

JEWES IN VIENNESE POPULAR CULTURE AROUND 1900 AS RESEARCH TOPIC



Popular culture represents a paradigmatic arena for exploring the interwovenness and interactions between Jews and non-Jews.¹ When considering the topic of Jews in the realm of Viennese popular culture at the end of the nineteenth and turn of the twentieth centuries, we must realize that this was an aspect of history not predominantly characterized by antisemitism. To be sure, antisemitism has represented one aspect characterizing the many and various relationships between Jews and non-Jews. But there was also cooperation between the two that was at times more pronounced than anti-Jewish hostility. We see evidence of the juxtaposition between Judeophobia and multifaceted forms of Jewish and non-Jewish coexistence in a brief newspaper quotation from 1904. The topic of this quotation is the Viennese folk song, and the anonymous author states that after a long time “an authentic, sentimental song, infused with folk humor, that is, an authentic Viennese folk song [*Wiener Volkslied*]” had finally once again been written. The song in question was “Everything Will Be Fine Again” (“Es wird ja alles wieder gut”). Martin Schenk (1860–1919) wrote the song’s lyrics, and Karl Hartl composed the tune.² The quotation continues, “After . . . the prevalence of Yiddish and Jewish anecdotes on the Viennese stage, following the unnatural fashions that have been grafted onto Viennese folk culture and which, as fashion always does, are thoughtlessly imitated, it does one good to hear once again something authentically Viennese.”³ The article in which this quotation appeared indicates that the song appeared in Joseph Blaha’s publishing house. What the author does not mention is the fact that Blaha was also Jewish.⁴ In addition, Martin Schenk was a longtime member of the Budapest Orpheum Society (Budapester Orpheumsgesellschaft), certainly the most important “jargon troupe” in Vienna in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The anonymous author of this quotation works from the assumption that Jews were responsible for a feeling of alienation that pervaded both Viennese folk songs and theatrical *Volkssänger* (performing musician) performances and plays.⁵ According to the stereotype evoked in this quotation, Jews exerted a detrimental influence on local Viennese culture. This culture is described as atmospheric and authentic, while the musical productions of Jews deviated from this tradition and therefore created an unnatural effect. In addition, Jews consciously and emphatically manipulated popular Viennese culture, as the use of the term “graft” (*auffpfropfen*) suggests.

The supposed distortion of the Viennese folk song is implicitly related to the widespread antisemitic stereotype of the cosmopolitan Jew. According to this prejudice, Jews are stateless and remain unrooted in the local, native culture and can therefore never understand it. The speaking of Yiddish (*mauscheln*) mentioned in the quotation symbolizes the allegedly difficult and complicated relationship between Jews and the majority culture in which they lived.⁶

However, we may also read this short newspaper quotation from a different perspective, keeping in mind that Jews helped considerably to shape the tradition of the Viennese folk song (*Wienerlied*), an interpretation that points to their cultural participation in Viennese folk culture. Although the author of this newspaper notice exaggerates the number of Jews who were involved as producers of Viennese songs and other popular folk pieces, he also does not entirely distort the facts. Jewish participation in this arena of cultural production was indeed remarkable. The importance of this Jewish involvement comes to the fore indirectly in an obituary written to eulogize Karl Kratzl (1852–1904). Kratzl composed the music for songs written by Josef Modl (1863–1915), Anton Amon (1862–1931), and other musicians, making him one of the best-known Viennese song composers. The author of his obituary remarks that Kratzl’s “‘Mir hat amal vom Himmel tramt!’ [will] live forever, just like the songs of Krakauer, Pick’s ‘Vienna Coachman’s Song’ [*Fiakerlied*], and certain songs by Wiesberg and the melodies of Sioly.”⁷ Of the four people named in the obituary, two were Jews, Gustav Pick (1832–1921) and Alexander Krakauer (1864–97). The author of the obituary also references the founding of the association Jolly Knights by Kratzl and Modl (who was also Jewish), hinting further at Jewish and non-Jewish cooperation in the realm of music and entertainment.⁸

