

SCIENCE AND EMPIRE IN EASTERN EUROPE

Imperial Russia and the Habsburg Monarchy in the 19th Century

Bad Wiesseer Tagungen
des
Collegium Carolinum

Band 38

Herausgegeben vom
Vorstand des Collegium Carolinum
Forschungsinstitut für die Geschichte Tschechiens
und der Slowakei

Science and Empire in Eastern Europe

Imperial Russia and the Habsburg Monarchy
in the 19th Century

Proceedings of the Annual Conference
of Collegium Carolinum
Bad Wiessee, 5–8 November 2015

Edited by
Jan Arend

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

ISBN 978-3-525-31074-8

© 2020 Collegium Carolinum, 81669 München
(www.collegium-carolinum.de)

Verlag: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
(www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com)

Das Werk einschließlich aller Abbildungen ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Collegium Carolinum unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Bearbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the Collegium Carolinum. Violations of the above may result in criminal prosecution or civil damage awards.

Für Form und Inhalt trägt der/die jeweilige Verfasser/in die Verantwortung.

Redaktion: Collegium Carolinum, München

Satz: Collegium Carolinum, München

Layout des Einbands: SchwabScantechnik, Göttingen (www.schwabscantechnik.de)

Druck und Einband: Verlagsdruckerei Michael Laßleben, Kallmünz
(www.oberpfalzverlag-lassleben.de)

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem und chlorfrei gebleichtem Papier.

CONTENTS

<i>Jan Arend: Science and Empire in the European Continental Empires: An Introduction</i>	1
I. Learned Societies and Academies	
<i>Martin Franc: An Academy of Sciences in Prague?: Purkyně's Akademia and Josef Hlávka's Emperor Franz Josef Czech Academy for Sciences, Literature, and Arts</i>	23
<i>Maciej Janowski: General Scientific Associations in Partitioned Poland: Socializing the Intelligentsia, Preserving the Nation, and Cultivating the Sciences</i>	43
II. Universities	
<i>Jan Surman: Habsburg Higher Education in the Eyes of Foreigners: Ludwik Tęgoborski and William Wilde</i>	55
<i>Mark Hengerer/Sabrina Rospert: Did the Universities of the Late Habsburg Monarchy Impart "Imperial Knowledge"?: A Survey of the Course Catalogues of the Universities of Budapest and Vienna (Summer Semesters 1866, 1886, 1906)</i>	77
<i>Andrej Andreev: Between Science and Empire: Superintendents in Russian Universities during the First Half of the Nineteenth Century</i>	97
III. Science on the Imperial Periphery	
<i>Daniel Baric: Classical Archeology and Science Policy in Habsburg Bosnia and Herzegovina: Carl Patsch in Sarajevo, 1891–1918</i>	119
<i>Matthias Golbeck: Letters from the Edge of Empire: Self-Descriptions of the Imperial Official and Scientific Amateur N. F. Petrovskii from Turkestan, 1870–1895</i>	135

IV. Oriental Studies

- Johannes Feichtinger*: “Orientalistik” in the Habsburg Monarchy
between Imperial Pragmatism and “Pure” Scholarship 151
- Arpine Maniero*: Oriental Studies in the Russian Empire in the
Context of Imperial Politics and Regional Discourse 169

V. Political Geography and “Landeskunde”

- Borbála Zsuzsanna Török*: Exploring the k. u. k. Province:
“Landeskunde” and “Honismeret” in Nineteenth-Century
Transylvania 187
- Peter Haslinger*: National Geopolitics in Habsburg Central Europe:
Imperial and Post-imperial Perspectives on Hungary and Poland,
1890–1930 205
- Guido Hausmann*: Between Complicity in Imperial Politics and
Exclusion: Politico-Geographical Sciences in the Tsarist Empire
and the Early Soviet Union 227

VI. Criminology

- Volker Zimmermann*: Criminology and Imperial Diversity: The
German Empire, the Habsburg Monarchy, and Tsarist Russia in
Comparison 251

VII. The Study of Natural Resources

- Marianne Klemun*: Interwoven Functionalities between Empire and
Science in the Habsburg Monarchy: A Comparison of
Nineteenth-Century Geology and Botany 275
- Jan Arend*: From Tsarism to Nazism: Evolution and Transfer of
Agro-Colonial Knowledge 289
- David Moon*: Scientific Innovation in the Russian Empire: The Case
of Genetic Soil Science 305

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms 321

Index of Personal Names 323

Contributors 333

Mark Hengerer/Sabrina Rospert

DID THE UNIVERSITIES OF THE LATE HABSBURG MONARCHY IMPART “IMPERIAL KNOWLEDGE”?

A Survey of the Course Catalogues of the Universities of Budapest
and Vienna (Summer Semesters 1866, 1886, 1906)*

Introduction

The relationship between empire and science in the nineteenth century has hitherto been approached primarily from the perspective of colonial empires with overseas territories, with variegated research taking place, especially under the influence of postcolonialism.¹ Terms like “imperial knowledge and colonial violence” (Heé),² “imperial knowledge” (Thompson),³ or “colonial

* We cordially thank Thomas Winkelbauer for giving us access to his as yet unpublished manuscript “Geschichte des Faches Geschichte an der Universität Wien: Von den Anfängen bis 1875.” The data on which this analysis is based were deposited at the University Library of Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5282/ubm/data.131>.

¹ On the relationship between empire and knowledge in the nineteenth century, cf. David Amigoni, *Colonies, Cults and Evolution: Literature, Science and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Catherine Delmas, *Science and Empire in the Nineteenth Century: A Journey of Imperial Conquest and Scientific Progress* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publ., 2010); there is a noticeable emphasis on Great Britain and its overseas colonies in North America and India, especially in Anglo-American research. Cf. Raymond Phineas Stearns, *Science in the British Colonies of America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970); Zaheer Baber, *The Science of Empire: Scientific Knowledge, Civilization, and Colonial Rule in India* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996); Christopher Bayly, *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780–1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Dhruv Raina and S. Irfan Habib, *Domesticating Modern Science: A Social History of Science and Culture in Colonial India* (New Delhi: Tulika Books, 2004); Brett M. Bennett, *Science and Empire: Knowledge and Networks of Science across the British Empire, 1800–1970* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). For the early modern period, see Arndt Brendecke, *Imperium und Empirie: Funktionen des Wissens in der spanischen Kolonialherrschaft* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2009).

² Nadin Heé, *Imperiales Wissen und koloniale Gewalt: Japans Herrschaft in Taiwan 1895–1945* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2012).

³ Ewa M. Thompson, *Imperial Knowledge: Russian Literature and Colonialism* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2000).

knowledge” (M. Bayly)⁴ can be found in the titles of corresponding studies. The term “imperial knowledge” itself is not actually defined even by Heé, however—only “scientific colonialism” is defined, namely as a “specific form of colonial policy that consists in facilitating the exertion of rule through the production of knowledge on the annexed territory and its population.” The conceptual section on “imperial knowledge” forgoes a definition, although it does point to the undoubtedly important aspects of the production, circulation, and categorization of knowledge.⁵

The term “scientific colonialism” can hardly be applied to the late Habsburg Monarchy, however, for considering its form and development, one cannot speak of annexation or of colonies in the strict sense with regard to most of its territories.⁶ With a view to the model of education,⁷ it is likewise debatable to what degree the design of academia and the concept of rule were interlaced at all.

