

# Unflinching loyalty or calm before the storm? Some events at the Prague University in the first half of the 19th Century

MILADA SEKYRKOVÁ

**Abstract.** In terms of the position of universities in the Habsburg monarchy, historiography usually views the first half of the 19th century as a period of absolute state control, lack of freedom of scientific investigation, and suppression of any expression of free opinion in teaching. Was this situation in reality uncomfortable for the teachers? Did they want the freedom to act, or did they prefer to obey the dictates of Vienna? In the given period, two faculties were significant among four faculties of the Charles-Ferdinand University: the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Medicine. Can we consider the Faculty of Arts merely a preparatory for studies at the other three faculties? Was its staff just an obedient executor of Vienna's decisions and its blind advocate after the departure of Bernard Bolzano?"

The Faculty of Medicine is considered as one with relatively free development of scientific research in the first half of the 19th century. In what ways were new ideas and knowledge coming from abroad and other parts of the Monarchy appropriated at the Faculty? What negotiations of the teaching staff took place in this respect? To answer these questions, the paper will focus mainly on the debates of professorial staff of the philosophical and medical faculties regarding the various curricular decrees and regulations coming from Vienna. It will analyze the staff's position as well as the opinions of individual professors, and consider their loyalty versus attempts to introduce independent views and modify (where possible) the regulations. The paper will be based on an analysis of procedural protocols of the professorial staffs of the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Medicine of the Prague University in the 1820s and 1830s of the 19th century.

**Absolutní loajalita nebo ticho před bouří? Z dění na pražské univerzitě v první polovině 19. století.** První polovina 19. století je z hlediska postavení univerzit v habsburské monarchii a výuky na nich historiografií nahlížena jako období absolutní státní kontroly, nemožnosti svobodného vědeckého bádání a potlačování projevů vlastních názorových vkladů do výuky. Článek se zaměřuje na tyto a další otázky: Bylo to pedagogům opravdu nepohodlné? Měli zájem svobodně vystupovat, nebo se rádi podřídili vídeňskému diktátu?

Tehdy byly ze čtyř pražských fakult nejvýraznější filozofická a lékařská fakulta. Byla filozofická fakulta stále „pouhou“ přípravkou pro studium na ostatních třech fakultách? Byli učitelé po odchodu Bernarda Bolzana jen poslušnými

vykonavateli rozhodnutí a jejich slepými obhájci. O lékařské fakultě se hovoří jako o jediné, kde se mohla relativně svobodněji rozvinout vědecká bádání. Jak probíhala jednání o zavádění nových metod a jak se poznatky ze zahraničí a ostatních částí státu dostávaly na půdu fakulty? Článek se zaměřil zejména na projednávání studijních a dalších nařízení z Vídně na půdě profesorských sborů filozofické a lékařské fakulty pražské univerzity. Pokusil se stanovit, jakým způsobem se k nim sbory stavěly, a zda je možné vysledovat i individuálně u jednotlivých profesorů z tehdy nepočtených profesorských sborů míra loajality, resp. pokusy vnést vlastní pohled a případně nařízení modifikovat a úspěšnost těchto snah.

