

FRANTIŠEK PALACKÝ AND THE BEGINNING OF
THE AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
(ÖSTERREICHISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN)

Anna M. Drabek

Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung

The first initiatives at founding an Imperial Academy of Arts and Sciences in Vienna have their origin in Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, who stayed in Vienna from 1712 to 1714 and tried to achieve the realization of his plans through Emperor Charles VI. After several other starts at the time of Maria Theresa, who regarded a project of that kind rather negatively¹, in 1810 a group of Austrian scientists centered about Friedrich Schlegel, who was then living in Vienna, took up the plan again. A member of this group was Joseph Freiherr von Hammer-Purgstall, later a famous orientalist, who did not abandon the idea of founding an academy until he was ultimately able to bring it to reality some years later. In 1837, the court was presented with a petition signed by twelve Austrian government officials doing scholarly work, requesting the founding of an Academy of Arts and Sciences in Vienna and pointing out that Vienna was the only one among the capitals of Europe where such an academy did not yet exist and that this was a disadvantage to Austria, compared with the other parts of the monarchy with their institutes in Prague, Pest, Venice and Milan.² But the *Vormärz* regime was opposed to the project, and only when Metternich, who was directing the monarchy during the reign of Ferdinand together with Kolowrat and the other members of the State Conference, made up his mind in 1845 to give way to the increasing number of Austrian scientists, poets, and intellectuals who were demanding an academy was the Austrian Academy of Arts and Sciences born. This step was meant to be a gesture toward the liberal tendencies of those days, but according to Metternich's will it was clearly to be no more than a gesture. Moreover, the new foundation was meant to serve, according to Metternich's intentions, the aims of the government and to control the "restless spirits". It was to provide the "fixed points" around which such spirits could gather.³ At the same time it was considered "a new central point" around which would gather all "patriotic scholars" as a "symbol of the unity of the monarchy." The new institute should not therefore, according

*Mit freundlichen Empfehlungen
und bestem Dank für die Ermög-
lichung des Besuchs der ÖAW*

to the suggestions of the President of the Court Chamber Karl Freiherr von Kübeck (who can be considered Metternich's mouthpiece in this case), be confined "to Vienna or a number of provinces" (namely the German-speaking Austrian hereditary lands) but should comprise the area of the whole monarchy. It was to be not only a symbol of unity but also of "German education".⁴ In fact, national troubles appeared only in a rather moderate way within the Academy of Arts and Sciences, except in the year of explosion, in 1848.⁵

One must not overrate the centralistic intentions of the Viennese government as far as the new foundation was concerned. Metternich's original idea was to take the wind out of the sails of the liberal and national tendencies among intellectuals and scientists and to keep them under the government's control. Yet he was quite willing to take into account the academies and learned societies already existing in the various parts of the monarchy. In his report to the Emperor on 13 January 1846, he states: "It" [the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences] "shall not be above but beside these." But he continues: "A natural dominance will be given to it by the central point where it will be situated [i.e. Vienna] and lead to an emulation of it by the academies throughout the entire state."⁶

The relationship between the Viennese academy and the "provinces" of the monarchy, respectively the scientists in those places, was therefore a main problem from the beginning, and one that was dealt with while the statutes for the new foundation were being worked out. Another problem was the range of sciences to be taken in. It should be noted that Minister of State Count Kolowrat-Liebsteinsky, a Bohemian aristocrat, opposed an explicit regulation to this effect, as Count Hartig had suggested. In his opinion, the scientific institutes already existing in Prague, Pest, Milan, and Venice would consider this a "painful slighting of their work," and they would "point to their results, to national and linguistic differences and to the fact that there should be no subordination in such corporations."⁷ But Archduke Johann, who was to become the first curator of the newly-founded academy, pointed out the "necessity to oppose the unfortunate provincial tendency of separation" and to expand the academy to the entire monarchy. Decisive for the admission of members should be "nothing but ability and general reputation, not merely residence in the capital."⁸

