

www.forumhistoriae.sk



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)



© 2025 The Author(s)
© 2025 Institute of History,
Slovak Academy of Sciences

The Stakes of Theatre Patronage in the Habsburg Monarchy's Eastern Lands at the Turn of the 19th Century (1790–1810)

Raluca Mureşan 

Keywords

theatrical patronage, social rise,
theatrical entrepreneurial typologies

DOI

[10.31577/forhist.2025.19.2.2](https://doi.org/10.31577/forhist.2025.19.2.2)

Author

Raluca Mureşan
Sciences Po Paris
Département d'Histoire, campus de Dijon
14 avenue Victor Hugo
21000 Dijon
France
Email: raluca.muresan@sciencespo.fr
 0000-0002-3897-0657

Cite

MUREŞAN, Raluca. The Stakes of Theatre Patronage in the Habsburg Monarchy's Eastern Lands at the Turn of the 19th Century (1790–1810). In *Forum Historiae*, 2025, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 11–25, doi: [10.31577/forhist.2025.19.2.2](https://doi.org/10.31577/forhist.2025.19.2.2)

Abstract

MUREŞAN, Raluca. The Stakes of Theatre Patronage in the Habsburg Monarchy's Eastern Lands at the Turn of the 19th Century (1790–1810).

The present paper offers a comparative analysis of the motivation and the economical strategies of theatre patrons from the late 1780s up to the 1810s in the eastern part of the Habsburg Monarchy (Kingdom of Hungary, Kingdom of Croatia, Principality of Transylvania and the Kingdom of Galicia-Lodomeria). By reconsidering the range of ideal entrepreneurial theatrical types, such as court, noble, municipal and bourgeois commercial theatres, this study explores hybrid patronage strategies, revealing a complex set of incentives and multiple sorts of both private and public actors. Firstly, an emphasis is placed on the formal and informal collaborations between private investors and high officials who indirectly supported the construction of these theatres. Secondly, the importance of profit-based businesses used for social rise which motivated theatrical patronage is discussed.

By 1790, no less than twenty public theatre buildings were operating in the whole of the Habsburg Monarchy, with fifteen new buildings erected in the following two decades. If all of them were identified as public theatres, only a few had been promoted, sponsored and run by municipalities. In most cases, private investors eagerly defended the public utility of a new theatre before the local authorities, eventually devoting a part of their own fortune to construction works, and sometimes even running the theatrical enterprise themselves. A few of these private investors were impresarios of former itinerant theatrical troops seeking a decent place for performances. Yet, several others were local notabilities. Whether relatively recent noblemen or rich burghers, it was common for such wealthy private investors to finance a grandiose public theater building until the early 1800s, when municipalities became interested in promoting public theatres.¹

This paper provides a comparative analysis of the motivations and the economical strategies of several local theatre patrons active in different lands of the eastern part of the Habsburg Monarchy² from

- 1 MURESAN, Raluca. *Bâtir un temple des muses: une histoire sociale, culturelle et politique de l'architecture des théâtres publics dans la partie orientale de la Monarchie des Habsbourg (vers 1770–1812)* (Ph.D. thesis). Paris : Sorbonne Université, 2020, pp. 174–187 and 963–964.
- 2 By “eastern part of the Habsburg Monarchy,” it is meant the lands located east from the Holy Roman Empire, whilst the western part of the monarchy refers to the Habsburg territories included in the Holy Roman Empire.

the late 1780s up to the 1810s. The aim of this research is to explore the prevalence of hybrid patronage strategies during the given period, revealing not only a complex set of motivations, but also multiple types of private and public actors. Hence, this study implicitly reconsiders typological categories of theatrical entrepreneurship during the Enlightenment, such as court, noble, municipal, and bourgeois commercial theatres.³ Due to the fact that permanent buildings for public theatres appeared slightly later in the eastern lands of the Monarchy than in the western lands, the forms of patronage studied here represent one of the main patterns of the emergence of public theatres in these regions.

Analysis will focus on five case studies taken from the eastern lands of the Habsburg Monarchy: the Hochmeister printers from Hermannstadt (nowadays Sibiu, Romania) in the principality of Transylvania; counts Károly and Anton Pejacsevich originating from Slavonia and Syrmia, and based respectively in Sopron (Western Hungary) and Zagreb (Croatia) in the Kingdom of Croatia; the Illyrian ship-owner and merchant Andrea Lodovico Adamich from Fiume (nowadays Rijeka, Croatia), at that time a Hungarian free port; and Polish nobleman Jacek Kluszewski from Kraków (nowadays Poland) in Western Galicia.

Despite their varied social backgrounds, such investment in the founding of a new theatre is usually compared to aristocratic theatrical patronage from the earlier decade, such as those performed by Count György Csáky in Pressburg (today, Bratislava, Slovakia) in 1774–1776 or Count Nostitz-Rieneck in Prague in 1781–1783.⁴ Seen as an expression of noble magnificence, aristocratic theatrical patronage was viewed as a generous contribution to public welfare. It was interpreted as either an extension of private noble theatrical practice,⁵ or as a sort of private complement to the noble patron's public duties as a statesman. Yet, even if all late 18th century patrons sought to portray the construction of a public theatre as a genuine welfare act for their home town, is it pertinent to assimilate them with those nonprofit motivated aristocrats supporting public theatres? If not, what sort of differences in terms of purpose and legal and economic strategies distinguish late 18th century theatrical patronage from the purely aristocratic understanding of the term?

The first part of this paper strives at identifying typological criteria for late 18th century's theatrical patronage, by adapting categories detailed in the literature of central European entrepreneurship during the Enlightenment. The second part deals with social benefits granted by the founding of a public theatre at the turn

3 For a clear definition of these ideal types, see: THER Philipp. *Typologie des Operntheaters*. In THER, Philipp. *In der Mitte der Gesellschaft: Operntheater in Zentraleuropa 1815–1914*. Vienna; Munich : Oldenbourg Verlag, 2006, pp. 70–95. The author also stresses the fact that these three types are not to be considered completely separate.

4 See, in issue of *Forum Historiae* by JANURA, Tomáš. The Construction of a New Theatre in Bratislava by George Csáky According to Documents of the Hungarian Royal Governor's Council. See also: LASLAVÍKOVÁ, Jana. Theater Decorations in Pressburg in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. In *Music in Art: International Journal for Music Iconography*, 2020, vol. 45, no. 1/2, pp. 155–192 and TEUBER, Oscar. *Geschichte des Prager Theaters von den Anfängen des Schauspielwesens bis auf die Neueste Zeit, Vol. 2: Von der Brunian-Bergopzoom'schen Bühnen-Reform bis zum Tode Liebich's des größten Prager Bühnenleiters. (1771–1817)*. Prague : Druck und Verlag der k k Hofbuchdruckerei A. Haase, 1885, pp. 66–99.

