TRANSVERSAL PRACTICES BETWEEN BOURGEOIS COSMOPOLITANISM AND FERVENT GERMAN NATIONALISM

THE SCHILLERVEREIN IN TRIESTE AS AN EXAMPLE OF THE IN-BETWEEN IN THE ALPS-ADRIATIC REGION
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In the course of the Europe-wide Schiller celebrations commemorating the centenary of Friedrich Schiller’s birth, a Schillerverein (Schiller Society) was founded in Trieste 1859. It was made up of members of different ethnicities and religious confessions. One of the main aims of the society was to contribute to the cultural life of Trieste by means of (popular) scholarly lectures, concerts, theater performances, dances, and excursions.
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THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF SCHILLER IN THE 1859 ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS

After Friedrich Schiller’s death in 1805, commemorative ceremonies were held during the first half of the nineteenth century, or pre-March era, at the local level, organized and carried out by local societies (Noltenius 1988: 237). In 1825 the Stuttgart Liederkranz (Stuttgart Singing Society), one of the first men’s singing societies in the German-speaking world, held the first Schiller Festival in honor of the poet. The revenue generated was planned to be used for a monument, which was erected in Stuttgart after successful calls for donations in 1839. The notion that started in the nineteenth century that non-nobility—people that had made contributions in the cultural sphere—could also be elevated to a pedestal was based on the cultural pattern of the Fürstendenkmäler (monuments to princes) and subverted the idea of an absolutist monument. With monuments dedicated to Martin Luther (Wittenberg, 1821), Johannes Gutenberg (Mainz, 1837), Friedrich Schiller (Stuttgart, 1839), Johann Sebastian Bach (Leipzig, 1843), and others, the nascent middle-class (intellectuals) sought to take
the idea of the “cultural nation”¹ (Meinecke 1908)—which, unlike the nation-state, was neither territorially nor politically conceived, but connected to a common language and culture—and to make it publicly visible and implement it as a horizon of values.

The Schiller celebrations and the large-scale establishment of Schiller societies must be considered in the same context. According to the historian Juliane Mikoletzky, no other German-speaking writer was used to such an extent to propagate and authenticate specific bourgeois concepts of social order in the state and society (Mikoletzky 1995: 165) as Friedrich Schiller. Between moderate patriotism, secularized religiosity, and bourgeois-liberal opposition, additional Schiller festivals were held in Breslau (now Wrocław), Leipzig, and other cities in the 1830s and 1840s. These became the testing ground for free and public speech (Noltenius 1992: 155) in the pre-March era under the mantle² of literary aesthetics, and they were subject to constant police surveillance as well as the danger of dissolution.

With the revolutionary year of 1848, the interest in joining literature and art together to an organized degree decreased in favor of political daily newspapers. Nevertheless, Schiller, as a political and national poet, remained of particular importance to middle-class intellectuals, as the Germanist Rainer Noltenius notes: the political events were caricatured with parodies in the style of the Kapuziner-Predigt (from Schiller’s Wallensteins Lager), which were led by Rütli verses at electoral meetings (Noltenius 1984: 74). Due to the strong pressure from the authorities, which regulated clubs and societies as a whole and curtailed political activities—for example, the Prussian prohibition of the Weimar classic works for elementary school teachers and the fact that even in German-language high schools Schiller could only be read in excerpts for moral and ecclesiastical reinterpretation—the membership numbers of the societies declined during the Restaurationszeit (“restoration period”) after 1848. From the mid-1850s onwards, however, there was a renewed upswing in the activities of societies and the founding of new societies was recorded (Noltenius 1984: 75–76).

The year 1859 marked a tentative highlight of the Schiller commemoration. On November 10th, Schiller’s birthday was celebrated for the hundredth time, which was the occasion of celebrations with pageants, the unveiling of memorials, and performances of poems, speeches, and plays in town halls, theaters, universities, clubs, and guilds with the participation of university professors, teachers, students, and booksellers, as well as craftsmen and workers. However, farmers, Catholic clergy, officers, and nobles were missing—which

¹ The juxtaposition of an “objective” (cultural nation/Kulturnation) versus a “subjective” (nation-state/Staatsnation) concept of the nation claimed by Meinecke has been widely discussed. Here, however, is not the place to present this debate.

² On this point, Noltenius (1992) adopts a position in stark contrast to that of Thomas Mann, who saw in the bourgeois reverence of Schiller an escape into the ‘machtgeschützte Innerlichkeit’ (‘power-protected inwardness’) (Thomas Mann) of aesthetic self-interest (Noltenius 1992: 155). Noltenius emphasizes the aspect of the poet’s appropriation by the bourgeoisie for the purpose of political action.
can be interpreted as reflecting its organization by the nascent bourgeoisie (Noltenius 1992: 158–159). Especially in large German towns and in other European countries—for example, in Paris and London—attendance of the festivities numbered in the five-figure range (Gudewitz 2009: 60).

The breadth of the Schiller commemoration was shown in the publication of numerous biographies and special editions of his works, as well as in popularization in the form of artefacts such as portrait lithographs, miniature busts, and Schiller champagne bottles, as well as scores of curiosities focusing on commercial and economic aspects that accompanied the organized commemoration in the form of material memorabilia (Gudewitz 2009: 60–62) and that can be viewed as forms of a bourgeois appropriation of Schiller by his admirers. This could be called an “invention of Schiller,” drawing upon Benedict Anderson (1983), and an “invention of tradition” with the resulting Schiller commemorative celebrations, in the sense of Eric Hobsbawm (1983).