Paragraph 1 of the statutes finally laid before the Emperor for signing on 14 May 1847 put the relation between the new foundation and the Emperor, respectively the Viennese government, into the following words: "The Academy of Arts and Sciences in *Vienna* is a learned corporation

under Our special protection which has the aim . . . of encouraging the arts and sciences *in the branches assigned to it . . . and of supporting the aims of the government* by assuming such tasks and questions pertaining to the field of sciences."⁹ The question of breadth was dealt with in a Great-Austrian way: the academy was to have 48 full members, 24 belonging to the capital and 24 to the provinces (paragraph 7). They were to be equally divided among the two classes, the mathematical-scientific one and the historical-philological one (paragraph 2).¹⁰ Among the six full members of the historical-philological class from Bohemia, Šafařík and Palacký were the only Czechs.¹¹ The custodian of the Prague University Library and the historiographer of the Bohemian Estates were "celebrities" of such a kind that one could not possibly omit them, although they did not hold professorships. Palacký did not even have a doctor's degree, as is well known.¹²

It is interesting to note, however, that Palacký, in spite of his good personal relations with the regent (*Landeschef*) of Bohemia, Archduke Stephan,¹³ was not originally listed among those Bohemian scholars whom the Archduke, at the suggestion of the First Chancellor Inzaghi, had recommended to the Emperor for admission as full members to the academy. Only Court Chancellor Pillersdorf, to whom the list of candidates proposed by the regents of the various lands of the monarchy had been sent for revision, had put Palacký, the historian Jodok Stülz from the Upper Austrian monastery of St. Florian, and Joseph Ritter von Rusegger, the director of the salt-works in Galicia, on the list, removing others to make places for them.¹⁴

František Palacký showed a rather keen interest in the newly-founded academy and its establishment right from the beginning. On May 25 he was already in Vienna, where he maintained lively contacts with the Viennese members of the new foundation and with personalities of Viennese society and the court during the following weeks.¹⁵ We find him talking with the spiritual father of the academy, Freiherr von Hammer-Purgstall, with the orientalist and botanist Endlicher, the physicist Ettingshausen, the director of the Viennese coins-and-antiques-cabinet Arneth, the slavist Miklosich, Baron Clemens Hügel, and others. Of special interest are Palacký's various conferences with Count Leo Thun-Hohenstein, an eager promoter of the Czech language and literature and a member of a corresponding committee of the Royal Bohemian Museum in Prague, who effected the reform of the Austrian universities as Minister of Education during the neo-absolutist regime after 1848, and his audience with State Minister Kolowrat on June 9.¹⁶

Unfortunately, we do not know the subjects of all these conferences. But it is certain that in most of them the main one was the affair of the

newly-founded academy. There was still an important act to follow, the election of the presidency, i.e., the president, vice-president, and two secretaries. This stimulated much interest and activity on the part of Purgstall and the other "academicians", which was not very much approved of by State Chancellor Metternich. The coming elections and the future organization of the new foundation were also reasons for Palacký's journey to Vienna.¹⁷ The curator of the academy, Archduke Johann, wanted the presidency elected by letter, in order to guarantee the exercise of the right to vote for the full members in the provinces, too. But Metternich pleaded for an election in the capital; the votes of the members from the provinces who might be unable to attend could be added to the majority. In fact, Metternich carried out his purpose, and the election took place in Vienna on June 27. Palacký, who had already returned to Prague on June 12, took part and came back to Vienna for that purpose.¹⁸

Palacký also took an active interest in working out the rules of the academy, with which the full members had been entrusted by the court. The newly-elected president, Hammer-Purgstall, originally wanted the rules of procedure to be worked out by all full members of the academy in general meetings in Vienna; but on the advice of Archduke Johann, who had doubts similar to those concerning the elections, he had the rules of procedure worked out by the Viennese members of the academy and sent to the members in the provinces for their opinion.¹⁹ Palacký's opinion of the draft of the rules still exists in the archives of the Austrian Academy of Arts and Sciences, together with a covering letter of 26 August 1847.²⁰ It was so negative in its main features that Palacký believed he had to apologize for it in the accompanying letter. The main point of Palacký's criticism was the fear that developments could lead to a situation where the members of the academy in the provinces would lose the practical exercise of their rights and that the scientific work and the administration of the academy would be carried out mainly by the members living in Vienna. He tried to avert this by a correction of a number of paragraphs in order to secure the equal cooperation of the members of the provinces in the future.²¹ Another aim of Palacký was to guarantee the essentially democratic structure of the academy and its self-government for the future, to exclude any influence of the court that exceeded the limitations of the statutes, and to prevent the forming of cliques and parties by its own members.²² One can also find supplements and comments of a merely technical kind, aiming only at a smooth and undisturbed functioning of routine research and administration.²³ It was Palacký's chance to speak as an expert, drawing upon his seventeen years in the Royal Bohemian Society of Arts and Sciences.²⁴

