally the re-Polonisation of the university (1870). Only then was it possible to implement many reforms, which in the last 50 years of foreign rule [sic!] (1870–1918) granted the honourable academy the rank of a scientific and educational centre, and an honorary place in the history of European science at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. The greatest merit in this magnificent work of academic reorganisation was earned by the professor and eager patriot, Józef Dietl, who also operated indefatigably at a social level [...]." IDEM.: *Die Jagiellonen-Universität: Tradition – Gegenwart – Perspektiven*, Krakau 1977, p. 59–60.

⁷⁰ Stanisław DZIEDZIC: *Alma Mater Jagellonica*, translated by Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, Kraków 2005.

appointments would be listened to in Vienna.⁷¹ But the hopes disappeared when attempts intensified from 1849 to introduce German as the language of instruction – attempts that were made by the ministry and which culminated in the placing of the university under provisional administration in 1853. “The years from 1853 to 1860 were among the hardest in the Jagiellonian University 19th century history.”⁷² Banach certainly considers the reforms to be a “turning point” for the academic development in the 19th century, but at the same time he also notes that only in “1870, after years of struggle, when the Jagiellonian University has been re-Polonized and the principle of academic liberty reinstated, its modern growth could begin at last.”⁷³ In this interpretation, the reforms are the prerequisite for a possible upturn in the fortunes of the university, but that could only be achieved when the university had become completely Polish (equated here with liberal).

Thun’s historiographical entourage – a comment

The overshadowing of Thun by Wincenty Pol, shown in the opening quote, indicates a group of people with whom the minister and his age are associated. In Austrian historiography, these include – without going into detail – Franz Serafin Exner and Hermann Bonitz, as well as, albeit less well-known, the conservative allies of Thun: Joseph Alexander Helfert, for example, is mentioned much less frequently, even though he had great influence on everyday business, as an undersecretary in the ministry. In Polish historiography, with the exception of Majchrowski, Thun’s Viennese circle is barely mentioned; if anything is written about the period after 1848, Thun is rather associated with various professors, who in turn were divided according to a black-and-white pattern. The decisive selection criterion is not the “nationality” of the scholars, but rather their political attitude to the nation and the state. Thus, no doubt was declared about the nationality of the much-mentioned saviour of the university in 1847, Endlicher, yet he is a positive figure in all texts.

Representative of a series of persons, I would like to mention only three: Wincenty Pol, who along with Małecki and Dietl is mentioned most frequently to underline the positive and progressive face of the university on the one hand, and in contrast, Antoni Walewski and Antoni Bryk, who to a certain extent symbolise the ‘dark side’.

Let us look first at Wincenty Pol. Since he is famous poet, there is generally an abundance of works devoted to him, and thereby also on his connections to Thun. However, the baseline of

⁷¹ Krzysztof STOPKA, Andrzej Kazimierz BANACH, Julian DYBIEC: *The History of the Jagiellonian University*, translated by Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, Kraków 2000, p. 99.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

the narrative does not deviate considerably from the biography by Mann, cited above. This narrative is characterised by the following key points – also mentioned above: the acquaintance between Thun and Pol from the pre-revolutionary period, Pol's rejection of the appointment to the chair in Polish language and literature, the establishment of the chair in geography, and finally his dismissal from the university. This very story is perfectly suited to concretising the briefly realised hope of liberalisation. Thus Barycz, for example, used his biography to describe in detail the internal history of the university 1849–1853, which takes up more space than the description of Pol's person and work.⁷⁴ It is also not a problem for historians that Pol was not only Catholic and conservative, but also loyal to the Habsburg monarchy – which is perhaps not surprising in the loyal narratives before 1918, but certainly in the period after 1945.⁷⁵ This image is not disturbed by the poor assessment of his academic qualities as a geographer. We can certainly speak here of a continuation of the positive evaluation that Pol enjoyed at the time of his appointment – as a poet he attracted not only students, but also many Krakow citizens into the lecture theatres, and thus enjoyed the status of a celebrity.

If Pol serves as an example of Thun's successful (in the short term) appointment policy, the two Antonis – Walewski and Bryk – symbolise the opposite. They are called by Banach, among the professors of neo-absolutism, “servile creatures, who would not shrink even from denouncing colleagues”.⁷⁶ Thus where Pol embodies the progressive and liberal face of the university, Bryk and Walewski are nothing other than ‘scratches’ on this picture.

The historian Walewski, whose appointment was imposed by the ministry against the proposals of the faculty, is described as an anti-Polish informer, whose denunciation led to the dismissal of patriotic professors; furthermore, his historiography is deemed to be anti-Polish, methodically arbitrary, and justifying the partitions of Poland.⁷⁷ Ultimately, the same applies to Walewski as to Pol, namely that memory dominates the historiography. However in the case of Walewski, the disappointment over the non-appointment of prominent patriots to the chair in history is combined with the general rejection of Walewski's academic impact and his historical works. The extremely negative assessment of Walewski by the strongly Polish-nationalist historian Henryk Schmitt⁷⁸ is repeated, along with that by Małcki, who suspected Walewski of being involved in his dismissal in 1852/53 and who, in a letter to Karol Szajnocha, even

⁷⁴ BARYCZ: Wincenty Pol.

⁷⁵ See also the assessment in MICHALSKI: Warunki rozwoju, p. 251.

⁷⁶ STOPKA, BANACH, DYBIEC: The History, p. 140.

⁷⁷ Expressed succinctly by Krzysztof BACZKOWSKI: W służbie dworu Habsburskiego. Antoni Walewski (1805–1876), in: *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne* 132 (2005), p. 99–108.

⁷⁸ Henryk SCHMITT: *Rozbiór krytyczny pomysłów historyzoficznych i odkryć dziejowych Pana Antoniego Walewskiego, członka czynnego krakowskiej akademii umiejętności, Lwów 1875.*

referred to him as follows: “A scoundrel! Dumb and evil, a true disgrace to the university”.⁷⁹ Małecki’s accusation is also an insightful testimony to how the process of historical codification can take place. Małecki’s suspicions are repeated by Łoziński, intensified in Barycz’s article on Pol, building on publications that were also based on Małecki’s memories, and then codified in 1964 in Barycz’ book – by 2005 it is accepted as historical fact that Walewski denounced his colleagues to Neusser – without any source having appeared since Łoziński that is independent of Małecki’s statement.

Antoni Bryk is usually called a Pole-hater in publications, who monitored the delivery of lectures in German. Without going into detail here on how exactly this term arose, it can be mentioned that this assessment initially comes also from a colleague, namely Fryderyk Skobel, and was repeated over time with increasing aggravation.⁸⁰ In contrast to Walewski, however, the defamation of Bryk does not solely dominate. In detailed publications on the history of medicine at the university, or on Bryk himself, his political attitude is explained by means of his personal circumstance. As an escaped servant of Polish landlords in Galicia, he was able to study only with the support of Vienna and only after long conflicts with his landlord, Kazimierz Graf Krasicki, and the pastor on whose lands he was supposed to work, and thus lost his earlier patriotism.⁸¹

In addition, those who were nominated but never appointed are also suitable for underlining the narrative of contrasts between the liberal university and the reactionary government. This list includes Seweryn Goszczyński, Adam Mickiewicz and Józef Ignacy Kraszewski, who represent the fruitless search for a suitable candidate for the prestigious chair in Polish language and literature. The search can be seen as fruitless because Karol Mecherzyński, who deputised in the chair and then occupied it, was considered to be unpopular and scientifically unproductive, and was overshadowed by the outstanding literary historian Stanisław Tarnowski, who held the chair after 1870.⁸² But the fact that the non-appointment of the three poets was due neither to Thun nor to the Vienna government fits the picture mentioned above: Goszczyński rejected the offer, the short-term governor of Galicia, Wacław Zaleski, objected to the nomination of Mickiewicz, and Kraszewski’s appointment failed due to the refusal of the Russia authorities to permit his departure. While these facts are known to specialist historians,⁸³

⁷⁹ Antoni Małecki to Karol Szajnocha, Lemberg 21.7.1862, reprinted in: Henryk BARYCZ (ed.): *Korespondencja Karola Szajnochy*, Vol. 2, Wrocław 1959, p. 354–355, here p. 355.

⁸⁰ SKOBEL: *Moje wspomnienia*, p. 34. For the direct use see e.g. MICHALSKI: *Warunki rozwoju*, p. 256–257.

⁸¹ For example Leon WACHHOLZ: *Bryk Antoni*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, Vol. 3: Brożek Jan – Chwalczewski Franciszek, Kraków 1937, p. 27; Zbigniew FRAS: *Galicia*, Wrocław 1999, p. 50–51.

⁸² Cf. e.g. Julian DYBIEC: *Stanisław Tarnowski: autorytet, polityk, uczonek*, in: *Stanisław Tarnowski (1837–1917). Materiały z Posiedzenia Naukowego PAU w dniu 14.XI.1997 r.*, Kraków 1999, 63–65, on Mecherzyński p. 64.

⁸³ BARYCZ: *Wincenty Pol*, p. 91; MROZOWSKA: *Okres*, p. 219–226.

the episode nevertheless casts a shadow on neo-absolutism and is interpreted as a portent of the events of 1853.

However Thun is not directly named here. “The government” is held responsible for the non-appointment of the poets, as well as for the appointment of Walewski and Bryk – in the latter case, also in the majority of specialist publications.⁸⁴ Thun’s role, however, is clear only in the appointment of Wincenty Pol or the relocation of Małecki to Lviv. It is never clearly stated who ordered the “Germanisation” of the Jagiellonian University – but it is stressed all the more clearly that it was Thun who opposed the dismissal of the four professors. The dismissal was conducted by the de-personalised government. This pattern repeats itself also in recent historiography. Here the memory of the positive minister, whose Poland-friendliness was often repeated, and his times, which are characterised by Germanisation and suppression, come apart. One thing is certain: Just as in the Austrian historiography, Thun also remains a thoroughly contradictory figure also in Polish historical research.⁸⁵

Summary

The assessment of Leo(n) Thun-Hohenstein by Polish historians provides an insight into the factors that influenced the historiography of Galicia. It is not, as one might suspect, the nation alone that is elevated to an evaluating criterion, even if the sceptre of Germanisation casts a deep shadow on neo-absolutism – above all in popular historiography. On the contrary, a linkage of several events and processes shapes the negative image of the 1850s: It was not the change in language alone that revealed the anti-Polish politics of the Vienna government, but above all the combination of the Austrian language policy with the university’s loss of autonomy, and the latter’s subjugation. That also occurred during different periodisations: Whether the timeframe leading up to Galician autonomy starts in 1833, 1846 or 1848 is also determined by the context in which the reforms and neo-absolutism are placed. The image changes, depending on when the beginning is defined, and ranges accordingly from a continuous suppression since the university reforms in the Free City of Krakow in 1833 to an interpretation that takes 1848 as the turning point, in which a brief awakening is replaced by

⁸⁴ Publications on Pol form the exception, who turned to Walewski so that he, who was a personal friend of Thun and happened to be in Vienna, might speak on his behalf when rumours spread of the political problems of the poet-geographer in Krakow. But we can note here – which is symptomatic of the situation – that there is no mention of this letter when only Walewski is being written about.

⁸⁵ Cf. the assessment by Hans LENTZE: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, Wien 1962 versus Adolf LHOTSKY: Das Ende des Josephinismus. Epilegomena zu Hans Lentzes Werk über die Reformen des Ministers Grafen Thun, in: Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs 15 (1962), p. 526–549.

the defeat of liberalism. With these different perspectives, the view of Thun's role also changes. At the same time however, this does not mean that the non-Polish actors are condemned *per definitionem* – in this respect, Endlicher is an excellent example, whose loyalty to Polishness makes him a positive figure in the historiography. Małecki speaks of “the German with white gums”⁸⁶ and those with “black gums”, depending on their attitude towards Polish patriotic activities, and this metaphor certainly continues to be valid. But where does Thun stand?

First it should be established that in terms of historical memory, Thun is given only a subordinate role in the historical narratives. He is named above all when it comes to direct negotiations between the ministry and scholars, less so with university authorities. In principle, the reform is appreciated: This is true both of the description in obituaries of Thun and of post-war historians and their account of the academic development. In histories of the university, historians since Barycz have constantly referred to the contrast between the expectations and the reality of the reforms, however without presenting Thun explicitly as a special agent of neo-absolutist politics – this dissonance conforms to the image of Thun's period in office in the literature in German. In this respect, the picture emerges of a minister who favoured Galicia but was powerless, which is also indicated by the use of the term “the government”, which is constantly shown as the central powers in matters of dispute. Therefore there is a dissonance between the very positive personal memories of Thun and the policy associated with his time in office, which can indeed also be explained by the lack of research on the power relationships within the Vienna government. Małecki, Skobel and Pol spoke highly of the minister. This verdict by prominent scholars who were recognised as Polish patriots prevailed and became a fixed component of the knowledge about Thun's activities.

However the narratives by these three patriotic professors form not only a knowledge base, from which historical statements are taken to justify Thun's involvement in the neo-absolutist government, but they also form the perspective-determining foundation of historical research. They form the unquestioned starting point for the narrative of the period immediately after 1848, and mask all statements to the contrary. Also in the biogram cited at the outset, Pol serves as a reference figure for Thun, who makes the abstract activities of the Viennese minister understandable to the Polish-speaking reader by means of a specific example of his Galician policy, thus endowing him with the desired contours.

A fundamental difference can be identified between the Polish and the Austrian Thun narrative. German-language publications see 1849 in principle as the start of a new liberal era for the universities; Polish historians, in contrast, consider 1852/53 to be the defining moment, which

⁸⁶ FINKEL: *Historia Uniwersytetu*, p. 336.

also marks the end of the liberal hopes, whose “victim” is shown to be Thun, to a certain extent. Thus two experiential worlds appear – mostly construed by historians, but also building on the ego documents selected. An image of separate memories emerges, which also underlines the marginal role of Galicia in the Habsburg narrative, in both the Polish and German-language historiography. I have named some processes, taking Thun as an example, which have intensified this image by means of *othering*, the distinction between oneself and the other, between the negative and the desirable in the past. One question remains open, namely how the latest historiography will deal with this problem, and which new narratives will be produced by the imperial history or the history of all the interconnections, for sooner or later they too will be confronted with the different experiential worlds of historical authors and will be assessed accordingly with new criteria. But also within this history, forgetting will play a not insignificant role.

Johannes Feichtinger, Franz Leander Fillafer

Leo Thun and posterity

The academic reformer in the Austrian historical and cultural politics of the 19th and 20th centuries

Confused by the parties of hate and favour, the character image of Leo Thun-Hohenstein fluctuates in history. Soon after his resignation as minister in 1860, Thun's university reform became an unavoidable reference in every reform debate on the educational system in Austria. The intentions of the minister and the turning points in the reform process were and are understood and modelled differently, depending on the circumstance of the time and political standpoints. With the unveiling of the monument dedicated by the University of Vienna to the trio Thun-Exner-Bonitz in 1893, the reform became the scene of public debate. In the same year, Salomon Frankfurter's hagiographic account was published, followed in 1905 by the critical *Geschichte des österreichischen Unterrichtswesens* by Gustav Strakosch-Graßmann.¹

The obituaries of Thun-Hohenstein, who died in 1888, first praised his activity as the gubernatorial president of Bohemia in 1848. The Austrian-conservative side considered him one of their own, the liberal press associated him with the suppression of the Prague Pentecost Uprising and with the Concordat of 1855. In overviews of Austrian history, the reform of the schools and universities was often ignored, apart from isolated pithy assessments, for example by Heinrich Friedjung.² The commemoration of Thun's reform activity once again attained public significance in the 20th century, when another reform of the universities was being concocted after the demise of the Austrofascist corporate state and of National Socialism. The *Hochschul-Organisationsgesetz* was passed in 1955. In this context, the two large works about the academic reform appeared, the monographs by Hans Lentze and Richard Meister, both of which were published in the 1960s.

¹ Salomon FRANKFURTER: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, Franz Exner und Hermann Bonitz. Beiträge zur Geschichte der österreichischen Unterrichtsreform, Wien 1893. Gustav STRAKOSCH-GRASSMANN: Geschichte des österreichischen Unterrichtswesens, Wien 1905.

² Cf. Heinrich FRIEDJUNG: Österreich von 1848 bis 1860. 2 vols, Wien, Berlin 1913, I, p. 329–331. Volume 9 of "Geschichte der Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918", Wien 2010, contains the chapter "Die Thun'schen Hochschulreformen und ihre Folgen" (p. 92–101), written by Margret FRIEDRICH, Brigitte MAZOHL and Astrid von SCHLACHTA. In contrast, in the most recent overview of Austrian 19th century history, the "university reform" of Thun-Hohenstein is given only half a paragraph in the chapter "Der Kampf um die Schule". Cf. Helmut RUMPLER: Eine Chance für Mitteleuropa. Bürgerliche Emanzipation und Staatsverfall in der Habsburgermonarchie (Österreichs Geschichte 1804–1914), Wien 2005, p. 335.

Leo Graf Thun-Hohenstein, the academic and university reformer of the 19th century, forced everyone with whom he came in contact to declare their political convictions. We can distinguish roughly between two main positions, an *apologetic* one and a *critical* one.

These two interpretative strains can be assigned to conservative and liberal political attitudes and their main features can be summarised as follows. From the *apologetic perspective*, Minister for Education Thun-Hohenstein was greatly praised: First, for managing to save the reform, i.e. the introduction of the freedom of teaching and learning and the self-administration of the faculties, despite fierce resistance and with only a few minor compromises, while remaining true in the restoration period of neo-absolutism to the progressive ideas of Franz S. Exner and Ernst von Feuchtersleben; second, Thun is acknowledged for protecting the universities from the grasp of the Church (in contrast to the secondary and elementary schools); third, for finally paving the way for “unconditional science”, in other words for the fact that Thun considered only academic suitability and not political or denominational aspects in his appointment policy. Fourth, Thun is ultimately also honoured for the fact that he conducted a ground-breaking university reform that remained essentially intact until the *Universitätsgesetz (UG)* of 2002.

The complementary critical view can also be characterised based on four positions. Here it is first stressed that the reform was by no means the achievement of Thun-Hohenstein, instead they attributed it to Exner’s liberal preparations whom Thun realised in more or less diluted and garbled form. Furthermore, the minister subverted the reform with the manner of its implementation: First, Thun undermined the unlimited freedom of teaching, which had been declared in 1848, with his vainglorious appointment style, stifled the unlimited freedom of learning with an over-regulated academic system, and systematically thwarted the legally secured self-administration of the universities, which had existed since 1849; second, Thun is accused of undermining the supposed protection against Church interference with his appointment policy, which was obliged strictly to the ideal of the compatibility of scientific knowledge and Christian revelation; Thun also removed the Catholic theological faculties from state control and reversed the secularisation of the schools; third, Thun is rebuked for the fact that he did not in fact represent an “unconditional” (*voraussetzungslos*) science, but rather one that was constantly oriented on the “Christian” and “historical-positive” foundations of enquiry; fourthly and finally, there is criticism that while Thun might have temporarily passed the law

on the organisation of the universities that was devised by Exner and Feuchtersleben, he failed to consolidate it.³

This critical view, usually presented from a liberal and German-national perspective, is remarkable for what it highlights as much as what it omits: The liberals sharply criticised the Thun-Hohenstein “system”, but assumed its basic structure and did not significantly change either the ministerially-controlled appointment practice or the state study regulations.⁴ The apologetic view, in turn, bears the imprint of Salomon Frankfurter’s aforementioned book of 1893; Richard Meister in particular drew on this text, and although he was not utterly uncritical of it, he clearly remained true to Frankfurter’s ideas. The crystallisation of the critical view can be attributed to Eduard Herbst’s vitriolic *Reichsrat* speech on the achievements of Thun-Hohenstein’s ministry on 5 June 1862. Herbst’s cues were subsequently used by Gustav Strakosch-Graßmann, Paul Molisch and by Hans Lentze in his ground-breaking 1962 monograph.⁵

In this chapter we attempt to reconstruct the origins and modifications of these two interpretative patterns. In the process, we limit ourselves essentially to the problem of autonomy. From 1848 onwards it permeated every controversy that was debated in Austria concerning the university reforms. The autonomy problem manifested itself primarily in the relationship of the state to the universities, particularly with regard to three areas: the freedom of teaching and learning, financial management, and the state’s supervisory powers. The

³ On Exner and Feuchtersleben cf. Herbert EGGLMAIER: Reformansätze vor der Thunschen Reform: Feuchtersleben und das Konzept der genuin österreichischen Universitätsreform, in: *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 18 (1998), p. 59–85. Deborah R. COEN: *Vienna in the Age of Uncertainty. Science, Liberalism, and Private Life*. Chicago, Ill. [i.a.] 2007. Ernst Freiherr von FEUCHTERSLEBEN: *Pädagogische Schriften*, ed. by Kurt G[erhard] FISCHER (Schöninghs Sammlung pädagogischer Schriften: Quellen zur Geschichte der Pädagogik), Paderborn 1963, p. 131–143.

⁴ Cf. Hans LENTZE: *Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 239. Vol 2. Abhandlung sowie Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts, Issue 7), Graz, Wien, Köln 1962, p. 276.

⁵ On the German-national historian and teacher Gustav Strakosch-Graßmann cf. E[imar] LECHNER: *Strakosch-Graßmann, Gustav (1869–1941), Historiker und Lehrer*, in: *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950*, Vol. 13, Wien 2009, p. 352–353. On the chief state librarian and German-national historian Paul Molisch cf. Robert STUMPF: *Bausteine der Wissensvermehrung: Alois Jesinger und die NS-Opposition an der Universitätsbibliothek Wien (1938–1945)*, in: *Mitteilungen der Vereinigung österreichischer Bibliothekarinnen und Bibliothekare VÖB* 61 (2008), 4, p. 7–40, here p. 13 and 35; and Paul MOLISCH: *Die deutschen Hochschulen in Österreich und die politisch-nationale Entwicklung nach dem Jahre 1848. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Wiener Hochschulen zumeist nach urkundlichen Quellen dargestellt*, München 1922 and IDEM.: *Politische Geschichte der deutschen Hochschulen in Österreich von 1848 bis 1918*. Second expanded edition, Wien, Leipzig 1939. On the priest and legal historian Hans Lentze cf. Helmuth STRADAL: *Hans Lentze †*, in: *Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht ÖAKR*, Vol. 21 (1970), p. 201–207, Werner OGRIS: *In memoriam. Hans Lentze †*, in: *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Germanistische Abteilung* 392/88 (1971), p. 508–517.

autonomy question is thrown into sharp relief in a debate that revolves around two opposite conceptions of the university as a state institution or a self-regulating corporation: All other subsidiary conflicts – about the tenability and desirability of unconditional, value-free science as well as over the prioritizing of holistic conceptions of humanistic education as *Bildung* or vocational training – remain bound up with the key debate over university autonomy.

In what follows we contend that with regard to the negotiation of university autonomy, the Thun-Hohenstein reforms set the central standard for university reforms in Austria for 150 years. The *Universitätsorganisationsgesetz* of 1873 consolidated the provisional law on the organisation of the academic authorities. There were no great changes, and no announcement of any university constitution that might clarify the autonomy question. “Nothing new, but rather definitive provisions,” according to the administrative lawyer and section head at the Ministry for Education, Karl Lemayer, with regard to the maxim of 1873.⁶ Neither was the autonomy question clarified by the *Hochschul-Organisationsgesetz* of 1955, and remained – if we ignore the complete loss of autonomy by the universities in the period of the authoritarian corporate state and National Socialism – by and large open until the *Universitätsgesetz* of 2002: So were the universities dependent state institutions or corporations? The administrative lawyers finally agreed on the view already taken by Lemayer in the 19th century: “To put it this way, these institutions have a side that veers towards the state, and one that is removed from state influence”.⁷ They were state institutes that contained domains of autonomous self-governance.⁸

In our essay we analyse how this problem was tackled by Austrian historians and academic politicians of the 19th and 20th centuries, and also examine the motives and modes that undergirded the commemoration of Thun-Hohenstein’s reform. Below, the treatment of the autonomy problem is examined in three time layers: the 1950s and 1960s, the period from 1888 to 1905 and, thirdly, the 1860s, the decade immediately after Thun-Hohenstein’s resignation.

⁶ Karl LEMAYER: Die Verwaltung der österreichischen Hochschulen von 1868–1877, im Auftrage des k. k. Ministers für Cultus und Unterricht, Wien 1878, p. 44. On Karl Lemayer cf. [Bruno] SCHIMETSCHKE: Lemayer, Karl Frh. von (1841–1906), Verwaltungsjurist, in: Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950, Vol. 5, Wien 1970, p. 123.

⁷ LEMAYER: Verwaltung, p. IV.

⁸ On the subject “corporation or institution” cf. Sascha FERZ: Ewige Universitätsreform. Das Organisationsrecht der österreichischen Universitäten von den theresianischen Reformen bis zum UOG 1993 (Rechts- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Reihe, Vol. 27), Frankfurt a. M., Berlin, Bern i.a. 2000, p. 266–270. Also Ludwig ADAMOVICH: Hochschulverwaltung und Universitäten, in: 100 Jahre Unterrichtsministerium 1848–1948. Festschrift des Bundesministeriums für Unterricht in Wien, edited by an editorial committee chaired by Egon Loebenstein, Wien 1948, p. 43–52, here p. 44–45.

We first turn to two books that appeared soon after the *Hochschul-Organisationsgesetz* of 1955 and which addressed the autonomy problem: Hans Lentze's large study *Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Grafen Leo Thun-Hohenstein* from 1962 and Richard Meister's *Entwicklung und Reformen des österreichischen Unterrichtswesens* from 1963.⁹ The next section is dedicated to these two works about Thun-Hohenstein's academic reform.

The Meister-Lentze episode

First a brief word on the *dramatis personae*: Hans Lentze (1909–1970) seems to have lived at least four-and-a-half lives: as a Germanist legal historian and canonist, as a young intellectual from a pietistic Silesian home, as a Catholic priest, as a German and Austrian, as a Premonstratensian at the Wilten monastery, and as a secular professor of legal history in Innsbruck and Vienna. Lentze, born in 1909 in Lauban/Silesia, studied in Göttingen, Bonn and Breslau.¹⁰ Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy supervised his doctorate, which Lentze completed with a profound work on the guild constitution in the German imperial cities until the death of Emperor Charles IV. In his dissertation, Lentze opposed the autochthonous guild theory of Georg von Below and Otto Gierke and identified northern Italian influences in the guild system of the empire. Lentze came to Vienna in 1933, where he supported Hans Voltolini in issuing the *Schwabenspiegel* legal code, and cooperated closely with Heinrich Mitteis and Emil Goldmann. His critical view of the genesis of traditions and sensitivity for the traditional and milieu-bound nature of source work and historical views were self-evident for Lentze, who was well-versed in diplomatics. Having converted to Catholicism in 1934, Lentze's response to the 1938 Anschluss was that he took the cloth. He studied theology, was ordained as a priest, and became the Premonstratensian in Wilten.¹¹ In the 1950s Lentze was appointed to a chair of legal history at Vienna before becoming a corresponding member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences in 1963. Lentze was a liberal and not a national Catholic, and was very sceptical towards German nationalism.¹² He was able to mould his Thun image sharply and yet communicate it kindly. As

⁹ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*. RICHARD MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen des österreichischen Studienwesens* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 239. Vol. 1. Abhandlung sowie Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts, Issue 6), Graz, Wien, Köln 1963.

¹⁰ Lentze studied above all with Herbert Meyer, Richard Honig and Wilhelm Levison, cf. OGRIS: *In memoriam*. Hans Lentze †, p. 508–509. We thank Professor Werner Ogris very much for the opportunity of a detailed conversation prior to the conference documented in this volume, and for the obliging information about his teacher, Hans Lentze.

¹¹ On Lentze's activity as an extremely popular priest co-operator cf. the letter by Michael Hofmann to the prelate of Wilten, 9 February 1939, Stift Wilten, Nachlass Hermann (Hans) Lentze A 8/01/54 H.