Against this background, it is understandable that the problem of the connection between knowledge and empire has primarily been approached by asking about the role of the educational system for both the stability and instability of the empire of the Habsburgs. Current research on this problem points out certain ambivalences: Judson, for example, emphasizes that the politicization of cultural conflicts surrounding the educational reforms during the second half of the nineteenth century threatened the unity of the Habsburg Monarchy.⁸ This applies in particular to the language policy featuring targeted assistance for minorities to support imperial unity, which collided with the instrumentalization

⁴ Martin J. Bayly, *Taming the Imperial Imagination: Colonial Knowledge, International Relations, and the Anglo-Afghan Encounter, 1808–1878* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016). See also Ulrike Hillemann, *Asian Empire and British Knowledge: China and the Networks of British Imperial Expansion* (Houndmills, NY: Palgrave, 2009).

⁵ Heé, *Imperiales Wissen*, 7 and 14–17.

⁶ Although research has frequently discussed the Habsburg Monarchy as a colonial power, this assessment hardly seems tenable; cf. e.g., Johannes Feichtinger, Ursula Prutsch, and Moritz Csáky, eds., *Habsburg postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2003). In the peripheral territories of Austria-Hungary in particular, e.g., Dalmatia, Bohemia, or Galicia, the Habsburgs found it difficult to exert administrative power and enforce their rule against the burgeoning nationalistic currents; cf. Pieter M. Judson, “L’Autriche-Hongrie était-elle un empire?,” *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 63, no. 3 (2008): 564 and 589; Pieter M. Judson, *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 16–18; István Deák, “Comments,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 3 (1967), 1.

⁷ On the model of education and its encyclopaedic redefinition in nineteenth-century Austria, see Alois Brusatti, Herbert Matis, and Karl Bachinger, *Betrachtungen zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1979), 69.

⁸ Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 292–299. On the system of education, see the seminal work of Helmut Engelbrecht, *Erziehung und Unterricht im Bild: Zur Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens* (Vienna: ÖBV Pädagogischer Verlag, 1995).

of languages as carriers of new, nationalistically indoctrinated generations.⁹ Similarly ambivalent was the founding of various universities: the establishment of the German-language University of Chernivtsi in 1875, for instance, frustrated those who were hoping for an Italian-language university in Trieste.¹⁰ The separation of the German-language University of Prague into a German and a Czech university in 1882 resolved an existing conflict, but simultaneously buried all hope for the successful coexistence of the two languages.¹¹ What was more, the establishment of additional universities reduced the integrative influence of the University of Vienna: from the 1880s onwards, the number of “Austrians” studying at the University of Vienna grew in comparison to that of students from other parts of the monarchy. The previously higher degree of cohesion had strengthened nationalisms, especially during the 1870s, however.¹² The situation in regard to academic subjects and publications was similarly equivocal: while the Vienna Institute for Slavic Studies founded in 1849 played a key scientific role in the Habsburg Monarchy (under the eschewal of “national idealism”) and was considered a symbol of the recognition of the “diversity of nations and languages of the monarchy,” its graduates often operated in the context of a specifically Slavic nationalism.¹³ And the *Kronprinzenwerk*—an attempt at an encyclopaedic presentation of the flora, fauna, geology, and ethnography of every individual crown land with the purpose of displaying the Habsburg Monarchy

⁹ In the Hungarian part of the empire in particular, the Hungarian language was viewed as a link between the different nations; within the framework of “Magyarization,” the Hungarians attempted to take away the non-Hungarian nations’ distinct languages and culture and instead integrate them into the Hungarian nation, thereby contributing to its growth; cf. Judson, *Habsburg Empire*, 302–309.

¹⁰ During the 1870s, demands for an own university or at least for a faculty in the corresponding language were voiced not only in the Italian territories but also by Czechs; guided by its belief in the principal superiority of the German language and culture, the government instead decided to establish a German-language university in one of the remotest areas of the Habsburg Monarchy. Chernivtsi, the capital of Bukovina, boasted only 25,000 inhabitants, who were mostly illiterate and spoke a mixture of Ruthenian, Romanian, Yiddish, German, and Polish; cf. Judson, *Habsburg Empire*, 321–327.

¹¹ Hans Lemberg, “Universitäten in nationaler Konkurrenz: Zur Geschichte der Prager Universitäten im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert,” in *Universitäten in nationaler Konkurrenz: Zur Geschichte der Prager Universitäten im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Hans Lemberg (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003), 28.

¹² Helmut Engelbrecht, *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens: Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs*, Band 4, *Von 1848 bis zum Ende der Monarchie* (Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1986), 242 and 246.

¹³ Cf. Rudolf Jagoditsch, “Slavistik an der Universität Wien,” in *Studien zur Geschichte der Universität Wien*, Band 3 (Vienna: Böhlau, 1965), 39–43. Generations of young “Slavs” educated at the Institute for Slavic Studies, which was considered the key centre for the study of Slavic languages and culture, went on to awaken the proclivity for their “national” language and history in their respective areas of origin; in this way, the Viennese Slavists contributed to the national and cultural self-image of the thus-constructed “Slavic nations” within the Danube Monarchy.

and its diversity in an agreeable light—was eventually published only (or at least?) in German and Hungarian.¹⁴

This emphasis on the ambivalent function of the educational system for the stability of the Habsburg Monarchy naturally suggests narrowing down the area of enquiry and investigating a smaller section of the state system of knowledge production, circulation and categorization. Inspiration for such research may be taken from Thomas Winkelbauer, whose study on the history of the subject of history at the University of Vienna highlighted the formative influence of the division of world history into the four so-called “world monarchies” and the considerable importance of empires for the research of Viennese historians during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.¹⁵

Our own approach in this context is not one of institutional history, however, but instead a semantic one: it focuses only on “the teaching” offered by the university as such. The concrete object of investigation are the courses listed in the course catalogues of the universities in the two most important cities of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Vienna and Budapest. While academic teaching can be assigned to the general realm of production, circulation, and categorization of knowledge, almost everything else to do with it is rather unclear: its reception by the students, the actual contents and attendance at the lectures, possible cancellations or belated additions of courses, accompanying reading, the “diversity of voices” in courses and among their recipients, etc. Irrespective of these aspects, however, the question of whether or to what extent university courses (or more precisely, their titles) can be linked to “imperial knowledge” may be posed. Since this question can only be answered with a view to the semantics of course titles, we assigned the attribute “imperial” to a course if

1. the word “Imperium” or “Reich” was used in the title,¹⁶ and/or
2. the subject of the course was a specific empire or its law, history, or culture and/or
3. the subject of the course was a language or languages assignable to an empire, to countries with “imperial” history, or to the contemporary present, and/or

¹⁴ The *Kronprinzenwerk*, a twenty-four-volume encyclopaedia financed with state subsidies, can be viewed as an attempt to emphasize the geographic and cultural diversity of the monarchy (cf. Judson, *Habsburg Empire*, 327–328).

