

The Founding of Minor Seminaries After 1850

Consequences of the Transformation of the Relationship Between Church and State in the Austrian Empire on the Example of Establishing a Minor Seminary in the Diocese of Budweis

Rudolf Svoboda

Introduction



The revolution of 1848–1849 caused social changes in the Austrian Empire, which included significant changes in the ecclesiastical-political sphere. A series of negotiations took place between the Viennese government and the Catholic bishops on the new relationship between Church and state. The results were reflected in the patents of Emperor Francis Joseph I from 1850 and in the subsequent government decisions, which both *de iure* and *de facto* marked the end of the ecclesiastical-political system of Josephinism, within which the state had exercised considerable control over purely internal Church matters in the previous decades. Until the issue of the concordat in 1855, these patents and subsequent government decisions determined not only the relationship between the Church and the state but also enabled the Church in the Austrian Empire to manage its internal affairs much more freely than before, which was manifested, among other things, by the establishment of the so-called minor seminaries, i.e., boys' seminaries or high school seminaries. Their existence was primarily intended to serve the intellectual and, at the same time, spiritual formation of future candidates for entry into priestly seminaries.

This study seeks to show that the establishment of minor seminaries had a double legal basis: one with its roots in the decisions of the Council of Trent and subsequent decrees from Rome, and the other in state legal decisions from 1850. Using the example of establishing a minor seminary in the Diocese of Budweis, it also seeks to present specific pitfalls of this process.

Minor seminaries in the view of the Council of Trent

The Council of Trent (1545–1563) ordered that seminaries intended for the formation of boys from twelve, i.e., before their potential entry into the priesthood, and thus before entering priestly seminaries, should be established in the dioceses. The implementation of the Council's decision into reality, however, depended on several circumstances, the most important of which were internal political circumstances, and many others, including financial ones, and cannot be neglected. With a view to the changing circumstances in the years after the Council, *The Congregation of the Council of Trent (Congregatio super executione et observantia sacri Concilii Tridentini)*, founded in 1564 by Pope Pius IV, explained and legally adjusted the obligation to establish minor seminaries. This Congregation was responsible for the correct implementation of the Council's decisions in practice and, from 1588, for the authentic interpretation of the decrees of this Council, too.

In general, it can be said that two types of seminaries were created following the Roman model: the minor seminary and the priestly or major seminary following it. In 1824, Pope Leo XII issued an apostolic constitution in which he recommended a more precise separation of these two types of seminaries in addition to changes in the organisation of theological studies. In practice, the boundary between boys' and priests' seminaries was not always clear, which was not welcomed by Rome. Typical examples of de facto minor seminaries, where the educational and formation aspects were combined in practice, were the Jesuit or Piarist colleges in the post-Trent period. These colleges were also gymnasiums, the equivalent of grammar schools. Especially in the case of Piarist gymnasiums, during the nineteenth century, the educational aspect not only prevailed over the formative aspect, but in the end the running of gymnasiums

was so expensive that they often passed entirely into the hands of cities or even the state.¹

Nevertheless, the formation was somehow present in them, and many graduates of the order's gymnasiums embarked on the path to the priesthood – either within the chosen religious order or in episcopal priestly seminaries. The cost mentioned above associated with running minor seminaries was one of the reasons why their existence was not at all common in the Habsburg Monarchy in the post-Trent era. Their number was further reduced by the abolition of the Jesuit order in the Habsburg monarchy and the consequences of reforms of the time of Josephinism. In general, it can also be said that the ecclesiastical-political system of Josephinism, which determined the relations between the Church and the state from approximately the middle of the eighteenth century until the middle of the nineteenth century, did not wish for the establishment of institutions of this type. However, that was about to change.

Imperial decrees of 1850

Emperor Francis Joseph I issued decrees regulating the relationship between Church and state on 18th and 23rd April 1850.²

The first decree cancelled *placetum regium* and enabled free contact with Rome (§ 1): the bishops were able to issue their regulations without the need for permission from government bodies, however, where the regulations did not consider only intra-ecclesial matters, copies were to be sent to the government offices (§ 2); the bishops were able to declare ecclesiastical punishments that did not consider civil rights (§ 3); the bishops gained the right to exercise power over clergy who

¹ On the topic of the Tridentine reform and post-Tridentine formation, see PŘIBYL, Stanislav, *Kanonickoprávní aspekty seminární výchovy*, in: *Revue církevního práva* (Church Law Review) No. 63–1/2016, pp. 23–38, here especially pp. 25–28.