¹² See the excerpt card files in the Lentze estate, Stift Wilten, Nachlass Hermann (Hans) Lentze, A 08/01/49 (on the work of Rolf Wolkan). Admittedly, Lentze also criticised the – anti-monarchist – “left-leaning school education”, which deprived the youth of the “basic facts of Austrian history” and thus prepared the ground for

the civil rights lawyer Hans Schima stated in 1970 in his commemorative speech at his consecration, Lentze never tripped “over threads of twine”.¹³

Richard Meister (1881–1964) was one of those Austrian university teachers who managed to serve every regime of the 20th century with similar submissiveness and dedication. Meister’s worldview can best be described as a national Catholicism. Born in 1881 in Znaim/Moravia, he studied Indo-German, classical philology and archaeology at the University of Vienna, and later philosophy and pedagogy. He completed his doctorate in comparative linguistics in 1904, and initially earned his living as a schoolteacher, before becoming an associate professor of classical philology in Graz in 1918, and from 1920 in Vienna. In 1923 he was appointed to the chair in pedagogy in Vienna. In this function he vehemently fought Otto Glöckel’s school reform, especially the idea of comprehensive schooling, against which Meister defended the importance of the *Gymnasium* in its long form and the relevance of classical languages to a humanist education.¹⁴ Already before and during the authoritarian corporative state, Meister was a member of several associations oriented on a Greater Germany, for example the *Deutscher Klub*, a reservoir for the now-illegal National Socialists. Between 1934 and 1938 Meister represented the sciences in the federal cultural council of the Austrofascist state. Despite his activities as a functionary in the corporative state, he was not persecuted after the *Anschluss* of 1938, but was moved from the chair in pedagogy to the chair in classical philology. In this position Meister, who did not apply to become a member of the NSDAP, seemed to be acceptable to the National Socialist potentates.

Meister’s moment came in 1945: First he served as vice-president of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and saved this institution from its dissolution. In those years, Meister undertook an institutional and personnel restructuring of the academy by modernising it regressively. In 1949 he was elected rector of the University of Vienna and in 1951 president of the academy. In this position he founded in 1960 – at the age of eighty – the *Österreichischen Forschungsrat*

German-national propaganda, cf. the manuscript Hans LENTZE: Bemerkungen zu Fritz Klenner, *Das Unbehagen in der Demokratie* [1956], Nachlass Hermann (Hans) Lentze A 8/1/21 V, p. 2.

¹³ Hans SCHIMA: Gedenkworte, ausgesprochen bei der Einsegnung von o. Univ. Prof. Hans Lentze in der Pfarrkirche Wien-Alservorstadt am 1. April 1970, Archiv der Universität Wien, Personalakt Lentze.

¹⁴ Cf. Wolfgang BREZINKA: Pädagogik in Österreich. Die Geschichte des Faches an den Universitäten vom 18. bis zum Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts, Vol. 1: Wien 2000, p. 372–389, here p. 381. Richard OLECHOWSKI: Die „Kulturpädagogik“ – ein Weg in die Erstarrung durch Konservatismus? Zum 50. Gedenktag des Todestags von Richard Meister, in: *Erziehung und Unterricht. Österreichische pädagogische Zeitschrift* 164 (2014), p. 521–529. Johannes FEICHTINGER: Richard Meister. Ein dienstbarer Hochschulprofessor in vier politischen Regimen, in: Mitchell G. ASH, Josef EHMER (ed.): *Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft, (650 Jahre Universität Wien, Vol. 2)*, Göttingen, Wien 2015, p. 311–317.

(Austrian Research Council), the predecessor to the *Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung (FWF)* (Austrian Science Fund).¹⁵ The self-governance of the academy and the university were as sacred to him as the political independence of the Austrian research council. He warded off political interventions and rebuffed the attempts of the Social Democrats, the SPÖ, who also sought to gain terrain in university politics. Meister was not only the originator of the *Hochschul-Organisationsgesetzes* of 1955, which he conceived together with his student, the later minister of education Heinrich Drimmel,¹⁶ but he was also the most important historian of education of his age. In 1949 Meister dedicated his rectorial speech on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Thun-Hohenstein taking office, and to his reform. In 1963 he published the aforementioned book “Entwicklung und Reformen des österreichischen Studienwesens”, in which Meister drew a different picture of Thun-Hohenstein and the reform to that presented by Hans Lentze in the work that appeared the previous year.

Lentze’s and Meister’s studies on the university reform were published in the proceedings of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (*Sitzungsberichte*), as Volume IV and V of the “*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Universität Wien*” in the context of publications by the *Kommission für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts* (Commission for the history of education). Lentze’s volume was published in 1962, Meister’s overview the following year. Meister, as series editor and cunning tycoon in the area of academic politics, was crafty enough to allow Lentze to go first and yet to maintain the last word. Although Lentze’s work was published in 1962, it bore the fascicle number 7/V, while Meister’s volume appeared one year later, however with issue number 6/IV. Thus Meister secured for himself the opportunity of a rejoinder, and was able to respond at length to Lentze’s fundamental criticism of Thun-Hohenstein.

First, to Lentze’s monograph: Hans Lentze’s work is mainly concerned with the problem of the freedom of teaching and learning. The question of the autonomy of the universities, i.e. their status as state institutions or corporations, always resonated implicitly. In the view of Thun’s eulogists, the achievement of the freedom of teaching and learning was the main achievement of his time as minister. For example, Joseph Alexander von Helfert, Thun’s undersecretary in the ministry of education (1848–1861), Christian-conservative cultural politician and founder

¹⁵ Cf. Christof AICHNER: 40 Jahre im Dienste der Forschung. Gründung und Geschichte des Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung (1967–2007), Dipl. Arb. Innsbruck 2007.

¹⁶ Cf. Demokratie und Geschichte. Jahrbuch des Karl von Vogelsang-Instituts zur Erforschung der christlichen Demokratie in Österreich, ed. Helmut WOHNOUT 9/10 (2005/2006): Themenschwerpunkt Heinrich Drimmel.

of the Austrian Leo Society (1892), expressed such a view.¹⁷ A similar note was sounded by the Vienna librarian Salomon Frankfurter.¹⁸ In contrast to Helfert and Frankfurter, to Lentze Thun was not bathed in sweetness and light; Lentze attempted to dispel the encrusted clichés about Thun’s ministerial period.

Lentze acknowledged Thun’s reform of law studies as “magnificent”,¹⁹ and referred to the criticism by Thun of Felix Schwarzenberg’s plan to suspend the constitution of March 1849: According to Lentze, Thun remained in office “in order to be able to continue working for his two great objectives, the Concordat and the academic reform”.²⁰ Despite this praise, Lentze did not hold back with his criticism of the ideological conception and implementation modus of the reform. While Frankfurter credited Thun with introducing the freedom of teaching and learning,²¹ Lentze corrected this claim by stating that this, and the introduction of the self-administration of the faculties, had already taken place prior to Thun taking office on 22 August 1849, “he therefore does not deserve any credit for that”. Instead, the Thunian system infringed “academic freedom in its different guises” in three different aspects, in terms of the “freedom of teaching for lecturers”, the freedom of learning for students”, and the “autonomy for the corporation as a whole”.²² The freedom of teaching was thwarted and cancelled out by Thun’s appointment policy.

Hans Lentze not only opposed the glorification of the Thunian reforms, he also advocated a reassessment of the academic system of the Vormärz. Here he introduced the concept of “unconditional science” (“voraussetzungslose Wissenschaft”), which was coined by the Viennese philosopher and priest Franz Brentano.²³ In the 1930s the concept was resurrected in the debate between Karl Mannheim and Eduard Spranger.²⁴ Mannheim had advocated an analysis of ideologies that would carve out their substantive and situation-specific logic. This

¹⁷ On the historian, jurist and politician Josef Alexander Helfert (1820–1910) cf. Erika WEINZIERL: Helfert, Joseph Alexander Freiherr von, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie NDB* 8 (1969), p. 469–470.

¹⁸ On the classical philologist and librarian Salomon Frankfurter (1856–1941) cf. Evelyn ADUNKA: Salomon Frankfurter (1856–1941), in: Stefan ALKER, Christina KÖSTNER, Markus STUMPF (ed.): *Bibliotheken in der NS-Zeit. Provenienzforschung und Bibliotheksgeschichte*, Wien 2008, p. 209–220.

¹⁹ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 250.

²⁰ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 34.

²¹ Cf. FRANKFURTER: *Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein*, p. 36.

²² LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 283.

²³ Cf. Franz BRENTANO: *Über voraussetzungslose Forschung* [1901], in: IDEM.: *Die vier Phasen der Philosophie und ihr augenblicklicher Stand. Nebst Abhandlungen über Plotinus, Thomas von Acquin, Kant, Schopenhauer und Auguste Comte*, ed. Oskar KRAUS, Leipzig 1926, p. 138–144.

²⁴ Cf. Eduard SPRANGER: *Der Sinn der Voraussetzungslosigkeit in den Geisteswissenschaften* [1929], in: IDEM.: *Grundlagen der Geisteswissenschaften*, ed. Hans Walter BÄHR (Gesammelte Schriften, Vol. 6), Tübingen 1980, p. 151–183.

analysis should highlight the social preconditions of ideological formations, and scrutinise the reassuring function of routinized references to “spirit” (*Geist*) and “meaning” (*Sinn*) in societies, showing that they gave leverage to certain visions of the social whole while surreptitiously delegitimizing others.²⁵ Spranger reacted to this in 1959 with the accusation that this approach leads to the “swamps of relativism” and abets “world-view universities”.²⁶ For Lentze, the Thunian reforms were in fact *not* unconditional: “For me it was a surprising result that the Imperial Commission on Education prior to 1848 was much more ‘unconditional’ than Graf Thun, so that even convinced liberals were able to become established as lecturers at the law faculty in Vienna”.²⁷

This interpretation proposed by Lentze was unpalatable to Meister who styled Thun the heroic architect of a valuable and durable reform. For Meister, the Revolution of 1848 and the reform by Exner and Feuchtersleben helped the “driving forces” of modern university development, nationalisation, and secularisation, “to their fulfilling evolvment”.²⁸ Meister positioned Thun in opposition to these driving forces. It is almost historical misrepresentation when Meister mentions Exner and Feuchtersleben, who actually developed the freedom of teaching and learning,²⁹ in the same breath as the – supposed – evils of the academic system of the Vormärz. Meister’s Thun appears in a very different light. Meister praised him for stemming the “alarming consequences” of those modern “driving forces”, the “autocratic management of the university”, the “paternalist tampering with scientists’ teaching” and the “restriction of the purpose of the universities to mere vocational training”. Thun entrusted the self-governance of the universities to their professors, and paved the way for the freedom of teaching: “It was, all in all, the breakthrough of the principles of self-administration, of freedom of teaching, and of scientific knowledge.”³⁰

²⁵ Cf. Karl MANNHEIM: *Ideologie und Utopie*, Bonn 1929.

²⁶ Cf. Reinhard LAUBE: *Platon und die Sophisten*, in: Hartmut LEHMANN, Otto Gerhard OEXLE (ed.): *Nationalsozialismus in den Kulturwissenschaften*, Vol. 2: *Leitbegriffe – Deutungsmuster – Paradigmenkämpfe. Erfahrungen und Transformationen im Exil*, p. 139–164, here p. 151.

²⁷ Hans LENTZE: *Graf Thun und die voraussetzungslose Wissenschaft*, in: Helmut J. MEZLER-ANDELBERG (ed.): *Festschrift Karl Eder zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Innsbruck 1959, p. 197–209, here p. 198. IDEM.: *Graf Thun und die deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, in: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 63 (1955), p. 500–521. Cf. Gerhard OBERKOFER: *Die Verteidigung der Lehrbücher von Karl Anton von Martini (1726–1800) und Franz von Zeiller (1751–1828). Eine Studie über das österreichische Juristenmilieu im Vormärz*, in: IDEM.: *Studien zur Geschichte der österreichischen Rechtswissenschaft (Rechtshistorische Reihe, Vol. 33)*, Frankfurt a. M. 1984, p. 9–78.

²⁸ MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen*, p. 89.

²⁹ Cf. EGGLMAIER: *Reformansätze*, p. 61. [Franz S. EXNER]: *Entwurf der Grundzüge des öffentlichen Unterrichtswesens in Oesterreich, III. Abtheilung: Die hohen Schulen*, in: *Wiener Zeitung*, 21.7.1848, p. 195–197, here p. 196.

³⁰ MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen*, p. 90.

Meister does not mention that the freedom of teaching and learning and self-governance had already been practised well before the announcement of the *Provisorisches Gesetz über die Organisation der akademischen Behörden* on the basis of the decree issued by Minister Franz von Sommaruga on 6 April 1848.³¹ As stated explicitly in this decree “the sphere of the teaching staff is expanded and the management of the higher schools is entrusted to the men of science themselves.”³² This meant that the freedom of teaching had already been decreed by government for the monarchy, with the exception of Hungary and Lombardy-Venetia, more than one year before Thun entered office, and the freedom of learning that had previously been declared for Vienna was now confirmed for these countries. This fact is intentionally ignored by Meister, and also overlooked by Lentze.

Lentze assessed Thun’s work as a minister as follows: Thun took office with the intention of carrying out the reform in the “spirit of the Catholic restoration”,³³ for Lentze that meant at the same time that Thun’s political concept for the universities was therefore “not determined by the liberal Exner and the Protestant Bonitz”.³⁴

Thuns autoritäres Regime war getragen von dem Bewußtsein seiner Verantwortung für die kulturelle Neugestaltung Österreichs. Dies drängte ihn zur Verwirklichung seines Konzeptes, dafür war ihm kein Einsatz zu groß. Unter ihm griff die Unterrichtsverwaltung initiativ in das wissenschaftliche Leben ein und hielt eine zielstrebige Lenkung des Kultur- und Bildungslebens bis ins einzelne für ihre Aufgabe. Die Geschäftsführung des Unterrichtsministeriums in der Ära Thun unterscheidet sich dadurch von der Geschäftsführung der konstitutionellen Zeit, wo man sich auf Verwaltungsarbeit nach der Schablone beschränkte und die Initiative den Fakultäten überließ.³⁵

Richard Meister agreed with Lentze’s assessment with regard to the reduction in the freedom of teaching and learning, but he also exculpated Thun-Hohenstein. According to Meister, Thun-

³¹ On Franz S. Sommaruga cf. H[ans] P[eter] HYE: Sommaruga, Franz Ser. Vincenz Emanuel von (1780–1860), Jurist und Politiker, in: Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950, Vol. 12, Wien 2005, 411–412.

³² Bestimmungen über die Lehr- und Lernfreiheit, Schreiben des k. k. Ministeriums des öffentlichen Unterrichtes v. 6.4.1848, an die Länderchefs in Oesterreich unter und ob der Enns, in Böhmen, Mähren, Galizien, Steyermark, Tyrol, Illyrien, Küstenland, Dalmatien und Krakau, in: Politische Gesetzes-Sammlung (S. k. k. Majestät Ferdinand des Ersten Gesetze und Verordnungen für sämtliche Provinzen des Oesterreichischen Kaiserstaates, mit Ausnahme von Ungarn und Siebenbürgen), p. 133–141, here p. 136. Meister refers to this ordinance, but does not refer to the freedom of teaching and learning in this context, MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen*, p. 70.

³³ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 81. Cf. the contribution by FILLAFER in this volume.

³⁴ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 79.

³⁵ “Thun’s authoritarian regime was borne by the awareness of his responsibility for the cultural restructuring of Austria. This forced him to realise his concept, and no effort was too great for him. Under him, the educational administration intervened in academic life with initiative and saw its mission in the ambitious control of the cultural and educational life to the smallest detail. This distinguishes the management of the ministry of education in Thun’s era from its management during the constitutional period, where administrative work was carried out according to a template, and the initiative was left to the faculties.” Cf. *ibid.*, p. 114.

Hohenstein felt obliged to the ideal of a limited autonomy, and restricted the freedom of teaching on reasonable grounds. Thun disregarded the right of professors to nominate candidates for vacant chairs at their faculties in order to save the reform, since most of the professors were followers of the familiar academic system of the Vormärz.³⁶ Thun-Hohenstein possessed the clear vision and energy the professors lacked; only by these means was he able to continue pursuing the objectives of the reform during neo-absolutism.

With regard to the freedom of learning, Lentze comments in his monograph that Thun-Hohenstein destroyed it. He introduced an overly academic system with obligatory courses and strict viva regulations.³⁷ Meister also agreed with this accusation: “The freedom of learning was already by and large withdrawn by Thun-Hohenstein, and rightly so”.³⁸ With this withdrawal, the minister not only preserved the “‘natural hierarchy’ in the appropriation of all science”,³⁹ he therefore also developed an adequate solution for the basic problem of mediation between a research university and a vocational training institute. The philosopher’s stone for the harmonisation of these two contradictory concepts had not yet been found, but Thun-Hohenstein enforced the intervention that was most reliable and most compatible with academic progress.

A third voice entered the fray in the dialogue between Lentze and Meister in the early 1960s. The Viennese professor Alphons Lhotsky also tested Thun’s university reforms.⁴⁰ The medievalist Lhotsky, who held his head above water before 1938 as a poorly paid assistant and who spent the war years as a house historian and custodian of the Kunsthistorische Museum, managed to embark on a university career only after 1945. As he writes in his extensive review essay of 1962 on Lentze’s book, Lhotsky felt “almost obliged”,⁴¹ as the author of a history on the *Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung (IfÖG)* (Institute for Austrian Historical Research), an institute founded by Thun in 1854, to express his opinion on the material. Some years before, in his history of the IfÖG on the occasion of its 100th anniversary in 1954, Lhotsky

³⁶ Cf. MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen*, p. 86.

³⁷ Cf. LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 236–250.

³⁸ MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen*, p. 88.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, cf. also Richard MEISTER: *Lehr- und Lernfreiheit in der Thunschen Reform und in der Gegenwart in Österreich*, in: *Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 15 (1957), p. 208–232.

⁴⁰ On Alphons Lhotsky (1903–1968) cf. Erich ZÖLLNER: *Alphons Lhotsky †*, in: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 76 (1968), p. 505–514.

⁴¹ Alphons LHOTSKY: *Das Ende des Josephinismus. Epilegomena zu Hans Lentzes Werk über die Reformen des Ministers Grafen Thun*, in: IDEM.: *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. Hans WAGNER and Heinrich KOLLER, Vol. 3: *Historiographie, Quellenkunde, Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, Wien 1972, p. 258–290 [first in: *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 15 (1962), p. 526–594].

had already written about Thun's work: "Precisely his serious Catholicism," it was said at the time of Thun, "never prevented him from ignoring small concerns when it came to great things and goal; above all he concentrated on the ability, he considered only science and its promotion, and therefore had to put up with some antagonism."⁴² Lhotsky passed a much more sober, indeed damnatory verdict in 1962, under the impression of Lentze's book on Thun. Now, the Austrian patriot Lhotsky⁴³ connected Lentze's work to one subject that also occupied Richard Meister – the problem of the "Austrian national education".⁴⁴ It is no coincidence that this was a highly topical subject in the post-war years, when public debate was awash with endeavours to therapeutically consolidate an "Austrian identity".⁴⁵ Also, it does not come as a surprise that Lhotsky placed a different emphasis than the politically versatile education expert Meister, whose miraculous adaptability ingratiated him with the Nazi potentates.

In his essay, Lhotsky agreed completely with Lentze, and praised him for the destruction of the legend of the "objectivity" of Thun-Hohenstein, which was "not tarnished by any ideological consideration, but only concerned with elevating science".⁴⁶ Lhotsky assessed the academic system of the Vormärz as a system of mere schools, which were training institutes for obedient state servants, stooges of "average" intelligence – one thinks of Robert Musil's diagnosis, according to which in Kakanian it "was merely that a *genius* was regarded as a *lout*", "but never, as sometimes happened elsewhere, that a *lout* was mistaken for a *genius*."⁴⁷ At the same time,

⁴² Alphons LHOTSKY: Geschichte des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 1854–1954. Festgabe zur Hundert-Jahr-Feier des Instituts (Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband 17), Graz, Köln 1954, p. 19.

⁴³ ZÖLLNER: Alphons Lhotsky, p. 509: "Old Austrian traditions continued to have an effect on Lhotsky; some features of liberal or Josephinian Austrians, such as Grillparzer, seemed to be resurrected in Lhotsky, however without the connection to anti-Church resentments. Lhotsky was distrustful and dismissive of the mass movements of our age; now we can say that he recognised the sign of the times much more clearly than some who felt more connected to life and the people than the distanced scholar Lhotsky. He was always true to Austria, even when it was not opportune; he found a loud, self-satisfied ultra-patriotism repugnant." Cf. also Alphons LHOTSKY: Das Problem des österreichischen Menschen, in: IDEM.: Gesammelte Aufsätze, Vol. 4: Die Haupt- und Residenzstadt Wien, Sammelwesen und Ikonographie, Der Österreichische Mensch, Wien 1974, p. 308–331, here p. 325 [first in: Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur 12 (1968), p. 429–443].

⁴⁴ On the Vormärz use of the term cf. Matthias KOCH: Ueber Nationalerziehung. Beschluß, in: Österreichisches Archiv für Geschichte, Erdbeschreibung, Staatenkunde, Kunst und Literatur 127, 22.10.1833, p. 505–507. On the genealogy of the term with Louis-René de Caradeuc de la Chalotais LHOTSKY: Das Problem des österreichischen Menschen, p. 316. IDEM.: Ein Bericht über die Universität Göttingen für den Staatskanzler Fürsten Kaunitz-Rietberg 1772, in: Peter CLASSEN, Peter SCHEIBERT (ed.): Festschrift Percy Ernst Schramm, Vol. 2, Wiesbaden 1964, p. 75–82.

⁴⁵ Cf. Friedrich HEER: Der Kampf um die österreichische Identität [1981], Wien, Köln, Weimar 2001. Stefan SPEVAK: Das Jubiläum „950 Jahre Österreich“. Eine Aktion zur Stärkung eines österreichischen Staats- und Kulturbewusstseins im Jahr 1946 (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Vol. 37), Wien, München 2003.

⁴⁶ LHOTSKY: Ende des Josephinismus, p. 259.

⁴⁷ Robert MUSIL: Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften (Gesammelte Werke in Einzelausgaben, ed. Adolf FRISÉ), Hamburg 1967, p. 33.

however, Lhotsky drew attention to research in the imperial collections, cabinets and patriotic societies, and sketched in brief strokes the underlying counter-reformational structure of the nationalisation of the universities.⁴⁸

Against the boastful gesture by the admirers of Thun-Hohenstein, Lhotsky pointed above all to the diffuse progress euphoria of 1848,⁴⁹ and regarded the plan to transform the study of law overnight as a “dangerous experiment.”⁵⁰ For Lhotsky, Leo Thun’s solution for the tricky problem of freedom of teaching and learning lay in the following “simple formula”: “to grant ‘freedom’, but to blunt it *a priori* by means of the expedient construction of the teaching staff”,⁵¹ this construction should guarantee the Catholic-conservative ethos of the professors. Disastrously, his choice of personnel was prompted by the two converts Karl E. Jarcke and George Phillips. Underlying this was the interlocking of national German and Catholic unification attempts, conducted by Thun’s advisers from their base in Austria.⁵² Lhotsky allowed for nuances insofar as he conceded that Thun, in the last six years of his period of office, devoted himself to unscientific “regeneration” without compromises, “under the shadow of the Concordat”, and at the time Thun had even appointed candidates such as the compromised Polish ex-revolutionaries and non-Catholics Eduard Sueß and Theodor Sickel.⁵³ Admittedly, Lhotsky added laconically, this failed to change anything in the anti-Austrian line of the overall reform. The anti-Josephinian Catholic romanticism of the professors appointed in the early 1850s soon disappeared, instead the German-liberal ideal of the nation state, represented by those newly appointed around 1860, took root even more deeply. This development would prove to be “catastrophe”⁵⁴ for the fate of the monarchy.

Lhotsky’s analysis culminates in a double verdict, which considerably intensifies Lentze’s findings. The first point concerns the liquidation of the freedom of teaching and learning. “What,” asked Lhotsky, “was one to think of a ‘freedom of teaching and learning that was to take a very particular direction by means of exceptionally authoritarian manipulations in the appointment of professors, ignoring the wishes and expert reports of the faculties? Even the

⁴⁸ Cf. LHOTSKY: *Ende des Josephinismus*, p. 263–264.

⁴⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 276.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Cf. *ibid.*, p. 278.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

‘Josephinians’, with their selection examinations and prescribed textbooks, handled these matters in a more accurate manner.”⁵⁵

Secondly, according to Lhotsky, by destroying all things Josephinian – the lock, stock, and barrel demise of the Vormärz educational system – Thun-Hohenstein also carried the Austrian system to its grave.⁵⁶ Thun-Hohenstein dreamed of the reunification of Austrian intellectual life with that of the greater Germany, and advocated a “rigid historicism”; thereby he successfully obliterated the Vormärz traditions of the legal and historical sciences.⁵⁷ Thus, from Lentze’s work Lhotsky derives the insight,

daß gerade durch die Maßnahmen Leo Thuns Gedankenfolgen angeregt [...] wurden, die nicht nur den geradezu gegenteiligen Effekt dessen hatten, was er eigentlich anstrebte, sondern folgerichtig die latenten Tendenzen zur *Verleugnung* und *Verneinung Österreichs* begünstigen mußten.⁵⁸

Thun’s protégés became propagandists of a Greater Germany and reared kindred souls thanks to the academic power they wielded. Thus Lhotsky, building on Lentze, turned Richard Meister’s idealisation of Thun-Hohenstein into shambles. That occurred on the one hand in that Lhotsky brightly highlighted the removal of the freedom of teaching and learning, on the other hand in that he steered the debate to the level that Richard Meister had discovered for himself after 1945, the “Austrian national education”.⁵⁹ Lhotsky’s vitriolic critique did not shatter Meister’s position in the academic establishment of the Second Austrian Republic, he never explicitly referred to Lhotsky’s essay in his monograph, yet the subtext is nevertheless remarkable: Lhotsky revealed the shakiness of Meister’s “Austrian”, which the latter had so suddenly and programmatically begun to embellish since 1945.⁶⁰

In view of this lively debate between Lentze, Lhotsky and Meister, the central question arises all the more strongly: Why did Richard Meister consider Thun-Hohenstein’s reform work to be

⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 279.

⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 278–279.

⁵⁷ Cf. Franz Leander FILLAFER: *Jenseits des Historismus. Gelehrte Verfahren, politische Tendenzen und konfessionelle Muster in der Geschichtsschreibung des österreichischen Vormärz*, in: Christine OTTNER, Klaus RIES (ed.): *Geschichtsforschung in Deutschland und Österreich im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Pallas Athene, vol. 48), Stuttgart 2014, p. 79–119.

⁵⁸ “that particularly due to Leo Thun’s measures, trains of thought were stimulated that not only had the opposite effect to that which he actually wanted, but which consequently had to favour the latent tendencies towards the *denial and negation of Austria*.” LHOTSKY: *Ende des Josephinismus*, p. 282. Emphasis in original.

⁵⁹ Cf. Richard MEISTER: *Die Idee einer österreichischen Nationalerziehung unter Maria Theresia*, in: *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historische Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 83 (1946), p. 1–16.

⁶⁰ Cf. Richard MEISTER: *Österreichs Großtaten auf dem Gebiete des Bildungswesens. Vortrag, gehalten in der Feierlichen Sitzung der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien am 31. Oktober 1945*, in: *Almanach für das Jahr 1945, 95 (1947)*, p. 411–433.

so exemplary? Meister's ideal was the university as a state institution, whose academic control was in the hands of the ministry. To him, autonomy meant necessarily restricted autonomy: the professoriate-based faculties should govern themselves, but by no means be free in shaping the curriculum. In Meister's view, Thun-Hohenstein laid the foundation for this: "The universities are based on the freedom of teaching, especially also in their self-governance; the self-governance of the university and the supreme supervision through the state are placed in a well-balanced relationship to each other."⁶¹ The objective followed by Meister, was obviously the consolidation of the prevailing decision-making and power structures. The calculation behind the restriction of autonomy was that only a university, whose autonomy was exercised by a curia of professors appointed by the ministry and with a homogenous ethos, could prevent the infiltration of the educational system by powers with a heterogeneous ethos. Hidden behind the shibboleth-like code of *humanism*, was a disguised reproduction of distinctly defined worldviews, the purpose of the system lay in the strengthening of the universities as strongholds of conservatism and Catholicism. Against this background, the Thun-Hohenstein reform gained in significance again in the mid-1950s, as a model scenario that allowed the autonomy of the university to be restricted to such an extent that it could not endanger the existing conditions and structures, namely the supremacy of the Austrian conservatives, the ÖVP, in the academic and university system.

This exemplary function explains why Meister regarded the role of a new Thun-Hohenstein to be perfectly tailored to himself: Meister was also faced with the challenge of preserving the existing institutions in a time of upheaval and to consolidate them, respectively to renew them regressively. In a barely-veiled self-justification, Meister wrote in 1963 that Thun-Hohenstein had realised the reform work

trotz der Belastung durch die Katastrophe des Oktobers 1848 und der aus deren Folge weiter dauernden Zwangsmaßnahmen verwirklicht, weil er das Zutrauen zum Reformwerke und seinem Geiste hatte und die Kraft, seine Gesetzeswerdung im Ministerrate und beim Monarchen durchzusetzen. Dies war seine große staatsmännische Tat und wird sein unvergänglicher Ruhmestitel bleiben.⁶²

If we replace the year 1848 with 1945, it is easy to read this account as a camouflaged self-testimony by Meister. Meister also wanted to attain "immortal glory" by means of a "political

⁶¹ MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen*, p. 85.