¹⁵ Cf. Thomas Winkelbauer, *Das Fach Geschichte an der Universität Wien: Von den Anfängen um 1500 bis etwa 1975* (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2018). On historical science at the University of Graz, see Alois Kernbauer, “Grazer Geschichtsforschung von europäischem Rang,” in *Kunst- und Geisteswissenschaften aus Graz: Werk und Wirken überregional bedeutsamer Künstler und Gelehrter. Vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zur Jahrhundertwende*, ed. Karl Acham (Vienna: Böhlau, 2009), 559–576.

¹⁶ Country names alone were not classified as “imperial” in our analysis.

4. the course imparted “cohesion knowledge,” which is defined as knowledge related to the cohesion between parts of empires.¹⁷

It is quite obvious and a result of the exploratory character of our investigation that we conceded a certain amount of analytic potential by combining semantic (1, 2) with analytic (3, 4) terminology at the level of our indicators. What is more, the binary code of “imperial” vs. “not imperial” frequently seemed too coarse a framework for the classification of university courses. We therefore also decided to evaluate the “degree of imperialism” and thus differentiate between “latently imperial” and “fully imperial” courses: courses bearing the name of a concrete empire or the term “Reich” or similar words in their title were considered “fully imperial,” while those whose titles merely contained a certain reference to a specific empire were considered “latently imperial.” In the summer semester 1906, for example, a course on Austrian History was offered at the University of Vienna; since “Austrian” refers (only) to a part of the Habsburg Empire, we classified this title as “latently imperial.” The course on Austrian Imperial History,¹⁸ on the other hand, was classified as “fully imperial.” We also treated the attribute “German” in political contexts accordingly against the background of the making of the German Empire. Wherever no explicit differentiation is made between “latent” and “full” in the following, the text refers to the sum total of both types.

In order to assess developments across different political circumstances, we chose to analyse course catalogues for the years 1866, 1886, and 1906, which represent the periods before and after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise, the phase of high imperialism, and the crisis-laden run-up to the First World War; the selection of the catalogues of the Universities of Vienna and Budapest allows a comparison between institutions that the working hypothesis assumes were under the influence of differing political preferences—namely for preservation of the empire in Vienna and for imperial nationalization (“Magyarization”) in Budapest respectively.¹⁹

¹⁷ In this case, delimitation problems to do with country names were unavoidable. By way of example, let us consider the philosophical faculty of the University of Vienna: the course on Serbo-Croatian offered in all three semesters surveyed was classified as cohesion knowledge; within the Dual Monarchy, Serbo-Croatian was among the minority languages, and its development and spread as standard language for various small nations had been intensively promoted by the Habsburgs since the second half of the nineteenth century. Cf. Robert Greenberg, *Language and Identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and Its Disintegration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 18–24.

¹⁸ This course was offered by the Faculty of Philosophy in 1906.

¹⁹ The course catalogues on which the quantitative content analyses are based are *Öffentliche Vorlesungen an der k. k. Universität zu Wien im Sommer-Semester 1866*; *Öffentliche Vorlesungen an der k. k. Universität zu Wien im Sommer-Semester 1886*; and *Öffentliche Vorlesungen an der k. k. Universität zu Wien im Sommer-Semester 1906* for the University of Vienna. For the University of Budapest, the following three course catalogues were analysed *Magyar Királyi Tudomány-Egyetem Tanrende: Az MDCCCLXV–VI. Tanév. Nyáry szakára*;

Both universities had four faculties at the time: in addition to the departments of theology, medicine, and law, each included a humanities or philosophical faculty that was also home to disciplines such as mathematics, geology, and geography. Following a suggestion voiced during the discussion of this essay, we also included an analysis of the professional status of lecturers and the duration of the courses offered at the University of Vienna.²⁰ Percentages without decimal places are generally rounded.

Basic Information

Let us first examine the sheer numbers of university courses offered during the three summer semesters surveyed, as distributed across the respective four faculties.

Table 1: Number of courses offered in Vienna and Budapest (by faculty and semester)

Faculty	Vienna				Budapest			
	1866	1886	1906	Total	1866	1886	1906	Total
Theology	19	24	33	76	14	21	16	51
Law	40	66	75	181	21	56	70	147
Medicine	96	194	368	658	31	92	128	251
Philosophy	111	210	303	624	61	147	204	412
Total	266	494	779	1539	127	316	418	861

We immediately see a considerable increase—most noticeably between 1866 and 1886—in the number of courses offered in Vienna as well as in Budapest. With the exception of the Faculty of Theology in Budapest, which reduced its teaching after 1886, but still offered more courses than in 1866, there is a steady increase across all faculties. In both Vienna and Budapest, the medical and philosophical faculties offered significantly more courses than the theological and juridical faculties.

Magyar Királyi Tudomány-Egyetem Tanrende: Az MDCCCLXXXV-VI. Tanév. Nyáry szakára; and Magyar Királyi Tudomány-Egyetem Tanrende: Az MDCCCCV-MDCCCVI. Tanév. Második Felére. During the three surveyed summer semesters, 1,539 courses were held at the University of Vienna and 861 at the University of Budapest. Not included in our analysis are the so-called *Fertigkeiten* (Proficiencies), which offered students the possibility of acquiring additional skills like fencing, singing, or stenography in addition to their regular curricula.

²⁰ Such an analysis was unfortunately not possible for the University of Budapest: while the course catalogues included the name of the person giving each course, they did not include the respective occupational status.

Determination of the percentages of courses classified as “imperial” (including “latently imperial”) results in the following table:

Table 2: Courses identified as “imperial” (including “latently imperial” courses)

Faculty	Vienna				Budapest			
	1866	1886	1906	Total	1866	1886	1906	Total
Theology	1/19 5%	2/24 8%	2/33 6%	5/76 7%	2/14 14%	3/21 14%	4/16 25%	9/51 18%
Law	25/40 63%	41/66 62%	47/75 63%	113/181 62%	7/21 33%	19/56 34%	26/70 37%	52/147 35%
Medicine	0/96 0%	0/194 0%	1/368 0.3%	1/658 0.2%	0/31 0%	1/92 1%	0/128 0%	1/251 0.4%
Philosophy	28/111 25%	61/210 29%	83/303 27%	172/624 28%	25/61 41%	60/147 41%	76/204 37%	161/412 39%
Total	54/266 20%	104/494 21%	133/779 17%	291/1539 19%	34/127 27%	83/316 26%	106/418 25%	223/861 26%

The first thing to be noted here is that the percentage of courses classified as “imperial” remains quite stable across the years surveyed. In Vienna, the share is 20 percent in 1866, 21 percent in 1886, and 17 percent in 1906; in Budapest, it is 27 percent in 1866, 26 percent in 1886, and 25 percent in 1906. With slightly greater variance, this likewise applies to the ratio between “fully imperial” and “latently imperial” courses, which is roughly 1:2 throughout.