Besides this criticism, referring to several items in the draft of the rules of procedure, Palacký pointed out two major troublesome areas. The first was the fact that in the draft "a more definite reference to those scientific fields and subjects with which the academy will have to deal" was missing. In this connection, Palacký queried "whether and how far one should consider economy and general medicine to be in the mathematical scientific class and whether there will be attention paid to the history of the Austrian state and the countries forming this state in the historical-philological class, or whether it has been determined to leave this subject to a special society, yet to be formed."²⁵ The second objection criticized the fact that the rules of procedure did not specify different sections in the two classes, sections that were to be dedicated to various subjects, respectively branches of science, as had been planned in paragraph 3 of the statutes concerning the separation of the scientific work into two classes. This problem was solved later by the institution of commissions to perform special tasks in both classes or in the whole academy, but there was never any division of the two classes into sections.

With both objections, Palacký had touched on two actually existing faults in the rules that had to be taken seriously. The range of the sciences to be included in the scope of the academy had been the subject of serious worry by Metternich and the government and of a tug-of-war between the government and private proponents of the academy for some years. Philosophy, political science, and poetry were considered extremely dangerous and were excluded from the concerns of the academy from the very beginning. But history, too, had often been regarded with suspicion²⁶, until someone had the idea to place it at the service of the state (under the name of "patriotic history") and to submit its exercise to the supervision of the government, e.g., in an Imperial Academy of Arts and Sciences.²⁷ Both problems, the question of which subjects were appropriate for study by the academy and the question of the practical organization of the academy's work, were to become matters of importance for Palacký's own work at the Academy.

On 5 May 1849, during a meeting of the philosophical-historical class (the new name of the historical-philological class), Palacký made a suggestion that the class put the editing of the documents of the fifteenth-century church councils on its working agenda and should found a special commission for this purpose.²⁸ As has been mentioned before, this form of cooperation had been chosen by the academy to perform certain tasks. The first commission of this kind had been created in November, 1847, the so-called "Commission for the Editing of Austrian Historical Sources" (later briefly called the "Historical Commission"), which still exists.

The designated leader of this commission, whose members were elected by the class, was Joseph Chmel, a member from the monastery of St. Florian in Upper Austria, since 1846 vice-director of the Secret Family-Court-and State-Archives, and like Palacký a full member of the academy from the beginning. This man had been among the first Austrian historians (Austrian historical science being rather neglected then) to discover the great value of research in historical sources in this time of romanticizing historiography. For years he had eagerly devoted himself to the edition of sources, though rather uncritically, publishing anything that came within his reach. He had also been able to convince the class of the necessity of a comprehensive collection and edition of all of the sources of Austrian history, and he had been the actual initiator of that commission to which, besides himself, the botanist and historian Stephan Endlicher, the custodian of the Viennese Court Library Freiherr von Münch-Bellinghausen (better known under the poet's pseudonym, Friedrich Halm), and the Romanist Ferdinand Wolf also belonged.²⁹

At Palacký's suggestion, the class commissioned him to work out the details of his publication plan, and Palacký sent this plan to Vienna in 1849. In it he proposed the institution of a commission "of about three members" who would be entitled to employ assistants necessary for the purpose, to supervise and coordinate their work, to undertake the necessary archival travels, and to have 1000 florins a year at their disposal. As "absolutely necessary" Palacký considered the admission to this commission of the corresponding member Ernst Birk, custodian of the Viennese Court Library, who had already made a name for himself with his edition of the *Regesten* to Lichnowsky's *History of the House of Habsburg* (8 Volumes, Vienna, 1836-1844) and who had already done some preliminary studies concerning the conciliar documents of the fifteenth century. Palacký declared himself ready to cooperate, too, but since the commission should properly have its residence in Vienna he would have to be reimbursed the costs of his necessarily frequent journeys to that city.³⁰