See also PAVLÍČEK, Tomáš W., *Výchova kněží v Čechách a jejich role v náboženské kultuře (1848–1914)*, Praha, 2017, p. 189; DVOŘÁK, Ladislav, *Biskupský kněžský seminář v Č. Budějovicích*, České Budějovice, 1905, pp. 13–16.

It should be stated that minor seminaries were not specific to the Austrian Empire or the Central European legal area only. It is an institute that closely connects with the canon law of the universal Church up to the present day.

² Decrees of Emperor Francis Joseph I. No. 156/1850 RGBI and No. 157/1850 RGBI. See *Allgemeines Reichs-Gesetz- und Regierungsblatt für das Kaiserthum Österreich für Jahrgang 1850*. See more in: TRETERA, Jiří Rajmund, HORÁK, Záboj, *Konfesní právo*, Praha, 2015, p. 314ff; HORÁK, Záboj, *Cirkve a české školství*, Praha, 2011, p. 188ff.

did not carry out their office properly, that is, they were able to suspend or remove them according to their consideration and remove from them the material provision granted by their position (§ 4); the bishops were able to request help from state authorities for enforcing their decisions over the clergy if, using the investigation file, they proved that they had followed Church law (§ 5); the Minister of Religion and Education Lev Thun was appointed to the role of putting this decision into practice (§ 6).

In the decree of Minister Thun, which specified the execution of the emperor's decree, it was written that if a secular authority seeks to remove a clergyman from his office, it must always approach his ecclesial superior. Courts were ordered that the bishop be allowed to view the case file if they were trying a clergyman's case for a crime or offence. It also announces that appointing bishops belongs to the emperor's rights, inherited from his predecessors. However, for the future, he always wanted to hear advice from the bishops of that particular Church province where the episcopal seat was vacant. The Minister of Religion and Education was to suggest how to appoint those offices and prebends where previously a secular power was in charge.

The emperor further declared that the episcopal overseeing of the parish selection processes were to continue formally as before, and also bishops were to set the order of liturgies according to their decision. Authorities were invited to ensure that, in those places where Catholics were in the majority, on Sundays and Holy Days, people should not be disturbed by noisy work and public trade. The emperor also stated that he had authorised the minister to resolve other unfinished proposals that the bishops had submitted, and he was especially to submit an analysis regarding the extent of the negotiations to be held with the Holy See. The negotiations were also to include the fact that those who might be potentially dangerous to the state were not to gain ecclesiastical office.³

³ See *Uspořádání církevních záležitostí v církvi Rakouské*, in: *Časopis pro katolické duchovenstvo* (Journal for Catholic Clergy) No 23, 3–1850, pp. 163–166. For the original see MAASS, Ferdinand, *Der Josephinismus, Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich 1760–1790*, vol. 5, *Lockerung und Aufhebung des Josephinismus 1820–1850* (= *Fontes rerum Austriacarum. Österreichische Geschichtsquellen. Zweite Abteilung. Diplomatica et acta. 75th vol*), Wien–München, 1953, pp. 741–742.

See also decree of the Minister of Religion and Education Lev Thun from 5th April 1850 (Vortrag des Ministers des Cultus und Unterrichts zu Nr. 156), in: *Achtzehntes Beilage-Heft zur allgemeinen Reichs-Gesetz- und Regierungsblatte für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich, Jahrgang 1850*, pp. 103–113.