Table 3: Proportion of “fully imperial” and “latently imperial” courses taught in Vienna and Budapest

	Vienna				Budapest			
	1866	1886	1906	Average	1866	1886	1906	Average
Fully imperial	41%	30%	41%	37%	59%	30%	31%	35%
Latently imperial	59%	70%	59%	63%	41%	70%	69%	65%

The three years selected thus indicate no significant development in terms of the frequency of “imperial” courses. Also noteworthy is the fact that the average share of courses classified as “imperial” at the University of Budapest (26 percent) is around seven percent higher than that for Vienna (19 percent). This is partly due to the far smaller offering of courses in medicine in Budapest; the medical courses are almost entirely “non-imperial” at both universities across all three years.

The distribution of the “imperial” university courses across the faculties also shows that the medical and theological departments offered few or no relevant courses and the vast majority of “imperial” courses were instead offered

at the law and philosophy departments. Taking all three years surveyed together, we arrive at values of 0.2 percent and seven percent for the Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Theology in Vienna respectively, while the value for the Faculty of Philosophy lies at 28 percent and the one for the Faculty of Law at 62 percent. The distribution in Budapest is slightly different: while the value for the medical department is similar at 0.4 percent, the 18 percent for the theological department is significantly higher than the corresponding percentage in Vienna (with the reason for this discrepancy being primarily that the Budapest theological faculty taught more languages of old empires); the values for the Budapest juridical and philosophical departments are closer together at 35 percent and 39 percent respectively. There are no noteworthy changes in the ratios at the individual faculties between the years surveyed; only the Faculty of Theology in Budapest saw an increase from 14 percent in 1866 and 1886 to 25 percent in 1906, but the absolute numbers of courses offered by this department are particularly low and the change therefore is statistically hardly significant.

Before looking more closely at the university courses classified as “imperial,” let us investigate two possible factors for the degree of “imperiality” of academic teaching: the status of the lecturers and the temporal duration of the individual courses.

Status of Lecturers

During the discussion following the lecture in Bad Wiessee on which this essay is based, we formulated the hypothesis that membership of the teaching staff in different status groups might be connected to different preferences for “imperial” topics. This hypothesis could be confirmed for Vienna; Budapest could not be investigated in this regard due to the prohibitive amount of effort involved in collecting the necessary data. Analysis of the course catalogues showed that the members of the teaching staff at the University of Vienna could be divided into eight groups: four different groups of *Professoren* (professors; the groups are *o.ö. Prof.*, *a.ö. Prof.*, *a.c.r.p.o. Prof.* and *a.c.r.p.e. Prof.*), *Doktoren* (doctors), *Privatdozenten* (private lecturers with habilitation), *Lehrer* (teachers), and finally, all other teaching staff, whose values are not taken into consideration in this study.²¹

²¹ The abbreviations *o.ö. Prof.* and *a.ö. Prof.* stand for *ordentlich-öffentlicher Professor* and *außerordentlich-öffentlicher Professor* respectively. Both titles (Amtsbezeichnungen) referred to professors who were permanently employed at the University of Vienna and thus enjoyed civil servant status. The difference between the two groups is that an *ordentlich-öffentlicher Professor* held his own chair at the university whereas an *außerordentlich-öffentlicher Professor* did not enjoy this privilege. An *a.c.r.p.o. Prof.* is essentially the same as an *o.ö. Prof.*, while the title of *a.c.r.p.e. Prof.* is equivalent to that of *a.ö. Prof.*

Collating the courses classified as “imperial” with these groups, we discovered a significantly—and surprisingly—inhomogeneous distribution. The highest percentage of “imperial” courses within a status group was offered by Lehrer (47 percent or 28 of 60 courses); the reason for this is the overrepresentation of this group in the field of philology, which dealt particularly intensively with manifestations of empires, especially with their languages.²² They are followed by the o.ö. Professoren, who offered a total of 519 courses during the three summer semesters 1866, 1886, and 1906, 24 percent of which were classified as “imperial.” In third place are the Privatdozenten with a share of “imperial” courses of 15 percent (82 of 543 courses), closely followed by the a.ö. Professoren (12 percent “imperial” courses or 36 of 295). Significantly fewer “imperial” courses were held by a.c.r.p.o. Professoren at 6 percent (2 of 31).

Closer examination of the developments within the individual status groups reveals interesting results. At the Faculty of Law, the percentage of “imperial” courses in the status group of the o.ö. Professoren increased over the years from 59 percent (1866) to 60 percent (1886) and finally to 73 percent (1906). The same applies to the Faculty of Philosophy, where the share of “imperial” courses taught by the o.ö. Professoren increased from 13 percent (1866) through 24 percent (1886) to 28 percent (1906).²³ Neither in the juridical nor in the philosophical department, however, did the percentages of “imperial” courses in the status group of the o.ö. Professoren increase significantly, nor did they exceed the average of the respective faculty. Among the a.ö. Professoren, on the other hand, the percentages declined between 1866 and 1906.²⁴ This can be interpreted as a sign that “imperial” topics were slowly shifting from the realm of the more specialized courses, which tended to be held by staff of lower statuses, into the focus of the—naturally not undivided—attention of the professors in ordinary.

Among the Privatdozenten, who offered a total of 543 university courses in the years analysed, we can see with regard to the Faculty of Law that the share of “imperial” courses in this status group across all three years (69 percent) was slightly above the faculty average of 62 percent. At the Faculty of Philosophy, the

²² The value for the Doktoren was even higher at 75 percent, but lecturers with this status only offered a total of four courses. The other extreme in this regard were the a.c.r.p.e. Professoren, who offered a total of three courses, none of which were classified as “imperial.”

²³ For the Faculty of Theology, the percentages are not very meaningful due to the low absolute numbers of courses classified as “imperial.” It can nevertheless be stated that the o.ö. Professoren at the theological faculty offered practically no “imperial” courses (6 percent or two of 36 courses across all years surveyed). The only course classified as “imperial” at the Faculty of Medicine was offered in 1906 by an a.ö. Professor.

²⁴ For the Faculty of Law, the values correspond to 50 percent (1866), 56 percent (1886), and 23 percent (1906), with a total of 35 courses; for the Faculty of Philosophy, the values are 83 percent (1866), 20 percent (1886), and 25 percent (1906), with a total of 70 courses offered by a.ö. Professoren.

values were closer together: private lecturers offered 27 percent of their courses as “imperial” courses, whereas the faculty average was 28 percent. In a diachronic perspective, this comparatively strong variance can be explained with the relatively small absolute numbers (only 51 courses at the juridical and 168 at the philosophical faculty by Privatdozenten in total across all three years). The plausible hypothesis formulated during the discussion on the lecture in Bad Wiessee prior to analysis of the corresponding data, namely that the more frequent selection of “imperial” course topics by private lecturers might be owed to their career aspirations, could not be corroborated.

Duration of Courses

The duration of university courses was a further variable to be investigated. This is not because of a highly unequal distribution of the course offering between professors and private lecturers. However, o.ö. Professoren taught an average of 3.42 hours per week at the University of Vienna across all three years analysed, while a.ö. Professoren taught 3.34 hours, and Privatdozenten taught 2.9 hours. This average was the result of wide variation even among the course offerings of o.ö. Professoren.