The philosophical-historical class referred Palacký's proposal to Chmel, who, as the head of the Historical Commission, might be considered an authority "in historicis." He reported to the class about it on 9 January 1850, and at the request of the class wrote a reply to Palacký, which he read during a meeting of the class on January 16.³¹ There Chmel expressed an extremely negative attitude towards Palacký's plan. Nevertheless, he wrote him that the Commission for the Editing of the Conciliar Documents of the Fifteenth Century had been established and that Birk as well as Palacký had been elected on the terms he had specified. Chmel himself, as well as Theodor Georg von Karajan, a well-known Germanist, had

declared themselves ready to cooperate "in order to favour such a meritorious undertaking and to give you, honourable friend, an evidence of our respect and good will." Chmel also admitted that Palacký's proposal for the editing and publication of the *Acta conciliorum saeculi XV* "certainly [was] a very important and excellent one." It was a "literary undertaking that would be sure of the gratitude of all present and future historians and Christian theologians."³² But, at the same time, he indicated serious doubts that the available talents within the academy would be sufficient to master such a difficult and complex undertaking.

It has been speculated that Chmel, who had initiated a broad program of editing for his own commission, feared the competing enterprise of Palacký and a division of financial and other means.³³ That, indeed, was the case. But the basic reason for his negativism lay deeper, and Chmel revealed it quite frankly in his letter: it was his conviction that the primary task of the academy was the cultivation of "patriotic history" and supplementing it with the necessary sources. In a rather direct manner, he reminded Palacký: "Our class has made the special cultivation of patriotic history the subject of its attention from the very beginning, even before the solemn opening of the academy, and it has given and dedicated important means and resources to it. You, honourable friend and colleague, appear not to have agreed to this direction of scientific work from the beginning. . . ."³⁴ By "patriotic history" Chmel meant the history of the different crownlands of the Habsburg Monarchy, not only their union in the hands of the dynasty, as it had been understood before. He demanded, in addition to the presentation of the "political" and "exterior changes", the investigation of the "inner life of the nations and peoples, their customs, habits, opinions, and prejudices."³⁵ At the time, this was a rather progressive idea, and one that had to appeal to Palacký, too. But Palacký wanted to leave the history of the various countries to the historical and museum societies there, whereas the work of the academy had to aim at something "more extraordinary", at a more comprehensive variety of themes. One must mention here that historical science was more advanced in Bohemia and Moravia—mostly because of Palacký's initiatives—than in the other lands of the monarchy, as Chmel specifically emphasizes.³⁶

Palacký's view here appears to be inconsistent with his criticism of the draft of the rules of procedure, concerning the sphere of operation of the philosophical-historical class.³⁷ But it is quite clear that to the great Czech historian, who agreed with the idea of the Austrian Imperial State and the Great-Austrian idea in general, "patriotic history" in the manner prescribed by the state (and which led also to the foundation of the Institut

für österreichische Geschichtsforschung in 1854³⁸) had nothing in common with the history of the country he considered his own fatherland, namely the lands of the Bohemian crown. To this kind of history, the conciliar movement of the fifteenth century with its national and democratic tendencies, appearing in Europe for the first time, had a much greater relevance. In his evaluation of the proposal for the edition of the council's documents, Palacký explained why the subject fascinated him: It is the "reformation of the church in head and members" with the "analogous political efforts, so that these councils as a kind of areopagus of peoples are not without importance for the development of the states' system in Europe as well."³⁹

In addition, it was certainly the profound personal differences between Chmel and Palacký which made it impossible for both of them to develop more intimate cooperation in the work of the academy, although there were the best intentions on both sides. The active politician and ardent nationalist Palacký necessarily had a different attitude toward the materials of the past than Chmel, the cool type of scholar who only "lived for the past" (according to his own words) and for whom "the present . . . is only interesting so far" as it "happens to invite comparisons with the past."⁴⁰ Chmel's share in the editing of the council's documents was therefore limited to some occasional work.⁴¹ The main work was done by Palacký and Birk. On the other hand, there was never any real co-operation on the part of the Czech historian as far as the work of the Historical Commission was concerned, although Chmel made urgent appeals to Palacký and Šafařík,⁴² appeals which were meant seriously and not merely to dissuade Palacký from his intention of founding a committee of his own.