We can therefore interpret the newspaper quotation regarding the ostensible detrimental influence of Jews on the Viennese *Volkssänger* tradition in a variety of ways, and no single interpretation is entirely correct or incorrect. To some degree, the interpretation of this quotation is subjective, dependent upon the individual reader. It is worth noting that the author of the quotation does not resort to the notorious prejudice that Jews were only capable of imitation and were therefore incapable of independent achievements.⁹ Instead, the author objects to the influence Jews had on the Viennese *Volkssänger* tradition and their attempt to assert

their own understanding of popular music. If we disregard, for a moment, the newspaper quotation's antisemitic exaggeration and anti-Jewish edge, the assertion made by the anonymous author clearly contains a grain of truth. Indeed, scholarly investigation into the topic "Jews in popular culture" demonstrates that Jews did not adapt to any popular cultural standards. But unlike the quotation suggests, neither did they manipulate them. Rather, Jews were involved in the music-cultural scene and helped steer its course. In other words, at least in this branch of Jewish cultural activity, the concept of acculturation, which still characterizes historiography about Jews, especially in Austria (see below), cannot accurately account for Jewish participation in popular culture.

A second theme that arises in connection with research on Jews in popular culture concerns the notion that their everyday life in Vienna was heavily influenced by antisemitism and that they lived largely separate from non-Jews. We see this assumption in the frequently cited idea that although Jews and non-Jews had professional interactions with each other, they rarely maintained private contacts.¹⁰ While this observation may have been true for particular segments of the Jewish and non-Jewish population, it can explain only to a limited extent the complexities of the relationships among participants in popular culture. In the realm of entertainment and popular culture, there was no dichotomous relationship between Jews and non-Jews.

A study on Jews in Viennese popular culture thus questions the validity of two basic assumptions in historiographical writing about them. Nevertheless, or perhaps because of this, as I mentioned in the introduction, this aspect of the Jewish past remains underrepresented in historical scholarship. In the following, I introduce four additional reasons that explain the widespread historiographical neglect of the subject of Jews in Viennese popular culture. I discuss in detail the last of these reasons, the selective coverage of Jewish newspapers, as it provides additional insight into relations between Viennese Jews and non-Jews at the turn of the twentieth century.

Identifying Jewish Artists in Popular Culture

At the turn of the twentieth century, there was a fruit vendor known as "Jewish Lisi" (Judenlisi) who sold her wares at the Viennese Naschmarkt. Her name alone might indicate that she was a Jewish businesswoman. Along similar lines, there was a woman named "Jewish-Liesel" (Juden-Liesel), a harpist from the early nineteenth century.¹¹ She sang, was a prostitute, and drew audiences with her ribald, suggestive songs.¹² Unlike the fruit vendor at the Naschmarkt, whose real name was Elisabeth Schrattenholzer and who was called Judenlisi only on account of her predominantly Jewish clientele, the true identity of Jewish-Liesel (Juden-Liesel) remains unknown.¹³ We cannot deduce whether artists who took

part in the early days of Viennese *Volkssänger* scene were Jewish based on their names alone. This lack of clarity also applies to Juden-Pepi, a member of the troupe surrounding the amateur dramatist Franz Deckmayer (1851–97).¹⁴

During the late nineteenth century, performing artists habitually adopted stage names, a practice that often creates confusion for scholars today working to assemble biographical data about them. When scholars happen upon newspaper reports on individual artists (or mentions of particular artists in print), it is for the most part impossible to determine whether they were Jewish or identified as Jewish at the time. To be sure, a name alone is never a sure indication of the individual's Jewishness, but it sometimes provides an important clue or starting point from which further investigations can be made. For example, in the previous chapter, I discussed the case of Mr. Katz. He performed under the pseudonym "Kaciander," a name that also gives no indication of his relationship to Judaism. In this particular case, however, I was able to identify him as Jewish on account of additional remarks made about him in various media. Otherwise, I could only pursue research on Katz-Kaciander's Jewishness if I could identify his real name, and consequently find it in the registers of the Viennese Jewish religious community (Israelitische Kultusgemeinde Wien). Often, though not always, one can find entries for specific names and thus attain confirmation that the individuals bearing these names were born, married, or died as Jews.¹⁵

The widespread practice among Jewish artists to assume stage names occasionally leads researchers to use questionable methods to secure concrete subjects for their studies. An example would be the examination of lists that the National Socialists created for the purpose of defaming Jewish artists to exclude them from the cultural scene and persecute them.¹⁶ This does not mean that researchers looking for Jewish participants in popular culture using such a source must remain faithful to the Nazi racist definition of Jewishness. In principle, they could exclude from their research those artists for whom there is no evidence of Jewish identification. Nevertheless, the difficulty in identifying Jews who performed and participated in popular culture can bear strange results.