This communicative link between local and national (fixed) space (Gudewitz 2009: 63), which spread across the emerging bourgeois public, triggered a change in the territorial integrity and the sociopolitical status of the members of the Deutscher Bund (German Confederation) and produced meaning-defining propositions of varying practical relevance. In Schiller’s birthplace in 1835 the first society was created with the Marbacher Schillerverein, in which Schiller became the object of a partly private, partly semi-public topic of discussion and information dedicated to the memory of the poet. This was followed by further societies also outside the German federation. Although these societies were first used as spaces of private activity, which did not explicitly aim at concrete political action, they played a central role in the pre-March era during the preparation for and the events of 1848–1849, just like the student fraternities. The idea adapted by Johann Gottfried Herder in his Briefe zur Beförderung der Humanität (Letters for the Advancement of Humanity) of a cultural nation linked by the German language and culture beyond territorial boundaries also served to promote nationalization tendencies, which ultimately led to the founding of the German Empire in 1871. The black-red-gold flag of German unity, which was forbidden in the pre-March era and the restoration, was carried by many Schiller societies at the centennial celebrations in 1859 (Noltenius 1992: 159–160). Thus the Schiller pageant, according to Noltenius’ interpretation, can be interpreted at the symbolic level as a feudal pageant for a poet appointed as a Bürgerkönig (bourgeois king), or as a military triumphal procession after a national victory, or even as a political demonstration in memory of the revolution of 1848 (Noltenius 1992: 160). This political significance is not insignificant in the context of the establishment of the Schillerverein in Trieste.
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TRIESTE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Trieste was part of the Habsburg Empire from 1382 to 1918. The rise of Trieste was connected with the monarchy’s economic and military-strategic interest in access to the sea, when Trieste, alongside Rijeka, was proclaimed a free port in March 1719 by a decree of Holy Roman Emperor Charles VI. This status entailed special freedoms for the movement of goods. Merchants were allowed to buy and sell goods at the port, as Jacob Löwenthal wrote in 1857, without paying any protection fee, seigniorage, or other fees (1857: 158). Within a few decades, the port location became an important economic center in the southern part of the Habsburg Empire. The associated duty-free trade, as well as the tolerant religious policy practiced under Maria Theresia and Joseph II, attracted capital and commercial enterprises to Trieste and made possible the free influx of immigrants.

According to Waltraud Kokot et al. (2008), ports and port cities—like airports, railroads, or hotels as discussed by Lars Wilhelmer (2015)—are transit areas where people spend an indefinite time and leave traces in various ways. Kokot describes them as “nodes of migration, concentrating ideas, economic and material goods, migration and exile (...) points of arrival and of departure for numbers of migrants, many of them remaining as expatriate communities of traders or merchants, who in turn fostered the cities’ development by their transnational connections and left their mark on the urban space” (2008: 14–15). According to this reading, the Port of Trieste can be considered one of those social spaces par excellence in which the sojourn and time spent create a tension-laden mixture of movement and perseverance, diversity and monotony, and social encounter and anonymity.

The many-faceted composition of the population—people speaking Italian, German, Slovenian, Greek, Serbian, Armenian, Hungarian, and others—shaped the character of the city into its hinterland. On the one hand, traders, merchants, and civil servants arrived from various parts of the Mediterranean area, who exerted both mercantile and cultural influence. On the other hand, there were workers from the immediate vicinity who switched from work in the countryside to port and craft work or employment in urban areas (Kalc 2008: 303–305). If Trieste is accorded a “cosmopolitan character” (Waley 2009: 253) in this context, it should also be taken into account that it was an advantage for the target group of immigrants to be multilingual and culturally open, especially for professional reasons and in everyday situations. In the words of Sergia Adamo: “Although multilingualism was the founding cultural token of this world, reflecting diverse influences and connotations, the context rather resembled an arena where complex dynamics of identity construction took place through the emergence of tensions, contradictions, more or less open confrontations and conflicts” (Adamo 2017: 4). The largest group of immigrants was comprised of the German-speaking population, although its share of the total population barely exceeded 5% by 1900 (Angelmaier 2000: 29).

The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 definitively strengthened Trieste’s position as a trade and economic center because the city now played a significant role not only for
Austria-Hungary, but also for the Asian and East India trade of neighboring countries (Schatzdorfer 2008: 45). However, when sailboats disappeared in favor of steam shipping and the city was integrated into the Vienna–Trieste railway system, which made possible the transport of goods and passengers to the capital within a day, the port developed from a trading center to a distribution center that lost its connection to the city. As a result of this development, many inhabitants of Trieste, as in other port cities, remained unaffected by the activities of the port, and often lived with their backs to the sea, so to speak (Driessen 2005: 130–131). In addition, there developed a detached harbor culture, which was based on specific forms of port work (from poorly paid odd jobs to highly qualified work) and had little in common with the heroic image of masculinity that romanticized the struggle with the forces of the sea.

Cultural and social life also experienced an upswing through the free port decree. Following the Napoleonic interlude from 1809 to 1813, there were two major cultural organizations that offered a heterogeneous field of activity to the rising bourgeoisie. Firstly the artistic and literary Società di Minerva (Minerva Society)—Daša Ličen sheds light on Minerva’s path in the 19th century (Ličen 2017)—, founded by Domenico Rossetti, Ignaz Kollmann, and others in 1810, which published the periodical Archeografo Triestino (The Trieste Archeographer) with the participation of Pietro Kandler. Secondly the Casino Tedesco (German Casino), active from the 1820s onward and dedicated to the cultivation of science. Its members came from both the Austrian and Italian business elites of Trieste. With the establishment of shipping and insurance companies, part of which merged with Austria’s Lloyd company in 1833, as well as branch offices of banks, which contributed to the conditions for Trieste’s global trade function and to quadrupling the population, German-Austrian cultural influences increased (Opela 1996: 439–440). During this time, societies for the promotion of art and culture were founded, such as the Philharmonisch-dramatische Verein (Philharmonic Dramatic Society, 1829) and the Triester Gesellschaft der schönen Künste (Trieste Society of Fine Arts, 1840; Angelmaier 2000: 17–18). On the Slovenian side, the first reading society (Slavjansko bralno društvo) was founded in 1848. A Slovenian society corresponding to a philharmonic dramatic society was founded with the Narodni dom (Slovenian Cultural Center) in 1909 (Millo 1990: 158).