The work on the *Monumenta conciliorum generalium saeculi XV*, which started with the sources on the Council of Basel on Palacký's advice, advanced rather slowly during the first years. Palacký had hoped to be able to publish the first volume in 1851, but that was out of the question. Even three years later we find Palacký busy collecting material during a journey to Paris.⁴³ The reason for the slow progress was primarily the size of the project, which Palacký himself could not estimate correctly at the beginning. Another likely reason was the limited financial means available. In the annual reports of the commission to the philosophical-historical class of the academy, there is the almost stereotyped, repeated complaint that it could not manage to make ends meet with the money provided.⁴⁴ But in 1857 the time came when the first volume of the *Monumenta conciliorum generalium saeculi XV* was published, with the two main authors, Palacký and Birk, writing the preface together.

NOTES

1. Richard Meister, *Geschichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, 1847-1947* (Wien, 1947), p. 12ff.

2. Ibid., p. 17ff.

3. Ibid., p. 31. Text: *Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv Wien* (Henceforth HHStA), *Minister-Kolowrat-Akten* (Henceforth MKA) 1847, No. 988, Appendix V.

4. Meister, p. 30.

5. Certainly the idea of Bartholomaeus Kopitar, who had wanted to found an Academy of Arts and Sciences of the Slavonic peoples four decades earlier, had no chance of realization in the middle of the century. See Eduard Winter, *Fruhliberalismus in der Donaumonarchie* (Berlin, 1968), p. 47.

6. Meister, p. 31.

7. HHStA, MKA 1847, No. 998, Appendix V. A "Pro memoria" added to the same act may be attributed to Kolowrat, too. There it says: "If the outlining of the statutes of an Imperial Academy of Arts and Sciences in Vienna is assigned to a committee of scientific men capable of doing so, . . . this committee must be informed of the will of the government concerning three items, namely: . . . 2) the limitation of the Viennese Academy to the capital and the countries of German language, without expansion to Bohemia, Hungary, Venice, and Milan; . . ."

8. Ibid., Appendix VI.

9. *Almanach der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften für das Jahr 1851* (Vienna, n.d.), p. 4. See also Meister, p. 44.

10. *Almanach 1851*, pp. 6 and 4.

11. Meister, p. 44f.

12. In the report of the presidency of the United Court Chancery (*Vereinigte Hofkanzlei*) of 24 September 1846 (HHStA, MKA 1846, No. 1126/1033), the emperor is advised, given the size and variety of the tasks of the planned academy and the rather advanced age of some of the 24 full members from Vienna, to add some scholars from the provinces as full members. But one could not count on an actual profit for the academy by doing so "except [for] some celebrities of Bohemia (Palacký, Šafařík and Rettenbacher) and the literary reputation of a small number of Italian scholars." This unfavorable opinion of the scientists outside of Vienna was certainly inspired by an obvious effort to keep the circle of full members from the provinces as small as possible, as the following passage shows: "From this the conclusion is derived and presented for His Majesty's judgment that, if it is His Majesty's purpose to appoint men from other parts of the monarchy as full members at the first nomination to the academy, *this should at least be done within strict limits*, though it cannot be denied that this limitation itself, if not justified by principle, will offer a new motive for national rivalries and feelings of presumed neglect." Joseph Rettenbacher, proposed for admission besides Palacký and Šafařík, was a professor of chemistry at Prague University. He was actually nominated as a full member. The other three of the total of six first full members from the Bohemian lands were: the meteorologist Karl Kreil, director of the observatory in Prague; the mineralogist Paul Partsch; and the latter's colleague, Franz Zippe, a professor at the technical college in Prague. (Meister, p. 44f.)

13. When Palacký travelled to Vienna at the end of May, 1847, he happened to meet the archduke at the station in Prague and was invited to travel a part of the

distance together with him in his compartment. (See Palacký's diary of his travel to Vienna [May/June 1847] in the Literary Archives, Prague. There is a copy in the Archives of the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Vienna). In 1846, Palacký had interceded with the archduke in favor of his friend, Šafařík, and had (in vain) asked for the establishment of a chair of Slavonic philology at the University of Prague, which was to be given to Šafařík. (František Palacký, *Spisy drobné*, ed. Bohuš Rieger, Leander Cech, and V.J. Nováček, III [Prague, 1900], p. 519 f.)