⁶² "despite the burden from the catastrophe of October 1848 and the consequent ongoing coercive measures, because he had confidence in the reform works and its spirit, and the power to enforce its legislation in the ministerial council and with the monarch. This was his great act as a statesman and it will remain his immortal glory." MEISTER: *Entwicklung und Reformen*, p. 113.

act”: Richard Meister not only saved the Academy of Sciences from the “catastrophe” of 1945 and blighted the coercive measures that resulted from the Academy’s involvement in National Socialism, namely denazification,⁶³ in 1955 he wished – just like Thun-Hohenstein a century before –, to impose a “reform” (“Reformwerk”), since he also enjoyed the confidence of the highest echelon of domestic Austrian politics, specifically of Minister of Education Heinrich Drimmel. It was with Drimmel that Meister shaped the *Hochschul-Organisationsgesetz* of 1955.

Several aspects deserve attention when reappraising Meister’s image of Thun-Hohenstein: Meister ostensibly agreed with Lentze’s conclusions, but ignored the central concern which was also taken up by Lhotsky – namely to show that Thun’s appointment policy did not in fact bring forth those Catholic, conservative, pan-monarchial and patriotic Austrian functionary elites that he had dreamed of. Meister swept this argument under the table. Lentze sympathised with the liberal interpretation of the reform and pointed to the fact that Thun-Hohenstein was circumvented against his intentions in the appointment of liberal professors, respectively that these appointments came from a later tendency of Thun, which manifested itself only after the departure of Thun’s clerically-oriented stooges Karl E. Jarcke and George Phillips. In contrast, Thun-Hohenstein’s intentions do not appear to have been worth any deeper analysis to Meister. The will applied to the work, the colossal success spoke for itself, and the intentions disappeared behind the sheer size of the “valuable achievement”.⁶⁴

Meister pulled out a second stop: He did concede that Thun-Hohenstein attempted to push through the reform under difficult circumstance against the Church and the Josephinians. At the same time, however, he rebuked Lentze for underestimating the extent of the resistance faced by Thun-Hohenstein and for setting him an unrealistic standard: “These are also the difficulties that the latest criticism of the reforms by Minister Thun-Hohenstein and their implementation have demonstrated,” wrote Meister in 1963, “but also the excuse for the opposite, in his theoretical adherence to the principle of the freedom of teaching and his practical conduct in consideration of state and religion.”⁶⁵ The delicate task of harmonising the

⁶³ Cf. Johannes FEICHTINGER, Dieter HECHT: Die Entnazifizierung an der Akademie der Wissenschaften, in: Johannes FEICHTINGER, Herbert MATIS, Stefan SIENELL, Heidemarie UHL (ed.): Die Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien 1938 bis 1945. Katalog zur Ausstellung, Wien 2013, p. 171–188. At the University of Vienna, Meister, as pro-rector 1945/46, pursued a similar policy, cf. Christian H. STIFTER: Zwischen geistiger Erneuerung und Restauration. US-amerikanische Planungen zur Entnazifizierung und demokratischen Neuorientierung österreichischer Wissenschaft 1941–1955, Wien 2014, p. 341–345.

⁶⁴ MEISTER: Entwicklung und Reformen, p. 84.

⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 89.

freedom of teaching with the demands of state and religion could only be fully appreciated and solved by an academic politician of the calibre of Thun, such as Meister.

Thun commemoration in the second half of the 19th century: Wilhelm Hartel, Salomon Frankfurter and Gustav Strakosch-Graßmann

Thun-Hohenstein's reputation dwindled when the liberals entered government in 1867. In 1893, the Viennese classical philologist and later education minister Wilhelm von Hartel, pleaded for the rehabilitation of Thun-Hohenstein's reform work.⁶⁶ "The reform of the higher educational system, which a benevolent Providence placed in the hands of Graf Leo Thun, had a sweeping effect on the entire culture of Austria", this, Hartel emphasized, "is evident to everyone who makes only a perfunctory comparison between the situation before 1848 and the present." According to Hartel, the educated public failed to properly appreciate "the scope and difficulty" of the task faced by Thun at the time: "In undisputed possession, the younger generation easily forgets the self-denying, sacrificial struggle of the fathers."⁶⁷ The occasion for Hartel's speech was the unveiling of the Thun-Exner-Bonitz monument, five years after Thun's death. In his speech, Hartel attested that the minister was the true guarantor of the implementation of the reform work. The manner in which he circumvented all resistance deserved the highest recognition. With his principle of publicity, for example with the *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, Thun-Hohenstein created a scholarly discourse among experts, which made political intervention much more difficult. Furthermore, Hartel praised Thun-Hohenstein's unconditional appointment policy.

Hartel's attacks were aimed primarily at the liberal interpretation of Thun-Hohenstein's reform work. In the 1860s it had received its still-valid expression from the liberal member of parliament and later justice minister Eduard Herbst, who had experienced Thun's era as a legal philosopher and professor of criminal law at the universities of Lviv and Prague; the German-national historian and teacher, Strakosch-Graßmann, would reiterate Herbst's criticism in his 1905 history of the Austrian educational system.

⁶⁶ On Wilhelm von Hartel (1839–1907) cf. Salomon FRANKFURTER: Wilhelm von Hartel. Sein Leben und sein Wirken. Zur Enthüllung des Denkmals in der Universität am 9. Juni 1912, Wien 1912.

⁶⁷ Festrede zur Enthüllung des Thun-Exner-Bonitz-Denkmal gehalten in der 1. Hauptsitzung der 42. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner am 24. Mai 1893 von dem Ersten Präsidenten derselben Wilhelm von Hartel. Den Festgästen überreicht vom Rector und Senat der Universität, Wien 1893, p. 5.

It is noteworthy that the liberal confrontation with Thun-Hohenstein was characterised by a strange ambivalence. The dissociation from Thun-Hohenstein in the ideal discourse was accompanied by a continuation of many of the guidelines of his ministerial work in tangible practice; this can be traced in the complete appropriation of key components of the reform by liberalism: the appointment of professors by the minister according to the suggestions of the faculties, the abolition of the doctoral colleges (*Doktorenkollegien*), which had been retained from the Vormärz, against which Thun had advocated in vain, and the adoption by the liberals of Thun's successful struggle against the recent introduction of academic directors, which would have placed the universities under direct state control. Also the so-called "citizen ministry" (Bürgerministerium) between 1867 and 1870 and the subsequent liberal ministries adhered to the core points of Thun's university reform, whether or not they criticised its originator. However, these continuities were cleverly masked by attacks on the Concordat of 1855, which Thun-Hohenstein had co-negotiated, and which determined as a *pars pro toto* the verdict on his ministerial policies.⁶⁸

While liberals failed to express their debt of gratitude to Thun-Hohenstein, this was more than compensated by the Vienna university librarian Salomon Frankfurter. His work was published on the occasion of the unveiling of the Thun-Exner-Bonitz monument on 24 May 1893: In his commemorative publication, Frankfurter provided a benignly ecumenical group portrait, blurring the differences between the three reformers. Frankfurter thereby lastingly shaped the interpretation of Thun-Hohenstein that was to hold sway in the 20th century until the appearance of Hans Lentze's seminal work discussed above. Lentze, however, also drew on an earlier study, which was also opposed to Frankfurter's interpretation, Gustav Strakosch-Graßmann's *Geschichte des Österreichischen Unterrichtswesens* from 1905. Although Lentze by no means shared Strakosch-Graßmann's German-national conviction, he reached similar conclusions in many aspects.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ Armand von Dumreicher's (1845–1908) programmatic work on the administration of the universities of 1873 bears witness to this. Dumreicher called the educational reformers of the 1850s "political-pedagogical dark wizards" (p. 3), whom he "blamed" for the fact that the universities "still lacked the fresh scientific movement". By giving the universities the task of "striving for the harmony of that which is researched and the revealed truth", the reformers had attempted to undermine "scientific life at that time at its roots", but ultimately did not manage to generate a "true alliance of research and revelation"; rather, "elements [were] observed and cultivated, which attain validity in the happy present." The objective aspired to by the German-liberal educational reformer and ministerial officer Armand von Dumreicher was defined: "The new organisation will finally give us really German universities." Armand Freiherr von DUMREICHER: *Die Verwaltung der Universitäten seit dem letzten politischen Systemwechsel in Oesterreich*, Wien 1873, p. 7–8. On the liberal polemic against the "ideological target" of the Concordat, above all against Church control over marital jurisdiction and school supervision while maintaining the paragraph on the right of the Church to self-administration, cf. John W. BOYER: *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna. Origins of the Christian Socialist Movement*, Chicago 1981, p. 20–21.

⁶⁹ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 290.

Under Frankfurter's soft focus, the reform seems to have come from one mould, and Thun-Hohenstein appears as a liberal reformer. In his work, Frankfurter refers to Thun's undersecretary Joseph Alexander von Helfert, who praised his minister to the heavens as a "great-Austrian statesman and unshakeable Catholic Christian".⁷⁰ Frankfurter's book was a celebratory publication, it appeared on the occasion of the unveiling of the monument on the 45th anniversary of the revolution. The framework was provided by the 42nd assembly of German philologists and schoolteachers in Vienna at Pentecost 1893. The "roving assembly" was held for the third time in Austria after 1858 and 1867, and Hartel chaired the 1893 meeting.⁷¹ It is noticeable that Frankfurter devoted the most attention in his book to Exner and Bonitz, whereas Thun took up relatively little space – conversely proportionate to the monument that was unveiled at the same time, which placed Thun-Hohenstein at the centre. In his work, Frankfurter ignored all of the contradictions: The central concern of the minister – academic juristic reform and the abolition of legal philosophy as a compulsory subject⁷² – was concealed by Frankfurter's focus on the philosophical faculty, and the reforming trio melted into a harmonious overall picture.

While Salomon Frankfurter considered Thun-Hohenstein's reform to be the completion of the freedom of teaching and learning that had been predetermined in Exner's organisational draft, the German-national teacher Gustav Strakosch-Graßmann, who held a doctorate in medieval history from Vienna, drew a very different picture in 1905: He accused Thun-Hohenstein of infringing all of the provisions of Stadion's constitution, in particular the freedom of teaching and learning and Exner's draft: The "freedom of teaching and learning remained on paper".⁷³ Like Lentze later, Strakosch made the minister responsible for the introduction of a rigid and constricting curriculum, for the restriction of the freedom of learning. With an obvious allusion to Frankfurter, Strakosch-Graßmann rejected the "historical legend-creation" around Thun-

⁷⁰ Joseph Alexander von HELFERT: Graf Leo Thun: Lehr- und Wanderjahre, in: Österreichisches Jahrbuch 15 (1891), p. 123–212, here 125.

⁷¹ On the unveiling of the Thun-Exner-Bonitz monument in the arcade walkway of the University of Vienna, cf. FRANKFURTER: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, p. VII–VIII.

⁷² Cf. Peter GOLLER: Naturrecht, Rechtsphilosophie oder Rechtstheorie? Zur Geschichte der Rechtsphilosophie an Österreichs Universitäten (1848–1945) (Rechts- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Reihe, Vol. 18), Frankfurt a. M., Berlin, Bern i.a. 1997, p. 61–80. Waltraud HEINDL: Bildung und Recht. Naturrecht und Ausbildung der staatsbürgerlichen Gesellschaft in der Habsburgermonarchie, in: Thomas ANGERER, Brigitta BADER-ZAAR, Margarete GRANDNER (ed.): Geschichte und Recht. Festschrift für Gerald Stourzh zum 70. Geburtstag, Wien, Köln, Weimar 1999, p. 183–207; Johannes FEICHTINGER: Wissenschaft als reflexives Projekt. Von Bolzano über Freud zu Kelsen: Österreichische Wissenschaftsgeschichte 1848–1938, Bielefeld 2010, p. 132–144; Franz Leander FILLAFER: Escaping the Enlightenment. Liberal Thought and the Legacies of the Eighteenth Century, Dissertation Konstanz 2012, p. 461–465.

⁷³ STRAKOSCH-GRASSMANN: Geschichte, p. 176.

Hohenstein.⁷⁴ Thun-Hohenstein by no means paved the way for unconditional science, but rather half-heartedly continued, or else thwarted, Exner's reform achievements.

One main aspect of Strakosch-Graßmann's argumentation is the special problem of inter-faculty subjects, especially canon law, which had been taught to theologians since 1766 at the law faculty, but was then ceded to the theological faculty from 1851. In Thun's regulations, which prescribed different versions of canon law for theologians and jurists, Strakosch-Graßmann recognised an indication of the fact that "the theological faculties [had lost] that scientific-philosophical character that the Josephinian politics in Austria had wanted to give them." They had therefore lost "all scientific value". This could not even be restored by the later appointment of some individual, able professors. In Thun-Hohenstein's era as minister of education, the Austrian theological faculties lacked "anything approaching a noteworthy teaching staff".⁷⁵

In addition, Strakosch-Graßmann accused Thun-Hohenstein of a whole range of other offences and failures; first, that he prevented the spread of any teaching opinion that did not conform to revelation and did not create any intellectual climate that would bind also non-Catholics to Austria in the long term. The difficulties that they constantly faced at the universities spoiled the work in Austria for most of the non-Catholic professors, and as soon as the first opportunity arose, they left the country (Georg Curtius, L. M. Lange, August Schleicher);⁷⁶ second, Thun-Hohenstein cleverly used relevant publications⁷⁷ to make the public well-disposed to the reforms and thus to guarantee their acceptance, yet he did not oppose the censorship that was introduced after 1849. The intellectual conditions in Thun's era were highly detrimental to scientific innovation in Austria: Reference to writing from abroad was restricted by press legislation and press police, just like the dissemination of those newspapers that did not genuflect before the Austrian government or "regularly included officious untruths in their columns."⁷⁸ Yet the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, "which, among others, had willingly printed the boastful officious notices provided by individual civil servants in the ministry of

⁷⁴ Ibid, p. 177.

⁷⁵ Ibid, p. 193.

⁷⁶ Cf. *ibid*, p. 198.

⁷⁷ Strakosch-Graßmann probably referred here to [Alois FLIR:] *Die Neugestaltung der österreichischen Universitäten über Allerhöchsten Befehl dargestellt von dem k. k. Ministerium für Kultus und Unterricht*, Wien 1853. On the authorship of Flir cf. Nikolaus GRASS: Alois Flir, in: IDEM: *Österreichische Historikerbiographien I*, Innsbruck 1957, p. 86–106, here p. 97 and [ANONYMOUS:] *Die Universitätsfrage in Österreich: Beleuchtet vom Standpunkte der Lehr- und Lernfreiheit*, Wien 1853, p. 22.

⁷⁸ Strakosch-Graßmann names here the *Westminster Review*, *Nationalzeitung*, *Kölnische Zeitung*, *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, *Indépendance Belge* and the *Breslauer Zeitung*. Cf. STRAKOSCH-GRASSMANN: *Geschichte*, p. 201.

education, [had been] allowed into Austria unhindered”. Under such conditions, no serious scientific activity could be conducted in Austria: “the discussion of philosophical, national economic, natural scientific, political, some civil and criminal law problems, the discussion of constitutional questions, were in some cases made difficult, deemed to be dangerous, or completely unable to be held.”⁷⁹

While Strakosch-Graßmann continued the stance of Eduard Herbst, whose interpretation of Thun-Hohenstein will be addressed in the third section of our chapter, he deviated from Herbst in one significant point: Strakosch-Graßmann misappropriated Herbst’s criticism of Thun’s Germanisation activity. For the German-national Strakosch-Graßmann, the – supposed – Germanisation was a glorious chapter, for which no credit was due to the Slavophile Catholic Thun-Hohenstein. Germanisation is a dazzling problem that shows just how diametrical the interpretations of Thun were.⁸⁰ For Lentze, Thun-Hohenstein had conducted ruthless Germanisation at the universities of Krakow and Lviv.⁸¹ The student of “reform Catholicism”, Eduard Winter from Bohemia, instead freed Thun from all blame,⁸² while Meister and Frankfurter never mentioned a word about it. The concluding verdict spoken by Strakosch-Graßmann in 1905 on Thun’s engagement for the reform is sobering:

Wäre nicht Leo Thun durch ein Verhältnis der persönlichen Pietät zu Exner, dem Reorganisator des höheren Unterrichts, der sein Lehrer war, gebunden gewesen: er hätte gewiß nie und nimmer das im Revolutionsjahre von 1848 geborene Werk der österreichischen Studienreform fortgesetzt.⁸³

Eduard Herbst’s Storyboard

The chief source of the critical view of Thun-Hohenstein can be found in a parliamentary speech by Eduard Herbst in 1862.⁸⁴ Herbst was an enlightened natural lawyer and legal philosopher,

⁷⁹ STRAKOSCH-GRASSMANN: *Geschichte*, p. 201–202.

⁸⁰ Cf. the essays by Jan SURMAN and Franz Leander FILLAFER in this volume.

⁸¹ LENTZE: *Universitätsreform*, p. 172.

⁸² Eduard WINTER: *Frühliberalismus in der Donaumonarchie. Religiöse, nationale und wissenschaftliche Strömungen von 1790–1868*, Berlin 1968, p. 259–260. On Winter cf. Franz Leander FILLAFER, Thomas WALLNIG (ed.): *Josephinismus zwischen den Regimen. Eduard Winter, Fritz Valjavec und die zentraleuropäischen Historiographien im 20. Jahrhundert*, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2015.

⁸³ “If Leo Thun had not been obliged, by means of a relationship of personal piety, to Exner, the reorganiser of higher education, who was his teacher: he certainly never would have continued the work of Austrian academic reform that had been born in the revolutionary year of 1848.” STRAKOSCH-GRASSMANN: *Geschichte*, p. 248.

⁸⁴ *Stenographische Protokolle über die Sitzungen des Hauses der Abgeordneten in der I. Reichsraths-Session (vom 29. April 1861 bis 18. Dezember 1862: Session 1: Sitzungsprotokolle: 129. Sitzung des Hauses der Abgeordneten des Reichsrathes am 5. Juni 1862, Rede des Abgeordneten Herbst (Böhmen) p. 2994–3000*. On Eduard Herbst cf. Gerhard OBERKOFER: *Die österreichische Juristentradition des Vormärz im Widerstreit mit*

who had already taught in the Vormärz as an assistant at the Theresian Academy. During Thun-Hohenstein's era he served as professor for criminal law in Lviv and Prague. Herbst rejected Thun's vendetta against the legal philosophy of the Late Enlightenment. Herbst, a radical German liberal, had been sent by the Bohemian state parliament to the parliament of the Reichsrat (at first accommodated provisionally in the so-called "Schmerlingtheater" on Schottenring). With his inflammatory speech of 1862, Herbst made "the education system as a whole in Austria the subject of discussion in this high house for the first time."⁸⁵

Herbst recalled that "during the entire ten years" of Thun's tenure the reform was represented by "official and semi-official pens and also by volunteers, whose personal interest guided their statements" as great feat of impeccable quality. In truth, however, "much ignorance prevailed in the area of the education system about the real situation among the great public. [...] I must confess," said Herbst, "and very many experts share my view, that it is all mostly vain illusion and deception, and what was originally good, did not get better over the course of these ten years, but instead got much worse."⁸⁶

According to Herbst, Thun-Hohenstein's ministry stifled the two principles of the freedom of teaching and learning and the self-governance of the faculties, which had thrived and flourished prior to Thun taking office. Herbst conceded that Thun had taken "the first steps in this direction by the Ministry for Religious Affairs and Education in a praiseworthy manner". The study regulations of 1849 and 1850 and the *Provisorisches Gesetz über die Organisation der akademischen Behörden* of 1849 gave the two principles "the correct, right form in the first place". "With this law we really did have freedom of learning and we really did have independent academic authorities," but with the disappearance of the spirit which shaped the law, its application turned to farce. The freedom of learning was de facto suspended by the "Studienordnung für die Juridische Facultät" of 1855, and there was now the imposition of a meticulously prescribed course of study, "like the one that had existed before 1848."⁸⁷

According to Herbst the public was left in the belief that nothing had changed. The legally enshrined independence of the academic authorities had been de facto undermined, in the universities outside Vienna the provincial governors had intervened in university matters, and

den Reformen des Ministers Leo Thun, in: IDEM.: Studien, p. 120–154 and Thomas DIERNHOFER: Eduard Herbst (1820–1892). Ein politisches Zeitbild anhand seines parlamentarischen Wirkens, Dipl. Arb. Wien 2005.

⁸⁵ Stenographische Protokolle, Rede des Abgeordneten Herbst, p. 2994.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 2995.

brazen paternalism was rampant instead of the rule of law.⁸⁸ Professors were being appointed to universities without a hearing, the study plans and curriculums had been imposed by the state. “If, however, the college of professors is not granted any significant influence in this regard,” concluded Herbst, “then all of their independence and autonomy is worth nothing.” “If, therefore, autonomy of this kind exists only on paper,” Herbst saw the reason for this in the fact that the ministry distrusted the professors. His many years of experience allowed Herbst to report of the unprecedented “unfruitfulness in all proper legislative work performed by that ministry”, which he believed was connected to a further deficit: “Due to the many regulations and ordinances, there was no time to regulate that by law which would have required legal legislation.”⁸⁹ The *Provisorisches Gesetz über die Organisation der akademischen Behörden* was not consolidated, but instead kept a provisional arrangement.

Ultimately, Thun-Hohenstein also betrayed his own political principles, since he Germanised and centralised:

Gerade derjenige, der jetzt das Wort immer im Munde führt, der hat wahrhaftig genug zu germanisiren versucht [...] und alles vorgeschrieben [...], wie es hier am grünen Tische ausgedacht worden ist. [...] Unsere Universitäten haben das am besten gezeigt. [...] Aber mehr noch als germanisirt [und] centralisirt hat jener Mann bureaukratisirt. [...] Der Mann war also als Bureaukrat groß.⁹⁰

Herbst also did not mince his words with regard to the freedom of teaching and learning:

Aus allen dem dürfe nun die Wahrheit meiner Behauptung hervorgehen, daß an den glänzenden Erfolgen und an der vollständig durchgeführten Lehr- und Lernfreiheit und an der Autonomie der akademischen Behörden, wie sie die Verteidiger und Bewunderer des Ministeriums Thun in alle Welt hinausposaunten, daß daran wahrhaftig viel mehr Schein als Wahrheit war.⁹¹

Herbst combined his criticism of Thun with the wish “that deeper insights can finally be gained about these conditions”, and the demand, obviously imperative at this time, “that the universities once again be given back what they were forced to forfeit, and which they need for the honour of the Fatherland and for their own honour: that is full academic freedom.”⁹²

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 2996.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 2997–2998.

⁹⁰ “Particularly he who now constantly mentions the word, he certainly made many attempts at Germanisation [...] and prescribed everything [...], as it was conceived here at the green table. [...] Our universities have shown it best. [...] But more than Germanising [and] centralising, that man has also bureaucratized. [...] The man was therefore great as a bureaucrat.” Ibid., p. 3000.

⁹¹ “From all of this, the truth of my claim now derives, that in terms of the brilliant successes and the fully implemented freedom of teaching and learning, and the autonomy of the academic authorities, as broadcast all over the world by the defenders and admirers of Thun’s ministry, that in truth it was more illusion than reality.”

⁹² Ibid.

Conclusion

The chief aim of our chapter was to analyse how Thun-Hohenstein's legacy was redesigned since his resignation as minister to how these commemorative strategies contributed to the legitimising and de-legitimising of new reform measures. The key question is: What were the structural features of this commemoration and appropriation of Thun's legacy? An important clue is provided by the *Hochschul-Organisationsgesetz* of 1955 which Richard Meister and Heinrich Drimmel – as shown recently by Thomas König – developed in close coordination.⁹³ We will revert to this HOG of 1955 toward the end of this section.

In a recent essay, Brigitte Mazohl drew attention to the political functionalising of Thun-Hohenstein's university reforms by posterity.⁹⁴ In her critical assessment of the consequences of Thun's achievement, Mazohl situates the reform's results in the context of a challenge that persists up to our times, namely the “formation of intellect and character”, a challenge getting all the more acute in times of the hyper-specialisation of academic subjects. Mazohl trenchantly observes that the Thunian reforms transformed philosophy from a propaedeutic foundation subject for all students into a specialist discipline among others; thus the reform made the general foundation of education that had united the natural sciences and the humanities melt into air.⁹⁵ The Viennese legal historian Werner Ogris also used the occasion of his speech, which he held 150 years after Thun assumed office in March 1999,⁹⁶ to reflect on the autonomy problem. Ogris dedicated his speech to his teacher, Hans Lentze, and took up his criticism of Thun's autocratic ministerial style. The very small degree to which scientists could determine their own fate, even in the second half of the 20th century, is shown, he believed, by the conflict over the *Universitätsorganisationsgesetz* of 1975. Ogris remembers that in 1975 the professors of the faculty of law and state science in Vienna submitted a “reasonable alternative draft” on the *UOG* to the ministry without any resonance, Ogris was unaware whether any of the “decisive politicians” even acknowledged the proposal's existence.⁹⁷ Brigitte Mazohl and Werner Ogris applied a historicising approach to the reform. Mazohl in particular points to the

⁹³ Cf. Thomas KÖNIG: Die Entstehung eines Gesetzes. Österreichische Hochschulpolitik in den 1950er Jahren, in: Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften (ÖZG) 23 (2012), 2, p. 57–81.

⁹⁴ Brigitte MAZOHL: Universitätsreform und Bildungspolitik. Die Ära des Ministers Thun-Hohenstein (1849–1860), in: Klaus MÜLLER-SALGET, Sigurd Paul SCHEICHL (ed.): Nachklänge der Aufklärung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft. Germanistische Reihe, Vol. 73), Innsbruck 2008, p. 129–149.

⁹⁵ MAZOHL: Universitätsreform, p. 147–149.

⁹⁶ Werner OGRIS: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Leo Graf Thun-Hohenstein. Festvortrag anlässlich des Rektorstages im Großen Festsaal der Universität Wien am 12. März 1999, Wien 1999.

⁹⁷ OGRIS: Universitätsreform, p. 22.

fact that the Thun-Hohenstein reform acted for a long time as a legitimation resource for political innovations in the academic structure.

Two further assessments by Austrian historians with very different itineraries merit attention in this context, the first is by Robert A. Kann, the second was written by Fritz Fellner. Both interventions date from the late 1960s and early 1970s, when university politics once again came under fire from critics. At that time, the universities were bastions of scholars who had executed the “autochthonous provincialisation”⁹⁸ of Austria since 1945, they resisted reforms based on models from abroad, conjuring up the republic’s baleful “intellectual servitude” to foreign powers. Fearing the destruction of the Austrian model of the special “relationship between the state and the university”, these scholars vehemently opposed the advocates of modern mass education, who designed schemes of social planning and applied structural-functional theorems.⁹⁹ Kann’s and Fellner’s essays can be situated in this context.

Robert A. Kann, from Vienna, was forced into exile by the National Socialist dictatorship; after retiring from Rutgers University, he once again worked in Vienna as a visiting professor.¹⁰⁰ Kann’s comments on the Thun-Hohenstein reforms in 1974 display a very subtle grasp of the nineteenth-century pedigree of contemporary attempts to shield the universities from political agitation. Kann particularly targeted Richard Meister’s talk on the justified limitation of the freedom of teaching and learning:¹⁰¹ This restriction stood in a state of irresolvable tension with the legal guarantees of the freedom of opinion, ethos, and conscience that had been constitutionally enshrined in 1848 and 1867, and Kann observed that this irreconcilability is “undoubtedly seen in too simplistic terms”¹⁰² by Meister. Kann demonstrated that Meister’s approach was a symptom of the traditional ideology of the old Austrian executive. This ideology was based on an understanding of the legitimate limitation of the freedom of teaching and learning, “which seemed to its representatives to be so self-evident that it did not require a

⁹⁸ Christian FLECK: Autochthone Provinzialisierung. Universität und Wissenschaftspolitik nach dem Ende der nationalsozialistischen Herrschaft in Österreich, in: *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 7 (1996), p. 67–92.

⁹⁹ Cf. Thomas KÖNIG: „Konserven des Geistes.“ Semantischer Wandel in den hochschulpolitischen Debatten der frühen 1960er Jahre in Österreich, in: Ingrid BÖHLER, Eva PFANZELTER-SAUSGRUBER, Thomas SPIELBÜCHLER, Rolf STEININGER (ed.): *7. Österreichischer Zeitgeschichtetag 2008. 1968 – Vorgeschichten – Folgen. Bestandsaufnahme der österreichischen Zeitgeschichte*, Innsbruck 2008, p. 64–71.