Another Jewish artist who appeared under a pseudonym was de Brye or Gaston de Brie, as he called himself, a so-called female impersonator. De Brye worked in various Viennese variety shows. His stage name does not appear to evince any connection to Judaism, nor does his name appear in Jewish community records. If de Brye had been an average artist with an inconspicuous lifestyle, then his Jewish background would probably have remained unknown to historians. But there are court proceedings pertaining to his ventures and intrigues, and a compilation of these proceedings allows us to identify the man behind the stage name as Emanuel Müller, also known as Emanuel Adler-Müller. We also learn that he opened a nightclub in the Viennese district Leopoldstadt in the late autumn of 1899 and invited *Volkssänger* to perform there.¹⁷

Stage names do not always pose a problem for historians. Occasionally, we find that various studies and publications have already researched individual Jewish artists, comedians, and *Volkssänger* and identified their real names and identities. Examples include Josef Armin (1858–1925), who was actually called Josef Rottensteiner; Heinrich Eisenbach (1870–1923), the singing comedian of the Budapest Orpheum Society, who was born Heinrich Mandl and also known by the nickname “Wamperl”; Armin Berg, also known as Hermann Weinberger; and Josef Müller, whose real name was Josef Schlesinger. This is just to name a few, as the list of these artists and performers goes on and on.

The use of artist names on the part of Jewish artists and *Volkssänger* engaged in Viennese popular culture around 1900 makes it difficult, not only in historical retrospect, to engage in scholarly studies about them. Sometimes even their contemporaries were mistaken about the ethnic-cultural or religious affiliation of these entertainers. We see a particularly interesting example of this kind of error in the announcement of the alleged death of the “humpbacked wine tavern poet [*Heurigendichter*]” Loisl Ungrad. He was famous for his “impromptu” *Gstanzeln* (short satirical songs), which he performed on the *Brettl*—the stages where *Volkssänger* performed. Ungrad, like many of his colleagues, performed under an assumed name. His real name, so people assumed, was Kohn. Only through an obituary printed by mistake do we learn that he was actually named Vopitschka (Ungrad even read the report of his own death in the newspaper).¹⁸

The choice of stage names also exerts an influence over historical research in other ways. For example, Koller’s 1931 overview of Viennese folk songs, *Das Wiener Volksängertum*, states that Franz Kriebaum, longtime director of Danzer’s Orpheum and a former *Volkssänger*, was “actually called Grünbaum.”¹⁹ We find this piece of information in almost all subsequent scholarly discussions and mentions of Kriebaum, including Ernst Weber’s 2006 article in which he references “Franz Xaver Kriebaum (a.k.a. Grünbaum, 1836–1900).”²⁰ Although not specifically mentioned, this kind of formulation contains an implicit reference to Kriebaum’s ostensible Jewishness.²¹ Even the 1994 *Historisches Lexikon Wien* (Historical lexicon of Vienna) gives the name “Grünbaum” in brackets following the name Kriebaum.²² The proliferation of this kind of information occurs despite reference in the encyclopedia entry to an article from the *Wiener Zeitung* stating that the name Kriebaum can be found listed in the baptismal records of the parish Nussdorf, indicating that his family was never called Grünbaum.²³ But the particular formulation of this artist’s name, “Kriebaum a.k.a. Grünbaum,” has apparently become so popular that it has been taken for granted, meaning that Kriebaum’s connection to Judaism has persisted in the scholarship as a given fact.

This approach seems to be the product of what might be described in Yiddish as *Efn a zeml un aroys a yid*, “Wherever you turn, you meet a Jew.” In other words,

many scholars endeavor to identify as many Jews as possible.²⁴ Whether some of these scholars consciously engage in this kind of practice simply for the purpose of bolstering their research findings remains unclear. Whatever the motivation for the negligent treatment of biographies, it distorts the results of this kind of scholarly work.

For historians, it may therefore be difficult to identify Jews among the artists who were a part of Viennese popular culture. Their custom of performing under a stage name often conceals clear references to their Jewish identity. This problem may constitute one of several reasons why scholarly research has tended to neglect them.