The second decree was issued in continuity with the first.⁴ It regarded schools and education, with the emperor approving the proposals of Minister Thun. The text has only six paragraphs (except a short introduction and conclusion where Thun is commissioned to carry out the regulations of the decision) where the following is written: without permission from a bishop, a person cannot teach religion in schools or become a professor of theology (§ 1); a bishop can withdraw his permission at any time, however, with such a withdrawal the person in question does not lose his right to a pension (§ 2); appointing professors of theology or private associate professors remains up to the government and these men will follow academic regulations (§ 3); the administration of priestly seminaries belongs to the bishop including the determination of scheduling teaching and internal seminary regulations (§ 4); the bishop must appoint at least half of those holding a doctorate in theology into the commission for exams for gaining a doctorate in theology (§ 5); no one can become a doctor of theology without previously confessing the Tridentine Creed (§ 6).⁵

Negotiations between the Church (represented by local bishops) and the state continued even after the decrees were issued. Regarding some important issues, for example, marriage, these were to be negotiated directly with Rome.⁶ Other important issues were to be discussed by the government, which they did. One of the results of the negotiations was a government decision signed on 29th April 1850,

⁴ This decree also followed the emperor's decree No. 151/1849 RGBI, which introduced political rights in connection with the Stadion Constitution.

⁵ *Uspořádání církevních záležitostí v církvi Rakouské*, pp. 166–177; MAASS, Ferdinand, *Der Josephinismus*, pp. 742–743. See also decree of the Minister of Religion and Education Lev Thun from 13th April 1850 (Vortrag des Ministers des Cultus und Unterrichts zu Nr. 157), in: Achtzehntes Beilage-Heft zur allgemeinen Reichs-Gesetz- und Regierungsblatte für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich, Jahrgang 1850, pp. 114–124.

⁶ KADLEC, Jaroslav, *Přehled českých církevních dějin II*, 2nd edition, Praha, 1991, pp. 201–202; ZLÁMAL, Bohumil, *Příručka českých církevních dějin VI. Doba probuzenského katolicismu (1848–1918)*, Olomouc, 2009, pp. 47–48; ZÖLLNER, Erich, *Geschichte Österreichs. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, 8th edition, Wien–München, 1990, pp. 399–401; VOCELKA, Karl, *Geschichte Österreichs. Kultur – Gesellschaft – Politik*, Graz–Wien–Köln, 2000, pp. 206–207; HOENSCH, Jörg K., *Geschichte Böhmens. Von der slavischen Landnahme bis zur Gegenwart*, 3rd edition, München, 1997, pp. 347–350; LEEB, Rudolf, LIEBMANN, Maximilian, SCHEIBELREITER, Georg, TROPPEL, Peter G., *Geschichte des Christentums in Österreich. Von der Spätantike bis zur Gegenwart*, Wien, 2003, pp. 375–376.

in which the bishops were not only given complete freedom in managing priestly seminaries but were also granted the right to establish minor ones.⁷

It is, therefore, possible to say clearly that after 1850 the Church in the Habsburg Monarchy gained *de iure* much greater independence from the state than it had in the previous century. This fact could easily manifest in the inner Church life, especially if the particular bishops decided to use the newly acquired freedom.

Founding of a minor seminary in the Diocese of Budweis

One of the Catholic bishops who saw a great opportunity in the new situation of the Church in the Austrian Empire was Jan Valerián Jirsík, bishop of the Diocese of Budweis (1851–1883). Already Jirsík's episcopal nomination in 1850 had been the result of the application of the imperial decree: while his predecessors were selected for their position by the state authorities only taking into account the wishes of the Church, in Jirsík's nomination, the emperor complied with the unambiguously formulated wishes of the Metropolitan, the Prague Archbishop Schwarzenberg.⁸ It is possible to consider Jirsík's episcopal nomination as tangible evidence that the abovementioned changes in the relationship between the Church and the state should not have remained only on paper.

When Jirsík became a bishop in 1851, he stepped straight into the reality of the diocese, founded during the reign of Emperor Joseph II, and it had lived its entire existence so far in the ecclesiastical-political system bearing his name. Despite its excellent location halfway between Prague and Vienna, it received almost no property and was almost entirely dependent on funding from the state, i.e., the state-controlled *Religious Fund*. From this fund came the clergy's salaries – including that of the bishop. The unfavourable financial situation of the diocese was reflected in the fact that it took decades for the diocese to build

⁷ KRYŠTŮFEK, František Xaver, *Dějiny církve katolické ve státech rakousko-uherských s obzvláštním zřetelem k Zemím Koruny české. Od doby slavného panování císařovny Marie Terezie až do časů J. V. císaře a krále Františka Josefa I. (1740–1898)*, vol. 2, Praha, 1899, pp. 79 and 90.