¹⁰⁰ On Robert A. Kann (1906–1981) cf. Gerald STOURZH: Robert A. Kann. A Memoir from Austria, in: *Austrian History Yearbook* 17 (1981), p. 25–26.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Robert A. KANN: Hochschule und Politik im österreichischen Verfassungsstaat (1867–1918), in: Gerhard BOTZ, Hans HAUTMANN, Helmut KONRAD (ed.): *Geschichte und Gesellschaft. Festschrift für Karl R. Stadler*, Linz, Wien 1974, p. 507–526.

¹⁰² KANN: Hochschule und Politik im österreichischen Verfassungsstaat, p. 509, with reference to MEISTER: *Entwicklungen und Reformen*, p. 249–252.

special formulation. Unpolitical thus meant implicit, which supported the existing system, while political was everything that could reform the system beyond the merely specialist, technical area, so to speak, in decisive points.”¹⁰³ Kann identified the roots of this as being in Leo Thun’s scientific ideal. Still adequate in the 1850s in order to safeguard the reform against challenges and turbulence, this ideal had remained, anachronistically, the guiding principle of the Austrian educational policies until well into the Second Republic. Kann concisely summarised this worldview when he spoke of an “impartial apolitical freedom of teaching and learning.”¹⁰⁴

The second notable position from the late 1960s is that of Fritz Fellner.¹⁰⁵ Fellner, liberal agnostic born in 1922 and member of that “betrayed generation”¹⁰⁶, whose members were able to start studying only after military service in the Wehrmacht, was appointed to a chair of modern history at Salzburg in 1964. Three years later he took stock of the traditions of Austrian university politics. Fellner’s 1967 essay was published in a book edited by the then young jurist and secretary of the SPÖ parliamentary group, Heinz Fischer. The book responded to the mild liberalising trend under ÖVP education minister Theodor Piffel-Perčević and foreshadowed the Kreisky era. In his essay, Fellner read the SPÖ the riot act. He identified anti-intellectualism and the neglect of education policy as their most serious sins of omission. Fellner evoked the brief intellectual spring of the late 1940s and early 1950s, which the conservative restoration then subsequently choked off. Fellner took the Socialists to task for their smug self-satisfaction and support of the ÖVP-instigated stagnation in the educational realm.¹⁰⁷ Obedience to authority and a hostility to technology were the two pillars of the conservative university policies, which were opposed to the democratic-pluralist modern society. Although Leo Thun-Hohenstein’s purpose with regard to the universities in terms of the “freedom of teaching and learning” and the “cultivation of science” was underpinned by religion and state politics – both guidelines were to be followed “in the spirit of the Church and with special consideration of the

¹⁰³ KANN: Hochschule und Politik im österreichischen Verfassungsstaat, p. 510.

¹⁰⁴ KANN: Hochschule und Politik im österreichischen Verfassungsstaat, p. 511. Here also Kann’s criticism of Lhotsky, *ibid.* Kann saw Lhotsky’s complaint that the state failed to create loyal studies in history in the universities, which would spread ideologies that were compatible with the monarchy and combat oppositional currents, as a regression to the establishment of the freedom of teaching and learning, as consolidated by Thun.

¹⁰⁵ On Fritz Fellner (1922–2012) cf. Brigitte MAZOHL: Fritz Fellner, in: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 121 (2013), p. 262–263. Cf. also the insightful report from memory of the witness interview conducted by Johannes Holeschofsky with Fritz Fellner about his teacher Hugo Hantsch. Cf. Johannes HOLESCHOFSKY: Hugo Hantsch. Eine biografische Studie, St. Pölten 2014, p. 194–197.

¹⁰⁶ Thus Fellner’s self-assessment, cf. MAZOHL: Fritz Fellner, p. 262.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Fritz FELLNER: Restauration oder Fortschritt. Hochschulprobleme aus der Sicht des Historikers, in: Heinz FISCHER (ed.): *Versäumnisse und Chancen. Beiträge zur Hochschulfrage in Österreich*, Wien 1967, p. 11–28, here p. 12.

interests of the state” – Fritz Fellner conceded that Thun “adapted the university in its structure to the changes in the scientific structure that had occurred since the Enlightenment.”¹⁰⁸ Richard Meister in particular, according to Fellner, “dogmatised” the Thunian university reform to an “unshakeable basis of academic education.”¹⁰⁹ Thus the universities were condemned to be satisfied with the passing down and forwarding of intellectual preserves; in Fellner’s view, only new foundations – Salzburg, Linz, Klagenfurt – and extra-university research could end this educational sclerosis.¹¹⁰

Thus Robert Kann and Fritz Fellner chose quite unflattering terms when describing why the university reform of the 1850s had a paradigmatic impact in posterity. Kann singled out the eminently political function of Thun-Hohenstein’s ideal of “impartial unpolitical freedom of teaching and learning”. Fellner, for his part, castigated the obsolete concept of humanist education. He pointed to the paradoxical preservation of the legacy of a displaced and destroyed educated bourgeoisie, which was veiled as Catholicism and converted after 1945 into the insignia of educational conservatism. Kann’s and Fellner’s positions from the late 1960s and early 1970s mark a turning point in the tradition of the Thun hagiography. This was made possible by both the political initiatives for the universities since 1966, and Hans Lentze’s monograph from 1962.

Ten years before Fellner and Kann critically pruned Meister’s hagiographic account, Thun-Hohenstein’s significance for conservative education experts was still unbroken. The legitimising function of Thun-Hohenstein’s reform and its usefulness as a basic template can be clearly grasped through an analysis of Meister’s and Drimmel’s statements surrounding the *Hochschul-Organisationsgesetz* of 1955, which the two men had developed together. In 1959 Drimmel made a kind of self-disclosure about the ideal principles of the *Hochschul-Organisationsgesetz*, stating openly of the structure for which he admired the Thun-Hohenstein reform, which determined academic life in Austria until well into the 20th century: The “continuous effect” of the reform was mainly due to “the dichotomy that has existed since then between the Christian conservative and the liberal (later socialist) perception of culture in Austria.” That is why the “conflicts” that were triggered by all the attempts at reform in the

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, p. 18.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, p. 14.

¹¹⁰ Cf. *ibid*, p. 21–28.

second half of the 20th century “can be found at the actual hotspots where our forefathers already bitterly struggled.”¹¹¹

In 1949 Richard Meister dedicated his speech as rector to the university reform. There he affirmed his esteem for the well-balanced equilibrium between “the right of scientific self-determination” and “the right of state supervision, which results in the academic self-administration of our universities.”¹¹² It is in the academic self-governance and in the “independence of science” that Meister sees the “timeless content” and “everlasting value” of Thun-Hohenstein’s reform work. This explains for Meister the immunity of the Thunian university reform, which aided the flawless integrity of an “autonomous” science to conquer “political driving forces”. Accordingly, and remarkably, the “timeless value” of the reform for Meister does not actually lie in the implementation of the freedom of teaching and learning.¹¹³ Minister of Education Drimmel also heaped lavish praise on his “kindred spirit” (Gesinnungsverwandter), when he referred to his role model in a lecture on 24 March 1959 in Raach am Hochgebirge: “During the many years of preparation for the Hochschulorganisationsgesetz of 1955, these components of the Thunian reform were tested for their durability in the present. By and large, they passed this test.”¹¹⁴

For Drimmel and for his revered academic teacher Meister, the central component of the *Hochschul-Organisationsgesetz* of 1955 consisted in the “well-balanced system of the relationships between the university and the state” while upholding the “autonomy of the intellectual area”. Drimmel openly mentioned the actual intention that was associated with this: “Just as after 1848, in the second half of the 20th century Thun-Hohenstein’s system remains of inestimable value against the rampant perils of the politicisation of the spirit (*Geist*) and its hotbeds, the universities”.¹¹⁵ Here the structure of the appropriation can be seen clearly: The recourse to Thun-Hohenstein ensured that nobody else could be attributed with defending the autonomy of the university other than the state, whose extended arm since 1945 had been the ÖVP ministry responsible for education; any “politicisation” must be prevented. It is clear what politicisation meant at the time, namely the conversion of the universities into truly autonomous

¹¹¹ Heinrich DRIMMEL: Die Hochschulreform von Thun-Hohenstein, in: Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur. Sonderheft Österreich 1848–1918 3 (1959), p. 1–7, here p. 1.

¹¹² Richard MEISTER: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Thun-Hohenstein. Wiener Inaugurationsrede 1949, in: Rektoratsbericht für das Studienjahr 1949/50, Wien 1949, p. 87–100, here p. 96–97.

¹¹³ MEISTER: Universitätsreform, p. 97.

¹¹⁴ DRIMMEL: Hochschulreform, p. 6.

¹¹⁵ Ibid, p. 6.

institutions. This would allow the university to escape the protective hand of the state and the professorial colleges, and would be exposed to encroachment by other players, specifically the SPÖ; such a scenario must be avoided at all costs.

Over the century that lay between Thun's and Drimmel's tenures as ministers, the interlopers who had to be repelled by means of a cautious reform of the universities had changed: In the 1850s liberalism had rebelled against the control the Catholic Church and the absolutist state exercised over the education system; now, a century later, socialism stood before the gates. Drimmel mentioned both in one breath in 1959. Not even half a century would pass before the university was confronted by a new kind of politicisation beyond that conflict observed by Drimmel between a conservative and a "liberal-socialist" perception of culture. These days, a third type of politicisation above party lines gives priority to a third guiding principle instead of the older ideals of education according to the maxims of autonomous science or value-based humanist education (*Weltanschauungsbildung*): the primacy of economics looms large as the basic principle of this most recent wave of "politicisation".

Lists and index

List of abbreviations

ASM – Archivio di Stato Milano

ASPV – Archivio di Stato di Pavia

AU – Archivio dell'Università (di Pavia)

AVA – Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv

BPLL – Bollettino provinciale delle leggi e degli atti ufficiali per la Lombardia

DBE – Dizionario biografico dell'educazione

fl. – Gulden

FWF – Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung

IfÖG – Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung

ÖBL – Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon

ÖVP – Österreichische Volkspartei

RGBI – Reichsgesetzblatt

SPÖ – Sozialdemokratische Partei Österreichs

UAG – Universitätsarchiv Graz

UG – Universitätsgesetz

UOG – Universitätsorganisationsgesetz

Literature and source material

Archives used

Archive of the Jagiellonian University, Krakow

Archive of the Charles University [Archiv University Karlovy], Prague

Archive of the University of Pavia [Archivio dell'Università di Pavia]

Archive of the University of Vienna [Archiv der Universität Wien]

Historical Archive of the City of Milan [Archivio Storico Civico di Milano]

Institute for Austrian Historical Research, Vienna [Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung]

National Archive of the Czech Republic [Národní archiv], Prague

Austrian State Archive, General Administrative Archive, Vienna

State Regional Archives Litomerice, District Decin, Family Archives Thun-Hohenstein [Státní Oblastní
Archiv Litoměřice, Zs. Děčín, Rodinný archiv Thun]

State Archive of Milan [Archivio di Stato Milano]

State Archive of Pavia [Archivio di Stato di Pavia]

Tiroler Landesarchiv, Innsbruck

University Archive Graz [Universitätsarchiv Graz]

University Archive Innsbruck [Universitätsarchiv Innsbruck]

Vatican Secret Archive, Archive of the Vienna Nuncio [Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Archivio Nunziatura
di Vienna], Rome

Literature

Ludwig ADAMOVICH: Hochschulverwaltung und Universitäten, in: 100 Jahre Unterrichtsministerium 1848–1948. Festschrift des Bundesministeriums für Unterricht in Wien, hg. von einem Redaktionskomitee unter dem Vorsitz von Egon Loebenstein, Wien 1948.

Sigmund ADLER: Die Unterrichtsverfassung Kaiser Leopolds II. und die finanzielle Fundierung der österreichischen Universitäten nach Anträgen Martinis, Wien, Leipzig 1917.

Evelyn ADUNKA: Salomon Frankfurter (1856–1941), in: Stefan ALKER, Christina KÖSTNER, Markus STUMPF (ed.): Bibliotheken in der NS-Zeit. Provenienzforschung und Bibliotheksgeschichte, Wien 2008, p. 209–220.

Christof AICHNER: 40 Jahre im Dienste der Forschung. Gründung und Geschichte des Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung (1967–2007), Dipl. Arb. Innsbruck 2007.

Christof AICHNER, Brigitte MAZOHL: La riforma scolastica di Thun-Hohenstein, 1849–1860, in: Simonetta POLENGHI (ed.): La scuola degli Asburgo. Pedagogia e formazione degli insegnanti tra il Danubio e il Po (1773–1918), Torino 2012, p. 179–209.

Christof AICHNER: Die Umsetzung der Thun-Hohensteinschen Reformen an der Universität Innsbruck (1848–1860), phil. Diss. Innsbruck 2014.

- Christof AICHNER, Tanja KRALER, Brigitte MAZOHL: Aspekte der Thun-Hohensteinschen Bildungsreform – ein Werkstattbericht, in: Harm-Hinrich BRANDT (ed.): Der österreichische Neoabsolutismus als Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsproblem. Diskussionen über einen strittigen Epochenbegriff, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2014, p. 195–220.
- Christof AICHNER: Franz Exner. Professor für Philosophie, Mitschöpfer der Universitätsreform nach 1848, in: Mitchell G. ASH, Josef EHMER (ed.): Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft, (650 Jahre Universität Wien, Bd. 2), Göttingen, Wien 2015, p. 183–188.
- Amato AMATI: Del movimento delle scuole elementari classiche e tecniche in Milano e in altre città lombarde, Milano, Napoli, Palermo 1870.
- Francesco AMBROSOLI: Scritti letterari editi ed inediti, I, Firenze 1871.
- [Francesco AMBROSOLI]: Notizia delle conferenze tenute in Verona dalla commissione per l'ordinamento degli studi [o. O., 1851].
- Luigi AMBROSOLI: La discussione dell'Istituto Lombardo sul progetto per lo sviluppo dell'insegnamento in Lombardia, in: Critica storica, 4 (1965), 6, p. 781–799.
- Viktor ANDRIAN-WERBURG: Österreich und dessen Zukunft, Hamburg 1843.
- Arianna ARISI ROTA: La gioventù delle università come avanguardia politica: per una fenomenologia dello studente patriota, in: Alessandra FERRARESI, Elisa SIGNORI (ed.): Le Università e l'Unità d'Italia (1848–1870), Bologna 2012, p. 281–290.
- Mitchell G. ASH (ed.): German Universities Past and Future: Crisis or Renewal? Oxford 1997.
- Mitchell G. ASH: Bachelor of What, Master of Whom? The Humboldt Myth and Historical Transformations of Higher Education in German-Speaking Europe and the US, in: European Journal of Education 41 (2006) 2, p. 245–267.
- Mitchell G. ASH: Humboldt the Undead: Multiple Uses of ‚Humboldt‘ and his ‚Death‘ in the ‚Bologna‘ Era, in: Peter JOSEPHSON, Thomas KARLSOHN, Johan ÖSTLING (ed.): The Humboldtian Tradition: Origins and Legacies, Leiden, Boston 2014, p. 81–96.
- Mitchell G. ASH: Die Universität Wien in den politischen Umbruchzeiten des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts, in: Mitchell G. ASH, Joseph EHMER (ed.): Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft, (650 Jahre Universität Wien, Bd. 2), Göttingen, Wien 2015, p. 29–172.
- Krzysztof BACZKOWSKI: W służbie dworu Habsburskiego. Antoni Walewski (1805–1876), in: Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne 132 (2005), p. 99–108.
- Ferenc BALOGH: A Debreceni Jogakadémia keletkezése, fejlődése és a jogászfjúság. Debrecen 1905.
- József BARSÍ: Magyarország felső tanintézetei és középtanodái 1870–1872-ben, Budapest 1874.
- Henryk BARYCZ: Dietl w walce o unarodowienie i zreformowanie szkół galicyjskich (1860–1866), in: Józef Dietl, pierwszy prezydent miasta Krakowa, znakomity lekarz, profesor i rektor Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, patriota polski: w 50-tą rocznicę śmierci, Kraków 1928, p. 121–134.
- Henryk BARYCZ: Wincenty Pol jako profesor geografii na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim, in: Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Prace komisji historii medycyny i nauk matematyczno-przyrodniczych 3 (1949), p. 43–128.
- Henryk BARYCZ (ed.): Korespondencja Karola Szajnochy, Bd. 2, Wrocław 1959.

- Henryk BARYCZ: Sześć wieków działalności Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego i jego związków z ziemiami zachodnimi i północnymi. 1364–1964, Warszawa 1964.
- Henryk BARYCZ: Uniwersytet Jagielloński w życiu narodu polskiego, Warszawa 1948, 2. Auflage 1964.
- Henryk BARYCZ: Die Rolle der Wiener Universität im geistigen Leben Polens, in: Österreichische Osthefte 7 (1965), p. 176–194.
- Henryk BARYCZ: U świtu nowoczesnej polonistyki uniwersyteckiej, in: Renata DUTKOWA, Julian DYBIEC, Leszek HAJDUKIEWICZ (ed.): Studia z dziejów oświaty i kultury w Polsce XVIII–XX w. Księga ofiarowana Janowi Hulewiczowi, Wrocław 1977, p. 109–125.
- Henryk BARYCZ: Józef Ignacy Kraszewski czterokrotny kandydat do katedry uniwersyteckiej, Kraków 1979.
- Josef BATRON: Der vergessene Mährische Verehrer Goethes, Ph. Dr. P. Thomas Bratranek OSA, Professor an der Universität Krakau, Olomouc 1937.
- Manfred Werner BAUER: Eine Reform unter dem Mikroskop. Die Umsetzung der „Thun-Hohensteinschen“ Universitätsreform an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Dipl. Arb. Graz 2011.
- Marita BAUMGARTEN: Professoren und Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert. Zur Sozialgeschichte deutscher Geistes- und Naturwissenschaftler (Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft Bd. 121), Göttingen 1997.
- Leo BECK VON MANNAGETTA, Carl von KELLE (ed.): Die österreichischen Universitätsgesetze. Sammlung der für die österreichischen Universitäten gültigen Gesetze, Verordnungen, Erlässe, Studien und Prüfungsordnungen usw., Wien 1906.
- Margit BEKE: A Pázmáneum története az újraindulástól napjainkig (1803–2002), Budapest 2010.
- Zbigniew BELA (ed.): 225 lat Farmacji na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim, Kraków 2008.
- Marino BERENGO: Il numero chiuso all'Università di Padova. Un dibattito della Restaurazione, in: Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova 14 (1981), p. 41–53.
- Maristella BERGAGLIO (ed.): Popolazioni che cambiano. Studi di geografia della popolazione, Milano 2008.
- Giampietro BERTI: L'Università di Padova dal 1814 al 1859, Treviso 2011.
- Zalán BICZÓ (ed.): A győri jogászképzés évszázadai, Győr 2011.
- Franciszek BIELAK: Katedra historii literatury polskiej Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w latach 1849–1870, in: Mirosława CHAMCÓWNA, u. a. (ed.): Dzieje Katedry Historii Literatury Polskiej na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim, Kraków 1966, p. 85–107.
- Janina BIENIARZÓWNA: Od Wiosny Ludów do powstania styczniowego, in: Janina BIENIARZÓWNA, Jan M. MAŁECKI (ed.): Dzieje Krakowa, t. 3: Kraków w latach 1796–1918, Kraków 1979, p. 177–224.
- Harald BINDER: „Galizische Autonomie“. Ein streitbarer Begriff und seine Karriere, in: Lukáš FASORA (ed.): Moravské vyrovnání z roku 1905: možnosti a limity národnostního smíru ve střední Evropě / Der Mährische Ausgleich von 1905: Möglichkeiten und Grenzen für einen nationalen Ausgleich in Mitteleuropa, Brno 2006, p. 239–266.

- Gyula BISZTRAY: Az erdélyi egyetemi gondolat, in: Gyula BISZTRAY, Attila SZABÓT, Lajos TAMÁS (ed.): Erdély magyar egyeteme. Az erdélyi egyetemi gondolat és a m. kir. Ferenc József Tudományegyetem története, Kolozsvár 1941, p. 29–138.
- Olaf BLASCHKE: Konfessionen im Konflikt. Deutschland zwischen 1800 und 1970: ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter, Göttingen 2002.
- Johann-Caspar BLUNTSCHLI: Lehrfreiheit und Lernfreiheit, in: Johann-Caspar BLUNTSCHLI, Carl BRATER (ed.): Deutsches Staats-Wörterbuch, Stuttgart, Leipzig 1861, p. 367–374.
- Taras von BORODAJKEWYCZ: Aus der Frühzeit der Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte. Rudolf Eitelberger und Leo Thun, in: Karl OETTINGER, Mohammed RASSEM (ed.): Festschrift für Hans Sedlmayr, München 1962, p. 321–348.
- Alajos BOZÓKY: A nagyváradi királyi akadémia százados múltja, Budapest 1889.
- Harm-Hinrich BRANDT (ed.): Der österreichische Neoabsolutismus als Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsproblem. Diskussionen über einen strittigen Epochenbegriff (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs, Bd. 108), Wien, Köln, Weimar 2014.
- Hans-Jürgen BRANDT: Eine katholische Universität in Deutschland? Das Ringen der Katholiken in Deutschland um eine Universitätsbildung im 19. Jahrhundert, Köln, Wien 1981.
- Wilhelm BRAUNEDER: Juristen in Österreich 1200–1980, Wien 1987, p. 152–155.
- Wilhelm BRAUNEDER: Leseverein und Rechtskultur. Der juristisch-politische Leseverein zu Wien, 1840–1990, Wien 1992.
- Fabiana DI BRAZZÀ, Claudio GRIGGIO: Appunti su Giovanni Battista Bolza e la „Rivista ginnasiale“ (1854–1859) in: Claudio GRIGGIO (ed.): Incontri di discipline per la didattica: raccolta di studi dedicati a Pierluigi Rigo, Milano 2006, p. 133–160.
- Franz BRENTANO: Über voraussetzungslose Forschung [1901], in: Franz BRENTANO: Die vier Phasen der Philosophie und ihr augenblicklicher Stand. Nebst Abhandlungen über Plotinus, Thomas von Aquin, Kant, Schopenhauer und Auguste Comte, Leipzig 1926, p. 138–144.
- Wolfgang BREZINKA: Pädagogik in Österreich. Die Geschichte des Faches an den Universitäten vom 18. bis zum Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts, 4 Bde., Wien 2000–2013.
- Bernhard VOM BROCKE: Wege aus der Krise: Universitätsseminar, Akademiekommision oder Forschungsinstitut. Formen der Institutionalisierung in den Geistes- und Naturwissenschaften 1810–1900–1995, in: Christoph KÖNIG, Eberhard LÄMMERT (ed.): Konkurrenten in der Fakultät. Kultur, Wissen und Universität um 1900, Frankfurt a. M. 1999, p. 191–217.
- Rüdiger vom BRUCH: Langsamer Abschied von Humboldt? Etappen deutscher Universitätsgeschichte 1820–1945, in: Mitchell G. ASH (ed.): Mythos Humboldt. Vergangenheit und Zukunft der deutschen Universitäten, Wien, Köln, Weimar 1999, p. 29–57.
- Carlo CANTONI: Sull'Università. Saggi e discorsi dal 1874 al 1905, Milano 1991.
- Carlo CATTANEO: Sull'ulteriore sviluppo del pubblico insegnamento in Lombardia, in: Carlo CATTANEO: Scritti sull'educazione e sull'istruzione, ed by: Luigi AMBROSOLI, Firenze 1963, p. 77–152.
- Maria Pia CASALENA: Per lo Stato, per la Nazione. I congressi degli scienziati in Francia e in Italia (1830–1914), Roma 2007.

- Jan Matěj ČERNÝ, Jan MATOUŠ (ed.): *Boj za právo. Sborník aktů politických u věcech státu a národa českého od roku 1848 s výklady historickými I., II.*, Praha 2007.
- Christophe CHARLE: *Grundlagen*, in: Walter RÜEGG (ed.): *Geschichte der Universität in Europa*, Bd. III: *Vom 19. Jahrhundert zum Zweiten Weltkrieg (1800–1945)*, München 2004, p. 55–59.
- Valentina CHERICETTI: *I ginnasi e i licei di Milano nell'età della Restaurazione. Professori, studenti, discipline (1814–1851)*, Lecce, Rovato 2013.
- Irene CIPRANDI: *L'Università di Pavia durante la Restaurazione*, in: Irene CIPRANDI, Donatella GIGLIO, Gabriella SOLARO (ed.): *Problemi scolastici ed educativi nella Lombardia del primo ottocento*, vol. II, *L'istruzione superiore*, Milan 1978, p. 193–316.
- Deborah R. COEN: *Vienna in the Age of Uncertainty. Science, Liberalism, and Private Life*, Chicago u. a. 2007.
- Győző CONCHA: *Báró Eötvös József állambölcsélete és a külföldi kritika*, Budapest 1908.
- Emmerich CORETH: *Die Theologische Fakultät Innsbruck. Ihre Geschichte und wissenschaftliche Arbeit von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart (Veröffentlichungen der Universität Innsbruck 212)*, Innsbruck 1995.
- Ivana ČORNEJOVÁ, Alena RICHTEROVÁ: *The Jesuits and the Clementinum*, Praha 2006.
- Ivana ČORNEJOVÁ, Anna FECHTNEROVÁ: *Životopisný slovník pražské univerzity. Filozofická a teologická fakulta 1654–1773*, Praha 1986.
- Ivana ČORNEJOVÁ: *Kapitoly z dějin pražské univerzity 1622–1773*, Praha 1992.
- Ivana ČORNEJOVÁ: *Pražská univerzita v letech 1622–1773: příspěvek ke správním a organizačním dějinám*, Praha 1986.
- Andor CSIZMADIA: *A közigazgatási képesítés és képzés Magyarországon (1918 előtt)*, in: *Állam és Igazgatás* Jg. 21. (1971), Nr. 7, p. 610–616.
- Wiktor CZERMAK: *Uniwersytet Jagielloński w czterech ostatnich wiekach*, Kraków 1900, p. 84–85.
- Ignaz Raphael CZERWIAKOWSKI, Joseph WARSZEWICZ: *Catalogus plantarum quae in C. R. horto botanico Cracoviensi anno (1864–) ab erecta C. R. Universitate studiorum Jagellonica quingentesimo a fundato vero horto octogesimo educantur, Cracoviae 1864*.
- Enrico DECLEVA: *Una facoltà filosofico-letteraria nella città industriale. Alla ricerca di un'identità (1861–1881)*, in: Gennaro BARBARISI, Enrico DECLEVA, Silvia MORGANA (ed.): *Milano e l'Accademia scientifico-letteraria*, Milano, 2001, 2 vol., I, p. 3–196.
- Alajos DEGRÉ: *Ügyvédképzés Magyarországon a polgári korban*, in: Kálmán KOVÁCS (ed.): *A jogászképzés a magyar felsőoktatás rendszerében*, Budapest 1984, p. 57–70.
- Juliusz DEMEL: *Požar Krakowa 1850 roku*, in: „*Rocznik Krakowski*“ 32, 1852, H. 3, p. 59–97.
- Demokratie und Geschichte. Jahrbuch des Karl von Vogelsang-Instituts zur Erforschung der christlichen Demokratie in Österreich*, 9/10 (2005/2006): Themenschwerpunkt Heinrich Drimmel.
- Pieter DHONDT, „Humboldt“ in Belgium: *Rhetoric on the German University Model*, in: Peter JOSEPHSON, Thomas KARLSOHN, Johan ÖSTLING (ed.): *The Humboldtian Tradition: Origins and Legacies*, Leiden, Boston 2014, p. 97–110.
- Thomas DIERNHOFER: *Eduard Herbst (1820–1892). Ein politisches Zeitbild anhand seines parlamentarischen Wirkens*, Dipl. Arb. Wien 2005.