The o.ö. Professoren at the philosophical faculty offered primarily two-hour courses across the three years in question (104); in addition, they also offered 49 three-hour, 31 four-hour, 33 five-hour, three six-hour, and two eight-hour courses. Upon collating the offered “imperial” and “non-imperial” courses with their respective durations, we found that “imperial” teaching made up 27 percent of the total time. This value is only one percentage point below the faculty average of the number of “imperial” courses held by the professors in ordinary.

The situation is similar for the Faculty of Law, where the average share of hours spent by o.ö. Professoren teaching “imperial” topics was 65 percent—exactly the same as the average percentage of “imperial” courses. It should be noted, however, that the differences in the duration of courses at the juridical faculty were even greater than at the Faculty of Philosophy. For Privatdozenten, the collation of courses with their duration likewise shows no distortive effects at the juridical (69 percent “imperial” time units vs. 69 percent “imperial” courses) or the philosophical faculty (29 percent “imperial” time units vs. 27 percent “imperial” courses). This means that distinguishing between the number of courses offered and their respective duration makes no difference in regard to the exposure of students to “imperial” topics.

Interdisciplinarity

Courses like Marriage Law of the Austrian Empire (Eherecht des Imperii austriaci) offered by Franz Laurin at the theological faculty in 1866 or German

Imperial and Legal History (Deutsche Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte) offered by Georg Phillips and Johann Adolph Tomaschek at the juridical faculty in the same year raise the question of whether “imperial” topics may have correlated with interdisciplinary approaches. On the other hand, interdisciplinary courses were apparently also offered without such “imperial” connotations—for example, the course Forensic Medicine and Criminal Psychology under Consideration of Existing Legislation (Gerichtliche Medizin und Criminalpsychologie mit Rücksicht auf bestehende Gesetzgebung), held by Hieronymus Beer in 1866 at the Faculty of Law, or the course History and Geography of the Widespread Diseases (Geschichte und Geographie der Volkskrankheiten) offered by Theodor Puschmann at the Faculty of Medicine in 1886. We considered interdisciplinarity worth investigating in this context because the assumption seemed plausible that empires may have been viewed as a topic so important or rewarding that their scientific elucidation justified a more complex form of subject constitution. The concept of interdisciplinarity our analysis was based on was formulated ad hoc: if the title of a course referred to a discipline outside of its own faculty or field, we classified it as “interdisciplinary.”²⁵

The share of courses thus categorized as interdisciplinary among the entire teaching offering was four percent for the University of Vienna and seven percent for the University of Budapest, with no major temporal developments discernible (Vienna: 1866: three percent, 1886: four percent, 1906: four percent; Budapest: 1866: eleven percent, 1886: seven percent, 1906: seven percent).²⁶ The distribution of these courses across the faculties exhibits a significant non-uniformity, however: at the theological departments, the mean values for the three years surveyed were 15 percent for Vienna and 20 percent for Budapest, at the juridical departments eight percent (Vienna) and 14 percent (Budapest), at the medical departments four percent (Vienna) and six percent (Budapest), and at the philosophical departments only 0.5 percent (Vienna) and three percent (Budapest). Although the values for the individual faculties differ slightly between Vienna and Budapest, their order is the same in both cases.

In Vienna, a noteworthy interlacing of interdisciplinarity and “imperiality” can be discerned only²⁷ at the Faculty of Law in courses on the historic dimension of imperial constitutions, for example, in 1866 in the courses on German

²⁵ Exempted from this approach are courses on church history at the Faculty of Theology; they were not classified as interdisciplinary because church history was considered constitutive for the teaching of the subject as well as for the Christian Church as an institution. As classification was disputable in several cases, the data set deposited at the repository contains the respective entries for critical assessment and, if necessary, supplementary statistical analysis with changed data.

²⁶ When examining the faculties individually, the values for the Faculties of Theology and Law of the University of Vienna fluctuate quite strongly, while those for the corresponding faculties in Budapest change only very little.

²⁷ The higher values for theology can be explained with the discipline’s interest in art history, cultural history, and philosophy.

Imperial and Legal History (Deutsche Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte) taught by Georg Phillips and Johann Adolph Tomaschek or on Recent German Constitutional History (Neuere deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte) by Hugo Ritter von Kremer-Auenrode, or in 1886 in the course Imperial History (Reichsgeschichte) taught by Heinrich Siegel and Johann Adolph Tomaschek. The situation was different in Budapest, however, where a course on European History of Law (Európai jogtörténet) not classified as “imperial” was taught by József Illés in 1906. In the same year, at the Budapest Faculty of Philosophy János Krscsmárik offered a General Introduction to religious law in Turkish Civil Legislature (A török polgári törvénykönyvnek vallásjogi általános bevezető)—a course classified as “imperial” due to the fact that it dealt with the language of an empire. Overall, while some interdisciplinarity is visible in the course catalogues of the Universities of Vienna and Budapest, its correlation with “imperiality” is weak unless established through engagement with the languages of empires. In Vienna, it is noticeably focused on the study of the German Empire.

“Imperialities”

It is now time to examine the university courses classified as “imperial” in more detail.

Faculties of Law in Vienna and Budapest

At the Viennese Faculty of Law, the high percentage of “imperial” courses resulted primarily from the large number of courses dealing with the laws of various empires. In symbolic first place in all the course catalogues examined was Roman law, including the Pandects, though it was quantitatively surpassed by Austrian law. The law of the German Empire (e.g., 1866: Georg Phillips and Johann Adolph Tomaschek, *Deutsche Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte*) was not taught very frequently, but still more often than English law (1886, Victor Waldner). We classified courses on the law of parts of the Habsburg Monarchy, for example on Hungarian constitutional law, Hungarian law, and the law of Bohemia and Moravia (1866: Anton Veghy, Johann Adolph Tomaschek) as cohesion knowledge. The Faculty of Law also offered teaching on Statistics of the Austrian Imperial State (1866: Leopold Neumann, *Statistik des österreichischen Kaiserstaates*) and the history of law of the Frankish Empire (1906: Emil Goldmann).

At the Faculty of Law in Budapest, Roman law represented a smaller share of the total offerings than in Vienna (1866 and 1886: Pál Hoffmann, *Római magánjog*; 1886: Ágost Pulszky, *Jog- és állambölcsészet*; Lajos Takács, *Római örökjog*; Gusztáv Schwarz, *Pandekták – római dologbeli jog*; 1906: Tamás Vécsey, *Római magánjog, tekintettel a pandektákra*; Marton Szentmiklósi, *Római*

jog; Zoltán Pázmány, *Római kötelmi jog általában*). On the other hand, the relative importance of Austrian law (“cohesion knowledge”) was greater—albeit at a lower base level—than that of Hungarian law in Vienna (e.g., 1866: János Baintner, *Ausztriai magánjog*; Sándor Konek, *Ausztriai birodalom*; 1886 Gyula Antal, *Ausztriai általános polgári magánjog*; 1886 and 1906: Gyula Sággy, *Ausztriai általános magánjog*). In 1906, more teaching was offered on the legal relationship between Austria and Hungary (Károly Kmety, *A magyar-osztrák dualizmus*; Ödon Polner, *Magyar közjog (különösen Magyarország és Ausztria kapcsolati és a társországok közjoga)*). Finally, there were courses on English law as well: in 1886 on the English constitution (Gyula Kautz, *Az angol alkotmány jelen állása szerint*) and in 1906 on English social policy (Manó Somogyi, *Angol szociálpolitika*).