In the course of the strong presence of German-speaking leading merchants and cultural elites, there was intensified expansion of German-speaking culture and society life as well as the educational system. The first schools—aNormalschule (teacher training school) and a high school—were opened in 1775 in the wake of Maria Theresia’s educational reform, which provided for the introduction of German as the language of instruction (Santi 2015: 169). German-language periodicals, such as the one founded by Jacob Löwenthal in 1838—Adria. Süddeutsches Centralblatt für Kunst, Literatur und Leben (Adria. The Central German Gazette of Art, Literature, and Life), to which the writer Adolf Ritter von Tschabuschnigg contributed, among others—strove to establish contact between German and Italian culture (Opela 1996: 440). The time of this intercultural exchange between
groups speaking German, Italian, and Slovenian probably reached its apex in the first half of the nineteenth century. For example, if members of the Società Minerva expressed concern about traditions and the Italian character of Trieste, they did so as inhabitants of a multiethnic state—and not with the aim of the cultural foundation of an Italian nation-state. According to Magris and Ara, until 1848 Trieste was a cultural melting pot that fueled itself: for example, the Italian periodical La Favilla (The Spark) sought a mutual cultural exchange of information with Adria (2014: 15–17). This phase was dominated by those reflexive and transversal practices of in-betweenness, which could be described as elements of a cosmopolitan consciousness and—closely linked with this—a corresponding everyday practice: the exchange and communicative reference between the residents did not depend on one’s language and particular place of birth within the defined borders of a land or nation, but on the possibility of shaping one’s own life and living together with others in a cultural mélange (Beck 2004: 10). The exchange of ideas and lifestyles was “thus distinguished more by a socially defined ‘bourgeois culture’, rather than by any exclusive ‘national’ markers” (Millo 2007: 68).

Notwithstanding the fact that in the second half of the nineteenth century there was a growing cultural supply, the conflict of nationalities increasingly dominated in the course of the pan-European revolutions of 1848 in Trieste. As a result, societies and clubs became the most important instrument for the political and national mobilization of large population groups (Moritsch 2001: 385). Societies such as the Triester Turn- und deutscher Gesangsverein (Trieste Gymnastics and German Singing Society, 1850) or the Freundschaftsbund (Friendship League, 1851) displayed an ethnic tendency, which was represented on the Italian side, for example, by the Società Triestina di Ginnastica (Trieste Gymnastics Society, 1863) and on the Slovenian side by Edinost (1875; Lugnani 1986: 44). Also the school system got affected by this development, when Count Franz Stadion, the imperial governor in Trieste, introduced teaching in the local languages in elementary schools in 1842. Official government organs, such as Triester Zeitung (The Trieste Gazette, 1851), with editors such as Jacob Löwenthal, Franz Ernst Pipitz, Robert Hamerling and Carl Dreger, reported on German-speaking cultural life and socio-political questions (Lugnani 1986: 50), whereas Edinost (Unity) and L’indipendente (The Independent, 1877) expressed nationalist tones on the Slovenian and Italian sides (Adamo 2017: 4). As a result of the irredentist movements from 1861 onwards, the armed conflicts and unification movements of 1866–1871, and electoral reforms adapted to the sociopolitical conditions, political camps took shape in Trieste by 1914. Due to the increasing nationalist rivalry between the Italian majority and the Slovenian minority—which was growing in both economic and sociopolitical strength—the reciprocal delimitation of ethnic communities penetrated increasingly larger sections of the population, especially through reading and school societies as well as through the press.
In the midst of Europe-wide Schiller festivities, German-speaking residents in Trieste and those interested in Weimar classic works founded the Schillerverein in 1859. According to the jubilee issue on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the society, the motivation for the founding of the society was to follow suit with the societies of “Deutschen aller Länder und Zonen [sic]” in order to contribute to the “Einigkeit deutscher Sprache, deutscher Wissenschaft und deutscher Kunst” in Trieste (Rabl 1885: 3). The link, which is connected by means of the common language, is named very expressively, that it should embrace all those, “denen unsere Sprache heimisch oder vertraut ist, und die für die reichen Schätze deutschen Geistes und Gemüthes Sinn und Empfänglichkeit haben” (Rabl 1885: 3). This refers to both ethnic Germans and German speakers. The association was not to be a “Versammlungsplatz glänzender Gesellschaften, wohl aber eine gemüthliche Vereinigung gebildeter bürgerlicher Kreise zur gegenseitigen Unterhaltung (…)” (Rabl 1885: 3).

In February 1860, the society counted 232 regular members and fifty-three corresponding members. The premises of the former Greek Casino in the Palazzo del Tergesteo (Trieste Palace) located between the old stock exchange and the Verdi Theater were used by the society. In these rooms, which were equipped with furnishings and instruments from the dissolved Società musicale (Music Society; Petronio 1989: 256), the society wanted to set up a reading room. For this purpose, the society subscribed to daily newspapers as well as literary and scholarly weekly and monthly publications. The furnishings of the library were donated by members of the society. Julius Heller, who had already made a name for himself as an artist and an orchestra conductor in the city, was appointed the society’s Kapellmeister (conductor). The celebration of the society’s founding took place on February 20th, 1860 and featured a concert and dance.

According to its charter, the purpose of the Schillerverein was to offer “seinen Mitgliedern und deren Familien einen Sammpunkt zu edlerem geselllichen Verkehre, zum Austausche der Resultate wissenschaftlicher und künstlerischer Bestrebungen, somit zur Belehrung und Erholung (…)” (Statuten 1897: 3). The main activity of the society involved popular scholarly lectures, concerts for the society or open to the public, theater performances, dances, excursions, later on also costumed events, the creation of a library, and subscription to magazines. Following a positive vote in a quorum meeting of the board of directors, membership in the society was open to men, widows, and unmarried self-employed women with their main residence in Trieste. For the most part these were Austrians drawn from the German-speaking provinces of the monarchy—for example, from Carinthia or Styria—or immigrants from regions of the German Confederation. Members of other nationalities also joined the society. There was also a large proportion of Jewish members.

Regular members with a fixed annual fee were entitled to use the society’s facilities, to participate in its events, and to exercise the right to vote for its board of directors and general meeting. In addition, they were allowed to bring adult female family members along.
and invite them to become members of the society. Corresponding members, who paid a smaller annual fee, were not allowed to invite family members and had no right to vote. Persons interested in the society’s activities that were only temporarily in Trieste were able to purchase an outsider’s admission ticket, which allowed them to use the society’s facilities and to attend its events. The house rules stipulated that children and dogs were not permitted in the society’s premises. Consumption of food and beverages and the use of tobacco was limited to selected rooms. Silence was required in the reading rooms (Statuten 1897: 12).