**Keywords:** Charles University in Prague • history of education • 19<sup>th</sup> century • Bernard Bolzano

The period between the Josephinian reforms and the events of 1848 so far has not attracted much interest among historians of science and technology in the Czech Lands<sup>1</sup>. The Napoleonic wars and the political conservatism of Metternich's system were seen as spreading a sense of immobility and torpor even into the area of scientific and technological ideas. Nonetheless, new research shows that this was a time when under a seemingly motionless surface industry expanded and grew, new technologies were being introduced, and the organisation of the entire society was about to change.<sup>2</sup> All of these developments, however, were not as yet accompanied by formal changes which are easy to describe and analyse, which is also why most studies dealing with this period focus on partial issues.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ivana ČORNEJOVÁ (ed.). *Dějiny UK II 1622–1802* [History of the Charles University, Vol. II, 1622–1802]. Praha, Karolinum, 1996, 286 pp.; Jan HAVRÁNEK (ed.). *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy III, 1802–1918* [History of the Charles University, Vol. III, 1802–1918]. Praha, Karolinum, 1997, 392 pp.; Peter STACHEL. Das österreichische Bildungssystem zwischen 1749 und 1918. In Karl ACHAM (ed.). *Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften*. Vol. 1: *Historischer Kontext, wissenschaftssoziologische Befunde und methodologische Voraussetzungen*. Wien, Passagen Verlag, 1999, p. 115–146; Richard MEISTER. *Entwicklung und Reformen des österreichischen Studienwesens*. Wien, Böhlhaus Nachf., Kommissionsverlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1963.

<sup>2</sup> Pavla HORSKÁ – Eduard MAUR – Jiří MUSIL. *Zrod velkoměsta. Urbanizace českých zemích a Evropa* [The Birth of a Metropolis. Urbanisation in the Czech Lands and Europe]. Praha, Paseka, 2002, 352 pp.

<sup>3</sup> Ferdinand SEIBT (ed.). *Böhmen im 19. Jahrhundert. Vom Klassizismus zur Moderne*. München – Berlin – Frankfurt am Main, 1995; Frank BOLDT. *Kultur und Staatlichkeit. Zur Genesis der modernen politischen Kultur in den böhmischen Ländern im Widerspiel von kulturellem und politischem Bewusstsein bei den böhmischen Tschechen und Deutschen*. Praha,

In science and technology, innovations were introduced into the Czech Lands mainly by private entrepreneurs, who were at this time still mostly of aristocratic origin. These people were interested in improving the productivity of their agricultural estates, expanding their existing industrial enterprises and creating new ones.

In cases, however, when entrepreneurs from the ranks of the aristocracy or the Church hierarchy<sup>4</sup> personally attended university, they tended to study law or theology. This is why they needed experts educated mainly in technical areas. They looked for them among their serfs whose education they supported or among scholars in towns, who could also help them to improve their estates.<sup>5</sup> Aristocratic or ecclesiastical entrepreneurs could also become active in politics, and thus indirectly influence the economy, including the areas they were interested in. As an example of this phenomenon, let us mention the interest of the Šternberks in mining or the Buquoyos in glass-making.<sup>6</sup>

Moreover, according to new directives, increasing numbers of positions in state administration were supposed to be filled by persons with higher education in the relevant area. There was a growing need for regional physicians and engineers and interest in education in these areas was thus naturally also on the increase.

Historiography of science and technology during this period still, however, tends to focus on only a few issues, such as Bernard Bolzano,<sup>7</sup> the National

---

Karolinum, 1996; Jiří KORÁLKA – Milan HLAVÁČKA – Jiří KAŠE – Jan P. KUČERA – Daniela TINKOVÁ. *Velké dějiny země Koruny české XI b, 1792–1860* [The Great History of Lands of the Czech Crown, XI b, 1792–1860]. Praha, 2014; Jitka LNĚNÍČKOVÁ. *České země v době předbřeznové* [Czech Lands Before March 1848, 1792–1848]. Praha, 1999.

<sup>4</sup> Milan MYŠKA (ed.). *Historická encyklopedie podnikatelů Čech, Moravy a Slezska do poloviny 20. století* [Historical Encyclopaedia of Entrepreneurs in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia Until Mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century], I –II. Ostrava, 2003, 2008.

<sup>5</sup> Jan JANKO – Soňa ŠTRBÁŇOVÁ. *Věda Purkyňovy doby* [Science in Purkynje's Time]. Praha, Academia, 1988; Miroslav HROCH. *Na prahu národní existence. Touha a skutečnost* [On the Threshold of National Existence. Desire and Reality]. Praha, 1999.