Faculty of Philosophy in Vienna

The high percentage of courses classified as “imperial” at the philosophical department of the University of Vienna is owed to its curriculum’s intensive engagement with the history, culture, and languages of empires. In 1866, for example, we find Roman history (Joseph Aschbach), the history of the Austrian Empire (Albert Jäger), German Historical Sources (Ottokar Lorenz, *Deutsche Geschichtsquellen*), Territories of the Austrian Imperial State and its Cultural Circumstances (Joseph Lorenz, *Gebiete des österreichischen Kaiserstaates und seine Culturbedingungen*), or Cultural Circumstances of the Russian Empire and its Relations to Western Europe and East Asia (Vincenz Klun, *Culturverhältnisse des russischen Reiches und dessen Beziehungen zu West-Europa und Ostasien*). Having barely exhibited any “imperial” contents in 1886, the science of history offered more “imperiality” in 1906, for example, Austrian Imperial History (for Jurists) (Gustav Turba, *Österreichische Reichsgeschichte [für Juristen]*), History of the Austrian Central Administration (Heinrich Kretschmayr, *Geschichte der österreichischen Zentralverwaltung*), Austrian History (Alfons Dopsch, *Österreichische Geschichte*),²⁸ and Overview of Russian Constitutional and Administrative History (Hans Uebersberger, *Überblick über die russische Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte*) as well as courses on the Roman history of the imperial period and Greek coins of the imperial period (Wilhelm Kubitschek).

Imperial history was important in the teaching of history during the period under scrutiny as well as beyond it all the way up to the Second World War.

²⁸ Dopsch, who was appointed professor in ordinary for general and Austrian history in 1900, was to represent Austrian history especially in the areas of constitutional, administrative, and economic history. His professorship, which was tailored specifically to this purpose, was dedicated to Austrian Imperial History; cf. Winkelbauer, *Das Fach Geschichte an der Universität Wien*, 123 f. with reference to Pavel Kolář, *Geschichtswissenschaft in Zentraleuropa: Die Universitäten Prag, Wien und Berlin um 1900*, Halbband 2 (Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsanstalt, 2008), 301.

Against the background of the tradition of the professors of imperial history or “Reichs-Historie” (meaning the history of the Holy Roman Empire and its institutions), which had been active since the second half of the eighteenth century, the concept of empire was relevant in the work of many influential academics. Theodor Sickel for instance, published a collection of sources from archives and libraries of the “imperium Austriacum” (1858–1882) along with sources on the history of German/Roman kings and emperors; Emil von Ottenhals contributed to the *Regesta Imperii* as well as to a volume in the MGH series *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae* (vol. 8). Among the most important works by Alfons Huber was the book *Österreichische Reichsgeschichte: Geschichte der Staatsbildung und des öffentlichen Rechtes* (Austrian Imperial History: History of State Formation and Public Law, 1st edition 1895). Austrian imperial history also became a compulsory subject at the Faculty of Law and Political Science in 1893. Oswald Redlich likewise contributed to the *Regesta Imperii* (1898) and published the relevant work *Österreichs Großmachtbildung in der Zeit Kaiser Leopolds I.* (Austria’s Development into a Great Power during the Time of Emperor Leopold I, 1st edition 1921). The interest in empires remained high, as evidenced by Wilhelm Kubitschek’s *Imperium Romanum tributim discriptum* (1889) and the idea of a *translatio imperii* of the Holy Roman Empire to the Austrian imperial state advanced by Heinrich von Srbik.²⁹

Cohesion knowledge dominated in the field of philology in 1866 with teaching in the languages of the monarchy: Slavic languages, “Bohemian,” Italian, Hungarian, and Hungarian stenography (Franz Xaver Milosich, Alois Šembera, Adolph Mussafia, Cattaneo Giammaria, Johann Reméle, Johann Markovits) were the most important subjects. French and English as languages of contemporary colonial empires were likewise taught (Georg Lega, Joseph Gischig, Johann Högl) as were languages with an imperial tradition like Persian and Arabic (Jakob Goldenthal, Friedrich Müller, Adolph Wahrmund) or those with an alluring significance in the history of languages like Indogermanic (Anton Boller). Courses on Latin authors were generally advertised with the name of the author they dealt with—we adopted the differentiation between Latin (e.g., Horace) and Roman (law)³⁰ insofar as we did not classify courses in Latin philology as “imperial.” Despite its considerable offerings in classical philology, however, the philosophical faculty achieved a large percentage of “imperial” courses.

A significantly greater number of philological courses were offered in 1886. Cohesion knowledge remained important, but after the Austro-Hungarian

²⁹ Cf. Winkelbauer, *Das Fach Geschichte an der Universität Wien*, passim.

³⁰ In 1886, however, Tacitus was offered as a “Roman author” (Max Büdinger) and classified accordingly. In 1906 Eugen Bormann offered a course on Literature of the Roman Imperial Period in the Greek Language (*Literatur der römischen Kaiserzeit in griechischer Sprache*) and Edmund Hauler offered another on the History of Roman Literature (not “Latin”; *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*).

Compromise and the cession of Italian territories, it now related only to the Slavic languages (Johann Leciejewski, Ferdinand Menčík). French and English, and England in general gained massively in significance (Jacob Schipper, Adolph Mussafia, Ferdinand Lotheissen, Wolfram Zingerle, Johann Alton, G. G. Bagster), and the field of Sanskrit, New Persian, and the Indian languages likewise grew (Friedrich Müller, Georg Bühler, Eugen Hultsch, Jakob Polak). The connection between this realm of older South and West Asian empires and former and still existing empires at the fringes of Europe was established with courses in Greek, Armenian, Lithuanian, Arabic, and Turkish (Joseph Sklenař, Rudolf Mehringer, Josef Karabacek, Adolph Wahrmund). Russian was now taught as well (Johann Glowacki), and the offerings were also extended to include the languages of other old empires: Welsh, Babylonian, and Assyrian-Babylonian. The Ethiopian Empire, the Egyptian Empire (with hieratic script and hieroglyphs), and the Byzantine Empire could likewise be studied (Johann Hanusz, Heinrich Müller, Leo Reinisch, Jacob Krall).

In 1906, the philological teaching was extended even further—not exclusively (Norwegian: Rudolf Much), but certainly substantially in the area of languages of old and new empires. In terms of old empires, Assyrian (Friedrich Hrozný); Old Babylonian and the Armana tablets (David Heinrich Müller); Ethiopian (Maximilian Bittner); Armenian (Maximilian Bittner); Hebrew (August Haffner); Persian and New Persian (Adolf Wahrmund, Maximilian Bittner); Arabic (Rudolf Geyer, Josef Karabacek, Adolf Wahrmund, David Heinrich Müller, August Haffner); and Syrian (David Heinrich Müller) were now offered. Sanskrit continued to be taught as well (Leopold Schroeder). Among the languages of the contemporary colonial empires, English (Jacob Schipper, Rudolf Brotanek, Francis H. Pughe, G. G. Bagster) had surpassed French (Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke, Armand Rey, Marc Gratacap) in importance. The languages of the former Spanish Empire (Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke, Rudolf Behr) and the oldest still existing empire, China, were new in the curriculum (Franz Kühnert).