⁸ See SVOBODA, Rudolf, *Biskupská jmenování Josefa Ondřeje Lindauera a Jana Valeriána Jirsíka jako ukazatelé proměn vztahu církve a státu v letech 1845–1851*, in: Jihočeský sborník historický Nr. 84, 2015, pp. 198–217; SVOBODA, Rudolf, *Nebroušený diamant. Třetí českobudějovický biskup Josef Ondřej Lindauer*, Praha, 2015, pp. 26–36; SVOBODA, Rudolf, *Jan Valerián Jirsík. In the Service of God, Church and Country*, Berlin, 2019, pp. 115–119.

a sufficient structure, even for the formation of future clergy at the level of the diocesan priestly seminary.⁹

The population of the diocese was relatively poor and devoted mainly to agriculture because there were not good conditions for the more significant development of the industry. On the other hand, almost a million people who lived there overwhelmingly claimed to be Catholic. At the time of Jirsík's arrival in the diocese, approximately 900 priests, who worked in more than 400 places of spiritual administration, cared for their spiritual needs.¹⁰ Jirsík's predecessors built an effectively functioning Church-administrative apparatus, the threads of which converged on the episcopal consistory in Budweis. The bishop also had a number of experienced collaborators at his disposal, most often members of the cathedral chapter or officials of the consistory.

The social changes caused by the revolutionary events of 1848–1849 naturally also affected the Diocese of Budweis itself and the episcopal seat city of Budweis. The Diocese of Budweis, in which Czechs and Germans lived side by side, saw an increase in national disputes, which were the result not only of the increasing national awareness of a larger number of the Czech population but also of the possibilities of their wider involvement in political and cultural life.¹¹

⁹ The diocesan priestly seminary was founded in 1803. In the first decades, only 30 seminarians could live here. Bishop Růžička managed to structurally modify the seminary building in 1843–1844 so that there was room for 100 seminarians. See Rudolf SVOBODA, *Johann Prokop Schaffgotsch. Das Leben eines böhmischen Prälaten in der Zeit des Josephinismus* (=Beiträge zur Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte 25), Frankfurt am Main, 2015, pp. 187–211; SVOBODA, Rudolf, *Arnošt Konstantin Růžička. Josefinista na českobudějovickém biskupském stolci*, České Budějovice, 2011, pp. 134–151; DVORÁK, Ladislav, *Biskupský kněžský seminář v Č. Budějovicích*, pp. 15–16.

¹⁰ For example: in 1844, in the diocese there were altogether 427 parochial administrations, out of which 300 parishes, 10 parish administrations, 91 local administrations, and 26 expositures and residential chapels. Altogether there were 881 priests – 773 diocesan and 108 from religious orders. In 1856 in the diocese there were 417 places of regular parochial administration (*beneficia curata*) – out of this was 1 provostry, 2 archdeaconries, 38 deaneries, 296 parishes, 11 parish administrations, 61 local administrations, 6 expositures, and 2 residential chapels. Further, there are listed also other places of Church administration (*beneficia simplicia*) – 1 administration, 13 castle chapels, 6 residential chapels, and 1 expositure. In the diocese served 910 priests – 763 secular priests and 147 priests from religious orders in the diocese. See SVOBODA, Rudolf, *Jan Valerián Jirsík*, pp. 129–130 and 138–140.

¹¹ The history of the diocese during this period is described in detail here: NOVOTNÝ, Miroslav et al., *Die Diözese Budweis in den Jahren 1785–1850. Das Aschenputtel unter den Diözesen I*, Berlin, 2018; NOVOTNÝ, Miroslav et al., *Die Diözese Budweis in den Jahren 1851–1907. Das Aschenputtel unter den Diözesen II*, Berlin, 2021.