- Józef DIETL: Mowa inauguracyjna Rektora Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego dra Józefa Dietla miana na otwarcie roku szkolnego dnia 10 października 1861 r. w sali uniwersyteckiej, Kraków 1861.
- Józef DIETL: O instytucji docentów w ogóle, a szczególnie na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim, in: Czas [Die Zeit], 31.10.1861, p. 1–2.
- Józef DIETL: O instytucji docentów w ogóle, a szczególnie na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim, in: Czas [Die Zeit], 31.10.1861, p. 1–2.
- Josef DOBIÁŠ, J. MAREK: Dr. Václav Treitz (1819–1872). On the 110th Anniversary of his Death and the 125th Anniversary of the Founding of the Pathologic Anatomy Institute in Prague, in: Časopis lékařů českých 122 (1983), p. 405–407.
- Olga DOBIJA-WITCZAK: František Tomáš Bratránek (1815–1884), in: Jan MICHALIK, Wacław WALEWSKI (ed.): Złota księga Wydziału Filologicznego, Kraków 2000, p. 50–58.
- Olga DOBIJANKA-WITCZAKOWA: Historia katedry Germanistyki w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim, in: Witold TASZYCKI, Alfred ZARĘBA (ed.): Wydział Filologiczny Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Historia Katedr, Kraków 1964, p. 349–365.
- Stanisław DOBRZANOWSKI: Wydział Teologiczny Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1849–1880, in: Studia Theologica Varsaviensia 10 (1972), Nr. 2, p. 67–104.
- Ottomar DOMRICH, Heinrich HÄSER: Verhandlungen deutscher Universitätslehrer über die Reform der deutschen Hochschulen in der Versammlung zu Jena vom 21. bis 24. September 1848, Jena 1848.
- Heinrich DRIMMEL: Die Hochschulreform von Thun-Hohenstein, in: Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur. Sonderheft Österreich 1848–1918 3 (1959), p. 1–7.
- Petr DUB, Jana MUSILOVÁ (ed.): Ernst Mach – fyzika – filozofie – vzdělávání, Brno 2010.
- František DUDEK: Vývoj cukrovarnického průmyslu v českých zemích do roku 1872, Praha 1979.
- Armand Freiherr v. DUMREICHER: Die Verwaltung der Universitäten seit dem letzten politischen Systemwechsel in Österreich, Wien 1873.
- Rudolf DVOŘÁK: Ernst Mach: fyzik a filozof, Praha 2005.
- Julian DYBIEC: Finansowanie nauki i oświaty w Galicji 1860–1918, Kraków 1979.
- Julian DYBIEC: Henryk Barycz (1901–1994), in: Kwartalnik Historii Nauki i Techniki 40 (1995), p. 135–159.
- Julian DYBIEC: Leszej Hajdukiewicz (1924–1995), in: Kwartalnik Historii Nauki i Techniki 41 (1996), p. 141–144.
- Julian DYBIEC: Profesor Kamilla Mrozowska, in: Biuletyn Historii Wychowania 9–10 (1999), p. 39–42.
- Julian DYBIEC: Stanisław Tarnowski: autorytet, polityk, uczony, in: Stanisław Tarnowski (1837–1917). Materiały z Posiedzenia Naukowego PAU w dniu 14.XI.1997 r., Kraków 1999, p. 63–65.
- Stanisław DZIEDZIC: Alma Mater Jagellonica, Kraków 2005.
- Entwurf der Grundzüge des öffentlichen Unterrichtswesens in Österreich, in: Wiener Zeitung, 197–200 (18.–21.07.1848), p. 169–171; 177–179; 187–189; 195–197.
- Matthias EGGER: „Für Gott, Kaiser und Vaterland zu Stehen oder zu Fallen...“. Die Aufzeichnungen Joseph Hundeggers, Mitglied der I. akademischen Kompanie der Universität Innsbruck, aus dem Jahr 1848, Dipl. Arb. Innsbruck 2007.

- Matthias EGGER: „Für Gott, Kaiser und Vaterland zu Stehen und zu Fallen...“. Die Aufzeichnungen Joseph Hundeggers aus dem Revolutionsjahr 1848 (Erfahren – Erinnern – Bewahren, Bd. 1), Innsbruck 2012.
- Matthias EGGER: Die I. Akademische Kompanie der k. k. Universität zu Innsbruck. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Tiroler Landesverteidigung im Jahre 1848, in: *Tiroler Heimat* (2010), p. 181–207.
- Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Die Errichtung von Lehrkanzeln für Deutsche Philologie in Österreich nach den Universitätsreformen in den Jahren 1848/49, in: Walter HÖFLECHNER (ed.): *Beiträge und Materialien zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Österreich (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 11)*, Graz 1981, p. 359–411.
- Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: *Naturgeschichte. Wissenschaft und Lehrfach. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des naturhistorischen Unterrichts in Österreich (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz 22)*, Graz 1988.
- Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Graf Thun und das Rechtsstudium an den oberitalienischen Universitäten Padua und Pavia. Ein Beitrag zur Bildungs- und Wissenschaftspolitik im Alpen-Adria-Raum, in: Herwig EBNER, Paul W. ROTH, Ingeborg WIESFLECKER-FRIEDHUBER (ed.): *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Alpen-Adria-Raumes. Festgabe für em. o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Othmar Pickl zum 70. Geburtstag (Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Geschichte, Bd. 9)* Graz 1997, p. 107–118.
- Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Feuchtersleben und das Konzept einer genuin österreichischen Universitätsreform, in: *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 18 (1998), p. 59–85.
- Herbert H. EGGLMAIER: Reformansätze vor der Thunschen Reform, in: *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 18 (1998), p. 59–86.
- Maria Clara EMANUELE: L'evoluzione degli studi secondari superiori a Pavia dalle riforme teresiane all'Unità d'Italia, in: *Annali di storia pavese* (1981), p. 23–37.
- Helmut ENGELBRECHT: *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens. Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs, Bd. 3. Von der frühen Aufklärung bis zum Vormärz*, Wien 1984.
- Karol ESTREICHER: *Kronika Biblioteki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego od 1811 roku*, Kraków 2012.
- Stanisław ESTREICHER: *Czterdzieści lat istnienia biblioteki słuchaczy prawa Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, Kraków 1891.
- Márta FATA, Gyula KURUCZ, Anton SCHINDLING (ed.): *Peregrinatio Hungarica – Studenten aus Ungarn an deutschen und österreichischen Hochschulen vom 16. bis 20. Jahrhundert (Contubernium 64. Tübinger Beiträge zur Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte)*, Stuttgart 2006.
- István FAZEKAS: *A Bécsi Pázmáneum magyarországi hallgatói 1623–1918 (1951). Matricula Collegii Pazmaniani Viennensis. Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban* 8, Budapest 2003.
- Johannes FEICHTINGER: *Wissenschaft als reflexives Projekt. Von Bolzano über Freud zu Kelsen: Österreichische Wissenschaftsgeschichte 1848–1938*, Bielefeld 2010.
- Johannes FEICHTINGER: ‚Staatsnation‘, ‚Kulturnation‘, ‚Nationalstaat‘: The Role of National Politics in the Advancement of Science and Scholarship in Austria from 1848 to 1938, in: Mitchell G. ASH, Jan SURMAN (ed.): *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848–1918*, Basingstoke 2012, p. 57–82.

- Johannes FEICHTINGER, Dieter HECHT: Die Entnazifizierung an der Akademie der Wissenschaften, in: Johannes FEICHTINGER, Herbert MATIS, Stefan SIENELL, Heidemarie UHL (ed.): Die Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien 1938 bis 1945. Katalog zur Ausstellung, Wien 2013, p. 171–188.
- Johannes FEICHTINGER: Richard Meister. Ein dienstbarer Hochschulprofessor in vier politischen Regimen, in: Mitchell G. ASH, Josef EHMER (ed.): Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft, (650 Jahre Universität Wien, Bd. 2), Göttingen, Wien 2015, p. 311–317.
- Fritz FELLNER: Restauration oder Fortschritt. Hochschulprobleme aus der Sicht des Historikers, in: Heinz FISCHER (ed.): Versäumnisse und Chancen. Beiträge zur Hochschulfrage in Österreich, Wien 1967, p. 11–28.
- A FELŐ OKTATÁSÜGY Magyarországon. Az 1896-iki ezredévi országos kiállítás alkalmára, Budapest 1896.
- István FENYŐ: Eötvös és Tocqueville, in: Aetas 22 (2007), p. 127–134.
- Alessandra FERRARESI: Tra matematica e ingegneria: il caso di Francesco Brioschi, in: Carlo G. LACAITA, Andrea SILVESTRI (ed.): Francesco Brioschi e il suo tempo, 3 vol., I, Milano 2000, p. 251–313.
- Alessandra FERRARESI: Dalla Facoltà Filosofica alla Facoltà Matematica: la formazione di ingegneri, architetti e agrimensori tra tradizione locale e modelli stranieri, in: Virginio CANTONI, Alessandra FERRARESI (ed.): Ingegneri a Pavia tra formazione e professione. Per una storia della Facoltà di Ingegneria nel quarantesimo della fondazione, Milano 2007, p. 49–130.
- Alessandra FERRARESI: Progetti e riforme universitarie nel Lombardo-Veneto dopo il 1848, in: Alessandra FERRARESI, Elisa SIGNORI (ed.): Le Università e l'Unità d'Italia, Bologna 2012, p. 85–104.
- Giuseppe FERRARIO: Statistica medica di Milano dal secolo XV fino ai nostri giorni, vol. 2, Milano 1840.
- Sascha FERZ: Ewige Universitätsreform. Das Organisationsrecht der österreichischen Universitäten von den thesesianischen Reformen bis zum UOG 1993 (Rechts- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Reihe, Bd. 27), Frankfurt a. M., Berlin, Bern u. a. 2000.
- Ernst Freiherr von FEUCHTERSLEBEN: Pädagogische Schriften, ed. by K[urt] G[erhard] FISCHER (Schöninghs Sammlung pädagogischer Schriften: Quellen zur Geschichte der Pädagogik), Paderborn 1963.
- Adolf FICKER: Die Österreichische Monarchie in ihren wichtigsten Momenten statistisch dargestellt, Gotha 1860.
- Adolf FICKER: Geschichte, Organisation und Statistik des österreichischen Unterrichtswesens, mit statistischen Tabellen von Gustav Schimmer, Wien 1873.
- Franz Leander FILLAFER: Escaping the Enlightenment. Liberal Thought and the Legacies of the Eighteenth Century in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1790–1848, Diss. Konstanz 2012.
- Franz Leander FILLAFER: Die Aufklärung in der Habsburgermonarchie und ihr Erbe. Ein Forschungsüberblick, in: Zeitschrift für historische Forschung 40 (2013), p. 35–97.
- Franz Leander FILLAFER: Jenseits des Historismus. Gelehrte Verfahren, politische Tendenzen und konfessionelle Muster in der Geschichtsschreibung des österreichischen Vormärz, in: Christine OTTNER, Klaus RIES (ed.): Geschichtsforschung in Deutschland und Österreich im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (Pallas Athene, Bd. 48), Stuttgart 2014, p. 79–119.
- Franz Leander FILLAFER, Thomas WALLNIG (ed.): Josephinismus zwischen den Regimen. Eduard Winter, Fritz Valjavec und die zentraleuropäischen Historiographien im 20. Jahrhundert, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2015.

- Franz Leander FILLAFER: Kant und die katholische Theologie im Vormärz, in: Violetta L. WAIBEL (ed.): Umwege: Annäherungen an Immanuel Kant in Wien, Österreich und Osteuropa, Göttingen 2015, p. 74–83.
- Franz Leander FILLAFER: Hermann Bonitz. Philologe, Mitschöpfer der Universitätsreform, in: Mitchell G. ASH, Josef EHMER (ed.): Universität – Politik – Gesellschaft, (650 Jahre Universität Wien, Bd. 2), Göttingen, Wien 2015, p. 189–195.
- Franz Leander FILLAFER: Sechs Josephiner, in: Rainer BENDEL, Norbert SPANNENBERGER (ed.): Katholische Aufklärung und Josephinismus. Religionsformen in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa, Köln, Wien, Weimar 2015, p. 349–389.
- Ludwik FINKEL, Stanisław STARZYŃSKI: Historia Uniwersytetu Lwowskiego, Bd. I (Ludwik FINKEL: Historia Uniwersytetu Lwowskiego do r. 1869), Lwów 1894.
- Christian FLECK: Autochthone Provinzialisierung. Universität und Wissenschaftspolitik nach dem Ende der nationalsozialistischen Herrschaft in Österreich, in: Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft 7 (1996), p. 67–92.
- Ludwik FLECK: Entstehung und Entwicklung einer wissenschaftlichen Tatsache – Einführung in die Lehre vom Denkstil und Denkkollektiv. Mit einer Einleitung herausgegeben von Lothar Schäfer und Thomas Schnelle, Frankfurt a. M. 1980.
- Alois FLIR: Briefe aus Rom, ed. by Ludwig Rapp, Innsbruck 1864.
- Helmut W. FLÜGEL: Briefe österreichischer ‚Mineralogen‘ zwischen Aufklärung und Restauration (Scripta geo-historica. Grazer Schriften zur Geschichte der Erdwissenschaften, Bd. 1), Graz 2009.
- Salomon FRANKFURTER: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein, Franz Exner und Hermann Bonitz, Wien 1893.
- Salomon FRANKFURTER: Leo Thun-Hohenstein, in: Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, Bd. 38, Leipzig 1894, p. 178–212.
- Salomon FRANKFURTER: Wilhelm von Hartel. Sein Leben und sein Wirken. Zur Enthüllung des Denkmals in der Universität am 9. Juni 1912, Wien 1912.
- Salomon FRANKFURTER: Die Qualifikation für den staatlichen Bibliotheksdienst in Österreich. Vortrag gehalten im Österreichischen Verein für Bibliothekswesen in Wien am 19. Februar 1898, Wien 1898.
- Heinrich FRIEDJUNG: Österreich von 1848 bis 1860. 2 Bände, Wien, Berlin 1913.
- Marian FÜSSEL: Wie schreibt man Universitätsgeschichte, in: NTM Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin 22/4 (2014), p. 287–293.
- Emilio GABBA: Giuseppe Müller, in: Bollettino della Società Pavese di Storia Patria 96 (1996), p. 75–77.
- Mario GECHELE: Maestri e formazione nelle province venete (1814–1866), in: Simonetta POLENGHI (ed.): La scuola degli Asburgo. Pedagogia e formazione degli insegnanti tra il Danubio e il Po (1773–1918), Torino 2012, p. 113–148.
- Stefan GERBER: Wie schreibt man „zeitgemäße“ Universitätsgeschichte?, in: NTM Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin 22/4 (2014), p. 277–286.
- Gian Franco GIANNOTTI: Gli studi classici, in: Italo LANA (ed.): Storia della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Torino, Firenze 2000, p. 229–231.

- Donatella GIGLIO: I ginnasi e i licei lombardi nell'età della Restaurazione, in: Irene CIPRANDI, Donatella GIGLIO, Gabriella SOLARO (ed.): Problemi scolastici ed educativi nella Lombardia del primo ottocento, vol. II, L'istruzione superiore, Milano 1978, p. 87–192.
- Walter GOLDINGER: Die Wiener Universität und die Studienreform von 1848/49, in: Wiener Geschichtsblätter 4 (1949) Nr. 1.
- Jaroslav GOLL: Rozdělení pražské univerzity Karlo-Ferdinandovy roku 1882 a počátek samostatné university české, Praha 1908.
- Peter GOLLER: Die Matrikel der Universität Innsbruck. Die Matrikel der Theologischen Fakultät, Bd. 1 (1857–1900), Innsbruck 1995.
- Peter GOLLER: Katholisches Theologiestudium an der Universität Innsbruck vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg (1857–1914) (Forschungen zur Innsbrucker Universitätsgeschichte, Bd. 19), Innsbruck, Wien 1997.
- Peter GOLLER: Naturrecht, Rechtsphilosophie oder Rechtstheorie? Zur Geschichte der Rechtsphilosophie an Österreichs Universitäten (1848–1945) (Rechts- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Reihe, Bd. 18), Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern u. a. 1997.
- Peter GOLLER: Die Matrikel der Universität Innsbruck. Abteilung: Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Fakultät, Bd. 1 (1849–1918), Innsbruck 1998.
- Peter GOLLER: Joseph Winiwarters Verteidigung von Karl Anton Martinis natürlichem Staatsrecht (1833). Zum Fortleben von Martinis Denken im Vormärz, in: Heinz BARTA, Rudolf PALME, Wolfgang INGENHAEFF (ed.): Naturrecht und Privatrechtskodifikation. Tagungsband des Martini-Colloquiums 1998, Wien 1999, p. 543–570.
- Theodor GOMPERZ: Hermann Bonitz, Biographisches Jahrbuch der Alterthumskunde, Jg. 1888, p. 53–99.
- Maciej GÓRNY: „Die Wahrheit ist auf unserer Seite“. Nation, Marxismus und Geschichte im Ostblock, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2011.
- Nikolaus GRASS: Rudolf Kink. Der Geschichtsschreiber der Universität Wien. Der Vorkämpfer der österreichischen Rechtsgeschichte, in: Nikolaus GRASS: Österreichische Historiker–Biographien I, Innsbruck 1954, p. 227–268.
- Nikolaus GRASS: Francesco Schupfer und Tullius von Sartori-Montecroce als Rechtshistoriker an der Universität Innsbruck, in: Hans LENTZE, Peter PUTZER (ed.): Festschrift für Carl Hellbling zum 70. Geburtstag, Salzburg 1971, p. 195–258.
- Ferdinand GRASSAUER: Handbuch für österreichische Universitäts- und Studienbibliotheken sowie für Volks-, Mittel- und Bezirks-Lehrerbibliotheken. Mit einer Sammlung von Gesetzen, a. h. Entschliessungen, Verordnungen, Erlässen, Acten und Actenausügen, Wien 1883.
- Matthew GRAVES, Valérie AUDA-ANDRÉ: Histoires de l'oubli dans les mondes anglophones et francophones, XXe–XXIe siècles, in: E-rea 10 (2012), Nr. 1 [<http://erea.revues.org/2952>], [eingesehen 30.08.2016](#).
- Franz GRILLPARZER: Sämtliche Werke, Band 1 (Gedichte – Epigramme – Dramen I), München 1960.
- Gerald GRIMM: Elitäre Bildungsinstitution oder „Bürgerschule“? Das österreichische Gymnasium zwischen Tradition und Innovation, 1773–1819, Frankfurt a. M., New York 1995.

- Sven HAASE: *Berliner Universität und Nationalgedanke 1800–1848. Genese einer politischen Idee*, Stuttgart 2012.
- Stanislaus HAFNER: *Geschichte der österreichischen Slawistik*, in: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Slawistik in nichtslawischen Ländern*, Wien 1986.
- Leszek HAJDUKIEWICZ, Mieczysław KARAŚ: *Uniwersytet Jagielloński: tradycje, współczesność, perspektywy*, Kraków 1975.
- Leszek HAJDUKIEWICZ, Mieczysław KARAŚ: *Die Jagiellonen-Universität: Tradition – Gegenwart – Perspektiven*, Krakau 1977.
- Leszek HAJDUKIEWICZ: *Wydziały i zakłady Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1849–1939 (1954)*, in: Jerzy MICHALEWICZ (ed.): *Inwentarz akt wydziałów i studiów Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1849–1939 (1954)*, Kraków 1997, p. 7–25.
- Jan HÁJEK, Drahomír JANČÍK, Eduard KUBŮ: *For Economic National Possessions: Reflections and Studies on Modern Czech and German Economic Nationalism in the Bohemian Lands: Tribute to the XIV. International Economic History Congress in Helsinki, Praha 2006*.
- István HALMAI: *Az egri érseki akadémia a jogi felsőoktatás rendszerében a századfordulóig*, in: *Az Egri Ho Si Minh Tanárképző Főiskola Tudományos Közleményei Jg. 18. (1987) Nr. 5*, p. 135–153.
- Notker HAMMERSTEIN: *Besonderheiten der österreichischen Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsreform zur Zeit Maria Theresias und Josephs II.*, in: *Österreich im Europa der Aufklärung*, Bd. 2, Wien 1985, p. 787–812.
- Joseph von HAMMER-PURGSTALL: *Erinnerungen und Briefe. Briefe von 1790 bis Ende 1819*, herausgegeben von Walter Höflechner und Alexandra Wagner, 3 Bde. Graz 2011.
- Eduard HANSLICK: *Vom Musikalisch Schönen. Ein Beitrag zur Revision der Ästhetik der Tonkunst*, Wiesbaden ²⁰1980 (1854).
- Wolfgang HÄUSLER: *Von der Massenarmut zur Arbeiterbewegung. Demokratie und soziale Frage in der Wiener Revolution von 1848*. Wien, München 1979.
- Friedrich HEER: *Der Kampf um die österreichische Identität [1981]*, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2001.
- Waltraud HEINDL: *Einleitung*, in: *Die Protokolle des österreichischen Ministerrats, 1848–1867*, III/2 (15. März 1853–9. Oktober 1853), Wien 1979.
- Waltraud HEINDL: *Universitätsreform – Gesellschaftsreform. Bemerkungen zum Plan eines Universitätsorganisationsgesetzes in den Jahren 1854/55*, in: *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 35 (1982), p. 134–149.
- Waltraud HEINDL: *Universitätsreform und politisches Programm. Die Sprachenfrage an der Universität Krakau im Neoabsolutismus*, in: *Österreichische Osthefte* 20 (1978), p. 79–98.
- Waltraud HEINDL: *Gehorsame Rebellen. Bürokratie und Beamte in Österreich 1780 bis 1848*, Wien 1991.
- Carl HEINTL: *Mittheilungen aus den Universitätsacten (vom 12. März bis 22. Juli 1848)*, Wien 1848.
- Hans HEISS, Thomas GÖTZ: *Am Rand der Revolution. Tirol 1848/49*, Wien, Bozen 1998.
- Antoni HELCEL: *Uwagi nad kwestyą językową w szkołach i uniwersytetach Galicyi i Krakowa, osnowane na liście odręcznym Jego C. K. Apostolskiej Mości z dnia 20 października 1860 r.*, Kraków 1860.

- A. HELD: Universität, in: Carl ROTTECK, Karl Theodor WELCKER (ed.): Das Staats-Lexikon: Encyklopädie der sämtlichen Staatswissenschaften für alle Stände, Leipzig ³1866, p. 776–800.
- Joseph Alexander von HELFERT: Über Nationalgeschichte und den gegenwärtigen Stand ihrer Pflege in Österreich, Prag 1853.
- Joseph Alexander von HELFERT: Graf Leo Thun: Lehr- und Wanderjahre, in: Österreichisches Jahrbuch 15 (1891), p. 123–212, 150, 153, 169, 178, 184.
- Richard HESCHL: Ueber die Aufgaben der Hochschule. Festrede zum 15. November 1864, gehalten vom Rector Magnificus Prof. Dr. Heschl in der Aula der Universität Graz, Graz 1864.
- Ludmila HLAVÁČKOVÁ, Eva ROZSÍVALOVÁ: Studium a přednášky na lékařské fakultě pražské univerzity v letech 1690–1848, Praha 1984.
- Ludmila HLAVÁČKOVÁ, Petr SVOBODNÝ: Dějiny pražských lékařských fakult 1348–1990, Praha 1993.
- Walter HÖFLECHNER: Metamorphosen und Konsequenzen. Zur Auflösung der Allgemeinen Geschichte an den Universitäten Wien, Prag und Graz, in: Reinhard HÄRTEL (ed.): Geschichte und ihre Quellen. Festschrift für Friedrich Hausmann zum 70. Geburtstag, Graz 1987, p. 289–298.
- Walter HÖFLECHNER: Joseph Chmel und Joseph Hammer-Purgstall, in: Herwig EBNER, Walter HÖFLECHNER, Helmut MEZLER-ANDELBERG, Paul ROTH, Hermann WIESFLECKER (ed.): Festschrift Othmar Pickl zum 60. Geburtstag, Graz 1987, p. 237–240.
- Walter HÖFLECHNER: Die Baumeister des künftigen Glücks. Fragment einer Geschichte des Hochschulwesens in Österreich vom Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in das Jahr 1938 (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 23), Graz 1988.
- Walter HÖFLECHNER: Zum Einfluß des deutschen Hochschulwesens auf Österreich in den Jahren 1875–1914, in: Bernhard VOM BROCKE (ed.): Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Wissenschaftspolitik im Industriezeitalter: Das „System Althoff“ in historischer Perspektive, Hildesheim 1991, p. 155–183.
- Walter HÖFLECHNER: Die Österreichische Rektorenkonferenz 1911–1938, 1945–1969, Fassung B. Preprint, Graz 1992.
- Walter HÖFLECHNER: Österreich: eine verspätete Wissenschaftsnation? in: Karl ACHAM (ed.): Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften, Bd. 1: Historischer Kontext, wissenschaftssoziologische Befunde und methodologische Voraussetzungen, Wien 1999, p. 93–114.
- Walter HÖFLECHNER: Die Auswirkungen politischer und kultureller Veränderungen auf Forschungsorientierung und Wissenschaftsorganisation, in: Karl ACHAM (ed.): Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften Bd. 1: Historischer Kontext, wissenschaftssoziologische Befunde und methodologische Voraussetzungen, Wien 1999, p. 149–214.
- Walter HÖFLECHNER: Materialien zur Entwicklung der Physik und ihrer „Randfächer“ Astronomie und Meteorologie an den österreichischen Universitäten 1752–1938, Graz 2002.
- Walter HÖFLECHNER: Das Fach „Geschichte“ an der Philosophischen resp. Geisteswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Graz. Vertretung und Institution von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 44/1), Graz 2015.
- Anton HOLASEK, Alois KERNBAUER: Biochemie in Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 35) Graz 1997.

- Johannes HOLESCHOFKY: Hugo Hantsch. Eine biografische Studie, St. Pölten 2014.
- Alžbeta HOLOŠOVÁ: Die Tyrnauer Universität im Licht der Geschichte, Kraków, Trnava 2012.
- Ivana HOLZBACHOVÁ: Ernst Mach a vědecké poznání, in: Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. Studia Minora Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Brunenses, Studia Philosophica B 48 (2001).
- Irena HOMOLA: Kwiat społeczeństwa, Kraków 1984.
- Nándor HORÁNSZKY, Endre ZIBOLEN, Ferenc SCHAFFHAUSER: Az ausztriai gimnáziumok és reáliskolák szervezeti terve, Budapest 1990.
- Jan HORSKÝ: Albert Einstein: genius lidstva, Praha 1998.
- Ödön HORVÁTH: Jogakadémiák és jogi vizsgálatok, Budapest 1903.
- Pál HORVÁTH: A porosz-német, ill. az osztrák-magyar Lehrfreiheit modell mibenléte a Leo Hohenstein-féle reformok alapján, in: Kálmán KOVÁCS (ed.): A jogalkotás és a jogalkalmazás egyes kérdései Magyarországon a 19–20. században. (Jogtörténeti értekezések), Budapest 1986, p. 7–22.
- Miroslav HROCH: Na prahu národní existence, Praha 1999.
- Florian HUBER: „Kulturkämpfer“. Vinzenz Gasser und der Katholizismus in Tirol 1830–1876, in: Der Schlern 84 (2010), p. 39–59.
- Florian HUBER: Konfessionelle Identitätsbildung in Tirol: Antiprotetantismus ohne Protestanten (1830–1848), in: Geschichte und Region. Storia e Regione 19 (2010), p. 28–52.
- Heinz HUBER: Geschichte der Medizinischen Fakultät Innsbruck und der medizinisch-chirurgischen Studienanstalt, Wien 2010.
- Franz HUTER: Hundert Jahre Medizinische Fakultät Innsbruck 1869 bis 1969 (Forschungen zur Innsbrucker Universitätsgeschichte 7), Innsbruck 1969.
- Franz HUTER: Salzburg oder Innsbruck? Ein Gerücht von der Verlegung der Universität aus der Inn- in die Salzachstadt, in: Tiroler Heimat (1969), p. 33–51.
- Antoni JACKOWSKI, Izabela SOŁJAN: Wincenty Pol jako geograf, in: Krystyna GRODZISKA, Adam KOTARBA (ed.): Wincenty Pol (1870–1872). W służbie nauki i narodu, Kraków 2010, p. 25–47.
- Drahomír JANČÍK, Eduard KUBŮ (ed.): Nacionalismus zvaný hospodářský: střety a zápasy o nacionální emancipaci/převahu českých zemích (1859–1945), Praha 2011.
- Jan JANKO, Soňa ŠTRBÁŇOVÁ: Vědy Purkyňovy doby, Praha 1988.
- Michael G. JAROSEVSKIJ: Die Logik der Wissenschaftsentwicklung und die wissenschaftliche Schule, in: Semen R. MIKULINSKIJ, Michael G. JAROSEFSKIJ, Günter KRÖBER, Helmut STEINER (ed.): Wissenschaftliche Schulen, Bd. 1, Berlin 1977.
- Carl JELINEK: Das Ständisch-polytechnische Institut zu Prag, Prag 1856.
- Karel JIČINSKÝ: Kritická úvaha o schfizi německých právníků, in: Právník 1862, p. 326–330, p. 367–375.
- Karel JIČINSKÝ: Vývin českého právnictví s obzvláštním zřetelem na jeho zdroje, Praha 1862.
- František JÍLEK, Václav LOMIČ, Pavla HORSKÁ: Dějiny Českého vysokého učení technického, Praha 1973.
- František JÍLEK: Pražská polytechnika a její studenti v revolučním roce 1848, in: Sborník Národního technického muzea v Praze/Acta Musei Nationalis Technici Pragae (1965), Jg. 4, p. 268–366.