14. HHStA, MKA 1846, No. 1126, with Appendix I. See Meister, p. 42. Ultimately, Rusegger became only a corresponding member.

15. As Hammer-Purgstall writes in his memoirs, Palacký had come from Prague to Vienna after having heard that the statutes of the academy had been published and that the academy was not limited to Vienna alone, but that it included all lands. He wanted to confer with those scientists and upholders of culture there who had spoken in favor of the foundation of the academy, most of all Hammer-Purgstall. At Palacký's suggestion, Hammer-Purgstall invited some personalities of this circle to a conference in his home on May 30. Obviously, they wanted to find appropriate measures to prevent the academy from coming too much under the influence of the court and becoming an instrument to control scientific life in the whole monarchy. This plan awakened Metternich's suspicions and had to be cancelled. See Josef Freiherr v. Hammer-Purgstall, *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben, 1774-1852*, in *Fontes rerum Austriacarum*, II, 70, (Vienna and Leipzig, 1940), p. 371 f.

16. Palacký, "Diary of Travel to Vienna."

17. Meister, p. 46.

18. Palacký, "Diary of Travel to Vienna."

19. Meister, p. 49.

20. The opinion of the non-resident members of the academy was to be expressed by the middle of September and not by October 1, as Meister says. See the letter of the first president of the academy, Hammer-Purgstall, of 28 July 1847, in which he orders the full members of the academy not living in Vienna to give their opinion of the draft of the rules being sent to them (Archives of the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna).

21. The draft of the rules differentiated class sessions (*Klassensitzungen*), which were to be reserved for the execution of "scientific affairs" (*wissenschaftliche Geschäfte*) and take place once a week, and general conferences (*allgemeine Versammlungen*) for other agenda, i.e., for administrative and business affairs, which were to be summoned by the president, if necessary. Moreover, there was to be an annual "festive session" (*feierliche Sitzung*) on May 30, the foundation day of the academy, to which all full members of the academy, including the ones living in Vienna, were to be summoned. (Draft of the rules, paragraphs 2 and 8, in the Archives of the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.) For the situation of the full members of the academy outside of Vienna there was another important paragraph of the rules, paragraph 1b, stating: "As the non-resident full members are summoned to Vienna on May 30, those subjects are to be reserved for the class sessions immediately before that day for which the participation of those members is made necessary by the rules of procedure or other reasons. Besides this, all or only some

individual members of a class may be invited, on demand of the class itself, by the president of the academy to come to Vienna as often as necessary. On the whole the class will maintain—by means of its secretary—a constant relationship with its members living in the provinces and ask their advice whenever necessary, for which the appropriate arrangements are to be made in the sessions." Palacký's criticism was stimulated by the words "those subjects . . . for which the participation of those members is made necessary by the rules of procedure or other reasons." He thought: "That is too ambiguous. What kind of rules of procedure are meant, since the draft being discussed does not say anything, or at least nothing clear and precise about them? The meaning of the words seems to be this, that they *reserve the right to require the participation of the non-resident members in every individual case . . . or not. The whole paragraph might therefore provoke and sanction an extreme arbitrariness*; but this would be the opposite of an orderly and legal situation." (Archiv der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, Palacký's opinion about the draft of the standing orders of the academy, p. 6.) Palacký's opinion concerning paragraph 19 of the draft (Opinion, p. 6) is aimed at the same point and so is item 5 of his opinion, where he says that he misses "a more precise definition of the . . . academic sessions and conferences of three kinds, namely a) the class sessions, b) the plenary sessions, and c) the festive sessions. Obviously, the class sessions as well as the plenary sessions should be divided into ordinary ones, for the scientists living in Vienna, and extraordinary ones, to which scholars living outside of Vienna should be called, too; such a thing is hinted at in paragraphs 16 and 19 of the draft, but too ambiguously. In what cases and under what circumstances are, for example, the resolutions of an ordinary class session binding on the whole academy, and when do they need the special consent of the plenary session?" (Opinion, p. 3, passage 5). At the end of his Opinion, Palacký mentions again the "extraordinary plenary sessions" proposed by himself, "to which . . . the whole body of the academy should be summoned." These should take place twice a year in May and November and should be reserved for the following subjects: a) all kinds of elections, namely of the presidency of the academy and of the full, corresponding, and honorary members; b) the examination of the annual estimate of costs and the closing of accounts; c) the cases dealt with in paragraphs 34, 48, and 49, i.e., decisions about publishing works outside the publication series of the academy, the election of a new president after the expiration of the term of office of the former one, and the election or re-election of the two secretaries after the expiration of their terms in office.