In other words, Jirsík did not begin his episcopal career in idyllic conditions. Still, he had considerable freedom to make decisions to encourage the diocese's religious life. He carried out general visitations practically throughout the whole of the thirty years of his episcopate and, in 1857, implemented the new organisational structure of the diocese. In 1859, Marian May services and Eucharistic celebrations of so-called Perpetual Adoration were established in all churches. He also organised great religious celebrations to mark significant diocesan and national anniversaries.

Supporting the religious life was also connected with the abovementioned creation and support of activities of numerous Church groups, priestly as well as lay: the priestly *Group of St Joseph / Spolek sv. Josefa* (1854), the priestly Marian association *Corona aurea* (1854), the *Group of Catholic Journeymen / Spolek katolických tovaryšů* (1858), the *Fraternity of the Perpetual Adoration of the Sacrament of the Altar / Bratrstvo ustavičného klanění svátosti oltární* (1859), the supporting group for the sick and poor priests *St Nicholas Fund / Fond sv. Mikuláše* (1863), the *Fraternity of Christian Mothers / Bratrstvo křesťanských matek* (1875), and the *Group for Clothing Poor Youth / Spolek pro ošacení chudé mládeže*, etc.

Besides disseminating Catholic books, it was also popular missions and spiritual retreats that were to assist the religious renewal of the people in the diocese. Originally, the parochial administrators in the diocese took care of the popular missions, while from the 1870s this service was carried out by the Redemptorists from Prague and also the Jesuits, who were very active in organising (amongst others) spiritual retreats.

To simplify the communication between priests and the episcopal ordinariate, the priestly bulletin was created, which was published from 1852 only in German as *Erllass des bischöflichen Ordinariates von Budweis an den Klerus der Diöcese (Regulations of the Episcopal Ordinariate in Budweis to the clergy of the diocese)* and then from 1871 in Czech and German as the *Ordinariate Letter of Budweis Diocese (Ordinariátní list Budějovické diecéze or Ordinariats-Blatt der Budweiser Diöcese)*.

Establishing annual priestly pastoral conferences and priestly retreats was to strengthen the clergy's discipline. The key issues for the future direction of the diocese were discussed at three diocesan priestly synods that took place in continuation from the Prague provincial synod in 1860. These took place on 31st August – 3rd September 1863, 24th – 25th September 1872, and 21st – 22nd September 1875.¹²

¹² See SVOBODA, Rudolf, *Jan Valerián Jirsík*, pp. 137–159.

He also conceived the nationality question as a spiritual shepherd. He was understandably well aware of the situation in the diocese, which is why he had emphasised in his first pastoral letter that he was the bishop of all believers, regardless of origin or language. He expressed – and later repeated many times – his belief that people should be Christians first and then Czechs or Germans. On the other hand, he had a reputation as a Czech patriot. His patriotism did not add to his popularity among residents of German origin in a situation where Czechs were becoming the majority population in the diocese and quite understandably sought to improve their positions in society. A typical example was the city of Budweis, where the Germans formed a clear but well-to-do minority that maintained control over the city's leadership thanks to the electoral system. Although Jirsík rejected nationality-motivated disputes, he considered it absolutely right that the Czech element should also be allowed to develop its language and culture. It was especially true as the number of Czech-speaking people in relation to the number of German-speaking inhabitants throughout more than thirty years of his episcopate continued to grow. It can therefore be very well understood that during his episcopal tenure, he supported the cultural and social positions of the Czechs, especially in education and community life, without taking part in national frictions, let alone supporting or intentionally provoking them.¹³

Jirsík decided to establish an episcopal minor seminary in his episcopal seat city, Budweis, right at the beginning of his episcopal tenure. It was publicly discussed as early as in 1852. It must be seen as an essential part of his efforts for the above mentioned encouragement of religious life in his diocese, made possible by the change in the conditions in the state. It is also possible to say that the example of his Metropolitan Schwarzenberg, who founded such a minor seminary as Archbishop of Salzburg in Salzburg town in 1848, could also have encouraged him. When Schwarzenberg became Archbishop of Prague in 1850, Jirsík – at that time a canon at the Cathedral of St Vitus in Prague – was his close associate. It can be assumed that he was initiated into the pastoral plans of his Archbishop, which also included the establishment of minor seminaries. The first such minor seminary in the Prague Archdiocese began its activities in Prague in 1855, and others soon followed.¹⁴

¹³ Idem, pp. 161–167 a 231.