Languages in the area of cohesion knowledge were also increasingly being taught (again) in 1906: Old Church Slavic (Wenzel Vondrák); South Slavic (Josef Konstantin Jireček); Serbo-Croatian (Milan Ritter von Rešetar); “Bohemian” (Ferdinand Menčík); Romanian (Sextil Pușcariu); Italian (Philipp August Becker, Edgardo Maddalena); Hungarian (Julius Stockinger) and, in the field of interest of the Habsburg Monarchy, modern Greek (Eugen Soma-rides).

Faculty of Philosophy in Budapest

At the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Budapest, the subject of history contributed only a little in terms of “imperial” courses during the summer semester of 1866, for instance with Archaeology of Barbarian and Roman Statues (Flóris Rómer, *A barbár és római műemlékek régészte*) or various courses on

Hungarian history (Árpád Alajos Kerékgyártó, *Magyarország története*; Ferenc Toldy, *A magyarok története*; Árpád Horvát, *Magyar oklevéltan*). Twenty years later, the few courses on Hungarian history (Árpád Alajos Kerékgyártó, e.g., *Magyarország újkori története*; Árpád Horvát, *A magyar oklevéltan folytatólag*) were supplemented with several on the history of the Roman Empire (Károly Torma, *Római régiségek*; József Hampel, *Római történelem Nagy Constantinus óta*), on German and Spanish history (Aladár Ballagi, *A németalföldi szabadságharcz története*; *Don Carlos története*), or on the history of the resistance against the Turks (Lajos Szádeczky, *A visszafoglalási harcok története*).

In 1906, however, the teaching offered in the field of history was much more heavily oriented towards “monumental” historiography (Nietzsche) with a “Hungarian” and “imperial” character. Source Studies on Germanic Tribes under Roman rule (Gyula Láncty, *Forrástanulmányok germán népek és a római birodalom*), Hungary in Roman Times, and History of the Romans (Bálint Kuzsinszky, *Magyarország a rómaiak idejében*; *A rómaiak története*), or Roman State Antiquities and The Life and Work of Julius Caesar (József Cserép, *Római államrégiségek*; *C. Julius Caesar élete és művei*) were the titles of courses. Other courses went so far as to unabashedly use the Roman terms for territorial and ethnic entities, for example, Pannonian and Dacian art (József Hampel, *Pannoniai és daciai emlékek*). The history of Hungary was told as one of heroes and of the founding of the empire: Hungarian-Croatian Contacts until 1105 (Antal Hodinka, *Magyar-horvát érintkezések 1105-ig*); The History of Hungary in the Age of the Hunyadis and the Jagiellons (Henrik Marczali, *Magyarország története a Hunyadiak és Jagellók korában*); The Development of Parliament after the Defeat at Mohács (Henrik Marczali, *Az országgyűlések fejlődése a mohácsi vész után*); The Era of Bethlen Gábor (Sándor Mika, *Bethlen Gábor kora*); and Bocskai István and the Treaty of Vienna (András Komáromy, *Bocskai István és a bécsi béke*). Courses dealing with non-Hungarian history were likewise related to empires, for example to Egypt (Ede Mahler, *Az egyiptomiak története*), to German History in the Age of the Hohenstaufen (Antal Áldásy, *Németország története a Hohenstaufok korában*) or to the Ottoman Empire (János Kracsma-rik, *A mohamedán házasságkötés kánonja*).

A large number of courses with “imperial” characteristics were offered by the philological branch of the Faculty of Philosophy in 1866. We classified courses on German (Szendé Riedl, *A német irodalom története*) and Serbo-Croatian (József Ferenc, *A szerb-horvát irodalomtörténet világi része*) literary history, on the West Slavic nations (József Ferenc, *A nyugati szlávajok nyelvtani néprajza*), and on the Romanian (Sándor Román) and Italian languages (Antal Messi) as “cohesion knowledge.” Turkish (Ármin Vámbéry), French (Alajos Mutschbacher, Károly Collaud), and English (Lajos Lewis, James Egan) were the languages of contemporary empires on offer.

By 1886, the number of language courses had increased significantly. The languages spoken in parts of Hungary and its neighbouring countries re-

mained important: besides Hungarian, they included German (Gusztáv Heinrich), Romanian and Romanian-Macedonian (Sándor Román), Italian (Antal Messi), and Czech (Oszkár Ásbóth). The languages of ancient Middle Eastern empires and of the Ottoman Empire were also taught: Arabic, Syrian-Chaldean, and Hebrew (Péter Hatala, *Szirus és khald olvasmányok; Arab olvasmányok*) as well as Persian, Turkish, Turkish-Tatar, and Kyrgyz (Ármin Vámbery). The interest in the history of Hungarian was likely the reason for teaching in Lappish, specifically Sami (József Budenz, *Svéd- és finnmarki-lapp nyelv*) and Finnish (József Szinnyei) as well as a course on the comparison of Ugric languages and Yakutian, a Siberian Turkic language (József Budenz, *A magyar-ugor összehasonlító nyelvészetből; A jakut nyelv ismertetése*). This interest in the history of languages was further satisfied by courses in Sanskrit and “Indogermanic” (Aurél Mayr). French (Sándor Rákosi) and English (Lajos Lewis, James Egan) were taught as the languages of the two major contemporary colonial empires.

Philology continued to contribute significantly to the “imperiality” of the overall course offerings in 1906. It is noteworthy that courses on Latin topics were now more frequently referred to with the attribute “Roman” (Emil Théwrewk, *A görög és római lantos költészet*; Vilmos Pecz, *Romános középkori görög egyházi költő himnuszai*; Géza Némethy, *A római költészet ezüstkora*); there was also a course on Greco-Roman Music (Géza Molnár, *A görög-római világ zenéje*). Otherwise, the spectrum of teaching on the languages of old and new empires developed in 1886 remained largely the same: Arabic and Syrian (Ignaz Goldziher); Ottoman-Turkish (Ignác Kúnos); Persian and Sanskrit (Sándor Kégl); Armenian (Lukács Patrubány); Hungarian with reference to the history of language and literature (Zsigmond Simonyi, *Régi magyar nyelvészek*; Zsolt Beöthy, *A régi magyar költészet főepikusai*; Zsigmond Bodnár, *A XVI. és XVII. század magyar irodalma*; Cyrill Horváth, *A középkori magyar irodalom története*; Lajos Dézsi, *A régi magyar epikai költészet története*); and Finno-Ugric studies (József Szinnyei, *Finn-ugor összehasonlító nyelvészeti gyakorlatok*). The naming of a course Correct Hungarian (Gyula Zolnai, *A helyes magyarság*) indicates a high level of normative thinking in the area of Finno-Ugric philology, as did the focus on Sándor Petőfi, János Arany, and Mihály Vörösmarty, three Hungarian national poets (Frigyes Riedl, *Petőfi Sándor élete és művei; Gyakorlatok Arany lyrai és Vörösmarty epikus költészetéről*). Also in the catalogue were courses on languages of parts of the Hungarian population (“cohesion knowledge”): Slavic languages (Oszkár Ásbóth, *A szláv igék képzése és ragozása*) like Croatian and Serbian, specifically Serbo-Croatian (Ede Margalits), along with Romanian (János Ciocan, József Popoviciu, György Alexics—Alexics also lectured on the influence of Hungarian on Romanian, *Magyar hatás a román nyelvre*); German (Gedeon Petz, Gusztáv Heinrich); and Italian (Péter Zambra). Courses in French (Frigyes Medveczky, Lucien Bezard) and English (Arthur Battishill Yolland) were offered as well.