<sup>6</sup> Jiří MAJER. *Kašpar Šternberk*. Praha, Academia, 1997; *Buquoyové sklo v Čechách* [Buquoy Glass in Bohemia]. Praha, Uměleckoprůmyslové muzeum v Praze, 2002.

<sup>7</sup> Jaromír LOUŽIL. *Bernard Bolzano*. Praha, 1978; Marie PAVLÍKOVÁ (ed.) *Bernard Bolzano. Vlastní životopis* [Bernard Bolzano. His Own Biography]. Praha, 1981; Arnošt KOLMAN. *Bernard Bolzano*. Praha, 1958; Jaroslav FOLTA. *Život a vědecké snahy Bernarda Bolzana* [Life and Scientific Aims of Bernard Bolzano]. In *Matematika a fyzika ve škole*. Vol. 12, 1981–1982, p. 85–95; Irena SEIDLEROVÁ. *Sociální a poli-*

Museum,<sup>8</sup> or perhaps also the humanities and their representatives. The abovementioned trends are usually treated only marginally or in different contexts.<sup>9</sup>

The situation at Prague University has most recently been summarised in a four volume history of the Charles University, which was published in the 1990s and whose second and third part touch upon the period we are interested in.<sup>10</sup> The years following the forced departure of Bernard Bolzano from the Faculty of Philosophy in 1819 are described there as a period of calm and stillness, and

---

*tické názory Bernarda Bolzana* [Bernard Bolzano's Social and Political Views]. Praha, Nakladatelství ČSAV, 1963; Kamila VEVERKOVÁ. K problematice studia osvícenství u nás a pramenů týkajících se některých Bolzanových žáků [On the Subject of the Study of Enlightenment in Our Lands and Sources Pertaining to Some of Bolzano's Students]. In R. SVOBODA – M. WEIS – P. ZUBKO (eds.). *Duchovní a myšlenkové proměny druhé poloviny 19. století*. [Intellectual Changes and Changes of Thoughts in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century]. Studie TF JČU, Vol. 40. České Budějovice, 2006, p. 25–47; Helmut RUMPLER (ed.). *Bernard Bolzano und die Politik*. Wien, Böhlau, 2000; Kateřina TRLIFAJOVÁ (ed.). *Osamělý myslitel Bernard Bolzano* [Solitary thinker Bernard Bolzano]. Praha, Filosofia, 2006; Jan BERG (ed.). *Briefe an František Příborský 1824–1848*. 3 Vol. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 2005; Eduard WINTER. *Der Briefwechsel B. Bolzano mit F. Exner*. Praha, Královská česká společnost nauk, 1935.

<sup>8</sup> Karel SKLENÁŘ. *Obraz vlasti, příběh Národního muzea* [The Image of Motherland, Story of the National Museum]. Praha, 2001.

<sup>9</sup> Miloslava MELANOVÁ. Vzdělanci a podnikatelé – formování občanské elity v průmyslovém městě v době předběžnové [Scholars and Entrepreneurs – The Formation of Civil Elites in Industrial Towns before the March Time]. In *Svět historie. Historikův svět. Sborník profesorů Robertu Kvačkoví*. Liberec, Technická univerzita v Liberci, 2007, p. 177–195; Zdeněk BEZECNÝ – Milena LENDEROVÁ. Elity v Čechách 1780–1914 [Elites in Bohemia 1780–1914]. In *Studie k sociálním dějinám*, 1999, č. 3 (10), p. 35–37; Ralph MELVILLE. *Adel und Revolution in Böhmen. Strukturwandel von Herrschaft und Gesellschaft in Österreich um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Mainz, 1998; Eva LISÁ (ed. Milada SEKYRKOVÁ). *Karel hrabě Chotek. Nejvyšší purkrabí Království českého*. Praha, Národní technické muzeum, 2008, 115 pp.; Ivo CERMAN. *Chotkové: příběh úřednické šlechty* [The Choteks: A Story of Administrative Nobility]. Praha, 2008; Radana ŠVARÍČKOVÁ-SLABÁKOVÁ. *Rodinné strategie šlechty: Mensdorffové-Pouilly v 19. století* [Noble Families and Their Strategies: Mensdorff-Pouilly in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century]. Praha, 2007 etc.