The Subversive Dimension of Popular Culture

Another reason that may have contributed to the widespread omission in scholarly research of the topic “Jews in popular culture” could be their subversive potential. Because popular culture is primarily constituted by practices that can easily elude established social standards, popular culture offers the possibility for criticizing normative prescriptions as well as countercultural ambitions.²⁵ We see this potential for subversion in Viennese popular culture around 1900, not least in the performances of Jewish *Volkssänger* and cabaret artists. These performers often ridiculed the values that were considered bourgeois and with which a large portion of the Jewish population identified. “Jewish” humor, with all its irony and sarcasm, rebelled against middle-class Jewish self-understanding, a practice that was often met with irritation among predominantly Jewish audiences. In this context, I draw the reader’s attention to an indignant letter addressed to the *Oesterreichische Wochenschrift*. This anonymous letter submitted to the newspaper remarks about the Budapest Orpheum Society: “A Jew (in the case of the Budapesters, everyone speaks Yiddish)—so one Jew spits in the other’s face; the same Jew engages in toilet humor, and so on with grace into infinity . . . any decent person can only react by saying ‘ugh!’”²⁶

A similar reaction to a performance deemed indecent occurred during a solo scene that Heinrich Eisenbach performed. After Eisenbach engaged in all sorts of lewd behavior while on stage, the audience broke out in a tumult. As one newspaper reported, they began to make noise, stamp their feet, whistle, and hoot. It was only after a long break and a formal apology from Eisenbach that the audience members calmed down enough for him to continue his performance.²⁷

The deliberate violation of social conventions and widely accepted mores and the parodying of these values articulated a critique of the self-understanding of much of the Jewish community. This popular cultural revolt against bourgeois values may have contributed decisively to the fact that Jewish newspapers had little regard for this kind of performance and the artists responsible for them.

In turn, this tendency makes it difficult for scholars today to identify archival evidence that points to Jewish participation in popular culture.

Jewish *Volkssänger* not only violated the accepted norms of decency and articulated salacious ideas, but they also sometimes attacked bourgeois values directly. The aforementioned composer Alexander Krakauer provides a key example of a Jewish artist who engaged in this kind of anti-bourgeois performance.²⁸ His songs, which have a radically pessimistic basic tenor and are deeply disillusioned, celebrate the destruction of positive sentiments such as love, joy, and success. Above all, marriage and the assurance that marriage brings happiness are frequent targets of his sarcasm. In one of his songs, he even describes marriage as suicide.²⁹ Krakauer was not alone in his criticism of marriage and family life. This critique of traditional bourgeois values formed a recurrent and central theme in many pieces composed and performed by Jewish *Volkssänger*.³⁰ Above all, this critique entailed an examination of traditional Jewish gender relationships, according to which women sometimes played the role of family breadwinner.³¹

Jewish *Volkssänger* tended to oppose social conventions and were therefore provocative. At times, the pieces that they performed were considered by many to be offensive and obscene. No matter how these performances were understood at the time, one thing remains certain: these performers and artists acted as anything but guardians of bourgeois values. This ribald behavior has not only contributed to their overall neglect in the Jewish press at the turn of the century, but this lacuna also creates difficulties for contemporary historians who endeavor to integrate such artists and their work into their historical narratives. Most of these historians assume that Jews habitually adopted bourgeois values.³²

The Historiography of Acculturation

Until the last quarter of the twentieth century, academic studies on Jews in Austria were rather rare.³³ And only a few such studies reflected larger international trends in their methodological approach. But in the late 1980s, a shift took place in the Austrian research landscape. In the wake of the Waldheim affair, initiatives were established that ushered in an intensive examination of the history of Jews and Judaism in Austria.³⁴ Without wishing to reconstruct here the multiplicity of activities that resulted from this larger cultural examination, I mention here only the most salient aspects, which have also found a permanent institutional foothold. The most important institution, whose foundation was announced at the height of international criticism of Austria's engagement with its Nazi past, is the Jewish Museum Vienna (Jüdisches Museum der Stadt Wien).³⁵ Since Danielle Spera took over the management of the institution in 2010, the Jewish Museum Vienna has significantly shaped the national conversation regarding Jewish history in Austria. The Institute for Jewish History in