22. Palacký explains this in his criticism concerning paragraph 45 of the rules as follows: "The question of elections is of vital importance for the academy; there have to be certain measures to make sure that no protective or personal relations gain importance, that all interests of the academy find appropriate representation, and that possible factious minorities not take power by surprise." (Opinion, p. 8.) See also passages 4 and 6 of the Opinion, as well as Palacký's criticism of paragraph 49 of the draft. (Opinion, pp. 2f. and 9.)

23. Passages 6, 7, 8, and 10 of the Opinion, p. 3 f.) and criticisms of paragraphs 2, 7, 11b, 13, 14, and 24 of the draft (Opinion, pp. 4 f. and 7.)

24. On the whole Palacký's criticisms and proposals for changes were hardly given any consideration, except for two items where his opinions did assert themselves. The first one deals with the number of corresponding members still to be elected by the full members of the academy. There Palacký had spoken in favor of

taking them not only from individual countries but also from the capital, Vienna; in this case, the original number of 24 domestic corresponding members would be too small. In the final version of the rules of procedure, it became 36. (See the draft of the rules, paragraph 43; Palacký's Opinion, pp. 7f.: and the final version of the rules, paragraph 44, in *Almanach 1851*, p. 27.) A second item was sharply criticized by Palacký and in the end does not appear in the final version of the rules. The question concerned paragraph 55 of the draft, which stated that "the full members present in Vienna . . . can claim a stipend of 5 florins for every academic session in which they take part." Palacký speaks against this regulation (in his opinion a waste of precious money) with a certain sharpness, indicating his true concern for matters of science but also his resentment at the fact that this compensation would have generally favored the Viennese members, who could take part in all sessions. The non-resident members, according to paragraph 56 of the draft (also later cancelled) were to be restricted to a remuneration of their travelling expenses and *daily wages* of 5 florins for every day spent in the capital in the interest of the academy. In his opinion he points out: "If the mere 'sitting' will bear such fruit, will there be even higher prices for the 'moving' and the 'progressing', or none at all? The work of the commissions is not granted any stipends in the draft, and yet it will take much more intelligence and time than the mere 'taking part in the sessions'. The undersigned consents to this paragraph only on the condition that scientifically productive work and commission affairs be paid for more suitably. It would be bad . . . if one had to tie every academic action to a certain stipend." (Opinion, p. 9 f.) It is quite evident how Palacký—here and elsewhere in his opinion—stresses the position of the commissions, still to be formed within the scope of the academy and only briefly dealt with in the draft of the rules of procedure as a possibility. Possibly he already carried the idea in his mind to found a special commission for the publication of the documents of the councils of the fifteenth century.

25. This is also connected with Palacký's criticism expressed in item 9 of his Opinion, concerning the fact that the draft of the rules did not include any details about the "cultivation of native languages", which was intended in paragraph 2 of the statutes. (This paragraph said: "The competence of this academy is to include: a) the mathematical and physical sciences, b) history, language and archeology (the original text says *Altertumskunde*) to the most extensive degree, including the cultivation of native languages. . . ." (*Almanach 1851*, p. 4). Palacký thought that "just there a regulation [would be] most necessary to guard against later complaints and troubles" and suggested that the academy cultivate permanent cooperation with the learned societies in Pest, Prague, Cracow, Milan, etc., concerning this matter. That Palacký proposed such an idea is not surprising, nor that Vienna ignored it.

26. See Hammer-Purgstall, *Erinnerungen, Fontes rer. Austr.*, II, 70, p. 362 ff.

27. Another possibility for the controlled cultivation of the science of history was an *Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*. See text, below.