For the planned annual celebration on November 10th, 1860, the hall of the Mauroner Theater, where the first major Schiller celebration took place, was rented because the society’s premises were too small. As this solution to the spatial conditions did not satisfy the society, it decided for a new location on Via del Lazzaretto vecchio (Old Hospital Street). Starting in August 1861, the society rented the third floor of a building on the street for the next eight years. In order to outfit the new location with appropriate furniture, the society took out a bond of 10,000 gulden from its members, which was repaid over the course of ten years. In the meantime, a resolution by the board of directors foresaw “den Winter hindurch an jedem Samstage Tanzunterhaltungen zu veranstalten und denselben in der Zeit vor dem Fasching kurze Musikproductionen, oder eine Gesellschafts-Tombola vorausgehen zu lassen (…)“ (Rabl 1885: 6). According to the notes in the jubilee publication, these dances were held every year.

The course of the years from 1860 to 1862 provides information on those activities reaching beyond educational activities held for society members only and could be applied to the following decades with only a few deviations. In 1860–1861, the 485 society members were offered ten lectures on scholarship and literature. When the imperial couple visited Miramare Castle in May 1861, the society decided to hold a serenade. The evening entertainment was apparently well received because Franz Folliot de Crenneville, the first general adjutant of the emperor, informed the society that Franz Joseph had ordained that, a sign of recognition, a marble portrait bust of the immortal poet whose name heads the society be conferred upon it (Rabl 1885: 8). In March 1862, the bust created by the sculptor Thomas Greinwald arrived in Trieste, and it was officially unveiled on April 12th that year. The Grazer Zeitung (The Graz Gazette), at that time the official gazette of Styria, reported a few days later:


In the course of this festive dedication, 525 gulden were raised in a lottery organized by the society members and donated to the poor of Trieste, regardless of their religious beliefs.
In September 1862, the *Wiener Männergesangsverein* (Vienna Men’s Choral Society) with almost 150 members visited the society. A joint excursion to the top of Boschetto Hill ended in a great singing festival, which, according to Rabl (1885: 10–11), was enthusiastically received by the audience. At the end of the year, a vocal and instrumental concert was held for the members in the Armonia Theater. The proceeds of more than 400 gulden were donated to the Directorate General of Public Institutions to help the poor of Trieste. Josef Rabl, the author of the first part of the jubilee publication, was selected as the society’s new director.

The detailed description of the society’s first three years offers an insight into its activities. These took place alongside responsibilities to one’s job or family among a self-selected group of like-minded persons in order to actively promote social and educational activities, to maintain contacts with people from outside the region, to engage in volunteer tasks for the welfare of the society, or to attend lectures, concerts, and song evenings for recreation. Those who participated in these activities did not necessarily identify themselves with the *Weimarer Klassik* (Weimar Classicism). Through membership, however, it was possible to become a recipient of a cultural exchange that, on the one hand, linked hitherto separated cultural experiences and established expanded social networks, and on the other hand marked and established affiliation with the social group of the bourgeoisie. As a latent political place of discussion and bourgeois self-understanding (Habsburg holidays, major anniversaries, and visits were consistently and duly celebrated), the *Schillerverein* was certainly
largely reserved for men. In addition, the rehearsals and other meetings often wound up in an establishment where unmarried women were not permitted. However, women were very welcome as audience members or artistic participants.

From 1862 until the beginning of the First World War, numerous oratorio and chamber music performances, instrumental concerts, and festive evenings were held every year, with international participation: the Philharmonische Gesellschaft from Ljubljana (Philharmonic Society), Wiener Männergesang-Verein (Vienna Men’s Choral Society), Liedertafel der Concordia from Graz (Concordia Singing Club), Société des Instruments anciens from Paris (Academy of Ancient Music), Brussels String Quartet, and so on. The many collaborations with theatrical ensembles or with music and singing societies point to transversal networking beyond the German-speaking countries. The artists invigorated the local music and cultural scene just as they were able to follow initiatives from abroad. For example, Adolf Grohmann served as concertmaster of the Klagenfurter Musikverein. In 1904 he was invited to play for the Philharmonic Society in Ljubljana as a violinist, and on November 10th, 1905 he performed with the pianist Sophie Auspitz from Vienna and the orchestra of the Austro-Hungarian 97th Infantry Regiment at the Schillerverein. The extent of the society’s artistic activity is shown by the fact that—mainly due to Heller’s efforts to invite renowned instrumentalists—the number of instrumental concerts in some years was higher than that of similar events at the Teatro Comunale (Trieste Theater; Santi 2015: 183). On the other hand, the society had opportunities to attend events abroad. Thus, in June 1864, the members of the Schillerverein visited the Männergesangsverein (Men’s Choral Society) in Klagenfurt to participate in a four-day singing festival with other singing societies from Austria.

In August 1868, the society moved one last time, to the Palazzo Stratti, which is located on today’s Piazza Unità d’Italia (Unity of Italy Square). Although the society’s leadership was endeavoring to establish adequate premises for the society’s activities, the majority of large events took place in theaters that they leased. The society members had dozens of daily, weekly, and monthly newspapers with political, scholarly, and scientific content at their disposal in the society premises. By the same token, according to Rabl’s explanation in the jubilee issue, the use of the society library holding over 2,700 volumes was lively. “(…) Gut besucht sind endlich allabendlich die Spielzimmer des Vereines, in denen den Mitgliedern zwei Billards zur Verfügung stehen” (1885: 36–37).

An extract from the accounts of 1882 provides information on financial matters. Revenue was mainly raised through membership fees (regular and corresponding), and marginally through entertainment at billiards and the gambling table, borrowing books and magazines from the reading room, and interest payments. The expenditures were more differentiated and mainly concerned renting and lighting for the premises, bills of the society’s staff—from the conductor (Kapellmeister) to the club and gambling table servants to craftsmen—advertisements and other printed matter, as well as sheet music (Schillervereins-Cassa 1882). At the end of the 1880s the great oratorio performances turned out to be too costly, which led to performances by smaller choirs in their own society hall.
Fünftes Mitglieder-Konzert

Beginn des Konzertes um 1/4 Uhr, Ende um 1/4 Uhr abends.

Programm


Für das Fondskonzert, welches am 16. April stattfindet, wurde das Orchester des Wiener Konzertvereines unter Leitung Ferd. Löwes gewonnen.

Der Vorhut der Gesänge ist in der Musikkolienhandlung des Herrn Otto Fischer und am Konzerttag an der Kasse um 20 Uhr erhältlich.


Zur gefügigsten Beachtung, im Interesse der Zuhörer und aus Rücksicht, für die Ausübenden wird hiezu erwartet, den Betreten und Verlassen des Gasthauses während der Dauer eines Musikstücks zu vermeiden.