5 On the integration of public theatres founded by nobles among the noble theatres (*Adelstheater*), see: THER 2006, pp. 77–78.

of the 19th century. In this respect, several different types of collaboration with public administrations facilitated by theatrical patronage will be highlighted. In the third and final part, the financial management of these theatres is discussed, in order to establish the extent to which the relevant projects might be considered welfare or profit-based enterprises. The inquiry relies, therefore, on a wide range of documents framing the juridical and economic criteria of the theatre's construction and management, starting from the first petitions submitted by the patrons to the authorities up to contracts and estimates framing the specific function of the theatre.

Typologies of Theatre Patrons in the Habsburg Monarchy

Given the diversity of the pertinent patrons' social backgrounds and regional specificities, it is impossible to establish typologies according to purely social, geographic or chronological criteria. Hence, the present research focuses on the motivations and interests at work for these private investors in accordance with typologies drawn by German and Hungarian historians Josef Menschl and Véra Bácskai for Central European industrial entrepreneurs during the Enlightenment and *Vormärz*. Both authors insist on a focus on the motivation of such private investors rather than social origin, ethnic or religious affiliations.

Menschl distinguishes three main categories of industrial entrepreneurs. The first group is comprised of noblemen investing a limited part of their fortune in industrial enterprises meant to improve the prosperity of the State in order to please the monarch. These noblemen continued to rely on substantial income from their estates, while this business income remained relatively insignificant. Secondly, this author identifies aristocrats putting a significant part of their fortune into manufacturing industries in order to apply economic development theories promoted by the cameral sciences. Finally, the third category highlights entrepreneurs, bringing together recent noblemen and bourgeois, for whom the theatre industry represented both a source of income and a means of social advancement.⁶

Theatrical aristocratic patronage from the 1770s and early 1780s may be compared to the first two of the three main categories of Central European entrepreneurs as defined by Menschl. Presented both as a contribution to the common welfare of the state and as an expression of their loyalty towards the sovereign, the theatre enterprise did not provide much financial gain. The aristocrats directing the Vienna court theatre can be categorized as the first of these two types.⁷ Several other public theatres built by noblemen during the 1770s and early 1780s correspond to at least one of these two types, such as Csáky's

6 MENTSCHL, Josef. Unternehmertypen des Merkantilzeitalters. In MATIS, Herbert (ed.) *Von der Glückseligkeit des Staates. Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft in Österreich im Zeitalter des aufklärten Absolutismus*. Berlin : Duncker & Humbolt, 1981, pp. 341–354.

7 Amongst these theatre directors of the *Burgtheater* between 1747 and 1820, one may find several Hungarian nobles: Colonel Baron Rokus Lo-Presti, Count János Koháry, Count József Keglevich, Count Pál Ráday, Count Leopold Pálffy. PÁSZTOR, Mihály. A százötvenéves Lipotváros. In *Statisztikai Közlemények*, 1940, vol. 93, no. 4, p. 129; KEIL-BUDISCHOWSKY, Verena. *Die Theater Wiens*. Vienne; Hambourg : Paul Zsolnay Verlag, 1983, pp. 104–120.

theatre in Pressburg, Nostitz-Rieneck's in Prague or the Estates theatres in the Archiduchy of Austria. All these were publicised by their patrons as acts of public welfare, as a complement to their public duties as statesmen. Additionally, some performance halls, like Nostitz-Rieneck's theatre, were also interpreted as attempts to compete with court theatres—a statement of the patron's noble magnificence.⁸ Thus, supporting public theatre also allowed for the transformation of a long-lasting aristocratic entertainment, formerly limited to the private sphere of their palaces, into a public welfare act. The construction of a public theatre appears as both an act of magnificence, completely coherent with aristocratic virtues, and as a form of active interference in the social, cultural and economic development of the city.⁹

The social heterogeneity of theatrical patrons active at the turn of the 19th century in the eastern part of the monarchy only partially matches Menschl's third category of entrepreneurs. According to the later, the interest in significant income and a rise in social status through industrial entrepreneurship went hand by hand.¹⁰ Such an attitude may be attributed to several patrons financing multifunctional buildings, often consisting of a multitude of commercial and entertainment premises set aside the theatre hall. This is the case of the Viennese printer Johann Thomas von Trattner, who submitted a project for a business, including an inn, a ball hall, a theatre and a textile factory in Lemberg (today, Lviv, Ukraine) in 1783.¹¹ The city rejected his proposal precisely because of the multiple privileges requested by Trattner. An explicit joint interest for pecuniary benefits and social status is suggested as well by the ingeniously multifunctional projects in Pest defended by Colonel Joseph Beckers¹² and Count József Csekonits in 1799, and those submitted in 1803 by Count Emmanuel Unwerth and Baron Lajos Lo-Presti, son of the former impresario of the Viennese *Burgtheater*, Baron Rokus Lo-Presti.¹³ Andrea Lodovico Adamich's investment in the theatre's construction in Fiume, as well as his manifold trade businesses, can be interpreted in the same vein.¹⁴ From a strictly biographical point of view, the multiple commercial activities driven by Polish Count Jacek

8 THER 2006, pp. 78–79.

9 ASCH, Ronald G. Die Adel und das Geld, Zwischen Demonstrativer Verschwendung und Bewahrung des Erbes. In CREMER, Annette C. – JENDORFF, Alexander (eds.) *Decorum und Mammon im Widerstreit? Adeliges Wirtschaftshandeln zwischen Standesprofilen, Profitstreben und ökonomischer Notwendigkeit*. Heidelberg : Heidelberg University Publishing, 2022, pp. 81–85.

10 MENTSCHL 1981, pp. 341–354.

11 Central'nyj Deržavnyj Istoryckij Archiv Ukraïny Lviv (CDIAUL), Lviv, Ukraine, F.146 (Halyts'ke namisnytstvo), Op. 88, Sp. 1333, fol. 20–21 (doc. du 31 octobre 1783).

12 Colonel Joseph Beckers was a descendant of Johann Stephan Beckers who initiated in 1711–1721 the reconstruction of the Slavonian capital city, Esseg (Osijek). MAŽURAN, Ivo. *Najstariji zapisnik općine Osijek – Tvrdá ode 1705. do 1746. Godine. Uvod u historiju osijeka XVIII stoljeća*. Osijek : Grada za Historiju Osijeka i Slavonije, 1965, pp. 21–23; SRŠAN, Stjepan. *Osječki Ljetopisi: 1686–1955*. Osijek : Povijesni Arhiv u osijeku, 1993, p. 8.