28. Meister, p. 87.

29. Ibid., p. 69. On Chmel, see Alphons Lhotsky, "Joseph Chmel zum hundertsten Geburtstag," *Anzeiger der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. K.L.* 95 (1958), pp. 323-347.

30. Palacký's opinion of 30 December 1849, Archives of the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, with accompanying letter of 31 December 1849.

31. *Stitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist.* Kl. 4 (1850), p. 55 ff.

32. *Ibid.*, pp. 60, and 56.

33. Lhotsky, "Joseph Chmel", *Anzeiger der Akademie d. Wissenschaften* 95, p. 336.

34. *Sitzungsberichte* 4, p. 56.—"I believe that an Austrian academy in Vienna . . . should be directed toward patriotic [goals] above all, and for two reasons: first, because the patriotic deserves preference in itself, and second, because it needs special cultivation." (*Ibid.*, p. 57.) "I let any unprejudiced person judge how one can serve science better, whether by forming such an apparatus for the exact knowledge of our native soil, our native languages, our native history, and our literatures, or by any other scientific undertaking; I think . . . the former could easily stand up to any other undertaking." (*Ibid.*, p. 57 f.)

35. Quotation from Lhotsky, "Joseph Chmel", *loc. cit.*, p. 340. In the class session of 9 January 1850, Chmel explained: "The Austrian historiographer shall . . . describe the fates of the Austrian peoples, their independence, their mutual influences, their combats and reunions, their union and community." [This task] takes it for granted that one knows all of the special histories profoundly and most extensively, that one has reached a certain knowledge of the points of view, efforts, and desires of the various nationalities, that one does not take into account only political history, which mostly considers external events, but has also studied the history of the religion, civilization, and especially the literature and arts of the various parts of the Austrian Imperial State." (*Sitzungsberichte* 4, p. 30.)

36. *Sitzungsberichte* 4, pp. 56 f., and 58 f.

37. See above.

38. See Alphons Lhotsky, *Geschichte des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 1854-1954*, in *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungs-Band* 17 (Graz-Höfn, 1954), pp. 4 ff.

39. Palacký's Opinion of 30 December 1849, Archives of the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.

40. *Stitzungsberichte* 4, p. 56. See also Lhotsky, "Joseph Chmel", *loc. cit.*, p. 335.

41. As he himself admitted frankly, He did not want to stray from his "main purpose", the edition of the *Monumenta Habsburgica*, and so he could note material relevant to the conciliar documents only incidentally, e.g., during a trip through the archives of southern Germany and Switzerland in 1850. (*Sitzungsberichte* 6, p. 44). Also, Chmel's opinion about the principles to follow in editing the conciliar documents was not identical with that of Palacký. (See *Ibid.*, p. 45, and Palacký's principles in the quoted Opinion.)

42. In the class session of 12 December 1849, Chmel had first given a survey of the documentary and narrative sources published in the first four volumes of Palacký's *Archiv český* and then asked the assembled class, "in the interest of all non-Czech historians to demand formally of the editor of this precious source, Mister Palacký, our honourable member, that he have made an authentic translation of the most interesting and important letters, documents, and acts of this *Archiv* under his supervision and verification." This translation could then be published either in the *Archiv zur Kunde österreichischer Geschichtsquellen*, edited by the Historical Commission, or as a publication of its own in Latin, to be accessible to all nations, not only the German one. *Sitzungsberichte* 3, pp. 414-423. In the same session, Chmel proposed

that the philosophical-historical class should "formally demand of the excellent Slavonic philologist and historian Šafárik and Palacký to join the Historical Commission of our Imperial Academy as members. They should permit that the other members of the Historical Commission consult them in all literary questions concerning *Slavica*, and they should also suggest and name all ways and means to promote the history of the Slavs." (Ibid., p. 423.) Chmel repeated the two requests in the same letter to Palacký in which he spoke in a very reserved way about Palacký's plan to edit the conciliar documents. (Ibid., p. 61 ff.)

43. *Sitzungsberichte* 11 (1854), pp. 277 ff.

44. *Sitzungsberichte* 12 (1854), pp. 688 f.; 16 (1855), p. 306; 20 (1856), p. 459.

Stellungnahme zur
Geschäftsordnung
und Kopie des
Wiener Tagebuchs

in:

Personalakt Palcky (Ph.K1.)