- František JÍLEK: Účast studentů na přípravách revoluce v Čechách roku 1849, in: Sborník Národního technického muzea v Praze/Acta Musei Nationalis Technici Pragae (1968), Jg. 5, p. 337–508.
- Bohumil JIROUŠEK (ed.): Proměny diskursu české marxistické historiografie, České Budějovice 2008.
- Uwe JOCHUM: Die Idole der Bibliothekare, Würzburg 1995.
- Uwe JOCHUM: Kleine Bibliotheksgeschichte, Stuttgart 2007.
- William M. JOHNSTON: The Austrian Mind: An Intellectual and Social History 1848–1938, Berkeley 1972.
- Rudolf JUNG: Frankfurter Hochschulpläne 1384–1868 (Frankfurter historische Forschungen N. F. 1), Leipzig 1915.
- Hedwig KADLETZ-SCHÖFFEL: Metternich und die Wissenschaften, 2 Bde., Wien 1992.
- Kristina KAISEROVÁ: Litoměřická diecéze – několik otazníků 19. století, in: Litoměřická kapitula. 950 let od založení, Ústí nad Labem 2007, p. 107–115.
- Marian KANIOR: Dzieje Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w latach 1780–1880, in: *Analecta Cracoviensia* 25 (1993), p. 195–203.
- Robert A. KANN: Hochschule und Politik im österreichischen Verfassungsstaat (1867–1918), in: Gerhard BOTZ, Hans HAUTMANN, Helmut KONRAD (ed.): *Geschichte und Gesellschaft. Festschrift für Karl R. Stadler*, Linz, Wien 1974, p. 507–526.
- Sieglinde KAPFERER: Graf Leo Thun von Thun und Hohenstein – ein Böhme zwischen deutschem und tschechischem Kulturkreis, Dipl. Arb. Innsbruck 2013.
- Jerzy KAULBERSZ, Ryszard BILSKI: Historia Katedry Fizjologii Wydziału Lekarskiego Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego i Akademii Medycznej, in: *Sześćsetlecie medycyny krakowskiej*, Bd. 2: Historia katedr, Kraków 1964, p. 392–432.
- František KAVKA, Josef PETRÁŇ (ed.): *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy 1348–1990*, 4 Bde., Praha 1995–1998.
- Karel KAZBUNDA: *České hnutí roku 1848*, Praha 1929.
- Alois KERNBAUER: Die Emanzipation der Chemie in Österreich um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Von der Hilfswissenschaft zur freien Wissenschaftsdisziplin, in: *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften* 4 (1984) p. 11–44.
- Alois KERNBAUER: Das Fach Chemie an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 17) Graz 1985.
- Alois KERNBAUER: Lorenz Rigler, Istanbul und die „medizinische Geographie“, in: Arslan TERZIOGLU, Erwin LUCIUS (ed.): *Türk – Avusturya tibbi iliskileri. Österreichisch-türkische medizinische Beziehungen. Berichte des Symposions vom 28. und 29. April 1986 in Istanbul*, Istanbul 1987, p. 121–132.
- Alois KERNBAUER: Zwischen Zunft und Wissenschaft. Der österreichische Apotheker- und Pharmazeutenstand in der Krise. Von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in das Jahr 1922 (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 14/2), Graz 1989.
- Alois KERNBAUER: Gregor Krek und die Anfänge der Slawistik an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, in: *Anzeiger für Slavische Philologie* XXXIII (2005), p. 53–70.

- Alois KERNBAUER: Gregor Krek in Začetki Slavistike na Univerzi v Gradcu, in: Gregor Krek (1840–1905). Filologija in Slovanstvo, Ljubljana 2006, p. 83–97.
- Alois KERNBAUER: Hochschulabschlüsse in der Habsburgermonarchie in der Zeit der Professionalisierung akademischer Berufe, in: Rainer Christoph SCHWINGES (ed.): Examen, Titel, Promotionen. Akademisches und staatliches Qualifikationswesen vom 13. bis zum 21. Jahrhundert (Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft für Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Bd. 7), Basel 2007, p. 89–168.
- Alois KERNBAUER: Slowenen als Professoren an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, in: Ludwig KARNIČAR, Vincenc RAJŠP (ed.): Graz und Slowenen. Gradec in Slovenci. Sammelband zum gleichnamigen Symposium vom 20.–21.V.2010 an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Wien, Graz, Ljubljana 2011, p. 39–59.
- Alois KERNBAUER: Leitlinien und Besonderheiten der medizinisch-chirurgischen Ausbildung in Graz. Eine Skizze, in: Petra SCHEIBLECHNER (ed.): Die neuen Wundärzte. Die Absolventen des Grazer Medizinisch-chirurgischen Studiums 1782–1863 (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz 6/6), Graz 2014, p. xi–xlvi.
- Alois KERNBAUER: Das historiografische Werk Grazer Historiker. 150 Jahre Institut für Geschichte an der Universität Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 44/2), Graz 2015.
- Alois KERNBAUER: Geschichtsstudium. Autobiografische Berichte. Die in Graz verfassten Dissertationen. 150 Jahre Institut für Geschichte an der Universität Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 44/3), Graz 2015.
- Rudolf KINK: Geschichte der kaiserlichen Universität zu Wien, Erster Band, I. Theil: Geschichtliche Darstellung der Entstehung und Entwicklung der Universität bis zur Neuzeit, Wien 1854.
- József Mihály Kiss, László SZÖGI: Magyarországi diákok bécsi egyetemeken és főiskolákon 1849–1867 (Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, Bd. 7), Budapest 2003.
- Jiří KLABOUCH: Osvícenské právní nauky v českých zemích, Praha 1958.
- Walter KLEINDEL: Österreich. Daten zur Geschichte und Kultur, Wien 1978.
- Marianne KLEMUN: Wissenswandel und botanische Gärten: Eine historische Reflexion, in: Karin STANDLER (ed.): Der Garten als Wissensraum. Eine Reise zu Gärten der botanischen Sammlungen in Europa, Budapest, Rom 2013, p. 11–14.
- Rupert KLIEBER: Jüdische, christliche, muslimische Lebenswelten der Donaumonarchie. 1848–1918, Wien u. a 2010.
- Eugeniusz KLIN, Jaromir LOUŽIL: František Tomáš Bratranek – ein polonophiler Mittler zwischen den Nationen – mit dem ungedruckten Kommentar zu Mickiewiczs „Totenfeier“ („Dziady“), Zielona Góra 1987.
- Grete KLINGENSTEIN: Akademikerüberschuß als soziales Problem im aufgeklärten Absolutismus. Bemerkungen über eine Rede Joseph von Sonnenfels' aus dem Jahre 1771, in: Grete KLINGENSTEIN, Hermann LUTZ, Gerald STOURZH (ed.): Bildung, Politik und Gesellschaft. Studien zur Geschichte des europäischen Bildungswesens vom 16. zum 20. Jahrhundert, Wien 1978, p. 165–204.
- Peter KNOODT: Anton Günther. Eine Biographie, 2 Bde., Wien 1881.
- Matthias KOCH: Ueber Nationalerziehung. Beschluß, in: Österreichisches Archiv für Geschichte, Erdbeschreibung, Staatenkunde, Kunst und Literatur 127, 22.10.1833, p. 505–507.

- Gernot KOCHER: „Man‘ studiert die Rechte in Graz“ – Nationalität und Herkunft von 1810–1820, in: Ludwig KARNIČAR, Vincenc RAJŠP (ed.): Graz und Slowenen. Gradec in Slovenci. Sammelband zum gleichnamigen Symposium vom 20.–21.V.2010 an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Wien, Graz, Ljubljana 2011, p. 73–80.
- Pavel KOLAR: Geschichtswissenschaft in Zentraleuropa. Die Universitäten Prag, Wien und Berlin um 1900, Leipzig 2008.
- Panajotis KONDYLIS: Der Niedergang der bürgerlichen Denk- und Lebensform. Die liberale Moderne und die massendemokratische Postmoderne, Weinheim 1991.
- Thomas KÖNIG: „Konserven des Geistes.“ Semantischer Wandel in den hochschulpolitischen Debatten der frühen 1960er Jahre in Österreich, in: Ingrid BÖHLER, Eva PFANZELTER-SAUSGRUBER, Thomas SPIELBÜCHLER, Rolf STEININGER (ed.): 7. Österreichischer Zeitgeschichtetag 2008. 1968 – Vorgeschichten – Folgen. Bestandsaufnahme der österreichischen Zeitgeschichte, Innsbruck 2008, p. 64–71.
- Thomas KÖNIG: Die Entstehung eines Gesetzes. Österreichische Hochschulpolitik in den 1950er Jahren, in: Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften (ÖZG) 23 (2012), 2, p. 57–81.
- Albrecht KOSCHORKE: Zur Logik kultureller Gründungserzählungen, in: Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte I/2 (Sommer 2007), p. 5–12.
- Sándor KÖTE, János RAVASZ (ed.): Dokumentumok a magyar nevelés történetéből, Budapest 1979.
- Janina KOWALCZYKOWA: Historia Katedry Anatomii Patologicznej w Krakowie, in: Sześćsetlecie medycyny krakowskiej, t. 2: Historia katedr, Kraków 1964, p. 415–432.
- Petr KREUZ: Das Appellationsgericht in Prag 1548–1783. Forschung, Quellen und historische Entwicklung, in: Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte Österreichs (2013), p. 231–250.
- Wojciech KRIEGSEISEN: Jerzy Michalski (9 IV 1924 – 26 II 2007), in: Kwartalnik Historyczny: organ Towarzystwa Historycznego 114 (2007), p. 199–201.
- Franz von KRONES: Geschichte der Karl-Franzens-Universität in Graz. Festgabe zur Feier ihres dreihundertjährigen Bestandes, Graz 1886.
- Kronika Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego od r. 1864 do r. 1887 i obraz jego stanu dzisiejszego wraz z rzeczą o rektorach od czasów najdawniejszych, Kraków 1887.
- Zdeněk KRYŠTŮFEK: Historický základy právního pozitivismu, Prag 1967.
- Ladislav KUBÍK (ed.): Česká korespondence se Lvem Thunem, Praha 1970.
- Karel KUČERA, Miroslav TRUC: Archiv University Karlovy. Průvodce po archivních fondech, Praha 1961.
- Kazimierz Władysław KUMANIECKI: Zarys prawa administracyjnego na ziemiach polskich, Kraków, Warszawa 1921.
- Bolesław KUMOR: Ustrój i organizacja kościoła polskiego w okresie niewoli narodowej 1772–1918, Kraków 1980.
- Peter KURANDA: Großösterreich und Großdeutschland bei den Hauptvertretern der deutschösterreichischen Literatur, 1830–1848, Wien 1928.
- Carlo G. LACAITA: L'intelligenza produttiva. Imprenditori, tecnici e operai nella Società di incoraggiamento di arti e mestieri di Milano (1838–1858), Milano 1990.

- Vlastislav LACINA: *Hospodářství v českých zemích 1880–1914* (Práce Historického ústavu ČAV. Opera Instituti Historici Pragae. Monographia A - 2), Praha 1990.
- Dieter LANGEWIESCHE: Humboldt als Leitbild? Die deutsche Universität in den Berliner Rektoratsreden seit dem 19. Jahrhundert, in: *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte* 14 (2011), p. 15–37.
- Reinhard LAUBE: Platon und die Sophisten, in: Hartmut LEHMANN, Otto Gerhard OEXLE (ed.): *Nationalsozialismus in den Kulturwissenschaften, Bd. 2: Leitbegriffe – Deutungsmuster – Paradigmenkämpfe. Erfahrungen und Transformationen im Exil*, p. 139–164.
- David LAVEN: Liberals or Libertines? Staff, Students and Government Policy at the University of Padua, 1814–1835, in: *History of Universities* 11 (1992), p. 123–164.
- Elmar LECHNER: Strakosch-Graßmann, Gustav (1869–1941), Historiker und Lehrer, in: *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950, Bd. 13*, Wien 2009, p. 352–353.
- Erich LEITNER: Die neuere deutsche Philologie an der Universität Graz 1851–1954. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Germanistik in Österreich (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 1) Graz 1973, p. 212–217.
- Kazimierz LEJMAN: Zarys Dziejów Wydziału Lekarskiego Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w okresie reformy Kołłątaja do lat sześćdziesiątych XIX wieku, in: *Sześćsetlecie medycyny krakowskiej, Bd. 2, Historia katedr*, p. 57–95.
- Karl LEMAYER: Die Verwaltung der österreichischen Hochschulen von 1868–1877. Im Auftrage des k. k. Ministeriums für Cultus und Unterricht dargestellt, Wien 1878.
- Hans LENTZE: L'insegnamento della storia del diritto nella riforma degli studi universitari promossa dal ministro austriaco von Thun e l'istituzione di una cattedra a Pavia e a Padova, in: *Archivio storico lombardo, LXXVIII–LXXIX* (1953), p. 291–306.
- Hans LENTZE: Graf Thun und die deutsche Rechtsgeschichte, in: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 63 (1955), p. 500–521.
- Hans LENTZE: Andreas Freiherr von Baumgartner und die Thunsche Studienreform, in: *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse* 96 (1959), p. 161–179.
- Hans LENTZE: Graf Thun und die voraussetzungslose Wissenschaft, in: Helmut J. MEZLER-ANDELBERG (ed.): *Festschrift Karl Eder zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Innsbruck 1959, p. 197–209.
- Hans LENTZE: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 239. Band 2. Abhandlung sowie Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts, Heft 7), Graz, Wien, Köln 1962.
- Hans LENTZE: Die Eingliederung der österreichischen Zivilrechtswissenschaft in die deutsche Pandektenwissenschaft, in: Andor CSIZMADIA, Kálmán KOVÁCS (ed.): *Die Entwicklung des Zivilrechts in Mitteleuropa (1848–1944)*, Budapest 1970, p. 59–70.
- Kazimierz LEPSZY: Rola Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w życiu narodu i państwa polskiego: (wykład Rektora na inauguracji Roku Jubileuszowego), Manuskript in der Jagiellonen-Bibliothek Krakau, sign. 584733 III.
- Erna LESKY: Die Wiener medizinische Schule im 19. Jahrhundert (Studien zur Geschichte der Universität Wien VI), Graz, Köln 1965.

- Dorota LEŚNIEWSKA: *Kolonizacja niemiecka i na prawie niemieckim w średniowiecznych Czechach i na Morawach w świetle historiografii*, Poznań, Marburg 2004.
- Umberto LEVRA: *Organizzazione istituzionale e ordinamento didattico (1792–1862)*, in: Italo LANA (ed.): *Storia della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Torino*, Firenze 2000, p. 79–80.
- Alphons LHOTSKY: *Geschichte des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 1854–1954. Festgabe zur Hundert-Jahr-Feier des Instituts (Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband 17)*, Graz, Köln 1954.
- Alphons LHOTSKY: *Das Ende des Josephinismus: Epilegomena zu Hans Lentzes Werk über die Reformen des Ministers Grafen Thun [1962]*, in: Alphons LHOTSKY: *Aufsätze und Vorträge, Bd. 3: Historiographie – Quellenkunde – Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, Wien 1972, p. 276–277.
- Alphons LHOTSKY: *Ein Bericht über die Universität Göttingen für den Staatskanzler Fürsten Kaunitz-Rietberg 1772*, in: Peter CLASSEN, Peter SCHEIBERT (ed.): *Festschrift Percy Ernst Schramm, Bd. 2*, Wiesbaden 1964, p. 75–82.
- Alphons LHOTSKY: *Das Problem des österreichischen Menschen*, in: Alphons LHOTSKY: *Gesammelte Aufsätze, Bd. 4: Die Haupt- und Residenzstadt Wien, Sammelwesen und Ikonographie, Der Österreichische Mensch*, Wien 1974, p. 308–331.
- Jitka LNĚNIČKOVÁ: *Čechy v době předbřeznové 1792–1848*, Praha 1999.
- Fritz Freiherr LOCHNER von Hüttenbach: *Das Fach Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft an der Universität Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 5)* Graz 1976.
- Bronisław ŁOZIŃSKI: *Agenor hrabia Gołuchowski w pierwszym okresie rządów swoich. (1846–1859)*, Lwów 1901.
- Ignatz de LUCA: *Versuch einer akademischen gelehrten Geschichte von der Kaiserl. Königl. Leopoldinischen Universität zu Insbruck (Journal der Literatur und Statistik, Bd. 1)*, Innsbruck 1782.
- Milan MACHOVEC: *Tomáš G. Masaryk*, Praha 2000.
- Ivana MADLOVÁ: *Hrabě Leo Thun a revoluce 1848/49*, Bakk. Univerzita Karlova Praha 2012.
- Imre MADZSAR: *A magyar közigazgatás az abszolutizmus korában*, in: *Magyar Pedagógia*, Jg. 31 (1922), p. 72–77.
- Thomas MAISEL: *Alma Mater auf den Barrikaden. Die Universität Wien im Revolutionsjahr 1848*, Wien 1998.
- Franciszek MAJCHROWSKI: *Sprawy pedagogiczne na ostatnim kongresie filologów i pedagogów w Wiedniu*, in: *Muzeum. Czasopismo Towarzystwa Nauczycieli Szkół Wyższych* 9 (1893), p. 547–570.
- Franciszek MAJCHROWSKI: *Dr. p. Frankfurter, Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein ...*, in: *Muzeum. Czasopismo Towarzystwa Nauczycieli Szkół Wyższych* 10 (1894), p. 4–51.
- Józef MAJER: *Zagajenie posiedzenia publicznego Towarzystwa naukowego z Uniwersytetem Jagiellońskim złączonego, w dniu 13 lipca 1850 r. obejmujące Pogląd na znaczenie uniwersytetów w stosunku do państwa i innych naukowych zakładów*, Kraków, 1850.

- Stefan MALFÈR: Una costituzione per il Regno Lombardo-Veneto. Speranze e fallimenti, 1848–1850, in: Alba LAZZARETTO ZANOLO (ed.): La ‚primavera liberale‘ nella terraferma veneta, 1848–1849, Venezia 2000, p. 113–129.
- Maurycy MANN: Wincenty Pol. studjum biograficzno-krytyczne, Bd. 2, Kraków 1906.
- Karl MANNHEIM: Ideologie und Utopie, Bonn 1929.
- Bedřich MANSFELD (ed.): Sto let Jednoty k povzbuzení průmyslu v Čechách 1833–1933, Praha 1933.
- Sándor MÁRKY: A Magyar Királyi Ferenc József Tudományegyetem Története 1872–1922, Szeged 1922.
- Heinrich MARQUARDSEN: Universitäten, in: Johann-Caspar BLUNTSCHLI, Carl BRATER (ed.): Deutsches Staats-Wörterbuch. In Verbindung mit deutschen Gelehrten, Stuttgart, Leipzig 1867, p. 677–728.
- Tomáš G. MASARYK, Univerzitní přednášky I: praktická filozofie, Praha 2012.
- Franciszek MATEJKO: Dzieje Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej w Krakowie, in: Zakłady Uniwersyteckie w Krakowie. Przyczynek do dziejów oświaty podany i pamięci pięciuset letniego istnienia Uniwersytetu krakowskiego poświęcony przez c. k. Towarzystwo Naukowe Krakowskie, Kraków 1864, p. 13–69.
- Achille MAURI: Studi biografici, Firenze 1878.
- Brigitte MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Die österreichische Unterrichtsreform in Lombardo-Venetien 1848–1854, in: Römische Historische Mitteilungen XVII (1975), p. 103–138.
- Brigitte MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Governo centrale e amministrazione locale. Il Lombardo-Veneto, 1848–1859, in: Franco VALSECCHI, Adam WANDRUSZKA (ed.): Austria e province italiane, 1815–1918. Potere centrale e amministrazioni locali, Bologna 1981, p. 13–46.
- Brigitte MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Der Einfluss Bolzanos und der Bolzanisten auf die österreichische Universitätsreform der Jahre 1848/49, in: Helmut RUMPLER (ed.): Bernard Bolzano und die Politik: Staat, Nation und Religion als Herausforderung für die Philosophie im Kontext von Spätaufklärung, Frühnationalismus und Restauration, Wien 2000, p. 221–246.
- Brigitte MAZOHL-WALLNIG: Il Regno Lombardo-Veneto ‚Provincia‘ dell’Impero Austriaco, in: Il rapporto centro-periferia negli stati preunitari e nell’Italia unificata (Atti del LIX Congresso di Storia del Risorgimento italiano), Roma 2000, p. 95–118.
- Brigitte MAZOHL: Universitätsreform und Bildungspolitik. Die Ära des Ministers Thun-Hohenstein (1849–1860), in: Klaus MÜLLER-SALGET, Sigurd Paul SCHEICHL (ed.): Nachklänge der Aufklärung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, Innsbruck 2008, p. 129–149.
- Brigitte MAZOHL: Fritz Fellner, in: Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 121 (2013), p. 262–263.
- Zbigniew MAZUR: Obraz Niemiec w polskich podręcznikach szkolnych do nauczania historii 1945–1989, Poznań 1995.
- Richard MEISTER: Österreichs Großtaten auf dem Gebiete des Bildungswesens. Vortrag, gehalten in der Feierlichen Sitzung der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien am 31. Oktober 1945, in: Almanach für das Jahr 1945, 95 (1947), p. 411–433.
- Richard MEISTER: Die Idee einer österreichischen Nationalerziehung unter Maria Theresia, in: Anzeiger der philosophisch-historische Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 83 (1946), 1–16.

- Richard MEISTER: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Thun-Hohenstein. Wiener Inaugurationsrede 1949, in: Rektoratsbericht für das Studienjahr 1949/50, Wien 1949, p. 87–100.
- Richard MEISTER: Feuchterslebens Anteil an der Unterrichtsreform 1848 und an der Akademie der Wissenschaften, in: Anzeiger der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 87 (1950), p. 214–237.
- Richard MEISTER: Lehr- und Lernfreiheit in der Thunschen Reform und in der Gegenwart in Österreich, in: Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 15 (1957), p. 208–232.
- Ralph MELVILLE: Adel und Revolution in Böhmen: Strukturwandel von Herrschaft und Gesellschaft in Österreich um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts, Mainz 1998.
- Angelo MENOZZI: Commemorazione di Angelo Pavesi, in: Annuario della Società chimica di Milan I (1896), p. 72.
- Marco MERIGGI: Il Regno Lombardo-Veneto (Storia d'Italia, Utet, XVIII), Torino 1987.
- Marco MERIGGI: La riorganizzazione del potere asburgico nel Lombardo-Veneto dopo il 1848–49: da Radetzky a Massimiliano, in: Verso BELFIORE (ed.): società, politica, cultura del decennio di preparazione nel Lombardo-Veneto, Brescia 1995, p. 29–41.
- Marco MERIGGI: Alcune osservazioni sul neoassolutismo nel Lombardo-Veneto, in: Rassegna storica del Risorgimento, 88, 2001, p. 213–216.
- Marco MERIGGI: Austriaci e austriacanti, in: Mario ISNENGI, Eva CECCHINATO (ed.): Gli italiani in guerra, I: Unità e disunità nel Risorgimento, Torino 2008, p. 226–232.
- Andor MÉSZÁROS, László SZÖGI, Júlia VARGA: Magyarországi diákok a Habsburg birodalom kisebb egyetemén és akadémiáin 1789–1919 (Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, Bd. 21), Budapest 2014.
- Barna MEZEY: A jogakadémiák 1874. évi reformja, in: Kálmán KOVÁCS (ed.): A jogászképzés a magyar felsőoktatás rendszerében, Budapest 1984, p. 103–116.
- Kazimiera MICHALEWSKA: Wydział Filozoficzny Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego (1849–1945), in: Inwentarz akt wydziałów i studiów, p. 227–284.
- Krzysztofa MICHALEWSKA: Habilitacje w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim 1848–1918, in: Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego LXXI, Prace Historyczne, H. 12, Kraków 1963, p. 79–133.
- Krzysztofa MICHALEWSKA: Próby utworzenia uniwersytetu ukraińskiego w Polsce 1919–26, phil. Diss. Krakau 1974.
- Krzysztofa MICHALEWSKA: Sprawa uniwersytetu ukraińskiego w latach 1848–1918, in: Studia historyczne 27 (1984), p. 35–60.
- Jerzy MICHALSKI: Warunki rozwoju nauki polskiej, in: Jerzy MICHALSKI: Historia nauki polskiej, Bd. 3, 1795–1862, Wrocław u. a. 1977, p. 3–354.
- Juliane MIKOLETZKY: „... um der Rettung der Freiheit willen!“: Das Jahr 1848 und die Folgen am k. k. polytechnischen Institut in Wien (Veröffentlichungen des Universitätsarchivs der Technischen Universität Wien, Bd. 3), Wien 1998.
- Lorenz MIKOLETZKY: Karl von Krauß (1789–1881). Die Stellung eines österreichischen Staatsmannes zur Innenpolitik seiner Zeit, in: Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur 14 (1970), p. 57–71.

- MINISTERO DEL CULTO E DELLA PUBBLICA ISTRUZIONE: Progetto di un piano d'organizzazione dei Ginnasi e delle Scuole Tecniche nell'Impero Austriaco, Vienna 1850.
- Paul MOLISCH: Die deutschen Hochschulen in Österreich und die politisch-nationale Entwicklung nach dem Jahre 1848. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Wiener Hochschulen zumeist nach urkundlichen Quellen dargestellt, München 1922.
- Paul MOLISCH: Politische Geschichte der deutschen Hochschulen in Österreich von 1848 bis 1918. Zweite, sehr erweiterte Auflage, Wien, Leipzig 1939.
- Jaroslav MORÁVEK: K bojům Českých právníků 60. let XIX. století o orientaci České právní kultury, in: Právník 107 (1968), p. 610–617.
- Mauro MORETTI: I cadetti della scienza. Sul reclutamento dei docenti non ufficiali nell'Italia postunitaria, in: Ilaria PORCIANI (ed.): Università e scienza nazionale, Napoli 2001, p. 151–203.
- Mauro MORETTI: L'istruzione superiore fra i due secoli: norme, strutture e dibattiti, in: Antonio CASELLA, Alessandra FERRARESI, Giuseppe GIULIANI, Elisa SIGNORI (ed.): Una difficile modernità. Tradizioni di ricerca e comunità scientifiche in Italia. 1890–1914, Pavia 2000.
- Michael MOSER: Prüfsteine des Austroslavismus: Das Allgemeine Reichs-Gesetz- und Regierungsblatt für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich und die „Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen Sprachen Oesterreichs“, in: Ivo POSPÍŠIL (ed.): Crossroads of Cultures: Central Europe, Brno 2002, p. 75–129.
- Justus MÖSER: Sämtliche Werke, neu geordnet und aus dem Nachlasse herausgegeben von Bernhard Rudolf ABEKEN, 10 Bde., Berlin 1842–1843.
- Kamilla MROZOWSKA: Okres ucisku i daremnych prób wyzwoleńczych, 1833–1850, in: Mirosława CHAMCÓWNA, Kamilla MROZOWSKA (ed.): Dzieje Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w latach 1765–1850, Bd. 2, Kraków 1965, p. 182–235.
- Kamilla MROZOWSKA: Okres ucisku i daremnych prób wyzwoleńczych, 1833–1850, in: Mirosława CHAMCÓWNA, Kamilla MROZOWSKA (ed.): Dzieje Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w latach 1765–1850, Bd. 2, Kraków 1965, p. 182–235.
- Kurt MÜHLBERGER: Das ‚Antlitz‘ der Wiener Philosophischen Fakultät in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Struktur und personelle Erneuerung, in: Johannes SEIDL (ed.): Eduard Suess und die Entwicklung der Erdwissenschaften zwischen Biedermeier und Sezession, Göttingen 2009, p. 67–102.
- Rainer A. MÜLLER: Geschichte der Universität. Von der mittelalterlichen Universitas zur deutschen Hochschule, München 1990.
- Robert MUSIL: Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften (Gesammelte Werke in Einzelausgaben, ed. by Adolf Frisé), Hamburg 1967.
- Ambrus NÉMETH: A győri királyi tudományakadémia története. Bd. III, Győr 1904.
- Die Neugestaltung der österreichischen Universitäten über Allerhöchsten Befehl dargestellt von dem k. k. Ministerium für Cultus und Unterricht, Wien 1853.
- Walter NEUHAUSER: Anton Roschmann als Bibliothekar und Handschriftenforscher, in: Florian M. MÜLLER, Florian SCHAFFENRATH (ed.): Anton Roschmann (1694–1760), Innsbruck 2010, p. 15–24.
- Miloslav NOVÁK: Austroslavismus, příspěvek k jeho pojetí v době předbřeznové, in: Sborník archivních prací 6, (1956), p. 26–50.