13 PÁSZTOR 1940, p. 129; Budapest Fővárosi Levéltára (FVL), Budapest, Hungary, Pest Város Tanácsának iratai (IV), 1202c intim. a. m. 4588–5752, fol. 526. For more information about the direction of Rokus Lo-Presti, see: MAYER, Gernot. *Kulturpolitik der Aufklärung. Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz-Rietberg (1711–1794) und die Künste*. Petersberg : Michael Imhof Verlag, 2021, pp. 55–57.

14 DUBROVIĆ, Ervin. *Adamićevo Doba – počeci modernoga svijeta*. In DUBROVIĆ, Ervin (ed.) *Adamićevo Doba 1780–1830: Rijčki trgovac u doba velikih promjena*. Rijeka : Muzej Grada Rijeke, 2005, p. 12.

Kluszewski from Kraków, and even those carried out by Transylvanian printers Martin Hochmeister father and son, may also seem to align with Menschl's third category of entrepreneurs.

Upon closer look, however, the majority of theatrical enterprises studied here fits Véra Bácskai's definition of the first generation of Hungarian industrial entrepreneurship active in the very same period (1790 up to 1820–1830) much more closely. Unlike Menschl, Bácskai notes that in Hungary until the 1820s, entrepreneurs seemed less concerned with commercial interests than by the quest of social prestige, aspiring to a title of nobility and adopting the way of life of the aristocracy.¹⁵ Similarly, the theatre in itself was seldom economically self-sustainable, unless it included numerous adjacent commercial or entertainment premises. Besides, several theatre patrons discussed here either acquired a title of nobility or significantly improved their social position shortly before or after the opening of their theatres. This is the case of Martin Hochmeister, father and son, as well as the Pejacevich counts or even Andrea Lodovico Adamich. In this respect, founding a theatre appears all the more as a means of imitating an aristocratic lifestyle, as the theatre used to be an old aristocratic entertainment which was only recently adjusted to a rather commercial display. Hence, would it not be more appropriate to interpret a theatre's establishment as a vehicle for social advancement, embodied by the very reappropriation of an old aristocratic social practice? If so, is it possible to identify recurrent strategies of social rise amongst patrons of public theatres?

Social Benefits Granted by the Construction of a Public Theatre

Several studies have previously presented the diverse commercial affairs simultaneously driven by each of these theatre patrons, though special attention must be given to their connections to the public administration as a vehicle of social rise. Only few of the theatres built before the *Vormärz*, like those in Pest (1806–1812) and in Kolozsvár (1802–1821) (nowadays Cluj-Napoca, Romania) promote the “complex decisional and executive mechanisms” characterizing the implementation of public urban works during the second half of the 19th century, according to Ákos Moravansky.¹⁶ Most of these late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century theatres arise from small scale and often informal arrangements between private parties and officials, characteristic of what Helen P. Liebel has designated as the mediator role (*Vermittlerrolle*) of bureaucrats, acting as supporters for private entrepreneurs.¹⁷ Even if theatre construction has always been presented by its patron as his mere contribution to the local development, private theatre owners and even municipalities were often *de facto* guided by high officials from central authorities. During the 1780's, encounters between high officials and theatre financiers were sometimes facilitated within

15 BÁCASKAI, Vera. *A vállalkozók előfutárai*. Budapest : Magvetőkönyvkiadó, 1989, pp. 50–51.

16 MORAVANSKY, Akos. *Competing Visions: Aesthetic Invention and Social Imagination in Central European Architecture, 1867–1918*. Cambridge (Massachusetts); Londres : MIT Press, 1998, p. 31.

17 LIEBEL, Helen P. Der Beamte als Unternehmertyp in den Anfangsstadien der Industrialisierung. In RITTER, Gerhard A. (ed.) *Entstehung und Wandel der modernen Gesellschaft*. Berlin; Boston : De Gruyter, 1970, pp. 221–222.

the frame of Freemason's lodges, as in Hermannstadt¹⁸ or western Hungary.¹⁹ Matrimonial alliances were also decisive for some patrons studied here, like Károly Pejacsevich and Andrea Lodovico Adamich.

Count Károly Pejacsevich was supported by the cameral administrator, Count Joseph Szent-Galy, who argued that “he has an appropriate way of thinking” (*Denkungsart*) and shows a strong “attachment to the town.”²⁰ Belonging to a relatively recent noble family from the military frontier of Syrmia and Slavonia, the count had integrated into western Hungarian aristocracy in 1786 by marrying countess Maria Eleonora Erdődy (1769–1840), daughter of Count Lajos Erdődy and niece of Count György Csáky's wife.²¹ Only five years after settling in Sopron, in 1788, Pejacsevich took over direction of the local theatre and expanded the old building at his own expense. Thanks to the cameral administrator's support, Count Pejacsevich was exempted from paying rent for the existing buildings he restored. At first glance, his status amongst the nobility as well as his matrimonial and freemasonic ties to the Erdődy's may recall both Philipp Ther's extended typology of noble theatres (*Adelstheater*)²² and Menschl's first two categories of entrepreneurs. However, it is important to point out that Count Pejacsevich, only recently established in Western Hungary, was still in need of legitimacy amongst high aristocrats. If the significant income provided by his estates in Slavonia allowed him to enter the high Hungarian nobility through marriage,²³ theatrical patronage established him as a local magnate.

Other theatrical patrons received orders for public works directly from Governors of the provincial administration as a reward for their investment in theatrical businesses. This is the case of Martin Hochmeister (1740–1789), a printer based in Hermannstadt, then capital city of the Grand Principality of Transylvania. He is usually described as a patron having “sacrificed its fortune” to erect a theatre for his home town in 1787–1788, just as if everything but his burgher origins would link him to Josef Menschl's second type of nobility entrepreneurs. Nevertheless, this local burgher would never have completed such construction without protection of the Transylvanian governor, Count György Bánffy. The governor stated in a letter sent to Hungarian and Transylvanian court chancellor Count Károly Pálffy that he was the actual initiator of

18 Martin Hochmeister and Transylvanian Governor György Bánffy were both members of the local freemasons' lodge in Hermannstadt. ŠINDRILARIU, Thomas. *Freimauer in Siebenbürgen: Die Loge “St. Andreas zu den drei Seeblättern” in Hermannstadt (1767–1790). Ihre Rolle in Gesellschaft, Kultur und Politik Siebenbürgens*. Brasov : Verlag Kronstadt, 2011, pp. II–IV.