Austria (Institut für jüdische Geschichte Österreichs), which has published a significant number of scholarly studies, especially on medieval Jewish history, has also emerged from this political context.³⁶ Students and scholars writing master's theses and doctoral dissertations at some Austrian universities came into contact with scholars from other countries and conducted their research under their influence. This contact laid the foundation for the Center for Jewish Studies at the University of Graz. At the University of Salzburg, the Center of Jewish Cultural History was founded at roughly the same time.³⁷

These academic studies stood in the shadow of pathbreaking work done by Anglo-American historians who had gained renown in the late 1980s with internationally acclaimed publications on Viennese Jews in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Among the most important authors were Steven Beller, Marsha Rozenblit, and Robert Wistrich.³⁸ Although they approached their topics from different perspectives and also differed in their methodological approach, their studies evince some similarities. For example, they widely portray the Jewish past as a history of assimilation or acculturation vis-à-vis the dominant, majority culture—that is, as an attempt to gain social advancement, above all to become part of the bourgeoisie. Steven Beller writes in this context, “It is true that Jews used culture as a means of creating an assimilation.” Although Rozenblit doubts that Viennese Jews completely assimilated, she writes instead of their acculturation, “Along with the apparent success with which Viennese Jews outwardly acculturated, and with which some of their numbers almost totally assimilated. . . .”³⁹

These three scholars were all trained at leading universities outside of Austria and incorporated theoretical approaches and questions into their work that shaped international research in the late twentieth century. Their publications were examples of cutting-edge research and represented important landmarks for the Austrian research landscape. Thus, the historiographical narrative of acculturation and the paradigm of embourgeoisement established themselves as *de rigueur*, in turn shaping the vast majority of subsequent publications on Austrian Jewry to this day.⁴⁰

But it was not long before the historical narrative regarding Jewish adaptation encountered increasing criticism. In Jewish studies in the German-speaking world, this development began in the late 1990s. Within the framework of cultural studies, scholars began to question the static, monolithic concept of culture—a questioning that in turn led to the dissolution of this concept.⁴¹ Instead, they began to perceive culture as dynamic and plural, making it difficult to write about Jewish adaptation to Viennese or Austrian culture. In addition, scholars working on the concept of cultural transfer drew attention to the fact that any group that adopts cultural standards aligns it with its own system of cultural interpretation, thereby altering it.⁴² The assumption that Jews, if they adopt cultural attitudes with which at least individual sectors of society identify, interpret these cultural

attitudes the same as these other groups must be viewed as counterproductive.⁴³ As a result of this scholarly innovation, some Jewish studies researchers have abandoned the acculturation narrative altogether.⁴⁴

Working with the concept of Jewish acculturation requires two things: first, knowledge of the culture or cultures in which adaptation takes place, that is, what constitutes these cultural systems; and second, an understanding of the agglomerate of (in this case Jewish) cultural significance, aspects of which must be abandoned in the process of acculturation. Only under these conditions is it possible to determine how Jewish acculturation takes place. But since culture cannot be fixed, but rather must be understood as something emergent and thus constantly in shift, such definitions are hardly useful.⁴⁵ In addition, a culture cannot be split into discrete parts. In concrete terms, this means that the attempt to differentiate the culture or cultural processes of a society into clearly transferable Jewish and non-Jewish components is essentially an impossible task.⁴⁶

Against the background of these theoretical considerations, scholars once again called into question the concept of acculturation. A change of perspective in the theorization of Jewish–non-Jewish relationships has also contributed to this reconsideration. According to this shift in perspective, Jews did not follow established cultural standards, but influenced and shaped them alongside non-Jews. Within this revised framework, Jews are not considered a foreign, non-native element, but rather are seen as belonging to the society in which they lived and worked. In particular, Israeli historian Steven E. Aschheim represented this viewpoint in the late 1990s.⁴⁷ Around the same time, German historian Till van Rahden confirmed this conception of Jewishness in his dissertation *Juden und andere Breslauer* (later published in English as *Jews and Other Germans*) by way of concrete examples, and he introduced the concept of situational ethnicity into Jewish studies.⁴⁸ Jewishness was thus radically contextualized and released from the burden of previous interpretations.