- Veronika M. NOVÁK: A Pozsonyi Jogakadémia hallgatósága 1777–1849, Budapest 2006.
- Gerhard OBERKOFER: Die österreichische Juristentradition des Vormärz im Widerstreit mit den Reformen des Ministers Leo Thun, in: Gerhard OBERKOFER (ed.): Studien zur Geschichte der österreichischen Rechtswissenschaft (Rechtshistorische Reihe, Bd. 33), Frankfurt a. M., 1984, p. 120–154.
- Gerhard OBERKOFER: Die Verteidigung der Lehrbücher von Karl Anton von Martini (1726–1800) und Franz von Zeiller (1751–1828). Eine Studie über das österreichische Juristenmilieu im Vormärz, in: Gerhard OBERKOFER (ed.): Studien zur Geschichte der österreichischen Rechtswissenschaft (Rechtshistorische Reihe, Bd. 33), Frankfurt a. M. 1984, p. 9–78.
- Gerhard OBERKOFER, Peter GOLLER: Geschichte der Universität Innsbruck (1669–1945) (Schriftenreihe des Ludwig-Boltzmann-Instituts für Internationale Kultur- und Wirtschaftsbeziehungen. Rechts- und sozialwissenschaftliche Reihe, Bd. 14), Frankfurt a. M., Berlin, Bern, New York u. a. 1996.
- ÖSTERREICHISCHE HOCHSCHÜLRSCHAFT (ed.): 300 Jahre Universitas Oenipontana. Die Leopold-Franzens-Universität zu Innsbruck und ihre Studenten, Innsbruck 1970.
- Robert OFFNER, Hansgeorg VON KILLYEN: A bécsi orvos-sebészeti József-Akadémia (Josephinum) magyarországi növendékei 1775–1874, Budapest 2013.
- Werner OGRIS: Die historische Schule der österreichischen Zivilistik, in: Nikolaus GRASS, Werner OGRIS (ed.): Festschrift Hans Lentze. Zum 60. Geburtstage dargebracht von Fachgenossen und Freunden, Innsbruck, München 1969, p. 449–496.
- Werner OGRIS: In memoriam. Hans Lentze †, in: Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Germanistische Abteilung 392/88 (1971), p. 508–517.
- Werner OGRIS: Die Universitätsreform des Ministers Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein. Festvortrag anlässlich des Rektorstags im Großen Festsaal der Universität Wien am 12. März 1999, Wien 1999.
- Richard OLECHOWSKI: Die „Kulturpädagogik“ – ein Weg in die Erstarrung durch Konservatismus? Zum 50. Gedenktag des Todestags von Richard Meister, in: Erziehung und Unterricht. Österreichische pädagogische Zeitschrift 164 (2014), p. 521–529.
- Doubravka OLŠÁKOVÁ, Hana FOŘTOVÁ (ed.): Lev Thun – Alexis de Tocqueville, korespondence 1835–1856, Praha 2011.
- Jaroslav OPAT: Filozof a politik T. G. Masaryk 1882–1893: příspěvek k životopisu, Praha 1990.
- Jaroslav OPAT: Průvodce životem a dílem T. G. Masaryka: česká otázka včera a dnes, Praha 2003.
- Elisabeth ORTNER: Dermatologie und Venerologie an der Universität Graz (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz Bd. 37) Graz 1998.
- Tivadar ORTVAY: Száz év egy hazai főiskola életéből, Budapest 1884.
- Sashegyi OSZKÁR: Iratok a magyar felsőoktatás történetéből 1849–1867, Budapest 1974.
- Marcela OUBRECHTOVÁ: Duchovní orientace děčínských Thun-Hohensteinů v době předbřeznové, in: Zdeněk R. NEŠPOR, Kristina KAISEROVÁ (ed.): Variety české religiozity v „dlouhém“ 19. století (1780–1918), Ústí nad Labem 2010, p. 254–269.
- Emanuele PAGANO: Ginnasi e Licei (Lombardia e Veneto, 1802–1848) in: Angelo BIANCHI (ed.): L'istruzione in Italia tra Sette e Ottocento. Lombardia – Veneto – Umbria, Bd. I. Studi, La Scuola, Brescia 2007, p. 269–302.

- Emanuele PAGANO: I professori di liceo nel primo Ottocento. Nascita di una professione moderna, in: Giovanni VIGO, Emanuele PAGANO (ed.): *Maestri e professori. Profili della professione docente tra Antico Regime e Restaurazione*, Milano 2012, p. 125–190.
- František PALACKÝ: *Die Geschichte des Hussitentums und Prof. Constantin Höfler*, Prag 1868.
- Sylvia PALETSCHKEK: Verbreitete sich ein „Humboldtsches Modell“ an den deutschen Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert? in: Rainer Christoph SCHWINGES (ed.): *Humboldt international. Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Basel 2001, p. 75–104.
- Sylvia PALETSCHKEK: Die Erfindung der Humboldtschen Universität. Die Konstruktion der Humboldtschen Universitätsidee in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts, in: *Historische Anthropologie* 10 (2002), p. 183–205.
- Sylvia PALETSCHKEK: Stand und Perspektiven der neueren Universitätsgeschichte, in: *NTM. Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin* 19 (2011), p. 169–189.
- Nicola PALLADINO, Anna Maria MERCURIO, Franco PALLADINO: *Per la costruzione dell'Unità d'Italia. Le corrispondenze epistolari Brioschi-Cremona e Betti-Genocchi*, Firenze 2009.
- Michał PATKANIOWSKI: *Dzieje Wydziału Prawa Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego od reformy kołłątajowskiej do końca XIX stulecia (Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego LXXIX, Prace Prawnicze, H. 13)*, Kraków 1964.
- Gábor PATYI, Simon ZSOLT, Miklós SZABÓ, László SZÖGI, Júlia VARGA: *Magyarországi diákok bécsi egyetemeken és főiskolákon 1867–1890 (Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, Bd. 22)*, Budapest 2015.
- Jan PEISKER: *Geschichte und Verwaltungstechnik eines zweifachbuchenden Bibliotheksystems*, Graz 1919.
- Helga PEPPENHAUER: *Geschichte des Studienfaches Mathematik an der Universität Wien von 1848–1900*, masch. phil. Diss. Wien 1953.
- Urszula PERKOWSKA: *Kształtowanie się zespołu naukowego w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim (1860–1920)*, Wrocław 1975.
- Urszula PERKOWSKA: La genèse et la caractéristique de la loi sur les écoles supérieures du 13 juillet 1920, in: *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne* 79, (1985), p. 95–107.
- Urszula PERKOWSKA: *Studia i kursy zawodowe na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim w latach 1868/69–1938/39*, Kraków 1995.
- Personal-Stand und Ordnung der Vorlesungen an der k. k. Jagellonischen Universität zu Krakau im Winter-Semester des Schuljahrs 1853/1854, Krakau 1853.
- Personal-Stand und Ordnung der Vorlesungen an der k. k. Jagellonischen Universität zu Krakau im Sommer-Semester des Schuljahrs 1857/1858, Krakau 1858
- Personal-Stand und Ordnung der Vorlesungen an der k. k. Jagellonischen Universität zu Krakau im Sommer-Semester des Schuljahrs 1859/1860, Krakau 1860.
- Franco DELLA PERUTA: *Milan nel Risorgimento. Dall'età napoleonica alle Cinque giornate*, Milano 1992.
- Franco DELLA PERUTA: *Cultura e organizzazione del sapere nella Lombardia dell'Ottocento. L'Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere dalla fondazione all'unità d'Italia*, in: Adele ROBBIATI BIANCHI (ed.): *L'Istituto Lombardo Accademia di Scienze e lettere, I. Storia istituzionale*, Milano 2007, p. 227–482.

- Franco DELLA PERUTA: *Il giornalismo italiano del Risorgimento: dal 1847 all'Unità*, Milano 2011.
- Anna PETRASZKOVSKY: *Szibenliszt Mihály természetjoga, különös tekintettel az államra*, phil. Diss. Miskolc 2011.
- Der Philologentag, in: *Neue Freie Presse* (20.05.1893), p. 1–2.
- Rupert PICHLER, Michael STAMPFER, Reinhold HOFER: *Forschung, Geld und Politik. Die staatliche Forschungsförderung in Österreich (Innovationsmuster in der österreichischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Bd. 3)*, Innsbruck, Wien 2007.
- Rupert PICHLER: *L'economia lombarda e l'Austria. Politica commerciale e sviluppo industriale: 1815–1859*, Milano 2001.
- Alicja PIEKIEŁKO: *Dzieje Krakowskiego Ogrodu Botanicznego w latach 1809–1917*, in: *Kwartalnik Historii Nauki i Techniki* 26, 1981, Nr. 1, p. 111–136.
- Alicja PIEKIEŁKO: *Historia Ogrodu Botanicznego Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w Krakowie*, Warszawa, Kraków 1983.
- Karl PISA: *Ernst Freiherr von Feuchtersleben. Pionier der Psychosomatik*, Wien, Köln, Weimar 1998.
- Jerzy PIWOCKI (ed.): *Zbiór ustaw i rozporządzeń administracyjnych*, Bd. 6, Lwów 1913.
- Ágnes POGÁNY, Eduard KUBŮ, Jan KOFMAN (ed.): *Für eine nationale Wirtschaft: Ungarn, Die Tschechoslowakei und Polen vom Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zum zweiten Weltkrieg*, Berlin 2006.
- Simonetta POLENGHI: *La politica universitaria italiana nell'età della Destra storica*, Brescia 1993.
- Simonetta POLENGHI: *Studenti e politica nell'Università di Pavia durante il Risorgimento (1814–1860)*, in: *Storia in Lombardia* 21 (2001), Nr. 3, p. 5–38.
- Simonetta POLENGHI: *From Vienna to Milan: the Austrian Reform of the Gymnasium and its Implementation in Lombardy and during the Restoration, with some Data on the Ginnasio di Brera*, in: *History of Education & Children's Literature* (2007), 2, p. 101–126.
- Simonetta POLENGHI: *Die Österreichische Schulreform in der habsburgischen Lombardei*, in: *History of Education & Children's Literature* (2011), 1, p. 77–91.
- Simonetta POLENGHI (ed.): *La scuola degli Asburgo. Pedagogia e formazione degli insegnanti tra il Danubio e il Po (1773–1918)*, Torino 2012.
- Simonetta POLENGHI: *Introduzione* in: Simonetta POLENGHI (ed.): *La scuola degli Asburgo. Pedagogia e formazione degli insegnanti tra il Danubio e il Po (1773–1918)*, Torino 2012, p. 1–16.
- Simonetta POLENGHI: *La formazione dei maestri nella Lombardia austriaca*, in: Simonetta POLENGHI (ed.): *La scuola degli Asburgo. Pedagogia e formazione degli insegnanti tra il Danubio e il Po (1773–1918)*, Torino 2012, p. 45–89.
- Simonetta POLENGHI: *Elementary School Teachers in Milan during the Restoration (1814–59): Innovations and Improvements in Teacher Training*, in: *History of Education & Children's Literature* (2013), 1, p. 147–166.
- Véronique PORRA, Danielle DUMONTET, Thorsten SCHÜLLER, Timo OBERGÖKER (ed.): *Les „lieux d'oubli“ de la Francophonie*, Hildesheim 2015.
- Marie POSPÍŠILOVÁ: *Výstavní činnost Jednoty k povzbuzení průmyslu v Čechách ve 30. letech 19. století na Pražském hradě*, in: *Průmysl a technika v novodobé české kultuře*, Praha 1988, p. 59–85.

- Franz POTOTSCHNIG: Staatlich-kirchliche Ehegesetzgebung im 19. Jahrhundert: Problematik, Auswirkungen, Gegenwartsbedeutung einer österreichischen Rechtsreform, Freiburg 1974.
- Susanne PREGLAU-HÄMMERLE: Die politische und soziale Funktion der österreichischen Universität, Innsbruck 1986.
- Jiří PŘENOSIL: Pražští univerzitní studenti v revolučním roce 1848, in: Jana RATAJOVÁ (ed.): Pražský student. Univerzitní studenti v dějinách Prahy, Praha 2008, p. 59–68.
- Jakob PROBST: Geschichte der Universität Innsbruck seit ihrer Entstehung bis zum Jahre 1860, Innsbruck 1869.
- Jaroslav PROKEŠ: Memoriály o hospodářském stavu Čech před selskou bouří z r. 1775, in: Časopis pro dějiny venkova 12 (1925), p. 49–57, 111–116, 158–167.
- Die Protokolle des österreichischen Ministerrates 1848–1867, II. Abteilung. Das Ministerium Schwarzenberg, Bd. 1, Wien 2002.
- Brigitte PRUTTI: Die Habilitationen an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Graz 1848–1890/91, in: Walter HÖFLECHNER (ed.): Beiträge und Materialien zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Österreich. Klassische Philologie in Graz – Habilitationen an der Grazer Philosophischen Fakultät – Einrichtung der Germanistik-Lehrkanzeln – Briefe Adlers an Meinong – Zur Grazer Studentengeschichte (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 11), Graz 1981, p. 323–358.
- Antonio QUADRI: Atlante di LXXXII tavole sinottiche relative al prospetto statistico delle province venete, Venezia 1827.
- Robert REMBIELŃSKI: Historia farmacji, Warszawa 1963.
- Reinhold REIMANN: „Ein freies Lied der Freiheit darzubringen“. Vom Studententum in Graz 1848/49 (Schriftenreihe des Steirischen Studentenhistoriker-Vereines, Bd. 25) Graz 1998.
- Alena RICHTEROVÁ: Děčínské rukopisy ze sbírky Františka Martina Pelcla (1734–1801), nyní ve fondech Národní knihovny České republiky, Praha 2007.
- Friedrich RINNHOFER: Grazer theologische Fakultät vom Studienjahr 1827/28 bis 1938/39. Das literarische Schaffen aller Lehrenden und die Entwicklung der einzelnen Disziplinen, 2 Bde. (Dissertationen der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, Bd. 82) Graz 1991.
- Wjciech ROESKE: Dzieje katedr farmaceutycznych w Krakowie, in: Sześćsetlecie medycyny, Bd. 2, p. 631–674.
- Walter ROGGE: Österreich von Világos bis zur Gegenwart, Bd. 1. Das Dezennium des Neoabsolutismus, Leipzig, Wien 1872.
- Mario ROMANI: Un secolo di vita economica lombarda. 1748–1848, Milano 1950.
- Maria Rosa DI SIMONE: Gli studi giuridici all'Università di Roma nella transizione tra Stato pontificio e Regno d'Italia, in: Alessandra FERRARESI, Elisa SIGNORI (ed.): Le Università e l'Unità d'Italia (1848–1870), Bologna 2012, p. 200–202.
- František ROUBÍK: Český rok 1848, Praha 1948.
- Walter RÜEGG: Der Mythos der Humboldtschen Universität, in: Mathias KRIEG, Martin ROSE (ed.): Universitas in theologica. Theologica in universitatae. Festschrift für Hans Henrich Schmitz zum 60. Geburtstag. Zurich 1997, p. 155–174.

- Helmut RUMPLER: Eine Chance für Mitteleuropa. Bürgerliche Emanzipation und Staatsverfall in der Habsburgermonarchie (Österreichs Geschichte 1804–1914), Wien 2005.
- Tommaso RUSSO: L'istruzione tecnica a Milan, in: Storia in Lombardia (2003), p. 31–55.
- Giuseppe SACCHI: Intorno all'attuale stato dell'istruzione elementare in Lombardia in confronto ad altri Stati d'Italia, Milano 1834.
- Robert SAK: Rieger: konzervativce nebo liberál?, Praha 2003.
- Zdeněk ŠAMBERGER: Austroslavismus ve světle snah feudální reakce. (Poznámky k jeho třídnímu charakteru a pojetí), in: Slovanské historické studie 16 (1988), p. 49–81.
- Zdeněk ŠAMBERGER: Časopis Vídeňský deník a jeho poslání v letech 1850–1851: Ke ztroskotanému pokusu Leo Thuna o založení české konzervativní strany, in: Slovanský přehled 71 (1985), p. 25–40.
- Oszkár SASHEGYI: Iratok a magyar felsőoktatás történetéből 1849–1867 (Felsőoktatás történeti kiadványok, Bd. 3.), Budapest 1974.
- Karel SCHELLE: Význam roku 1848 pro vytvoření moderního státního aparátu, Ostrava 2008.
- Uwe SCHIMANK: Humboldt in Bologna – falscher Mann am falschen Ort? in: HIS (ed.): Perspektive Studienqualität – Themen und Forschungsergebnisse der HIS-Fachtagung „Studienqualität“, Bielefeld 2010, p. 44–61.
- Bruno SCHIMETSCHKE: Lemayer, Karl Frh. von (1841–1906), Verwaltungsjurist, in: Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950, Bd. 5, Wien 1970, p. 123.
- Henryk SCHMITT: Rozbiór krytyczny pomysłów historyzoficznych i odkryć dziejowych Pana Antoniego Walewskiego, członka czynnego krakowskiej akademii umiejętności, Lwów 1875.
- Alfred SCHNEIDER (ed.): Briefe österreichischer Gelehrter 1849–1862. Beiträge zur Geschichte der österreichischen Unterrichtsreform. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen, in: Archiv für österreichische Geschichte 113 (1936) p. 167–304.
- Richard SCHOBER: Geschichte des Tiroler Landtages im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (Veröffentlichungen des Tiroler Landesarchivs, Bd. 4), Innsbruck 1984.
- Elmar SCHÜBL: Mineralogie, Petrographie, Geologie und Paläontologie. Zur Institutionalisierung der Erdwissenschaften an österreichischen Universitäten, vornehmlich an jener in Wien, 1848–1938, Graz 2010.
- Karl SCHURZ: Der Studentencongreß zu Eisenach am 25. September 1848. Seine Bedeutung und seine Resultate, Bonn 1848.
- Ferdinand SEIBT (ed.): Die Teilung der Prager Universität 1882 und die intellektuelle Desintegration in den böhmischen Ländern, München 198.
- Georg SEIDERER: Das Ringen um die Kommunalverfassung 1849 bis 1859, in: Harm-Hinrich BRANDT (ed.): Der österreichische Neoabsolutismus als Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsproblem. Diskussionen über einen strittigen Epochenbegriff, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2014, p. 281–305.
- Milada SEKÝRKOVÁ: Komitét pro přírodovědecký výzkum Čech, Praha 1992.
- Miroslav ŠESTÁK: Der tschechische Austroslavismus bis zum österreichisch-ungarischen Ausgleich in der tschechischen Historiographie, in: Andreas MORITSCH (ed.): Der Austroslavismus. Ein verfrühtes Konzept zur politischen Neugestaltung Mitteleuropas. Wien 1996, p. 24–35.

- István SINKOVICS (ed.): *Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem története 1635–1985*, Budapest 1985.
- Fryderyk SKOBEL: *Moje wspomnienia (1812–1876) [Meine Erinnerungen (1812–1876)]*, ed. By Adam WRZOSEK, Poznań 1924.
- Zofia SKUBAŁA-TOKARSKA, Zbigniew TOKARSKI: *Uniwersytety w Polsce: rys historyczny*, Warszawa 1972.
- Zofia SKUBAŁA, Zbigniew TOKARSKI: *Polnische Universitäten*, Warschau 1959.
- Helmut SLAPNICKA: *Die Sprache des österreichischen Reichsgesetzblattes*, in: *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 23 (1974), p. 440–454.
- Helena SMÍŠKOVÁ: *František Antonín Thun a správa děčínského panství v letech 1808–1844*, in: *Z minulosti Děčína a Českolipska III*, Ústí nad Labem 1977, p. 163–187.
- Václav ŠOLLE: *Trestní soudnictví předběžné v českých zemích*, in: *Sborník archivních prací* 12 (1962), p. 87–142.
- Janusz SONDEL: *Słownik historii i tradycji Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, Kraków 2012.
- Stefan SPEVAK: *Das Jubiläum „950 Jahre Österreich“. Eine Aktion zur Stärkung eines österreichischen Staats- und Kulturbewusstseins im Jahr 1946 (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Bd. 37)*, Wien, München 2003.
- Alexandra ŠPIRITOVÁ, *Jednota k povzbuzení průmyslu v Čechách*, in: *Paginae Historiae* 3 (1995), p. 9–23.
- Daniel SPITZER: *Wiener Spaziergänge*, Wien 1877.
- Eduard SPRANGER: *Der Sinn der Voraussetzungslosigkeit in den Geisteswissenschaften [1929]*, in: Eduard SPRANGER: *Grundlagen der Geisteswissenschaften*, ed. by Hans Walter BÄHR (Gesammelte Schriften, Bd. 6), Tübingen 1980, p. 151–183.
- Heinrich von SRBIK: *Metternich. Der Staatsmann und der Mensch*, 3 Bde., München 1925–1954.
- Andrzej ŚRÓDKA, Paweł SZCZAWIŃSKI (ed.): *Biogramy uczonych polskich. Część I: Nauki społeczne. Zeszyt 2*, Wrocław 1983.
- Peter STACHEL: *Das österreichische Bildungssystem zwischen 1749 und 1918*, in: Karl ACHAM (ed.): *Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften*, Bd. 1: *Historischer Kontext, wissenschaftssoziologische Befunde und methodologische Voraussetzungen*, Wien 1999, p. 115–127.
- Friedrich STADLER, Bastian STOPPELKAMP: *Die Universität Wien in Kontext von Wissens- und Wissenschaftsgesellschaft*, in: Katharina KNIEFACZ, Elisabeth NEMETH, Herbert POSCH, Friedrich STADLER (ed.), *Universität – Forschung – Lehre (650 Jahre Universität Wien, Bd. 2)*, Göttingen, Wien 2015, p. 203–241.
- Jiří ŠTAJF: *Revoluční léta 1848–1849 a české země (Práce Historického ústavu ČAV. Opera Instituti Historici Pragae. Monographia A – 3)*, Praha 1990.
- Jiří ŠTAJF: *Obezřetná elita. Česká společnost mezi tradicí a revolucí 1830–1851*, Praha 2005.
- Statuti e ordinamenti della Università di Pavia dall'anno 1361 all'anno 1859*, Pavia 1825.
- Hannes STEKL: *Zwischen Machtverlust und Selbstbehauptung. Österreichs Hocharistokratie vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, in: Hannes STEKL (ed.): *Adel und Bürgertum in der Habsburgermonarchie, 18. bis 20. Jahrhundert*, Wien 2004, p. 14–34.

- Matthias STICKLER: „Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918“ – Ein Jahrhundertwerk auf der Zielgeraden, in: *Historische Zeitschrift* 295 (2012), p. 690–719.
- Christian H. STIFTER: *Zwischen geistiger Erneuerung und Restauration. US-amerikanische Planungen zur Entnazifizierung und demokratischen Neuorientierung österreichischer Wissenschaft 1941–1955*, Wien 2014.
- Krzysztof STOPKA, Andrzej Kazimierz BANACH, Julian DYBIEC: *The History of the Jagiellonian University*, Kraków 2000.
- Krzysztof STOPKA: Henryk Barycz jako dziejopis Akademii Krakowskiej, in: Rita MAJKOWSKA (ed.): *Henryk Barycz 1901–1994. Materiały z posiedzenia Naukowego PAU w dniu 22 czerwca 2001 r.*, Kraków 2001, p. 51–66.
- Bastian STOPPELKAMP: *War Humboldt ein Kapitalist? Über den Zusammenhang von Ökonomie und Autonomie in der österreichischen Hochschulgeschichte des mittleren und späten 19. Jahrhunderts*, beim Österreichischen Universitätsarchivkolloquium in der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz 14. und 15. April 2015.
- Gerald STOURZH: Robert A. Kann. A Memoir from Austria, in: *Austrian History Yearbook* 17 (1981), p. 25–26.
- Helmuth STRADAL: Hans Lentze †, in: *Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht ÖAKR*, Bd. 21 (1970), p. 201–207.
- Gustav STRAKOSCH-GRASSMANN: *Geschichte des österreichischen Unterrichtswesens*, Wien 1905.
- Robert STUMPF: Bausteine der Wissensvermehrung: Alois Jesinger und die NS-Opposition an der Universitätsbibliothek Wien (1938–1945), in: *Mitteilungen der Vereinigung österreichischer Bibliothekarinnen und Bibliothekare VÖB* 61 (2008), 4, p. 7–40.
- Jan SURMAN: *Habsburg Universities 1848–1918. A Biography of Space*, phil. Diss. Wien 2012.
- Jan SURMAN: *Uniwersytety Galicyjskie w Monarchii Habsburskiej: Nacjonalizacja nauki i internacjonalizacja wiedzy*, in: *Prace Komisji Historii Nauki PAU* 9 (2012), p. 39–52.
- Wolfram W. SWOBODA: Ernst Brücke als Naturwissenschaftler, in: Hans BRÜCKE, Wolfgang HILGER, Walter HÖFLECHNER, Wolfram W. SWOBODA (ed.): *Ernst Wilhelm von Brücke. Briefe an Emil du Bois-Reymond*, 2 Bde. (Publikationen aus dem Archiv der Universität Graz, Bd. 8/1 + 8/2), Graz 1978.
- József SZABADFALVI: A magyar észjogi iskola, in: *Állam- és Jogtudomány* 50 (2009), p. 17–44.
- Miklós SZÁRAY: *Történelem III.*, Budapest 2009.
- László SZÖGI: *Mérnökképző Intézet a Bölcsészeti Karon 1782–1850 (Fejezetek az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem történetéből, Bd. 5)*, Budapest 1980.
- László SZÖGI: *Humboldt-Rezeption in Ungarn. Das System des ungarischen Hochschulunterrichts in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, in: Rainer Christoph SCHWINGES (ed.): *Humboldt International. Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Basel 2001, p. 163–178.
- László SZÖGI: *Magyarországi diákok németországi egyetemeken és főiskolákon 1789–1919 (Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, Bd. 5)*, Budapest 2001.

- László SZÖGI: Zur Rolle der Wiener Universität im ungarischen Hochschulwesen von der Anfängen bis zum ersten Weltkrieg, in: *Mensch Wissenschaft Magie. Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 20/2000, Wien 2001, p. 203–208.
- László SZÖGI: Magyarországi diákok bécsi egyetemeken és akadémiákon 1789–1848 (Magyarországi diákok egyetemjárása az újkorban, Bd. 20), Budapest 2013.
- László SZÖGI: Ungarländische Studenten an den Wienerischen Universitäten und Akademien 1789–1848, Budapest 2013.
- Władysław SZUMOWSKI (ed.): Człowiek nauki taki, jakim był: pamiątniki profesora Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego Fryderyka Hechela, Bd. 2, W wolnym mieście Krakowie, 1834–1846, Kraków 1939/1945.
- Zbigniew TABAKA: Analiza zbiorowości studenckiej w latach 1850–1918 (studium statystyczne), Kraków 1970.
- Attila Szilárd TAR: Az állami jogakadémiák szerepe a magyar felsőoktatásban és jogászképzésben, Dipl. Arb. Budapest 1996.
- Attila Szilárd TAR: Die königlichen juristischen Akademien in Ungarn, in: Márta FONT, László SZÖGI (ed.): Die ungarische Universitätsbildung und Europa, Pécs 2001, p. 223–235.
- Tadeusz TEMPKA: Józef Dietl, profesor chorób wewnętrznych, in: J. GROCHOWSKI (ed.): Złota Księga. Wydział Lekarski Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 2000, p. 77–107.
- Heinz-Elmar TENORTH: Genese der Disziplinen – Konstitution der Universität. Zur Einleitung, in: Heinz-Elmar TENORTH (ed.): Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden, Bd. 4. Praxis ihrer Disziplinen. Genese der Disziplinen. Konstitution der Universität, Berlin 2010, p. 9–42.
- Heinz-Elmar TENORTH: Wilhelm von Humboldts (1767–1835) Universitätskonzept und die Reform in Berlin – eine Tradition jenseits des Mythos, in: Zeitschrift für Germanistik, Neue Folge 20 (2010), p. 15–28.
- Heinz-Elmar TENORTH: Eine Universität zu Berlin – Vorgeschichte und Einrichtung, in: Heinz-Elmar TENORTH, Charles MCCLELLAND (ed.): Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden, Bd. 1. Gründung und Blütezeit der Universität zu Berlin 1810–1918, Berlin 2012, p. 3–75.
- Georg THAA: Sammlung der für die österreichischen Universitäten giltigen Gesetze und Verordnungen, Wien 1871.
- Christoph THIENEN-ADLERFLYCHT: Graf Leo Thun im Vormärz: Grundlagen des böhmischen Konservatismus im Kaisertum Österreich, Graz 1967.
- Christoph THIENEN-ADLERFLYCHT: Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein als nachjosephinischer Vorkämpfer eines aufgeklärten Konservatismus, in: Ulrich ZELLENBERG (ed.): Konservative Profile. Ideen & Praxis in der Politik zwischen FM Radetzky, Karl Kraus und Alois Mock, Graz, Stuttgart 2003, p. 103–168.
- Zdeněk V. TOBOLKA: Franz Ser. Vincenz Emanuel von Sommaruga, in: Ottův slovník naučný, Bd. 23, Praha 1905, p. 671–672.
- Václav Vladivoj TOMEK: Paměti mého života, Praha 1905.
- Xenio TOSCANI: La politica scolastica nel Regno lombardo-veneto: scuole elementari, in: Luciano PAZZAGLIA (ed.): Chiesa e prospettive educative in Italia tra Restaurazione e Unificazione, Brescia 1994, p. 317–353.