19 BALÁZS, Éva. *Hungary and the Habsburgs: 1765–1800. An Experiment in Enlightened Absolutism*. Budapest : Central European University Press, 1997, p. 37.

20 Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár – Országos Levéltár (MNL – OL), Budapest, Hungary, C49 (Helytartótanács, Civitatensia), 1788, F 290, pos. 1, fol. 3–3v.

21 NAJCER-SABLJAK, Jasminka. A Pejacsevich család Našice (Nekcsei) ágának művészeti öröksége. In VERESS, Ferenc (ed.) *A Pejacsevich család művészeti öröksége, Likovna baština obitelji Pejačević*. Sopron : Soproni Múzeum; Muzej likovnih umjetnosti, 2016, pp. 5–38; BUBRYÁK, Orsolya. Az érsektől a szabadkőművesig. Az Erdődyek mint nagybirtokos család a dél-dunántúlon, 1500–1800. In VERESS 2016, pp. 45–47.

22 THER 2006, pp. 77.

23 In 1784–1788, he lent 148 thousand Florins to his father-in-law. According to Jasminka Najcer-Sabljak, the money served for the reconstruction of the castle in Gyepfűzes, which became headquarters of the freemasons' lodge in 1784–1785 and also where concerts were held (*musikalische Akademien*). NAJCER-SABLJAK 2016, p. 47.

the project.²⁴ According to Bánffy, he himself had proposed to Hochmeister to build the theatre at his own expense, and promised him two loans (*aerarium*), the first one of 4 000 Florins for the theatre then a second of 8 000 Florins for a paper mill. Eventually, financial restrictions brought by the Russian-Turkish war blocked the delivery of these funds.²⁵ Nevertheless, shortly after, the governor granted him the exclusive privilege for all official printings of the *Gubernium* (the so called “dicasterial printings”), as well as for school books.²⁶

Martin Hochmeister the older eventually died in 1790, less than two years after the theatre's opening. In turn, the construction of Hermanstadt's first public theatre launched the brilliant career of his son, Martin Hochmeister the younger (1767–1837). A year before construction of the theatre, in 1786, Hochmeister's son graduated from the Theresian college in Vác, and entered in the office of the *Gubernium* himself. While working for the *Gubernium*, he not only inherited the printing business of his father and other commercial affairs, but also completed construction of the theatre. Perhaps it is this combination of bureaucracy, business affairs and intellectual concerns that best allows us to assess the Hochmeister family's strategies for social advancement. Acquainted with the title of nobility in 1814, the son pursued a career as a bureaucrat throughout his life; first in the *Gubernium* between 1786 and 1789, then in the municipality as a councilor (1798–1805), then *Stadthann* (1805–1811),²⁷ judge (1811–1817) and finally, mayor from 1817 to 1829. In such positions, he was involved in several public welfare activities in Hermannstadt and Kolozsvár, as well as in the construction of public buildings and the development of public spaces.

Other theatre patrons also managed to obtain official positions shortly before or after the inauguration or reconstruction of their theatres, like Count Anton Pejacevich, the younger brother of Károly Pejachevich. After a brilliant military career, he took the lead of the Komitat Possega (*Obergespann*) in 1797. The very same year, he inaugurated Zagreb's first permanent public theatre by reconstructing one of his palaces.²⁸ Another example is provided by Andrea Lodovico Adamich's attempts to integrate the municipal council in Fiume. According to Ervin Dubrović, construction of the theatre mainly served to develop his network amongst merchants.²⁹ Such a role is undoubtful for this rich shipowner and merchant of Illyrian origin married to Elisabeth Barcich, a patrician's daughter. Yet, one should also stress the fact that being a theatrical patron might have facilitated Adamich's integration amongst the municipal

24 MNL – OL, F37 (Erdelyi Gubernium Praesidialia), documents, 1787, no. 49 (microfilms): “Dieser Allerhöchster Erlaubniß zufolge, habe ich mich dann in der Sache beworben, und einerseits einen zum Theater schicklichen Platz, anderseits aber einen verlässlichen und mit den erforderlichen Eigenschaften versehenen Partikulier ausfindig zu machen getrachtet, der das Theater, und die ganze Sorge für dessen Bau und Errichtung, auf sich nehmen wollte.”

25 MNL – OL, A39 (A Magyar Kancellária, Acta Generalia), 1787, N° 14288, fol. 2, 4–5, 6; N° 15192, fol. 4. No public funds were allowed to any “extraordinary construction works” since November 1787 after the Habsburg Monarchy's involvement in the Russian-turkish war.

26 MNL – OL, A39, 1787, N° 1451, 6216, 11791, 13273. Martin Hochmeister was periodically printing documents for the *Gubernium* since 1778.

27 City official in charge of police and urban economy matters. This also included control of the state of the buildings and streets.

28 Österreichische Staatsarchiv (OeStA), Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HHStA), Wien, Austria, Staatsrat Protokoll (SRP), 1797, N° 4017.

29 DUBROVIĆ 2005, p. 12.

patrician's council. After several unsuccessful attempts in 1790, 1795 and 1796, Adamic was nominated a provisional member in January 1799, two months before the theatre project's submission. In 1802, while the theatre's construction was in process, he became full member of the council. That his investment in the theatre's erection facilitated his integration amongst the local patricians seems all the more likely given that the Council justified Adamic's inclusion precisely by his "commitment to the public interest of the city."³⁰ Besides, the decision to build a theatre in Fiume according to his own plans and at his own expense also complemented the service "in the interests" of the city that Adamich provided as assistant (*Bau-Kanzelist*) to the *Gubernium's* construction department between 1791 and 1799—his first public position.³¹ Undoubtedly, the status of a patron acting as an architect was another important part of his strategy for social advancement, as illustrated by his famous portrait. This painting represents him with the plans for his theatre, compass in hand, pen and ink on the table.³²

Count Jacek Kluszewski, the patron of Kraków's public theatre (1798–1799), maintained another sort of tight connection to the Habsburg high officials in Galicia. A descendent of a noble Polish family, loyal and related to the former King Stanisław II August, he financially supported Kościuszko's insurrection in 1794. After Kraków's integration to the Habsburg Monarchy in 1795, like other Polish noblemen, Kluszewski actively cooperated with the Austrian administration.³³ Zbigniew Jabłoński, Jerzy Got and Karzimirz Nowacki already noted that Kluszewski was the only man in Kraków rich enough to afford the construction of such a large building and to support a company of actors. After selling his estate in 1783, the nobleman bought several properties in Kraków and engaged himself in industrial and commercial ventures, actions entirely representative of Menschl's third category of industrial entrepreneurs. Austrian authorities initially rejected Kluszewski's first attempts at the opening of a public theatre.³⁴ On the contrary, official support went to Ludwig Wothe in 1796, a German speaking impresario who never managed to maintain a profitable theatre himself, finally working as an artistic director in Kluszewski's first theatrical hall opened in the Pałac Spiski,³⁵ his primary residence.