Der Saal wird um 7 Uhr geöffnet.

An die P. T. Mitglieedr! Man stelle die Mitgliedschaft weithin und selbst am Eingang des Theaters selbständig, da ohne Karte kein Eintritt gestattet.

Figure 2: Members’ Concert of the Philharmonic Society in Ljubljana with the participation of Adolf Grohmann (Digitalna knjižnica Slovenije / Digital Library of Slovenia http://www.dlib.si/stream/URN:NBN:SI:DOC-HGRUVKO2/9010ae42-b17a-494d-b6e4-b6c631921c38/PDF).
Figure 3: Certificate of gratitude from the *Triester Liedertafel* for participation in the singing festival in Klagenfurt from June 26th to 29th, 1864 (Kärntner Landesarchiv, Bildarchiv D 129)
Figure 4: Performance by the Berliner Tonkünstler-Orchester (Berlin Musicians' Orchestra), 1903. Conductor: Richard Strauss (Archivio del Civico Museo Teatrale Carlo Schmidl, Trieste)
Taking account of the financial requirements, the charter was amended in 1897 in such a way that surplus seats in the theater could be sold to non-members. The resulting increase in revenue allowed a series of symphonic concerts to be held annually with visiting orchestras and conductors. In 1899, for example, the Schillerverein in the Polytheama Rossetti theater was able to invite the Münchner Kaim-Orchester (Munich Kaim Orchestra) with court orchestra conductor Felix von Weingartner—later the imperial court opera director in Vienna—or the Berliner Tonkünstler-Orchester (Berlin Musicians’ Orchestra) under Richard Strauss in 1903. After the illness and the death of Heller in 1901, there was a perceptible decline in the musical draw of the Schillerverein, apart from performances by guest orchestras. In addition to financial reasons, this could be due to the creation of new societies that, like the Società dei Filarmonici (Philharmonic Society), constituted considerable competition for the society (Santi 2015: 189). On the other hand, the chroniclers succinctly noted around 1909: “Es ist eine Erfahrung, die gegenwärtig allenthalben gemacht wird, daß die Musikpflege unter der Ausübung der verschiedenen Sportsarten leidet. Doch das eine braucht das andere nicht auszuschließen, denn was der Sport dem Körper, das ist die Musik dem Gemüte (…)” (Kesel, Pipitz, & Rabl 1909: 31–32).

MEMBERS OF THE SCHILLERVEREIN

Even though it is clear from the society’s charter that ‘nationality’ and linguistic affiliation did not constitute any discriminating features against non-members, there were certainly criteria that were decisive for inclusion in the society and participation in the society’s activities: alongside a certain interest in education, this meant in particular social status—which, however, was not understood in the sense of segregation, as was the case with the old corporations, but rather, in Rabl’s words, a “Annäherung der Angehörigen verschiedener Nationalitäten, sowie der verschiedenen zur guten Gesellschaft gehörigen Berufsschichten” (Rabl 1885: 36). That this reference to “good society” could be taken literally is seen in the rejection of the membership of Theodor Brehmer, the later general inspector of the Trieste’s Generali Insurance Company. Brehmer had divorced his first wife and married her sister, the German writer Antonie Gaffron. In August 1872, he wrote a letter from Klagenfurt to the board of the Schillerverein, in which he spoke of its superficial straitlaced character:

“Die Gründe meiner Nichtannahme (…) sind mir genügend bekannt, sie bestehen einfach in meiner Ehescheidung und zweitem Ehe. (…) Sollten Sie nun immer so gewissenhaft vorgegangen und Jeden ausgeschlossen haben, in dessen Familienleben dunkle Schatten treten? Haben Sie z. B. vielleicht die Väter ausgeschlossen, deren Söhne ein nichts weniger als moralisches Leben führen? Wahrlich nicht, denn sonst würde Ihr Verein eine völlig andere Gestalt haben und kaum seine Existenz fristen können” (Brehmer 1872).
Membership fees on a graduated scale weighted by participation in decisions, by recommendations, such as those decided on the basis of good character as for Brehmer, and by permanent residence were instruments of exclusion or inclusion, which served to ensure the social homogeneity of the society (Nipperdey 1976: 186). Thus the list of members of the Schillerverein read like a who’s who list of the upper middle class and nobility—in other words, the economic and cultural elite of the assessable German-speaking world in Trieste. There were representatives of the aristocratic and (economic) bourgeois senior bureaucracy, army and the navy officers, executives from industry, banking, and trade, and from the turn of the century onward also an increasing number of women. It was a social—that is, class-oriented—form of exclusion and inclusion, and thereby went along with self-elevation to “good society” (Rabl 1885: 36). This, however, was connected with the multifaceted character of practices of in-betweenness, which do not allow a strict classification into a homogeneous group of “German Trieste” or “German Austrians in Trieste.” The 1911 membership list states the members’ professions (DLA Marbach). This shows that most of the members belonged to the economic bourgeoisie and the military. There were also representatives of political institutions, especially consuls of various countries, and—to a lesser extent—people who could be considered part of the intellectual class.

Individuals such as Julius Kugy or Julius Heller came from elsewhere to Trieste for professional reasons. Kugy had studied law in Vienna and took over his father’s import and trade company in Trieste. He was elected to the board of the Schillerverein in 1882, and from 1891 onwards was in charge of concert affairs. At his suggestion, in 1888, an independent singing club of the Schillerverein was established with its own charter, which non-members could also join. This resulted in its choral performances becoming better known in wider circles (Radole 2010: 144). The society provided a choral director, premises, and lighting in order to cultivate mixed choral singing through weekly rehearsals (Kesel, Pipitz, & Rabl 1909: 27). Julius Heller, already mentioned above, had studied music in Vienna and had come to Trieste as the conductor of the Società musicale (Music Society) in 1857. After the dissolution of this society, he became the conductor of the newly founded Schillerverein. It is thanks to his engagement that the Liedertafel of the Schillerverein, initially founded as a men’s choir, was decisively expanded by the admission of women in order to perform larger choral works (Kesel, Pipitz, & Rabl 1909: 51–52).