<sup>10</sup> Ivana ČORNEJOVÁ (ed.). *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy II, 1622–1802*, [History of the Charles University, Vol. II, 1622–1802], Praha, Karolinum, 1996; Jan HAVRÁNEK (ed.) *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy III, 1802–1918* [History of the Charles University, Vol. III, 1802–1918]. Praha, Karolinum, 1997.

with the exception of the Faculty of Medicine<sup>11</sup> also as a time lacking in new ideas or any scientific progress. Most links between the university (and the Polytechnic) with institutions we would nowadays see as focusing on research – such as the Royal Bohemian Society of Sciences, the Patriotic Museum (Vlastenecké muzeum), and the Patriotic Society for Economy (Vlastenecko hospodářská společnost), which focused exclusively on practical applications of new scientific research especially in agriculture – took the form of personal relations and the doubling of functions. František X. M. Zippe, for example, custodian of mineralogy collections of the Patriotic Museum, was at the same time professor of mineralogy and geology at the Polytechnic,<sup>12</sup> while brothers Jan Svatopluk and Karel Bořivoj Presl, active collaborators of the museum, lectured on natural sciences at the university<sup>13</sup>.

All three regular faculties and the preparatory Faculty of Philosophy of Prague University were under strong pressure of state censorship. This situation started changing only in 1848, when the university and people connected with it became actively involved in the events in Prague and the rest of the country. On March 11, 1848 several hundred people met for the first time to express their dissatisfaction with the political situation in the country and their intention to change it. They gathered in the Saint Wenceslas Spa (Svatováclavské lázně) in Prague and agreed on a petition which demanded:

- ☐ The strengthening of a connection between the lands of the Bohemian Crown, i.e., a closer administrative union;
- ☐ Establishment of an elected assembly;
- ☐ Equality of the Czech and German nationality and language;
- ☐ A reform of judicial administration;
- ☐ The end of corvée (statute labour);
- ☐ A reform of provincial administration;

<sup>11</sup> Ludmila HLAVÁČKOVÁ – Petr SVOBODNÝ. *Dějiny pražských lékařských fakult 1348–1990* [The History of Medical Faculties in Prague], Praha, 1993; Ludmila HLAVÁČKOVÁ. Priority pražské lékařské fakulty v procesu specializace lékařských oborů v 1. polovině 19. století [Priorities of the Prague Medical Faculty in the Process of Specialisation of Medical Fields in the First Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century]. In Jaroslav FOLTA (ed.). *Dějiny vědy a techniky: semináře pro vyučující dějinám věd a techniky v českých zemích 1996–1997*. Praha, Národní technické muzeum, 1997, p. 85–87.

<sup>12</sup> Josef HAUBELT. F. X. M. Zippe (1791–1863) und Polytechnisches Institut des Königreichs Böhmen. In *Z dějin hutnictví*, 31, 2002, p. 90–99.

<sup>13</sup> JANKO, Jan – ŠTRBÁŇOVÁ, Soňa. *Věda Purkyněovy doby* [Science in Purkyně's Time]. Praha, 1988; Eva HOFFMANNOVÁ. *J. S. Presl – K. B. Presl*. Brandýs nad Orlicí, 2007.

- ☐ Introduction of a requirement of proficiency in both languages of the province for officials;
- ☐ Freedom of the press;
- ☐ Tax reform;
- ☐ Freedom of assembly;
- ☐ Freedom of religion.<sup>14</sup>

The definitive text of the petition was the work of František Brauner (1810–1880), a lawyer. It was presented to the assembly by Alois Pravoslav Trojan (1815–1893), also a lawyer. The assembly was attended, among others, by numerous students of the Prague University and the Prague Polytechnic.