Without any doubt, it was Kluszewski's ownership of real estate in Kraków that enabled him to gain the favor of commissar Margelik. This eventually

30 DUBROVIĆ, Ervin. Izgradnja Rijeke, Adamićevo kazalište i inženjerske ambicije. In DUBROVIĆ 2005, pp. 120–121. The author quotes two documents no longer available in the city archives. Državni Arhiv u Rijeci (DAR), Rijeka, Croatia, Spisi fonda Gradsko poglavarstvo Rijeka JU-2 (minutes), kut. 568/2, 28 August 1799; Kut. 563/1, 9 September 1799.

31 For Adamich's integration in the council, see: MNL – OL, A39, 1790, N° 13045, 12295, 14276, 13319.

32 LUKEŽIĆ, Irvin. Životopis Andrije Ljudevita Adamića. In DUBROVIĆ 2005, p. 15.

33 VUSHKO, Iryna. *The politics of cultural retreat: imperial bureaucracy in Austrian Galicia, 1772–1867*. New Haven; London : Yale University Press, 2015, pp. 69–70.

34 According to Jabłoński, Kluszewski's journey to Vienna from 1796 was made for this precise purpose. JABŁOŃSKI, Zbigniew. Jacek Kluszewski (1761–1841). In *Rocznik Biblioteki Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Krakowie*, 1996, vol. 2, p. 25.

35 This hall already existed during the 1780s, that is prior to Kraków's integration in the Habsburg Monarchy. Kluszewski was a tenant of this building from 1787, he became its owner in 1798. GOT, Jerzy – JABŁOŃSKI, Zbigniew. *Dzieje teatru w Krakowie w latach 1781–1830*. Kraków : Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1980, p. 39; GOT, Jerzy. *Das österreichische Theater in Krakau im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*. Vienna : Verlag der ÖAW, 1984, pp. 21–26; NOWACKI, Kazimierz. *Dzieje teatru w Krakowie. Architektura krakowskich teatrów*. Kraków : Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1982, p. 25.

pushed him to build a new theatre for the city in 1798–1799. In this respect, it should be mentioned that the commissioner Johann Wenzel Margelik lived for the time in the Krzysztofor Palace, of which Kluszewski was owner.³⁶ Moreover, a new contract for the accommodation of the commissioner was signed in April 1797, only one year before the theatre's construction.³⁷ Additionally, the Habsburg provincial administration's offices were also hosted in Spiski's Palace second floor after 1795, under the theatre hall opened by Kluszewski in 1787. These ties to the commissioner might also have played a role. Moreover, Kluszewski even claimed to have built the theatre, following an "oral order" given by commissioner Margelik in a funding request submitted to the *Gubernium* in 1808. He asserted that he had provided a theatre for "a town destined by His Majesty to be capital of Western Galicia and seat of the provincial administration."³⁸ Obviously, Kluszewski's letter manipulates rhetorical devices meant to highlight what he called in another request "the patriotic aim" of his action, in other words, his claimed fidelity to the Habsburg rule.³⁹

Setting aside such rhetorical devices abounding in all of the patrons' requests submitted to authorities, the very fact of integrating public offices might be seen as a way of adopting the way of life of the aristocracy. We should not forget that high aristocratic theatre patrons from previous decades, like Csáky and Nostitz-Rieneck, were also public officials. Whether the theatre was a means to integrate the aristocratic elite, as was the case for Károly Pejacsevich, or was an act marking the culmination of social ascent, as it was for Anton Pejacsevich, sometimes the patronage of a public theatre was also parallel to the patron's distinction in the imperial Court. Shortly after the inauguration of their theatres, the two Pejacsevich counts were distinguished with the honorific title of *Kämmerer*; Károly in 1792 and Anton in 1798.⁴⁰ If such a distinction acknowledges their assimilation to the high aristocratic elite, it remained nevertheless inferior to the distinctions of closer members of the Court, like the title of private councilor or commanders of the Saint Stephen's Order. These were allocated to higher aristocratic theatre patrons, like Count György Csáky and Count Franz Anton Nostitz-Rieneck.⁴¹

Patrons like Adamich and Hochmeister the younger presented their investment in theatre construction as a complement to overall public service, as if they would have aspired to a similar status as such well-known former theatrical patrons. Though they were in charge of numerous other commercial

36 JABŁOŃSKI 1996, p. 26. Information also mentioned in GOT 1984, p. 41.

37 OeStA, Finanz- und Hofkammer Archiv (FHKA), Neue Hofkammer (NHK), österreichische Kammerale (ÖK), Fasz 72/34, no 12649/1020 ex April 1797; Fasz. 72/225, no. 19707/1527 ex June 1797. See also: Minute book, vol. 116 (1797, January–June), fol. 390, 621.

38 CDIAUL, F. 146, op. 77, Sp. 19, Kluszewski's request from 27 April 1808, fol. 42–49: "Ich habe nämlich auf mündliche Zuordnung Se[iner] Excellenz, der bevollmächtigte Einrichtungs Hof-Commissärs, [...], da diese Stadt von Eurer Mayestät zur Hauptstadt Westgaliziens—und zum Sitz der Provinzial-Regierung allergnädigst bestimmt worden ist—und kein den Endzwecken einer öffentlichen Unterhaltung dieser Art entsprechendes Gebäude besaß."

39 GOT 1984, p. 34. The author quotes several requests submitted to the imperial chancellery in 1809. Nowadays, these archival sources are no longer available.

40 Hrvatski Državni Arhiv (HDA), Zagreb, Croatia, fonds. 753, obitelj Pejacsevich, 1. vol. manuscript; PEJAČEVIĆ, Julian. *Forschungen über die Familie der Freiherrn und Grafen Pejacsevich und die Stammverwandten Freiherrn von Parchevish etc etc. von Julius Grafen Pejacsevich*. Vienna: [n.p.], 1877–1899, p. IX.