Other personalities, such as Franz Ernst Pipitz, whose life and works are presented like the prestigious biography of a nineteenth-century cosmopolitan, also came from elsewhere. Born in 1815 in Klagenfurt, Pipitz attended the high school there, which had been run by the Benedictines of St. Paul since 1808, and the obligatory two-year philosophy course at the lyceum. In 1832 he began the law program in Vienna, but he dropped out and, after a brief period as a private tutor, joined Stift St. Paul im Lavanttal (St. Paul’s College in the Lavant Valley) in 1833 as a novitiate, where he began a theology program at the lyceum in Klagenfurt (Baum 1991: 12–14). In 1838, because of a relationship with a tradesman’s daughter and doubts about becoming priest, he withdrew from the monastery and traveled
via Innsbruck to Zurich. In 1839 he published his *Fragmente aus Österreich* (Fragments from Austria), a collection of diary records, aphorisms, literary and political essays, and poems that contained a critical piece of history about the pre-March era, Metternich, and Sedlnitzky. In 1842, his *Memoiren eines Apostaten* (Memoirs of an Apostate) followed, which as a novel not only provides information about his youth, but is a valuable cultural and genre image from the Klagenfurt of the 1830s (Nußbaumer 1956: 362). In 1848 he qualified as a private lecturer of history in Zurich and lectured on the French Revolution as well as Italian and German history until the fall semester of 1850. This period of lecturing was followed by the publication of a two-volume biography about Mirabeau (1850)—the second volume was devoted to Adolf Ritter von Tschabuschnigg, one of the closest friends of his youth (Ortner 1910: 73–74). On the basis of his writings, Pipitz was awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Königsberg. In 1851, after a partial confirmation of his request for unfrocking, he was relieved of his professional reorientation and his return to Austria was facilitated. After a brief job with the Ministry of the Interior, he was appointed to Trieste by Trade Minister Karl Ludwig von Bruck, the co-founder of the Austrian Lloyd company. Pipitz worked there as a copyeditor starting in 1851 and as the editor of *Triester Zeitung* (The Trieste Gazette) starting in the mid-1860s. In 1853 he was appointed deputy secretary of the Trieste Chamber of Commerce. In his additional function as a correspondent for foreign journals, he dealt with important questions concerning the development of Austrian maritime trade and the city of Trieste (Ortner 1910: 75). In 1865 he represented the Trieste Chamber of Commerce on the occasion of the last German-Austrian trading day in Frankfurt am Main, through the mediation of von Bruck. In 1873 he resigned for health reasons and moved to Graz, where, in addition to writing other works, he was able to devote himself to his extensive collection of beetles as an enthusiastic entomologist until his death in 1899 (*Insekten-Börse* 1899: 74).

At the beginning of the 1860s, Pipitz was a corresponding member of the *Schillerverein*, and later, until his departure from Trieste, a regular member of the society. Through his central co-management of the content of *Triester Zeitung* (The Trieste Gazette), he decisively shaped the external profile of the *Schillerverein* through articles about the society’s activities, announcements of concerts, and reports on celebrations. It is important in this context that, on the one hand, editorial staff such as Hamerling or Dreger were at the same time (founding) members of the *Schillerverein*, thereby increasing its range of coverage in publications, and on the other hand the majority of the company’s printed publications, as well as *Triester Zeitung* itself, were produced by the Lloyd company, which operated as a hinge between economic interests and cultural-political aims to strengthen the cultural presence of the German element in Trieste, albeit according to Lengauer (2006: 66) without any chauvinist intent expressed. Pipitz’s son, also named Franz Ernst, had been a corresponding member since the end of the 1880s, and starting in 1908 he served as the director of the *Schillerverein* alongside Franz Rabl and the trade councilor Karl Hoffmann. He eventually headed the governing council of Trieste, and in 1909, together with Franz Rabl and the merchant Hugo Kesel, issued the second part of the society’s jubilee publication.
Figure 5: Franz Ernst Pipitz – ca. 1865 (Kärntner Landesarchiv, Bildarchiv A 127)
The *Schillerverein* in Trieste was founded at a time when the process of nationalization had already begun. The Italian bourgeoisie began to orient itself away from the Habsburg Monarchy in 1860–1861 and towards an Italian nation state still to come. Slovenian immigrants from the nearby countryside acquired greater political influence and sought to gain economic importance, and there were pan-German⁵ as well as loyal Habsburg aspirations. This was the constellation in which the Trieste *Schillerverein* operated.

Two prominent comments by Josef Rabl in the jubilee issue offer insight into how the *Schillerverein* attempted to prevent the emerging ethnic conflict from becoming overwhelming. The society, as Rabl’s comments suggest, had always endeavored

„den durch den Dichterheros, dessen Namen er trägt, verkündigten, erhabenen Kosmopolitismus der Wissenschaft und Kunst im gesellschaftlichen Leben Triests zur Geltung zu bringen, und selbst die Angehörigen anderer Nationalitäten als Mitarbeiter zur Lösung dieser Aufgabe herbeizuziehen“ (Rabl 1885: 4).

His comprehensive review of activities in the first twenty-five years conjures up this “sublime cosmopolitanism” as well as peaceful coexistence and togetherness:

Durch das Zusammenwirken Aller hat der Verein unter Anderem auch die von den wohlthätigsten Folgen für die socialen Zustände Triests begleitete Annäherung der Angehörigen verschiedener Nationalitäten (…) bewirkt, welche sich hierorts mehr als irgendwo fremd geblieben waren. (…) Grosse Ereignisse haben Europa, haben unser Vaterland im letzten Vierteljahrhundert in ihre Kreise gezogen, die Kriegsfurie hat wiederholt in unserer Nähe gewüthet, auch unser Triest ist vom Parteihader und Racenzwist (sic!) nicht verschont geblieben: in unserem Vereine aber hat (…) der Friede ununterbrochen sein mildes Scepter geführt; gebildete, gute Menschen jedes Stammes und Standes haben sich um das Friedensbanner eines deutschen Dichterfürsten geschaart und sich die Hand gereicht (...) (Rabl 1885: 36–38).