In the days that followed, another meeting took place in Prague. This gathering called for changes specifically in academia. The students demanded:

- ☐ Freedom of religion for teachers and students;
- ☐ Freedom in teaching;
- ☐ Equality of Czech and German as a language of instruction;
- ☐ Permission to study at foreign universities;
- ☐ The requirement of state examinations for select professions and offices;
- ☐ A fusion of the Prague University and the Prague Polytechnic;
- ☐ Introduction of physical education into the curriculum;
- ☐ Permission for students to gather in clubs and associations.<sup>15</sup>

The meeting was an immediate reaction to current events, but both the university and the Polytechnic had been heading towards a crisis for some time. Ever since the Josephinian reforms, both of these institutions were subjected to strict state supervision, which manifested itself in censorship of material which was taught, state-prescribed curricula based on prescribed textbooks, etc. On the other hand, religious tolerance allowed non-Catholics (including Jews) into academia at least formally, since they were subject to the same rules as Catholics. These people were then in a position to somewhat widen the range of opinions. The most famous (and first) Protestant professor at the Prague university was August Gottlieb Meissner (1753–1807).<sup>16</sup> While the official language of instruction was German, some courses were still taught in Latin, whole other subjects – such as pastoral theology and courses for midwives – were taught in

<sup>14</sup> František ROUBÍK. *Český rok 1848* [Czech Year 1848]. Praha, Ladislav Kuncíř, 1948.

<sup>15</sup> Jan HAVRÁNEK (ed.). *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy III, 1802–1918* [History of the Charles University, Vol. III, 1802–1918]. Praha, Karolinum, 1997, p. 91.

<sup>16</sup> Arnošt KRAUS. August Gottlieb Meissner. *Athenaeum*, 5, 1888, č. 6, p. 153–163.

Czech. The university aimed at educating state officials loyal to the regime and its graduates, if they followed the rules, could relatively easily find adequate professional positions. Teachers, too, were seen and evaluated as part of the centralised state administration.

Ever since their foundation in the Middle Ages, the three regular university faculties and the preparatory Faculty of Philosophy had similar administration and formally functioned in a like manner. Their inner life, however, had undergone substantial changes since the time of the Josephinian reforms, which set them on diverging courses of development.

In the traditional view, which persisted for centuries, first among the faculties was the Faculty of Theology.<sup>17</sup> Enlightenment reforms, however, changed the position and functioning of Church institutions in the state and that naturally led to a decline in this faculty's influence. Expansion of crafts and industry and the support they received from the state meant that many students from poorer families, who may have previously seen the Church as a secure living, now preferred other studies. Many opted for the Prague Polytechnic, which had recently been reorganised (in 1803–1806), since it offered the study of a wide range of practical fields and its graduates easily found good positions. All in all, in the first four decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Faculty of Theology lost several dozen percent of its students and henceforth remained the smallest faculty of the Prague University.

During the period of our interest, teachers at the Faculty of Theology were academically not above average, and some were known more for their cultural activities than for their scholarship. For example, Jakub Beer (1796–1866), professor of dogmatic theology, was an active co-organiser of academic celebrations in 1848, while Maximilian Millauer (1784–1840), professor of pastoral theology and historiographer of the faculty, became known for his numerous works on Czech history.

The Faculty of Law has always been the richest faculty. Its teachers and students were mainly people from the higher ranks of the society. The four year study of law and politics, as it was officially called, was during the period of our interest attended by a relatively stable number of students. The slight rise in the number of students is rather a sign of generally increasing interest in university education in the society as a whole. Moreover, ever since Jewish persons could attend the university, their representation at this faculty also grew.

---

<sup>17</sup> Peter STACHEL. Das österreichische Bildungssystem zwischen 1749 und 1918. In Karl ACHAM (ed.). *Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften*, Vol.1: *Historischer Kontext, wissenschaftssoziologische Befunde und methodologische Voraussetzungen*, Wien, Passagen Verlag, 1999, p. 117.