41 TEUBER 1885, pp. 66–73. According to Jean Béranger, the private council represented the supreme political authority and it was the closest to the sovereign. See: BÉRENGER, Jean. *Les Habsbourg et l'argent: de la Renaissance aux Lumières*. Paris: PUPS, 2014, p. 489.

affairs, they have also claimed to have extracted the theatrical enterprise from a speculative profit-based way of functioning, typical for the so-called commercial theatres from the Viennese suburbs. However, did the actual management of their theatrical businesses reveal a genuine conception of the performance space as a non-commercial business?

Act of Charity or Profit-based Business? Running Theatrical Enterprises

A comprehensive study of late 18th century theatres' profitability remains impossible to conduct because of the scarcely preserved accounting of theatre buildings. Subsequently, the sharp devaluation of the Habsburg currencies at the turn of the 19th century makes such an attempt to compare the function of theatres even more difficult. Nevertheless, contracts regulating the theatre organization concluded between the patrons and the municipality give useful clues on the extent to which theatrical enterprises may be regarded as for-profit businesses. What kind of taxes were the patrons required to pay? Had they any exclusive privilege on different types of performances? Was the theatre's management linked to monopolies on other, more profitable activities, like balls and casinos? Did their newly built theatres dispose of commercial premises for rent? Ultimately, such data regarding the function of the theatre must be compared with the varied amounts invested in the theatre's construction by each patron.

Regarding municipal taxes and the enjoyment of privileges, all patrons were initially exempted of taxes pertaining to exclusive privileges on theatrical performances. In turn, the period of the exemption was not always the same; whilst Martin Hochmeister and Andrea Lodovico Adamich enjoyed free attendance to all sorts of performances for an indefinite period, Jacek Kluszewski was only exempted for a period of 10 years.⁴² Count Károly Pejecsevich's exemption initially ran for 16 years, but it was eventually extended for another 12 years, until the count's death in 1815.⁴³ Additionally, the count was exempted from rent on the former building. Hence, he enjoyed a very privileged regime compared to previous theatrical entrepreneurs; between 1769 and 1772, Count Estupignam paid no less than 700 Florins per year.⁴⁴

The only taxes that were collected almost without exception were fees for the police and the charity tax, sometimes called the orphanage or hospital tax. Only in Hermannstadt and Fiume did the taxes' exemption also cover the cost of the police. In turn, Hochmeister was required to pay an annual rent of 50 Rhenish Florins to the municipality of Hermannstadt in exchange for the use of the structure of the old fortification tower,⁴⁵ though, the tower had been enlarged to support a theatre.

42 GOT 1984, p. 30.

43 Unfortunately, the theatre was demolished during the nineteenth century and no plan of the building has been preserved. Therefore, we may not continue with any typological analysis.

44 Győr-Moson-Sopron Megye Soproni Levéltára (GyMSMSL), Sopron, Hungary, IV.1003.a. (Sopron Város Tanácsának iratai, minutes books), Magistrat, Raths u. Gemein Protokoll, 1769, N° 240.

45 Arhivele Naționale ale României, județul Sibiu (ANRS), Sibiu, Romania, Collection Brukenthal, DD1-4 nr. 192: 1787/1850 (contract), fol. 3–5.

Andrea Adamich enjoyed a particularly privileged regime in Fiume compared to many other theatrical entrepreneurs of the Habsburg Monarchy. Adamich was exempted from all sorts of taxes except for the hospital tax, which amounted to 50 Florins per year.⁴⁶ Although he had to pay for the land of the theatre⁴⁷ in addition to the construction costs estimated at 73 thousand Florins, it should be mentioned that he covered part of those expenses by selling the first two rows of loge boxes in advance.⁴⁸ Besides, the Fiume cameral administration provided him with wood for construction.⁴⁹

Another important discriminatory aspect is the privilege of masked balls and the operation of a casino. Whilst Pejacsevich's and Adamich's permit included the organization of balls for thirty years,⁵⁰ neither Hochmeister, nor Kluszewski had secured the right to organize balls. In Hermannstadt, the organization of public balls was only briefly negotiated thanks to impresario Christoph Seipp in 1790, as temporary compensation for his financial losses caused by the interdiction of public entertainment during the mourning of Joseph II.⁵¹

Even if Kluszewski had no right to organize balls in Kraków, he tried to improve the theatre's profitability by connecting it to a tavern and premises for rent. A large building measuring about twenty-three fathoms (*Klafter*) long and eighteen fathoms large cost him 86 thousand Florins in building and demolition works, plus 10 489 złoty for the purchase of the building plot containing two old houses in 1795.⁵² The patron managed to obtain an annual subsidy of 2 000 Florins from the local *Gubernium* in 1803, meant for supporting German theatrical performances in the difficult Galician economical circumstances.⁵³ Thus, the language of performances seems to have been a more important issue than in the other public theatres studied here. In 1808, the authorities complained about the poor quality of German performances for whom the annual subsidy of 2 000 Florins was intended since the approval of Polish performances once a week in 1805.⁵⁴ This type of subsidy was initially created in Lemberg, capital of eastern Galicia. In 1789, it was eventually attributed to impresario Franz Heinrich Bulla, patron of the theatre built in 1789 and of the subsequently

46 PALINIĆ, Nana. *Riječka Kazališta: Nastanak, kontinuitet i značenje kazališnih zgrada i scenskih prostora u razvitku urbane strukture grada*. Rijeka : Državni arhiv u Rijeci, 2016, p. 83.

47 More precisely, Adamich obtained the plot in question free of charge, but had to buy another one for the military guard who used the land on which the theatre was built.

48 LUKEŽIĆ 2005, p. 38.

49 For the wood supplies, see: DAR, DS-60 (Spisi fonda Kazališna direkcija), carton 3, minute of the mixt commission held on the 5 September 1800, without fol. n°. The wood was delivered during the following year. MNL – OL, C51 (Helytartótanács, Politia in genere et civitatum), F6/10-11, fol. 21–23.

50 LUKEŽIĆ 2005, p. 35; DAR, DS-60, carton N° 3, 563/1, contract between the municipality and Andrea Locovico Adamich, 12 September 1803, §2, without fol. n°. For Adamich's request d'Adamich, see DAR, JU-2, vol. 1–157, minutes of the Municipal council, 1799, N° 3 (25 January 1799); VIEZZOLI, Giuseppe. Contributi alla storia di Fiume nel Settecento (Continuazione). In *Rivista della Società di studi Fiumani in Fiume*, 1936, vol. 11/12, pp. 143–149.