Several aspects of this presentation are remarkable, but also typical of the tendency to de-politicize nineteenth-century artistic and scholarly societies. Rabl’s account reflects

---

⁵ Cf. a press release from the newspaper *Presse* of November 10th, 1859 on the occasion of the torch-light procession celebrating the centennial of Schiller’s birth: “(…) daß wir uns als Deutsche fühlen, daß wir uns als ein starkes, von Deutschland unabhännebares Glied betrachten, und daß wir uns trotz alledem und alledem ein warmes Herz erhalten haben, fähig der Begeisterung für ideale Zwecke” (cited in Mikoletzky 1995: 167).
the process that can be seen as a result of the defeat of the bourgeois revolutions of 1848–1849. Associated with this was a representation of interests by bourgeois societies that no longer aimed at changing political or economic and social conditions, but propagated culture and education as a substitute. In the course of the restoration after the defeat of 1848–1849, the bourgeoisie renounced the demand to seize the political power of the state. As a result, the social commitment of the bourgeoisie shifted from the political to the cultural. This cultural orientation is characterized by Ernst Hanisch in his analysis of the Austrian nation-building process in Vienna: “Räumlich gesehen, an der Schnittfläche von Heldenplatz und Ringstraße, zeitlich gesehen, an der Schnittfläche von Neoabsolutismus und liberaler Ära, sozialgeschichtlich gesehen, an der Schnittfläche von Stand und Klasse, nistete sich die Weimarer Klassik, Goethe und Schiller, ein” (Hanisch 1998: 131).

Hanisch argues that in this context, especially with regard to Schiller, a “catalyzing function,” which was typical of the urban bourgeois attitude in the multinational state, was at work: His pathos for freedom extended to the Galician shtetl. Schiller became the projection surface on which freedom and nation were reflected. At the Schiller celebration of 1859, the educated middle classes, primarily the students, celebrated themselves as a sacred community, in which magic and rationality, emotional nation-building and democratic ideas amalgamated (Hanisch 1998: 131). The performative actions associated with the Schiller celebrations were an expression of political impotence as well as an act of their own aesthetically argued bourgeois self-elevation: Just as the Schiller celebration is no longer part of, but a substitute for revolutionary action, the artistic program that can be identified with this celebrated poet becomes a substitute for revolutionary ideology (Graevenitz 1989: 547).

After the political defeat of the bourgeois revolution of 1848–1849, Schiller played a special role and became the formative framing figure for escape into the cultural realm and the accompanying bourgeois desertion from the “democratic creative drive” (Hanisch 1998: 131). In this process, Schiller was elevated as a bright figure on a pedestal and his linguistic paths was advanced to a medium of idealistic exaltation. In this context, the cataclysmic career of the concept of “culture”, in contrast to the notion of civilization (Elias 1976), also gathered momentum. Not least in this appropriation of Schiller, the narrow, bourgeois, idealistic, Platonic concept of culture (the true, the beautiful, and the good) was spelled out. It elevated art and literature in an idealistic way into a higher sphere and kept it distant from the lowlands of everyday life, especially political matters.

The cosmopolitan conceptions of affection and loyalty to humanity (Albrecht 2005: 111) that Schiller propagated in their entirety, as well as the Enlightenment idea that a humane and free society can be created through education and art (Wirtz 2006: 9), formed corresponding ideological connections for his appointment as a poet-prince orchestrated by the Schiller societies. The reinterpretation and instrumentalization of Enlightenment ideas in this appropriation of Schiller is indeed obvious, but cannot be further elaborated at
this point (Grawe 1994: 638–668). For the following argument, it is central that Schiller’s pathos provided sufficient ambiguity to maintain the fiction of unity and the claim of non-partisanship in the complex political situation in Trieste.

In *Triester Zeitung* in 1866, the demand for commonalities transcending ethnic and religious affiliations reads as follows: “Dieser Verein steht in hoher Blüte und seine künstlerischen Bestrebungen zeigen, (...) Alle Menschen werden Brüder in der Kunst (...) ohne Rücksicht auf Nationalität, Confession und Vermögensunterschied (...)” (*Triester Zeitung*, May 18th, 1866). However, contemporary observers already drew a more nuanced picture of the society and its activities. Joseph Lehmann, the Berlin editor of *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes* (Foreign Literature Magazine), characterized the efforts made during the early years of the society against nascent Italian irredentism:


With regard to the popular elections in the duchies of Parma and Piacenza, Modena, and Tuscany, which voted almost one hundred percent “yes” for Italy (Moritsch 2001: 348), Lehmann speaks of the active political advocacy of the *Schillerverein* in view of Italy’s impending proclamation as constitutional monarchy. The extent to which Lehmann interpreted the private and isolated appearance of individual members as the causes of the society, or how the society functioned as a platform for networking political representatives, would have to be analyzed more closely. It is, however, interesting to see how strongly the nationalism of the Italian unification movement, or *Risorgimento*, was felt and followed in Berlin during the initial phase of the society.

A comment from the Trieste port authority director, Friedrich Bömches—who, in contrast to Lehmann, was able to follow the activities of the society on the ground—points to disagreements in the program design and appropriate content. In the columns section of the Saturday edition of the *Triester Tagblatt* (Trieste Daily News) of March 24, 1883, he criticized the program and the public representation of the society, in addition to what he viewed as questionable financial conduct and some organizational and statutory details of its annual general meetings:
Die Verfolgung der ethischen Ziele beschränkt sich heute auf die Combination von ‚Tanz‘, ‚Musik‘ und ‚Vortrag‘, (...) Wir gelangen zu dem Capitel der Vorträge und vermissen bei denselben ebensowohl System in der Auswahl des Stoffes, als directen Nutzen für den Zuhörer. (...) Die Werke der Bibliothek erreichen nicht an Zahl und Bedeutung die eines wohlhabenden Privatmannes, der Werth des Inventars ist bald abgeschätzt und das Wohnungslocal entspricht weder den Bedürfnissen noch der Würde des Vereins (...) (Bömches 1883).

Because the article does not state which system, what use, and which selection of authors is considered adequate, one can conclude above all that differences of opinion on the society’s orientation were aired publicly and that trivialization apparently displeased Bömches. In addition, his description is in sharp contrast to Rabl’s retrospective assessment: In the first place, the society as an educational institution exerted great attraction and quickly had a large number of members, so that in a short time the society presented “das poliglottte Bild einer aus verschiedenen Nationalitäten und Staatsangehörigen bestehenden Gesellschaft (...)” (1883). However, according to Bömches, the weak vitality of the society was reflected in the small share of quorate members in the annual general meetings, which decided on financial and, above all, ethical issues. After the exhibition of artworks was soon given up again, instead of the established cultivation of music, dances with a raffle were the entertainment most frequently offered to members (1883). Apart from large-scale performances of classical music carried out with musical support from Ljubljana, Klagenfurt, Vienna, Berlin, Brussels, and so on, the cultivation of song was greatly neglected and found little appeal in the often mild criticism in Triester Zeitung, frequently written by a friendly hand. Likewise, the (popular) scholarly lectures lacked a careful selection between literature and science, when a stereotyped number of professionals were called upon to talk about more or less interesting topics (1883). Bömches concluded with the remark that more frequent changes in the board of directors could contribute to a necessary change.