- Eliana TRÁVNÍČKOVÁ (ed.): Jan Evangelista Purkyně – život a dílo. Sborník, Praha 1986.
- R. Steven TURNER: The Growth of Professorial Research in Prussia, 1818 to 1848: Causes and Context, in: *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences* 3 (1971), p. 137–182.
- R. Steven TURNER: The Prussian Universities and the Research Imperative 1806 to 1848, Diss. phil. Princeton 1973.
- R. Steven TURNER: Humboldt in North America? Reflections on the Research University and its Historians, in: Rainer Christoph SCHWINGES (ed.): *Humboldt international. Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Basel 2001, p. 289–311.
- [Joseph UNGER?]: Die Universitätsfrage in Österreich: Beleuchtet vom Standpunkte der Lehr- und Lernfreiheit, Wien 1853.
- Josef UNGER: System des österreichischen allgemeinen Privatrechts, I, Leipzig 1856.
- Václav VANĚČEK: „V Praze budou...dvě univerzity ...“, in: *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* XXII, Fasc. 1, (1982), p. 7–14.
- Vincenc VAŇOREK: Procházky v oboru právní filosofie a národním hospodářství, in: *Právník* 1861, p. 251–258.
- Júlia VARGA: A Kolozsvári Királyi Líceum hallgatósa 1784–1848, Budapest 2000.
- Júlia VARGA: A Nagyváradai Jogakadémia (1780–1848) és a Püspöki Szeminárium (1741–1848) hallgatósa, Budapest 2006.
- Júlia VARGA: A Kolozsvári Jezsuita Gimnázium és Akadémia hallgatósa 1641–1773 (1784), Budapest 2007.
- Sándor VARGA: A pozsonyi jogakadémia az abszolutizmus és a dualizmus korában (1850–1914), in: *Jogtörténeti Tanulmányok*, Bd. 3, Budapest 1974, p. 237–251.
- Albert Vojtěch VELFLÍK: Die k. k. Deutsche Technische Hochschule in Prag. Festschrift zur Hundertjahrfeier, Prag 1906.
- Verhandlungen der achten Generalversammlung des katholischen Vereines Deutschlands am 23., 24. und 25. September 1856 zu Linz, Linz 1857.
- Verhandlungen der neunten General-Versammlung des katholischen Vereins Deutschlands am 21., 22., 23. und 24. September 1857 zu Salzburg, Salzburg 1858.
- Václav VOJTÍŠEK: O archivu University Karlovy a jeho ztrátách, in: *Archivní časopis* 1, 1951, p. 86–98.
- Irma VÖLLMECKE: Österreichische Hochschulstatistik 1829 bis 1979, in: *Geschichte und Ergebnisse der zentralen amtlichen Statistik in Österreich 1829–1979. Festschrift aus Anlass des 150jährigen Bestehens der zentralen amtlichen Statistik in Österreich (Beiträge zur österreichischen Statistik 550)*, Wien 1979.
- Rudolf WAGNER: Alma Mater Francisco Josephina. Die deutschsprachige Nationalitäten-Universität in Czernowitz. Festschrift zum 100. Jahrestag ihrer Eröffnung 1875, München 1975.
- Georg WALDENEGG: L’Austria e l’Italia dopo la Rivoluzione del 1848, in: *Rassegna storica del Risorgimento*, 88 (2001), p. 65–76.
- Hanna WĘGRZYNEK: Niemcy – Polacy – Żydzi: jak w PRL powstawał podręcznikowy schemat interpretacji dziejów najnowszych (1943–1952), in: Ruth LEISEROWITZ u. a. (ed.): *Lesestunde/Lekcja Czytania*, Warszawa 2013, p. 199–216.

- Erika WEINZIERL-FISCHER: Der Ministerrat und die kaiserlichen Verordnungen vom 18. und 23. April 1850, in: MÖSTA 11 (1958), p. 467–494.
- Hubert WEITENSFELDER: Studium und Staat. Heinrich Graf Rottenhan und Johann Melchior von Birkenstock als Repräsentanten der österreichischen Bildungspolitik um 1800, Wien 1996.
- Henryk WERESZYCKI: Pod berłem Habsburgów: zagadnienia narodowościowe, Kraków 1975.
- Günther WINKLER: Die Rechtspersönlichkeit der Universitäten. Rechtshistorische, rechtsdogmatische und rechtstheoretische Untersuchungen zur wissenschaftlichen Selbstverwaltung (Forschungen aus Staat und Recht, Bd. 80), Wien, New York 1988.
- Eduard WINTER: Ferdinand Kindermann, Ritter von Schulstein (1740/1801), der Organisator der Volksschule und Volkswohlfahrt Böhmens: ein Lebensbild und nach archivalischenn Quellen, Augsburg 1926.
- Eduard WINTER: Frühliberalismus in der Donaumonarchie. Religiöse, nationale und wissenschaftliche Strömungen von 1790–1868, Berlin 1968.
- Eduard WINTER: Revolution, Neoabsolutismus und Liberalismus in der Donaumonarchie, Wien 1969.
- Konstanty WOJCIECHOWSKI: Uniwersytet Jagielloński i jego dzieje. W pięćsetną rocznicę jego założenia, Lwów 1900, p. 84.
- Zdzisław WOJTASZEK: Zarys historii katedr chemicznych Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego (1 X 1783–31 VIII 1939), in: Stanisław GOŁĄB (ed.): Studia z dziejów katedr Wydziału Matematyki, Fizyki, Chemii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 1964, p. 133–219.
- Eduard WONDRAK: Český anatom a patolog Vincenc Alexandr Bochdalek. 100 let od smrti, in: Časopis lékařů českých 122 (1983), Nr. 43, p. 1334–1337.
- Peter WOZNIAK: Count Leo Thun: a Conservative Savior of Educational Reform in the Decade of Neoabsolutism, in: Austrian History Yearbook 26 (1995), p. 61–81.
- Václav ŽÁČEK: Jan Evangelista Purkyně, Praha 1987.
- Pietro ZAMBELLI (ed.): Scritti letterari editi ed inediti di Francesco Ambrosoli, Firenze 1871.
- Alicja ZEMANEK: Dzieje nauczania botaniki w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim 1793–1917, Kraków 1991.
- Alicja ZEMANEK: Historia botaniki w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim. History of botany at the Jagiellonian University (1780–1917), Kraków 1989.
- Alicja ZEMANEK: Historia Ogródu Botanicznego w Krakowie, Warszawa 1993.
- Klaus ZERNACK: Krakau: Eine Universität als nationales Symbol, in: Der Tagesspiegel, Nr. 17.284, 08.01.2001, p. 27 [<http://www.tagesspiegel.de/weltspiegel/gesundheits/krakau-eine-universitaet-als-nationales-symbol/192242.html>], [eingesehen 30.08.2016](#).
- Józef ZIELIŃSKI: Archiwum w okresie 1849–1900. Czasy austriackie 1849–1900, in: Henryk BARYCZ (ed.): Historia Archiwum Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 1965, p. 77–92.
- Blanka ZILYNSKÁ (ed.): Universitäten, Landesherren und Landeskirchen: Das Kuttener Dekret von 1409 im Kontext der Epoche von der Gründung der Karlsuniversität 1348 bis zum Augsburger Religionsfreiheit 1555. Acta Universitatis Carolinae–Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis Tomus XLIX, Fasc. 2, Praha 2010.

Erich ZÖLLNER: Alphons Lhotsky †, in: Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 76 (1968), p. 505–514.

István ZOMBORI (ed.): A Bécsi Pázmáneum, Budapest 2002.

Przemysław ŻUKOWSKI: Corpus professorum Facultatis Iuridicae Universitatis Jagellonicae, T. II: 1780–2012, ed. By Dorota MALEC, Kraków 2014.

Authors

Christof Aichner works on the project *LFU 350*, a research project on the imminent 350th anniversary of the foundation of the University of Innsbruck in 2019. He is the secretary of the Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs. His research focus is university history and history of science. He is co-editor of the correspondence of Leo Thun-Hohenstein.

Mitchell G. Ash was university professor of modern history from 1997 to 2016 and head of the working group on the history of science at the Institute of History at the University of Vienna, and is spokesman of the multidisciplinary DK-doctoral programme, funded by the Austrian Science Fund: *Naturwissenschaften im Historischen, Philosophischen und Kulturellen Kontext*. He is a full member of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Valentina Chierichetti is a lecturer at the Università del Sacro Cuore, Milan. She researches education history in Lombardy-Venetia and wrote her dissertation on the secondary schools and lyceums of Milan in the era of the restoration.

Johannes Feichtinger is Senior Research Associate at the Institut für Kulturwissenschaften und Theatergeschichte of the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. He completed his habilitation in 2011 in the subject of modern history at the University of Vienna. His research focus is on the history of science, the Habsburg monarchy and Austria, and cultural science.

Alessandra Ferraresi is associate professor of early modern history at the University of Pavia. Her research focus includes the history of education and science and the history of technology. She is co-editor of *Almum Studium Papiense. Storia dell'università di Pavia (2013ff.)*.

Franz Leander Fillafer is a research associate in history and sociology at the University of Konstanz. His research focus is on the history of the Enlightenment and intellectual history. He has written numerous publications on the history of the Habsburg monarchy.

Walter Höflechner is professor emeritus for Austrian history and the history of science at the University of Graz. He is a member of numerous scientific societies. His research focus is the history of universities and the history of science.

Alois Kernbauer is head of the university archive of Graz and associate professor at the University of Graz. He is particularly occupied with the history of science and the history of the University of Graz.

Thomas Maisel is head of the archive of the University of Vienna. He is a graduate of the training programme at the Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung in Vienna. His research focus is above all the history of the University of Vienna. He is co-editor of the series *Schriften des Archivs der Universität Wien*.

Brigitte Mazohl is professor emeritus for Austrian history at the University of Innsbruck and president of the Phil.-Hist. Klasse at the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Her research focus lies in the framework of Austrian, German and Italian history in the period between the 18th century and the First World War. She is editor of the correspondence of Leo Thun-Hohenstein.

Simonetta Polenghi is full professor of the history of pedagogy at the Università del Sacro Cuore in Milan and head of the department of pedagogy there. Her research focus is on university history, the history of pedagogy, and research on children's literature and schoolbooks. She has been awarded the Österreichische Ehrenkreuz für Wissenschaft und Kunst (2011) and is a member of the *Executive Committee of ISCHE International Standing Conference of History of Education*.

Milada Sekyrková works at the Institute of the History of Charles University and Archive of Charles University, as well as in the department for the auxiliary sciences and archival studies at the Charles University in Prague. Her research focus is in the area of the history of science and education.

Maria Stinia is associate professor in the department for cultural and education history at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow. Her research focus includes the history of science and education in Galicia, and the history of the Jagiellonian University, on which she has produced numerous publications.

Jan Surman is a post-doc at the *Leibniz Graduate School Geschichte Wissen, Medien in Ostmitteleuropa* at the Herder-Institut für historische Ostmitteleuropaforschung in Marburg. He completed his doctorate with a work on the Habsburg universities 1848–1918. His other research areas include the relationship between science and nation, the history of sociology, post-colonial theory and Eastern Europe, and science and translation.

László Szögi is the former head of the university library in at the Loránd-Eötvös University of Budapest. His research focus lies especially in the area of researching the peregrinatio academica of the Kingdom of Hungary.

Attila Szilárd Tar teaches at Krúdy Gyula Gymnasium in Győr (Hungary). He obtained his doctorate with a work on the Hungarian law academies, and conducts research on Hungarian students at German universities 1700–1919 and on Hungarian higher education in the modern period.

Index

Ahrens, Heinrich	106, 113
Alardi, Aleardo	235
Albini, Giuseppe	166
Amati, Amato	247, 248
Ambrosoli, Francesco	212, 213, 214, 215, 223, 232, 234, 235, 237, 239, 240
Ampferer, Otto	31
Andrian-Werburg, Viktor	6
Aschbach, Joseph	152
Aubertin, Franciszek	162
Auersperg, Anton	28
Baader, Franz	43
Bach, Alexander	27, 36, 48, 51, 256
Barinetti, Pietro	222
Bartynowski, Piotr	161
Barycz, Henryk	259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 265, 269, 270, 272
Baumgartner, Andreas	21
Beck von Mannagetta, Leo	67
Beckx, Pierre	135
Beer, Johann Georg	165
Belli, Giuseppe	212
Bentham, Jeremy	43
Berger, Johann Nepomuk	47
Bernardi, Giuseppe	212
Bętkowski, Nikodem	171
Bill, Georg	115
Blaschke, Johann	101, 113
Blodig, Karl	118
Bohdalek, Vinzenz	147, 157
Boller, Anton	32
Boltzmann, Ludwig	22, 31, 32, 33, 35, 74
Bolza, Giovanni Battista	212, 232, 234, 235, 236, 239
Bolzano, Bernard	39, 42, 43, 53, 54, 55
Bonitz, Hermann	8, 11, 24, 25, 26, 27, 64, 65, 66, 70, 73, 111, 130, 232, 254, 256, 264, 268, 274, 283, 290, 291, 292
Bordoni, Antonio	217
Bratranek, Franz Thomas	162, 167, 171
Bravo, Gian Maria	222
Brentano, Franz	53, 281
Brezanóczy, Ádám	184

Brioschi, Francesco	205, 210, 224, 225
Brücke, Ernst	24, 28, 64, 118
Brühl, Carl Bernhard	88, 170, 265
Brunn, Franz	118
Bryk, Antoni	162, 171, 265, 268, 269, 270, 271
Buhl, Eduard	165, 171
Bunsen, Robert Wilhelm	111, 219
Buol-Schauenstein, Karl	152
Burger, Moritz	216
Burzyński, Piotr	163, 165
Buß, Joseph	132
Cannizaro, Stanislao	225
Casati, Gabrio	223, 224, 246, 247, 248
Cattaneo, Carlo	208, 212, 242, 247
Chabert, August	114
Charles IV	145
Chmel, Josef	22
Clar, Franz	118
Cornova, Ignaz	49
Cossa, Luigi	222
Crivelli, Giuseppe Balsamo	212
Cukrowicz, Aleksander	165, 169
Curtius, Georg	24, 153, 293
Czartoryski, Adam	153
Czartoryski, August	173
Czermak, Johann	115, 166, 171, 265
Czermak, Wiktor	257
Czerwiakowski, Ignacy Rafał	173, 174
Czyrniański, Emil	166
Demelius, Gustav	114, 165, 171
Deutsch, Simon	91
Dietl, Józef	166, 170, 171, 253, 254, 261, 262, 265, 266, 267, 268
Dilthey, Wilhelm	31, 32
Dobhoff, Anton	8, 63, 86, 88
Dobner, Gelasius	49
Dobrovský, Josef	32, 49
Domański, Wawrzyniec	162
Doppler, Christian	21, 25, 33
Dottesio, Luigi	233
Dreschnigg, Bartholomäus	118
Drimmel, Heinrich	280, 289, 297, 300, 301, 302
Drobnic, Josef	106

Droysen, Johann Gustav	32
Dumas, Jean-Baptiste	111
Dumreicher, Armand	135, 291
Dunajewski, Julian	169
Egger, Franz	46
Einstein, Albert	156
Endlicher, Stephan Ladislaus	32, 62, 78, 83, 90, 261, 263, 268, 272
Eötvös, József	186
Eötvös, Loránd	204
Esmarch, Karol	165, 171
Ettingshausen, Andreas	21, 22
Ettingshausen, Constantin	31
Exner, Franz Serafin	8, 9, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 51, 54, 55, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 70, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89, 128, 130, 144, 147, 160, 232, 234, 237, 239, 254, 256, 264, 268, 274, 275, 276, 282, 283, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294
Faber, Antal	184
Fellner, Fritz	298, 299, 300
Ferdinand I	77, 81, 159
Ferdinand Maximilian, Archduke	15
Feuchtersleben, Ernst	9, 13, 24, 51, 62, 63, 64, 67, 78, 84, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 275, 276, 282
Feuerbach, Ludwig	91
Ficker, Julius	134, 152
Fierich, Edward	165, 169
Finkel, Ludwik	254, 257
Flir, Alois	138
Folwarczny, Karl	118
Frankfurter, Salomon	256, 274, 276, 281, 290, 291, 292, 294
Franz II/I	18, 50, 81, 95, 124, 177
Franz Joseph	9, 101, 122, 134, 141, 161, 253, 256
Franz Karl, Archduke	18
Fruhmann, Michael	113
Füster, Anton	77
Gabba, Alberto	211, 212, 213, 214
Gabriel, Lorenz	114
Garibaldi, Giuseppe	242
Gąsiorowski, Ludwik	170
Gasparini, Guglielmo	219
Gautsch von Frankenthurn, Paul	30
Glax, Heinrich	142
Glöckel, Otto	279

Gołuchowski, Agenor	52, 253, 255
Gorini, Paolo	242
Görres, Joseph	152
Goszczyński, Seweryn	170, 270
Grillparzer, Franz	28, 135
Gruber, Ignaz	285
Haase, Friedrich	111
Haidinger, Wilhelm	21, 32
Hajnik, Pál	184
Halm, Karl	137
Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph	18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 32
Hanslick, Eduard	136, 139
Hartel, Wilhelm	30, 256, 290, 292
Hartenstein, Gustav	66
Helcel, Antoni Zygmunt	161, 165, 169, 253, 254, 266
Helfert, Joseph Alexander	8, 9, 32, 63, 64, 67, 111, 137, 221, 222, 223, 268, 280, 281, 292
Heller, Camillo	170
Helly, Karl	118
Helmholtz, Hermann	72
Herbart, Johann Friedrich	22, 25, 39, 54, 65, 232
Herbst, Eduard	47, 276, 290, 294, 295, 296
Heschl, Richard	118, 120
Hess, Victor Franz	31
Heyßler, Moritz	47
Heyzmann, Udalryk	165
Hochegger, Franz	220
Hodobay, Konstantin G.	117
Hoffmann, Emanuel	106, 111, 114, 115, 116
Höfler, Constantin	70, 152, 153
Hofmann, August Wilhelm	72
Holovac'kyj, Jakiv	265
Hornstein, Karl	114
Hruschauer, Franz	114, 118
Humboldt, Alexander	173
Humboldt, Wilhelm	17, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 69, 71
Hummel, Karl	24, 104, 105, 108, 114
Hus, Jan	153
Hye von Glunec, Anton	47, 77, 78, 83, 88, 90
Hyrtil, Josef	157
Jäger, Albert	33, 128
Jaksch, Anton	147, 174
Jarcke, Karl Ernst	20, 23, 29, 30, 70, 131, 132, 286, 289

Johann, Archduke	18, 21, 62
Joseph II	6, 123, 136, 145, 186, 226
Juhbal, Karl	203
Jülg, Bernhard	162, 167, 168, 171, 175
Jüstel, Alois	228
Kann, Robert A.	298, 299, 300
Kant, Immanuel	20, 25, 32, 45, 53, 129
Karabacek, Joseph	32
Karajan, Georg Theodor	107
Karajan, Maximilian	109, 119
Karl Ludwig, Archduke	133
Kelle, Carl	67
Kerner von Marilaun, Anton	31
Klementsich, Anton	113
Knar, Josef	103, 104, 114
Koczyński, Michał	163, 165, 169
Kolowrat-Liebsteinsky, Franz-Anton	18
Kopatsch, Johann	109, 114
Kopetzky, Joseph	142
Kopezky, Benedict	115
Kopitar, Jernej	32
Körner, Moritz	118
Kossuth, Lajos	19
Kozubowski, Antoni	162
Krainz, Josef	109
Kraszewski, Józef Ignacy	170, 262, 270
Kraus, Alois	147
Krauß, Karl	44
Kreisky, Bruno	299
Krek, Gregor	110, 116
Krones, Franz	109, 116
Kübeck, Carl	39, 44
Kwaśniewski, Józef	162
La Marmora, Alfonso	246
Lang, Viktor	22
Lang, Donat August	118
Lang, Franz Innozenz	228
Lange, Ludwig	153, 293
Lehmann, Heinrich August	113
Lentze, Hans	274, 276, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 289, 291, 292, 294, 297, 300
Leopold II	50, 80

Lerch, Alexander	90
Lhotsky, Alphons	284, 285, 286, 287, 289
Liebig, Justus	22, 102, 111, 148
Linker, Gustav	167, 171, 265
Lipp, Eduard	118
Loewi, Otto	31
Londonio, Carlo Giuseppe	228, 229
Löschner, Joseph Wilhelm	147, 158
Lovati, Teodoro	209
Łoziński, Bronisław	255, 265, 270
Luick, Karl	116
Lumbe, Karl	147, 157, 158
Mach, Ernst	22, 24, 30, 31, 74, 156
Majchrowski, Franciszek	256, 268
Majer, Józef	160, 161, 162, 165, 166, 171, 264, 267
Małecki, Antoni	161, 167, 168, 170, 175, 254, 255, 257, 264, 265, 268, 269, 270
Manara, Luciano	247
Mann, Maurycy	255
Mannheim, Karl	281
Margules, Max	31
Maria Theresa	6, 8, 11, 139, 177, 186
Marquardsen, Heinrich	7
Martini, Karl Anton	46, 47, 49, 50
Mazzini, Giuseppe	215, 233, 242
Mecherzyński, Karol	162, 167, 170, 175, 270
Meister, Richard	17, 274, 276, 278, 279, 280, 283, 284, 285, 287, 288, 289, 290, 294, 297, 298, 300, 301
Meitner, Lise	31
Menin, Ludovico	212
Mensi, Daniel	126, 127
Mercandin, Franz	173
Metternich, Klemens Wenzel Lothar	18, 19, 20, 22, 29, 54
Michel, Adalbert Theodor	113
Mickiewicz, Adam	170, 270
Miklosich, Franz	32, 109
Molisch, Paul	276
Montecuccoli, Albert	210
Möser, Justus	45
Moy de Sons, Ernst	133, 134, 138, 152, 153
Mozart, Josef	66
Müller, Adam	43
Müller, Giuseppe/Joseph	220

Münter, Friedrich	32
Mutti, Giovanni Pietro	212
Nadherny, Ignaz	157
Nahlowky, Gabriel Johann	114
Namias, Giacinto	212
Napoleon	238
Nassau, William Senior	43
Nessel, Franz	147, 157
Neusser, Karl	255, 270
Nicolai, Friedrich	23, 45
Ninaus, Ehrlich	113
Nippel, Franz Xaver	46
Odescalchi, Antonio	212, 236
Ogris, Werner	297
Oppolzer, Johann	24
Palacký, František	109, 153
Parravicini, Alessandro	212, 236
Pauler, Tivadar	47
Pavesi, Angelo	219, 222
Pebal, Leopold	103
Perthaler, Hans	47
Pertile, Giambattista	212, 222
Petter, Franz	233
Pettovar, Johann	106
Petzval, Josef	21
Pfeiffer, Franz	29
Pfizmaier, August	32
Phillips, George	70, 132, 152, 153, 286, 289
Piffl-Perčević, Theodor	299
Piotrowski, Gustaw	166
Pitřha, Franz	147, 158
Planner, Julius	118
Pol, Wincenty	161, 170, 250, 254, 255, 257, 260, 265, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272
Poli, Baldassarre	239
Poniatowski, Michał Jerzy	173
Porta, Luigi	212
Purkyně, Johann	19, 24, 151, 154, 171
Racchetti, Alessandro	212
Radetzky, Josef Wenzel	209, 210, 212, 214, 215, 216, 233, 235, 240, 242
Radwański, Feliks	175
Ramisch, Franz	147

Ranke, Leopold	155
Rattazzi, Urbano	246
Redlich, Oswald	73
Redtenbacher, Josef	148, 157
Redwitz-Schmölz, Oscar	29, 32
Reiner, Joseph	164
Reiss, Franz	147, 157, 158
Reßl, Alois	118
Riedl, Johann	113
Riedl, Joseph Gottfried	147, 157, 158
Rieger, František Ladislav	153
Robitsch, Matthias	113
Rohrweck, Johann	43
Rokitansky, Carl	22, 118
Rollett, Alexander	100, 118
Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen	278
Rößler, Emil F.	47
Rottenhan, Heinrich Franz	50
Ruge, Arnold	91
Rzehaczek, Karl	118
Šafárik, Pavel Jozef	32, 52
Salvotti, Anton	48
Sandhaas, Georg	113
Santini, Giovanni	212
Savigny, Friedrich Carl	47, 48
Schäfer, Eduard	118
Schauenstein, Adolf	118
Schenkl, Karl	115, 116, 137
Scherer, Martin	138, 139, 140
Schindler, Aleksander	164
Schlager, Marcellinus	113
Schleicher, August	24, 32, 293
Schmarda, Ludwig Karl	105, 114, 115
Schmidt, Johannes	116
Schmidt, Oskar	108, 115, 170
Schneider, Franz	43
Schönauer, Augustin	148
Schreiner, Gustav	113
Schrödinger, Erwin	31
Schrötter von Kristelli, Anton	32, 102
Schuchardt, Hugo	32, 116
Schuster, Michael	46
Schwarzenberg, Felix	44, 53, 112, 250, 281

Schwarzenberg, Friedrich	167
Schwarzenberg, Karl	211
Schweitzer, Franz	113
Scopoli, Giovanni	228
Serafini, Filippo	222
Sickel, Theodor	32, 33, 286
Siemieński, Lucjan	170
Simor, János	185
Skedl, Michael	109
Skobel, Fryderyk	166, 254, 270, 272
Škoda, Josef	22, 87
Slaviček, Josef	183
Sławikowski, Antoni	165
Smoluchowski, Marian	31
Sommaruga, Franz	8, 18, 23, 25, 61, 62, 63, 64, 78, 81, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 144, 283
Speri, Tito	233
Spranger, Eduard	281, 282
Stadion, Franz	8, 44, 64, 99, 292
Stefan, Josef	22, 33
Stifter, Adalbert	22
Strakosch-Graßmann, Gustav	274, 276, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294
Strassoldo-Grafenberg, Michele	209, 215, 217, 233
Stroński, Franciszek	175
Suchecki, Henryk	170
Suttner, Hermann	22
Swieten, Gottfried	49
Szajnocha, Karol	260, 269
Szibenliszt, Mihály	47
Szlemenics, Pál	184
Tangl, Karlmann	117, 119
Tazzoli, Enrico	233
Tenca, Carlo	247, 248
Theser, Ernst	138
Thinnfeld, Ferdinand	8
Thun-Hohenstein, Leo	5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73, 86, 92, 94, 99, 100, 110, 111, 112, 115, 117, 119, 122, 123, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 159, 160, 161, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 176, 178,

	179, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 188, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196, 197, 204, 210, 211, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 226, 227, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 238, 239, 240, 241, 245, 247, 248, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 259, 262, 263, 264, 265, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302
Thun-Hohenstein, Franz Anton	41, 43, 44
Tocqueville, Alexis	45
Tomaschek, Karl	115
Tomek, Václav Vladivoi	42, 151, 154
Tosis, Josef	113
Treitz, Wenzel	162
Trendelenburg, Friedrich Adolf	66
Türkheim, Ludwig	21, 22
Turroni, Girolamo	220
Unger, Franz	31
Vadusek, Mathias	117
Venanzio, Girolamo	212
Verzeri, Girolamo	212
Viale Prelà, Michele	132
Vicari, Hermann	167
Virozsil, Antal	184
Voigt, Christian August	165, 171
Volkman, Wilhelm	148
Wagl, Friedrich	107, 113
Walewski, Antoni	171, 250, 255, 261, 265, 268, 269, 270, 271
Wander von Grünwald, Leopold	157
Waniorek, Wincenty	165, 171
Warszewicz, Józef	173, 174
Weber, Friedrich	31
Wegener, Alfred	31
Weinhold, Karl	104, 106, 107, 108, 111, 114, 115, 167, 171, 175
Weiß, Johann Baptist	108, 111, 115, 117, 152
Weisse, Maximilian	162, 173
Wenzel IV.	145
Wessely, Wolfgang	148
Wiesnauer, Franz	113

Winiwarter, Joseph	46
Winter, Eduard	294
Wirer, Franz	21
Wiszniewski, Michał	175
Wöhler, Friedrich	22
Wojciechowski, Konstanty	257
Zahn, Josef	109
Zambelli, Andrea	220
Żebrowski, Teofil	171
Zeiller, Franz	46, 47
Zepharovich, Viktor	115, 170
Zielonacki, Józefat	161, 165, 169, 254, 265
Zimmermann, Robert	92
Zingerle, Ignaz Vinzenz	139, 140
Zoncada, Antonio	219