51 ANRS, Collection Brukenthal, DD1-4 nr. 192: 1787/1850 (contract between Hochmeister and the municipality), fol. 2; ANRS, Magistrat, Minutes of the municipal council, N° 55 (January–July 1787), fol. 309–310v (minute of the contrat, 11 June 1787); MNL – OL, F37, 1790, N° 229 (Seipp's request, 23 March 1790).

52 NOWACKI 1982, p. 25. Polish currency was in use, as the houses were bought in 1795.

53 NOWACKI 1982, p. 32.

54 JABŁOŃSKI 1996, p. 27; GOT 1984, p. 36.

erected *ridotto*, inaugurated in 1794. Kluszewski not only began construction without any kind of subsidy, but the patron had also to secure ownership of the building plot for his theatre, whereas, in Lemberg, Bulla received the right to transform a former secularized church. It is therefore not surprising that the theatre in Kraków contained commercial premises, such as rooms for rent and a tavern. The benefits provided by these adjacent premises do not seem to have been sufficient as in 1808, following the devaluation of the Austrian currency, Kluszewski was on the verge of bankruptcy. Hence, the theatre does not seem to have granted pecuniary benefits, but rather to express Kluszewski's interest in integrating into the new elites of the Austrian regime, bolstered by his wealth of real estate in Kraków.

Pejacsevich's privilege for the *ridotto* included not only masked balls, but all sorts of dances. Even if he had to pay a tax of 150 Florins per year, and it was not a free privilege as for other patrons, such a wide authorization had no precedent. Usually theatrical impresarios were responsible for masked balls only, whilst innkeepers maintained the right to organize other kinds of public dancing entertainment.⁵⁵ In addition, Pejacsevich also obtained the right to sell wine for a period of four years, even though most municipalities reserved the privilege of selling drinks in theatres and ball halls for themselves.⁵⁶ Considering that Pejacsevich spent only 5 000 Florins on the modernization of the old theatre and 50 thousand Florins on the construction of a new *ridotto* and a coffee house in 1788–1789, one may suppose that staging theatrical performances represented only one third of the entertainment directed by the count.⁵⁷ Far from being a patron acting in the mere interest of his home town, Count Pejacsevich seemed rather to be preoccupied by the profitability of his entertainment business, evident in the joining of different sorts of entertainment premises and by directing commercial activities like wine distribution.

Indeed, the amount and diversity of commercial premises operating within the theatre are another important factor indicating profit-based entertainment. The largest number of such premises was to be found in the theatre in Fiume. Visited only during the Carnival (*Faschingszeit*) by itinerant theatrical troops,⁵⁸ the building instead served other forms of entertainment—balls, casinos, restaurants and pubs, hotels and lotteries.⁵⁹ The sheer size and diversity of the commercial spaces—including shops, a casino, a café, an estaminet, a hotel, craftsmen's workshops and an insurance and savings company⁶⁰—as well as sparse theatrical activity, leave no doubt as to the commercial purpose of the building. In terms of the variety of commercial and entertainment premises, the Fiume theatre may be compared only to the projects for a theatre in Pest

55 In Sopron, a similar privilege was refused for Count Festetics in 1788, when he proposed to take over the municipal theatre's direction. GyMSMSL, IV.1003.b. Magistrat, Raths u. Gemein Protokoll, 1788, Fas. XI, N° 241 (27 January 1788).

56 MNL – OL, E316 (Magyar Kamara, Raaber Cameral Administration), 1789, 3718, fol. 66.

57 GyMSMSL, IV.1003.b. Magistrat, Raths u. Gemein Protokoll, 1789, N° 611, 673.

58 DUBROVIĆ 2005, Izgradnja Rijeke, p. 120.

59 LUKEŽIĆ 2005, p. 60.

60 DAR, DS-60, carton 3, 563/1, N° 2281, Adamich's request from 8 September 1801, without fol. N°.

proposed by Count Emmanuel Unwerth and Baron Lajos Lo-Presti in 1803.⁶¹ These two entrepreneurs are the only ones not to defend their project as a welfare act for the urban society. Putting aside such widespread arguments like the theatre's contribution to the morality and education of residents, Unwerth and Lo-Presti presented a public theatre as a mere speculation, whose pecuniary benefits are uncertain, requiring not only municipal support but also joint management with other entertainment and commercial affairs. Adamich and Pejacsevich both obviously agreed with this assertion, as among all the patrons studied, they are the only ones not to complain about financial difficulties.

The only building lacking adjacent entertainment or commercial premises is Martin Hochmeister's theatre erected in the Transylvanian capital, Hermannstadt. The building was entirely devoted to theatre performances, except for the occasional transformation of the auditorium into a ballroom. Thus, the functioning of the theatre rather recalls the enterprises founded by some municipalities or theatrical impresarios, like Franz Heinrich Bulla (Lemberg, 1789) or Felix Berner (Pest, 1774). Furthermore, the owner was required to rebuild the entire structure in the event of a fire, regardless of the cause of the disaster. Such a clause was quite severe. In 1776, Count Csáky was only required to do so if he or the theatre employees could have been held responsible. Hochmeister initially invested an amount of money estimated to be 24 thousand Florins in 1787–1788. This was admittedly the lowest from all the patrons studied here, but we know that the denial of a public subsidy (*aerarium*) was partially compensated by comprehensive public printing orders granted by the *Gubernium*. Thus, the approach of printer Martin Hochmeister seems to have no commercial character. The theatre strictly appears to be the reflection of Martin's Hochmeister's will to climb the social ladder, allowing him to present himself as a local patron, whilst financial support was indirectly assured by the *Gubernium*.

The above comparative survey of the exploitation of theatres allows Andrea Lodovico Adamich and Count Károly Pejacsevich to stand out as being the most concerned with the profitability of the theatre, via the association with several other commercial businesses. They are, thus, both to be considered as pure illustrations of Menschl's third category of industrial entrepreneurs, cleverly attaining a joint goal in the matter of social status and economic benefits. In turn, Martin Hochmeister's tight connections to the *Gubernium* provided him with significant income for printing works and inaugurated the bureaucratic career of his son. These are mainly characteristic for the interference of statesmen in private entrepreneurship matters, as noted previously by Helen P. Liebel.