¹⁴ More detail about this matter, as well as about the meaning and inner life of minor seminaries, is in PAVLÍČEK, Tomáš W., *Výchova kněží v Čechách*, pp. 189–227.

Jirsík did not have enough funds to establish a minor seminary. This is why he announced a collection in his diocese, which had such a positive response that it enabled both the purchase of the building where the new seminary was to be located and its necessary structural modifications. Jirsík explained to the diocese his decision to establish a minor seminary by referring to the Council of Trent, the decree of which he intended to fulfil. Not a word was said about the state – but members of the imperial family supported the establishment of the seminary with considerable financial donations.¹⁵

The minor seminary in Budweis officially began its activities at the beginning of the school year 1853/1854, on 1st October 1853. It was presented to the public at its ceremonial opening on 22nd October 1853.¹⁶ Interestingly, the reality of the minor seminary did not correspond to the Tridentine regulations because, in this way, only a formation institution was created, not an educational one. The seminarians had to study at the German gymnasium, located in another part of the city, which disrupted the minor seminary's internal functioning.¹⁷ Finally, in 1868, Jirsík founded the bishop's Czech gymnasium, which he housed directly in the seminary building – of course, somewhat expanded. The reason for founding the Czech gymnasium was the growing number of minor seminarists who only spoke Czech. For Czech-speaking boys, studying at the German gymnasium, which until then was the only gymnasium in the city, was extremely demanding, and therefore their prospects for completing their studies were not very good.

It would seem that in this way, the regulations of the Council of Trent were finally (almost) satisfied. However, it was not so. The bishop's Czech gymnasium and the minor seminary institutions merged into one only for less than four years. There were financial reasons for this. Jirsík founded the Czech gymnasium and subsequently financed it from the diocese's resources, in other words, from regular collections among Czech patriots, for whom the existence of the Czech

¹⁵ A separate study will be devoted to the process of establishing the minor seminary in Budweis.

¹⁶ *Erlass des bischöflichen Ordinariates von Budweis an den Klerus der Diözese* (henceforth *Erlass*), 8–1853, pp. 61–64; *Erlass*, 11, 16, 21, 23–1853.

¹⁷ *Hohe Ministerial-Verordnung zu Gunsten des budweiser Diöcesan-Knabenseminars*, *Erlass*, 7–1854, p. 53; HOFFMANN, Josef, *Studentský Seminář v Českých Budějovicích*, České Budějovice, 1878, pp. 36–37; ŠEDA, Oldřich, *SOA Třeboň – oddělení Třeboň, Biskupský diecézní chlapecký seminář České Budějovice*, (1853) 1867–1847, inventory, Ev. Nr. 312, pp. 1–20, here see the chapter *Dějiny původce fondu*, p. 2.

gymnasium was essential. The financial burden on the poor diocese was so great that the bishop finally, with great relief, handed the gymnasium over to the state. In the following years, not only boys of the minor seminary studied at the Czech gymnasium, but of course, regular students also came to the gymnasium and seminary building. On the contrary, German-speaking seminarians continued to attend the German gymnasium. Two institutions coexisted in one building – the state Czech gymnasium and the diocesan minor seminary – until the beginning of the twentieth century, when the gymnasium moved to a new, modern building. In any case, the minor seminary, as an important formation institution of the diocese, of which the seminarians studied at the Czech or German state gymnasium, existed until its abolition by the communists in 1950.