In the early years of retrospectives on the society’s existence there was an averred openness to the outside and an emphasis on a principled openness of the society’s space of representation, but this changed in favor of nationalist tendencies as a result of the strengthening of the irredentist aspirations in the city in the late nineteenth century. Shortly before the centennial of Schiller’s death on May 9th, 1905, the Schillerverein announced a ceremony in Triester Zeitung to which all of Trieste’s German societies were explicitly invited. Following this, the newspaper reported on the festivities of the members of the combined city theater in Graz under the direction of Alfred Cavar:

Der Schiller-Verein hatte (…) dazu nicht nur die eigenen Mitglieder, sondern auch die Mitglieder von anderen achtzehn deutschen Vereinen Triests und deren Angehörige eingeladen. So war es ein echt deutsches Fest geworden (…) Mit Rücksicht auf die Absicht, ein ausgesprochen deutsches Fest zu feiern, abgesehen
von der beschränkten Zahl der zur Verfügung stehenden Plätze, konnten außer vielen Deutschen auch alle jene Nichtdeutschen nicht zugelassen werden, die bereit waren, des großen Schillers Angedenken mitzufeiern (Kesel, Pipitz, & Rabl 1909: 15).

During the ensuing festivities, the beginnings of the society were commemorated. Chairman Franz Rabl summarized the influence of German culture on the development of the city:


Here, Hanisch’s reflections, which point to a “triple-knotted” formula of pathos for the Austrian nation-building project, can be followed: Unity of the people, unity of the cultured nation, unity of the Austrian bourgeoisie across national and ethnic boundaries. In essence, this was tantamount to a characteristic double identity: state-Austrian, but also ethnic-German (1998: 131).

Obviously, there are practices in the development of the Schillerverein that more or less explicitly refer to these moments. Hardly any clear determinations can be made because of the multifaceted practices of in-betweenness. For analyzing the Habsburg Empire and the emergence of nationalisms, Pieter Judson proposes distinguishing between contexts and situations: “The point is not to ask ‘who is a nationalist?’ and ‘who is indifferent?’ but rather to ask ‘in what situation does a person see the world through the lens of nation, and in what situations does that lens of nation lose its relevance?’ (…) we give it a new meaning as a way to think situationally about nationhood (…)” (2016: 153).

Applied to the Schillerverein: identification with the society is not sufficient for its protagonists regarding characterization of identification with Germanness. Equally important is the class-specific differentiation—which Hanisch referred to as the social “unity of the people”—and the constitution of the bourgeoisie in the corporative state. Thus, the Schillerverein can be regarded as typical of a mixture that allowed both ethnic exclusiveness and indifferent transversal practices of in-betweenness. There are signs of a cultural opening up beyond ethnic boundaries, as well as of an exclusion process in which social differences were selectively settled as ethnically culturalized or as class oppositions.
Figure 6: Concert with the Swedish opera singer Valborg Werbeck-Svärdström in November 1913 (Archivio del Civico Museo Teatrale Carlo Schmidl, Trieste)
THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND THE DISSOLUTION OF THE SOCIETY

After the assassination in Sarajevo in July 1914, freedom of association was suspended in Cisleithania. With the beginning of the First World War, in addition to a general slump in economic and artistic development, a large-scale standstill occurred in society activities—in Trieste especially with the entry of Italy into the war in May 1915. A large part of the male population was called up for military service, as a result of which regular activities of the society could only be re-established after 1918.

Compared to the early years, when the society had more than seven hundred members, only 253 regular and 197 corresponding members were mentioned at the 54th Annual General Meeting in March 1914. In 1913 there were at least twenty-five concerts, including one by the Stockholm opera singer Valborg Werbeck-Svärdström, thirteen dances, four lectures, a magic show, and a children’s Christmas festival (Jahres- und Kassenbericht über das vierundfünfzigste Vereinsjahr 1913: 5). In the final report, drawn up in retrospect by Hugo Kesel in 1933, the dissolution of the society can be interpreted as a consequence of the war: “Wie so vieles, wurde auch der ‘Schiller-Verein’ ein Opfer des Weltkrieges und der damit verbundenen politischen und territorialen Umwälzungen. (…) der Eintritt Italiens in den Krieg verursachte dem Vereinsleben eine jähe Unterbrechung infolge der militairischen Einberufungen und der Domizilwechsel so vieler Kaufleute, Beamte (…)” who had invigorated the society (Schlussbericht des “Schiller-Verein” zu Triest 1933). After the entry of Italian troops into Trieste on November 3rd, 1918, the society was not officially disbanded, but restarting the society’s activities could no longer be considered due to the departure and/or absence of the society’s German-speaking members.

The list of the society’s bylaws concluded with a note from Karl Hoffmann from 1924:

Der Ausbruch des Weltkrieges unterbrach die Tätigkeit des Vereines, der seitherige Chronist war im Felde und konnte nicht mehr nützen. Als er im Herbst 1919 endlich wieder nach Triest gelangen konnte, fand er von der einst so vielversprechenden und blühenden Vereinigung nichts mehr vor und konnte auch Ursachen und Verantwortung (Dr. Rabl) an diesem Zusammenbruch nicht einwandfrei feststellen. Dieses in seiner Verwahrung gewesene Buch und die zugehörigen Akten sind das einzige, was er retten konnte (Verzeichnis der Vereinsakten des Schiller-Vereins in Triest 1933).

According to Kesel, the inventory was sold and the library had been lost. Like other German and German-speaking institutions and societies, the Schillerverein was dissolved or closed after the end of the war. Kesel’s two-page final report, written in retrospect in 1933, leaves the date of the official closure open as no official dissolution took place.4

4 In connection with the historical society, the Friedrich Schiller Cultural Society (German: Kulturverein Friedrich Schiller, Italian: Associazione culturale Friedrich Schiller) was newly established in 2007 (http://www.schillertrieste.altervista.org/index.html).
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