Conclusion

Throughout the given period, the practices of aristocratic patronage, social status motivated patronage and profit-based entrepreneurship were usually intertwined. In line with Annette C. Cremer's recent research on aristocratic entrepreneurship during the Early Modern Period, this study of late 18th century

61 PÁSZTOR 1940, p. 129; FVL, IV, 1202c intim. a. m. 4588–5752, fol. 526.

theatrical patrons invalidates the established thesis of a general disinterest in profit-based businesses amongst noblemen.⁶² Rather than a bare reflection of a transition period mixing the typical functioning of a noble society with speculative practices linked to the advent of an active bourgeois society described by Norbert Elias' famous theory on the court society,⁶³ the present study emphasizes the different means through which aristocrats and bourgeois shaped urban theatrical life. The motivation to become a patron combined the interest for the common good, political duties, the quest for social rise and personal income. During the 1780s–1790s, the foundation of a theatre remained a vehicle for a rise in social class in the Habsburg Monarchy, materialized through formal or informal collaborations with high officers from the public administration. The present research reveals not only how several bourgeois and recent nobles were supported by high bureaucrats belonging to the aristocracy, it also shows that such patrons sometimes even became public officials themselves, by joining central administration offices and/or the local municipal elite. For some of them, like the Hochmeister printers and Jacek Kluszewski, the theatre was obviously not a profitable affair. In turn, for others like Károly Pejacsevich and Andrea Lodovico Adamich, the theatre both provided significant income and aided their integration to the local social elite, may it be aristocratic as in Sopron or patrician as in Fiume.

Regional specificities in terms of economic development contribute to a better understanding of the variations in these patrons' interests and strategies. It is perhaps no coincidence that both Count Károly Pejacsevich and Andrea Lodovico Adamich hail from the south—the Hungarian Kingdom's Littoral and the Kingdom of Croatia. In these regions, interest in trade was highly diffused, even among noble elites which were often directly involved in such business.⁶⁴ Becoming a theatrical patron in Sopron marked Pejacsevich's integration to the western Hungarian aristocracy, well-known for its longstanding tradition of musical and theatrical patronage.⁶⁵ In the meantime, he carried on an unprecedented management model with regard to former public theatres in Sopron, encompassing not only a theatre, but also a billiards hall, casino and inn. On a larger scale, similar management models were later proposed in Pest by Colonel Joseph Beckers and Count József Csekonits in 1799 and Count Emmanuel Unwerth and Baron Lajos Lo-Presti in 1803. The extensive development of Pest during this period also accounts for the highly varied profiles of patrons' ambitious but unsuccessful attempts to erect a new theatre. The municipality eventually constructed a theatre at its own expense in 1806–1812.

62 CREMER, Annette C. *Adeliges Wirtschaftshandeln in der frühen Neuzeit – Eine Annäherung*. In CREMER, Annette C. – JENDORFFE, Alexander (eds.) *Decorum und Mammon im Widerstreit? Adeliges Wirtschaftshandeln zwischen Standesprofilen, Profitstreben und ökonomischer Notwendigkeit*. Heidelberg : Heidelberg University Publishing, 2022, pp. 27–45.

63 ELIAS, Norbert. *Die höfische Gesellschaft*. Berlin : Suhrkamp, 1983, (1st edition 1969).

64 BALÁZS, Éva. La noblesse hongroise et les Lumières. In KÖPECZI, Béla – BALÁZS, Éva (eds.) *Noblesse française, noblesse hongroise: XVI^e–XIX^e siècles*. Paris; Budapest : Éditions du CNRS; Akadémiai Kiadó, 1981, pp. 181–183.

65 Concerning the patronage of Lajos Erdödy, Pejacsevich's father in law, see: SEIFERT, Herbert. Die Verbindungen der Familie Erdödy zur Musik. In *Haydn Jahrbuch*, 1978, vol. 10, pp. 151–152; SEIFERT, Herbert. Musik und Musiker der Grafen Erdödy in Kroatien im 18. Jahrhundert. In *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*, 1995, vol. 44, p. 193.

In the Eastern part of Hungary and in Transylvania, the insufficient development of the middle-class combined with a less wealthy and conservative nobility was not as favorable for the development of public theatres and other entertainment establishments. Therefore, the first theatre was built thanks to the protection of the central authorities in the principality's capital, Hermannstadt. Fifteen years later, in Kolozsvár (1802–1821), a designed capital since 1790, a theatre was financed by a committee of Hungarian noblemen sitting in the regional (*Komitats*) and central (*Gubernium*) administration of the principality, who aspired to found a national theatre. However, neither of these theatres included other types of entertainment premises.

In Galicia, the case of Jacek Kluszewski recalls both an early interest in manufactures of the high Polish aristocracy and the reorientation towards trade of less wealthy noblemen after the partition of the Commonwealth.⁶⁶ Obviously, this Polish nobleman engaged in numerous commercial businesses and kept close relations to the Austrian administration in order to re-establish his status in the new political context following the third partition of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth (1795).

During the following decades, private patrons, both noblemen and burghers, continued to build public theatres provided with additional commercial premises adjacent. Although obviously profit-based businesses, most later developers still presented themselves as patrons, acting out of love for the fatherland—an expression that became increasingly common toward the middle of the century. Such rhetoric can be seen both in projects submitted by burghers, like Jewish merchant Jacob Hirschl, who was the patron of a theatre built in Arad in 1818–1819,⁶⁷ and by noblemen, as in the case of Polish Count Stanisław Skarbek, who built a theatre in Lemberg between 1818 and 1842.⁶⁸

Nevertheless, such a close relationship to central administration officials and the aspiration to integrate into the public administration are specific traits of the turn of the 19th century. If it is quite difficult to handle high bureaucrats as an actual main entrepreneurial type in line with Helen Liebel, it may certainly be stated that state officials were central actors of the development of public theatres during the 1780s and 1790s. Not only statesmen supported municipalities and private investors, but such private patrons also aspired to become public officials themselves, directing and building a public theatre facilitated such ambitions, at least in the eastern lands of the Monarchy. Therefore, unlike high aristocratic theatrical patrons, the more heterogeneous social group of late eighteenth century investors seemed much more in quest of social status. These patrons were not only imitating the aristocracy's way of life, but also sought to present their investments as a complement to future public duties, just as high aristocrats had done a few decades earlier.

66 JEZIEŃSKI, Andrzej – LESZCZYŃSKA, Cecylia. *Historia gospodarcza Polski*. Warszawa : Key Text, 1997, pp. 83–88.

67 Arhivele Naționale ale României – județul Arad (ANRA), Arad, Romania, Primăria municipiului Arad (PMA), *Protocolum oeconomicum-politicum*, n°. 670/1818, fol. 1.

68 CDIAUL, F146, Op. 77, Sp. 22, fol. 392. Jerzy Got quotes some lines from this document. GOT, Jerzy. *Das österreichische Theater in Lemberg im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. Aus dem Theaterleben der Vielvölkermonarchie*, Vol. 1. Vienna : Verlag der ÖAW, 1997, pp. 342, 352.