Among teachers who importantly influenced the Faculty of Law during this period, we ought to mention at least Josef Helfert (1791–1847), professor of Church law and father of the historian Josef Alexander Helfert, and the Kopetz brothers, of whom Adolf Martin K. (1764–1832) taught natural law as well as state and international law, and Václav Gustav (1781–1857) wrote a treatise on Austrian legislation pertaining to craftsmen and small businesses.<sup>18</sup>

In the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Faculty of Medicine was the only faculty of the Prague University which engaged in scientific research proper. It was subjected to less political control than the other schools and during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, its administration successfully introduced the extension of study to five years and closer links to clinical practice, i.e., a connection between theoretical studies and teaching at the clinics. Throughout the entire period, graduates of both external and internal medicine found employment relatively easily. The director of studies at the Faculty of Medicine was also a ‘protomedicus’, i.e., a person supervising health throughout the province. The most important of these directors was doubtless Ignác Nádherný (1789–1867), a typical example of a gifted man and able organiser of modest background, whose hard work eventually won him an important position. Nádherný was a leading personality of the faculty for many years. He managed to introduce numerous organisational changes, making studies at the Faculty of Medicine more modern than the study at other faculties of the Prague University.<sup>19</sup>

Regarding its organisation, it would seem that the Faculty of Philosophy<sup>20</sup> had undergone less change than the other faculties. It still prepared students for their study at the other three faculties and its student numbers remained more or less stable. Regarding the intellectual influence on the Prague and Bohemian society of the time, however, it played a leading role within the university.

Among the most influential figures of the Faculty of Philosophy during the period of our interest was the abovementioned Bernard Bolzano (1781–1848),

<sup>18</sup> Dušan HENDRYCH (ed.). *Právnická fakulta Univerzity Karlova 1348 – 1998* [The Faculty of Law of the Charles University 1348–1998]. Praha, 1998.

<sup>19</sup> Ludmila HLAVÁČKOVÁ – Petr SVOBODNÝ (ed.). *Biografický slovník pražské lékařské fakulty 1348–1939* [Bibliographic Dictionary of the Prague Medical Faculty 1348–1939], Vol. 2, L – Ž. Praha, 1993.

<sup>20</sup> Josef PETRÁŇ, Josef. *Nástin dějin Filozofické fakulty UK* [Outline of the History of Faculty of Philosophy of the Charles University]. Praha, 1983, p. 95–143; Peter STACHEL. Das österreichische Bildungssystem zwischen 1749 und 1918. In Karl ACHAM (ed.). *Geschichte der österreichischen Humannwissenschaften. Vol. 1: Historischer Kontext, wissenschaftssoziologische Befunde und methodologische Voraussetzungen*. Wien, Passagen Verlag, 1999, p. 121–123, 133.



who lectured here during the first and the second decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Bolzano was appointed professor of philosophy of religion in 1805.<sup>21</sup> At the same time, he also served as a preacher in the St. Salvator Church. In his lectures, he flouted various directives and did not follow the state curriculum which was based on the textbook of Jacob Friedrich Frint (1795–1827). He taught his own ideas. He had this privilege thanks to the intervention of M. J. N. Grün, director of studies at the Faculty of Philosophy and since 1812 Rector of the Prague University.