Faculties of Theology and Medicine in Vienna and Budapest

The medical and theological faculties contributed little to the “imperiality” of the teaching offered by the Universities of Vienna and Budapest. An academic engagement with tropical medicine might have been expected in the Habsburg Monarchy, but there was only a single course on Asian Cholera in Budapest in 1886 (Frigyes Korányi, *Az ázsiai choleráról*) and a course on Animal Plagues and Invasive Diseases with Special Consideration of Bacteriology and Parasitology in Vienna in 1906 (Johann Nepomuk Csokor, *Tierseuchen und Invasionskrankheiten mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Bakteriologie und Parasitenkunde*).

The situation in theology was slightly different, as the departments afforded some space to the laws and languages of old empires. At the Faculty of Theology in Vienna, for example, Franz Laurin offered a course on Marriage Law of the Austrian Empire (Eherecht des Imperii austriaci) in 1866 as well as another on canon law with explicit reference to Roman law in 1886. In 1906, there was one course each on papal documents (Hirsch) and the Frankish Empire (Rudolf Ritter von Scherer). At the Budapest theological department, languages and history were apparently considered more important: in 1866, Arabic, Syrian, and Chaldean grammar (János Ruzsicska, *Syriai és chaldeai nyelvtan*) along with Hebrew (Ev. János Berger) and (as well as in 1906) Arabic, Syrian, and Chaldean (György Kayurszky, *Szür és khald nyelvtan*) were part of the curriculum.

Conclusion

Research on the connections between empire and knowledge has hitherto been focused primarily on colonial circumstances. For the late Habsburg Monarchy, attempts to address this lacuna have generally consisted in examining the (ambivalent) effects of education policy. Against this background, we used highly simplified concepts of knowledge and empire to reduce the problem to the question of whether, to what degree, and in which faculties academic teaching offered in the course catalogues of the Universities of Vienna and Budapest for the summer semesters of 1866, 1886, and 1906 can be described as “imperial.” We made this classification if the word “empire” or equivalent terms were used in course titles, if courses related to old or new empires and/or their languages, and/or if courses offered “cohesion knowledge” like the law of a part of the Habsburg (or a different) empire. Due to the high importance of semantics, we also assessed an “imperiality” that was only implied in context (“latently imperial”); the ratio between “manifest” (ca. 36 percent) and “latent” (ca. 64 percent) was around 1:2.

The data thus collected shows that around 20 percent of the courses in Vienna and around 26 percent of those in Budapest should be considered manifestly or latently “imperial,” but also shows that—although the surveyed time

period included the period of high imperialism—there was no noticeable development in the frequency of “imperial” topics. The majority of relevant academic courses were offered at the Faculties of Law and Philosophy. For Vienna, our survey showed that the degree of “imperiality” varied with the occupational status of the teaching staff. The courses offered by *Lehrer*, who frequently taught languages (of empires), exhibited the highest ratio of “imperiality.” O.ö. Professoren offered “imperial” courses somewhat more often (with a diachronically increasing tendency) than a.ö. Professoren (with a diachronically decreasing tendency) (24 percent vs. 12 percent overall); the value for Privatdozenten (15 percent) was slightly greater than that for a.ö. Professoren. The significant variance in the duration of courses made no difference in terms of their “imperiality,” however. The phenomenon of interdisciplinary teaching played a rather marginal role at both universities, barely correlating with the feature of “imperiality” outside of the teaching of languages—most noticeably in the field of history of law of the German Empire.

Courses at the Faculties of Law in Vienna and Budapest classified as “imperial” dealt primarily with the law of the Roman Empire, that of the Austrian Empire and, to a lesser degree, that of the German Empire. For Vienna, teaching on the law of various parts of the empire (Hungary, Bohemia, Moravia) was considered “cohesion knowledge”; in Budapest, Roman and Austrian law was likewise important, as were matters pertaining to the relations between the two parts of the empire. The large numbers of “imperial” courses at both philosophical departments resulted from the great significance placed on the history of empires: ancient Rome, the Austrian Empire, the German Empire (often with its preceding empires), and the Russian Empire were topics of interest. In Budapest, the Faculty of Philosophy also taught Hungarian history as imperial history, with a historical perspective on its neighbouring countries and the Finno-Ugric family of languages.

Although courses on Latin were only classified as “imperial” if their titles included the term “Roman” (which was rarely the case, albeit with a slightly increasing tendency over time), the teaching of languages of old and new empires (even without Latin) contributed significantly to the presence of “imperiality” in the course catalogues; what is more, the years 1886 and 1906 saw a distinct increase over 1866 in the respective offerings. Both faculties offered courses in the important languages of the two monarchies: various Slavic languages along with Hungarian, German, and Italian formed the core, which was supplemented with French and English as the languages of the major contemporary colonial empires as well as with Turkish and the languages of older empires, particularly those of the Near East. Hence in Vienna, students could study the languages of Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Ethiopia, the Caliphate, the eastern Roman Empire, Russia, Spain, and China. In Budapest, the spectrum in terms of the old empires was not quite as broad, but in exchange, Turkish and Romanian were taught more intensively and Armenian, Arabic, and Turkish were also offered.

The overall result is the following: the teaching offered by the Universities of Vienna and Budapest in the period surveyed transported references to empires to a significant extent primarily in the Faculties of Law and Philosophy respectively; the law, history, and languages of empires were key to the share of “imperial” courses in this context. Especially noticeable is the prominence of the Roman Empire—well ahead of the contemporary colonial empires, the Austrian Empire and the old empires of the Near East: almost a quarter (23 percent) of all university courses classified as “imperial” engaged with the empire whose “best poet” (John Dryden) had perhaps described “imperial” rule the most succinctly, *pacis imponere morem, / parcere subjectis et debellare superbos* (Verg. Aen. VI, 852 f.).³¹

Translated from German by Stephan Stockinger.

³¹ Roland Gregory Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber sextus, with a commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977 [ND 1992]), 263, translates (in the commentary, abridged) the passage as: “these skills you shall have, to set the stamp of civilized usage upon peace, to be merciful to the submissive, and to crush in war those who are arrogant” and interprets the last lines as a “final definition of the fusion of pax with imperium.”