Conclusion

Although the establishment of minor seminaries was ordered by the Council of Trent, and, in the post-Trent era, their necessity for the inner Church life continued to be emphasised, their very establishment in the Habsburg Monarchy and later in the Austrian Empire ran into legal and, above all, financial reality. The changes in conditions in society that arose as a result of the revolutionary events of 1848–1849 also resulted in a transformation of the relationship between the Catholic Church and the state in the Austrian Empire, which received its first legal basis in the imperial decrees of 1850 and the governmental decisions that followed. The subsequent establishment of minor seminaries can thus be understood as a consequence of these decisions and, at the same time, as one of the manifestations of the emancipation of the Church from the state. As was shown by the example of the Diocese of Budweis, the establishment of a minor seminary did not automatically mean the literal fulfilment of all the decrees of the Council of Trent and the Council Congregation. The functioning of this institution was always determined by the political and financial reality, which did not allow the literal fulfilment of Church-legal regulations. However, Rome itself did not view this fact critically. Rather, on the contrary, it supported the bishops' efforts to establish minor seminaries.¹⁸

¹⁸ Archivio Apostolico Vaticano, Congregazione del Consiglio, *Relationes Dioecesium* (fine sec. XVI – 1890 circa), Budvicen., České Budějovice – Budweis (Bohemia), sign. 153, fol. 22–27; Erlass, 9–1958, p. 69; Erlass, 11–1858, pp. 81–88; Erlass, 12–1858, pp. 89–91; Erlass, 20–1858, pp. 153–160.

Summary

This study is devoted to the legal basis for establishing minor seminaries in the Austrian Empire after 1850, of which their existence was supposed to help the intellectual and spiritual formation of future candidates for entry into priestly seminaries. The legal basis had its roots both in the decisions of the Council of Trent and the subsequent decrees from Rome and in the state legal decisions that resulted from negotiations between the Catholic bishops and the state as a result of the revolutionary events of 1848–1849. Using the example of establishing a minor seminary in the Diocese of Budweis, this study shows the pitfalls of such a decision, reflecting social and economic reality.

Resumé

Zakládání menších seminářů po roce 1850.

Důsledky proměny vztahu církve a státu v rakouském císařství na příkladu zřízení menšího semináře v českobudějovické diecézi

Tato studie se věnuje právnímu základu zakládání chlapeckých seminářů v prostředí habsburské monarchie po roce 1850, jejichž existence měla pomoci k intelektuální i duchovní formaci budoucích kandidátů pro vstup do kněžských seminářů. Právní základ měl své kořeny jednak v rozhodnutích tridentského koncilu a následných nařízeních ze strany Říma, jednak ve státních zákonných rozhodnutích, která vyplynula z jednání mezi katolickými biskupy a státem v důsledku revolučních událostí let 1848–1849. Na příkladu zakládání chlapeckého semináře v českobudějovické diecézi tato studie ukazuje úskalí takového rozhodnutí, které v sobě odráží společenskou a především ekonomickou realitu.

Keywords: Catholic Church, state, Austrian Empire, nineteenth century, minor seminaries, law, church law

Klíčová slova: katolická církev, stát, Rakouské císařství, devatenácté století, chlapecké semináře, právo, církevní právo

Author

Dr Rudolf Svoboda is an associate professor of Church history in the Department of Theology, Faculty of Theology, University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice (Budweis). He focuses on the fields of Church history and the history of the theology of the second half of the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries. Based on research in European archives, his academic activity is related in a narrower context to the Diocese of Budweis

and in a broader context to the spiritual and social history of the Habsburg monarchy. In recent years, he started to deal with the topics of Catholic missions from Europe to the USA and the life of Catholic missionaries in the USA in the nineteenth century.

Autor

Doc. ThDr. Rudolf Svoboda, Th.D., působí na Katedře teologických věd Teologické fakulty Jihočeské univerzity v Českých Budějovicích. Zaměřuje se především na církevní dějiny a dějiny teologie druhé poloviny osmnáctého a první poloviny devatenáctého století. Věnuje se tématům v užším kontextu svázaným s dějinami jeho domovské českobudějovické diecéze, v širším kontextu s duchovními a společenskými dějinami habsburské monarchie. V posledních letech se intenzivně zabývá tématy katolických misí z Evropy do USA, a také životními osudy katolických misionářů působících v USA v devatenáctém století.

Doc. ThDr. Rudolf Svoboda, Th.D.

Faculty of Theology
University of South Bohemia
Kněžská 8
CZ-370 01 České Budějovice
e-mail: svobodar@tf.jcu.cz