Bolzano's views regarding equality among people, progress, the functioning of society, equitable division of property, and national issues were close to the ideas of the French Revolution. They became popular not just among students but also among other people of Prague, who frequented his sermons in great numbers. His teaching significantly diverged from the officially promoted views and finally in 1819, as soon as a good enough excuse for his deposition was found, he had to leave both his academic and his preaching posts and withdraw from Prague to the countryside. Even so, his ideas remained influential and many of his students stayed at the university. One of them was Michael Josef Fesl (1788–1863), who was, however, soon afterwards also banned from teaching and even imprisoned for several years.<sup>22</sup>

It took some time to find a suitable excuse for removing Bolzano from his posts, since he was a very popular man. In the end, among the reasons listed as causes of his removal was an alleged increase in disorder at university faculties which was said to be a consequence of Bolzano's lectures.<sup>23</sup> This unruliness was said to have become most apparent in November 1818 when Bolzano's accuser Wilhelm, director of studies of the Faculty of Philosophy, read out the rules of discipline of the Faculty of Philosophy.<sup>24</sup> This allegation was unanimously opposed by professors of all faculties of the Prague University. They expressed their view in a message sent to Vienna, according to which discipline at the Prague University had been improving ever since the dissolution of the Jesuit Order.<sup>25</sup>

After Bolzano's departure, the Faculty of Philosophy was under the strictest police supervision of all the Prague University's faculties and in the years that followed, no professor achieved influence comparable to Bolzano's. Some of

---

<sup>21</sup> See footnote 7.

<sup>22</sup> Eduard WINTER. *Bolzano a jeho kruh* [Bolzano and His Circle]. Praha, 1935.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* p. 75.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

his friends, however, stayed at the university, such as Josef Stanislav Jandera (1776–1857), professor of mathematics,<sup>26</sup> and briefly – until his appointment in Vienna – also František Xaver Němeček (1766–1849), successor of Professor Karl Heinrich Seibt (1735–1806) in the chair of practical and theoretical philosophy.<sup>27</sup>

In the two decades that followed, the university seemed to have turned into a routinely running mechanism where lectures met the demands of official curricula and teachers were loyal state employees with minimal freedom of expression.<sup>28</sup> Until 1848, none of Bolzano's former colleagues attempted anything in the way of a public and free expression of his views. Lectures followed curricula prescribed by the study committee at the Viennese court. These curricula reflected the ruler's notions about a desirable form of the sciences taught. They formed a theoretical basis of lecture series which took place in individual universities during individual academic years. Lists of lectures were then a link between the theory coming from the Imperial court and the actual lectures; they are the furthest traceable official documents regarding actual teaching practice.<sup>29</sup>

On the outside, it was the students who were most vocal. Despite all the preventive efforts of the state apparatus, the German nationalist movement found its echoes in Prague. One can learn more about this from police archives, because the police frequently had to react to various manifestations of students'

<sup>26</sup> Josef DURDÍK. *Řeč při odhalení pamětní desky na rodném domě profesora J. L. Jandery v Hořicích* [Speech at the Unveiling of a Memorial Plaque on the House where Professor J. L. Jandera was Born in Hořice]. Jičín, self-published, 1877.

<sup>27</sup> Karel VÍT. Karl Heinrich Seibt a estetika napodobování. Kapitola z dějin obecné estetiky na pražské Karlo-Ferdinandově univerzitě [Karl Heinrich Seibt and the Aesthetics of Imitation. Chapter from the History of General Aesthetics at the Charles-Ferdinand University in Prague]. In *Sborník prací FF Brněnské univerzity. Studia Minora Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Brunensis*, H 19–20, 1984, p. 27–31; Jan JANKO – Soňa ŠTRBÁŇOVÁ. *Věda Purkyněovy doby* [Science in Purkyně's Time]. Praha, 1988, p. 72.

<sup>28</sup> Peter STACHEL. Das österreichische Bildungssystem zwischen 1749 und 1918. In ACHAM, Karl (ed.), *Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften*, Vol. 1: *Historischer Kontext, wissenschaftssoziologische Befunde und methodologische Voraussetzungen*. Wien, Passagen Verlag, 1999, p. 119.

<sup>29</sup> Aesthetics was taught according to two plans of philosophy studies proposed by Emperors Francis I and II, namely the *Philosophical Plan of Studies* (Philosophischer Studienplan), declared by a decree of the Imperial office on August 9, 1805, and a *New Teaching Plan for Philosophical Studies* (Neuer Lehrplan der philosophischen Studien), declared by a decree of the study committee of the Imperial court on October 2, 1824. The last plan published during the period of our interest, i.e., the plan of philosophical studies, was decreed in 1846.

high spirits.<sup>30</sup> Reports, most frequently filed by neighbours of these establishments, speak of noise coming from student pubs where students not only played dice and cards but also expressed their political views. We know which parts of attire students used to express their sympathies with their colleagues abroad (broad black cloaks, eye-catching collars, berets) because the police repeatedly banned the wearing of these articles of clothing by various directives.

A certain turning point in developments at the university prior to March 1848 came with the November 1830 uprising in Poland, which demanded more autonomy for so-called 'Congress Poland' within Russia. The uprising was swiftly and harshly put down and most of the autonomy which Poland hitherto had was lost. Many activists fled from persecution through the Czech Lands further West, mostly to France. Bohemian society became divided in its views on the issue but especially in academic circles sympathisers with the Polish cause prevailed. They organised help to Polish refugees who were fleeing through Bohemia and Moravia. Among well-known organisers of such initiatives we find various well-known persons, such as the poet Karel Hynek Mácha (1810–1836), then student of the Faculty of Philosophy.<sup>31</sup>

Records from meetings of senior academic staff of Prague University's faculties during this period survive only in fragments (due to transportation of the university archive in 1945) and in many cases,<sup>32</sup> all that is left are just excerpts from debates on particular points hidden in other material. These notes show that these meetings dealt almost exclusively with internal administrative affairs, the personnel situation in particular departments, etc. But even these terse records indicate that these issues were highly politicised.

In the 1840s, the atmosphere at the university started to change. Students became more active and teachers published more and were increasingly active in public life. Staff meetings quite inconspicuously started including various political subjects, but greater emphasis was also placed on professional ability and reorganisation of the system of teaching, the first sign of which was the

<sup>30</sup> Milada SEKYRKOVÁ. Ze stížností na pražské studenty v první polovině 19. století [From Complaints Against Prague Students in the First Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century]. In *Město a intelektuálové od středověku do roku 1848. Documenta Pragensia XXVII*. Praha, Scriptorium, 2008 (vyšlo 2009), p. 959–969.

<sup>31</sup> Vladimír ŠTĚPÁNEK. *Karel Hynek Mácha*. Praha, 1984, 377 pp.; Aleš HAMAN – Radim KOPÁČ (eds.). *Mácha redivivus (1810 – 2010). Sborník ke 200. výročí narození K. H. Máchy* [Mácha Redivivus (1810–2010). Anthology for the 200<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of K. H. Mácha's Birth]. Praha, 2010.

<sup>32</sup> Karel KUČERA – Miroslav TRUC. *Archiv UK. Průvodce po archívních fondech* [Archive of the Charles University. Guide to the Archive Collections]. Praha, SPN, 1962.

establishment of the position of Privatdozent, first at the Faculty of Medicine<sup>33</sup> and later also at the Faculty of Philosophy and Faculty of Law.<sup>34</sup>

The 1840s also witnessed the first preparations for the 500<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the foundation of the university, which was coming up in 1848. These preparations involved not only the faculties but also representatives of various other provincial and state institutions. Yet despite all the preparations, the actual course of the celebrations was determined not by these carefully laid plans, but by the events of March 1848.

Author' address:  
Ústav dějin UK a archiv UK  
Ovocný trh 3,  
116 36 Praha 1

---

<sup>33</sup> First: Personal Stand des akademischen Senates und der Fakultäten-Lehrkörper an der kais. königl. Universität zu Prag, Prag 1842, p. 19.

<sup>34</sup> First: Personal Stand des akademischen Senates und der Fakultäten-Lehrkörper an der kais. königl. Universität zu Prag, Prag 1847, p. 14, 22.