A prime example often given for the adaptation of Jews to the standards of the majority society is their ostensible adoption of prevailing clothing trends.⁴⁹ But we can see how misleading this example can be, however, when we take a look at a late nineteenth-century photographic collection from Galician Krakow, which American historian Nathaniel D. Wood analyzes in his study *Becoming Metropolitan*. The photographs from the 1880s show people who are clearly identifiable in their appearance as Jews, workers, Roma, aristocrats, and members of other groups. But in the photographs taken about thirty years later, it is not possible to make such differentiations. In the later set of images, the individuals all look strikingly similar to one another.⁵⁰ During the time period between the two sets of images, the individuals depicted were not trying to adopt the same fashion standards, but rather were all undergoing the process of modernization. We can neither explain nor trace this development using the concept of acculturation. In addition, the garment industry, with its large percentage of Jewish produc-

ers, traders, and sellers of fashion articles, and fashion designers in particular, offers a paradigmatic example of an area in which Jews co-determined prevalent standards.⁵¹ Lisa Silverman has recently described the significant role that the Viennese Zwieback department store played in this cultural and economic sector.⁵² In other words, even if some Jews traded the caftan in favor of the business suit, reflecting an acculturation to prevailing clothing conventions, this did not constitute the adoption of non-Jewish standards, but rather an interest in fashion trends that were pursued by Jews and non-Jews alike.

Finally, I must mention the influence of the performative turn in cultural studies. This influence has also contributed to theoretical reflections in the field of Jewish studies that have in turn undermined the previously upheld importance of the acculturation narrative.⁵³ According to the concept of performance, cultural meaning is constituted interactively between a sender and a receiver. For every performative act, at least two people or two interacting groups are necessary. Every change in the communication partner and any change in the composition of the group or the context of interaction has an impact on the content of the culturally negotiated message. Culture is considered highly fluid in this case. Its transience eludes any effort to determine exactly how and where cultural adaptation might take place. Instead of acculturation, the performative approach outlines social and cultural processes that were jointly designed by non-Jews *and* Jews. Especially in the field of Viennese popular culture at the turn of the twentieth century, where there was a dense network of Jewish–non-Jewish cooperation, this concept has proved immensely fruitful.

We can see a special form of interaction that influenced Viennese popular culture and reveals the dynamic character of cultural significance in performances by *Volkssänger* groups. They took place in a so-called performative setting. This means that the audience was able to participate in the performances by making noises, whistling, uttering compliments, and other articulations, and so to some extent also negotiated the interpretation of the plot, as the actors only roughly adhered to a script and focused instead on improvisation. Since Jewish *Volkssänger* groups usually played in front of a mixed, Jewish and non-Jewish audience, non-Jews also took part in these performances. Non-Jews were thus involved in the creation of cultural meaning, and sometimes also in the understanding of what was “Jewish.”

We can identify an example of a performance influenced by the interaction between audience and actors in the theater piece *Der Findling* (The foundling) by the S. Fischer Society. In this play, a Jewish peddler takes shelter in the home of a man known to be a miser and to his surprise discovers that his daughter is employed as the man’s cook. Concerned about her well-being, he starts a conversation with her employer, which turns into a fight. In what follows, the miser expels the Jewish peddler from his house. At this point, a portion of the audience took sides with the peddler, while another segment of the audience found themselves rooting for the miser. Both groups loudly expressed their respective sympathies

and thereby influenced the further representation of the characters. During one performance, however, the actors apparently did not respond to the satisfaction of the audience members, who were worked up over the miser's treatment of the peddler and even wanted to beat up the actor playing the miser after the performance.⁵⁴ In this instance, the spectators (a group that may have also included non-Jews) were clearly rooting for the Jewish character. Whether the favorable portrayal of the Jewish peddler influenced the audience's attitude toward Jews in everyday life remains unclear in this particular instance.

Constructions of Jewishness in Popular Literature

The performance of *Der Findling* by the S. Fischer Society suggests how Jews and non-Jews mutually negotiated Jewishness. Additionally, American literary scholar Jonathan Hess deftly analyzes in a recent article how *Deborah*, a melodramatic folk play from the 1840s, portrays this process of negotiation. *Deborah* was written by the German-Austrian Jewish writer Salomon Hermann Mosenthal (1821–77) and was one of the greatest successes of nineteenth-century German-language theater. *Deborah* has been performed in various European countries as well as in the United States and has been translated into fifteen languages. Due to audience enthusiasm for the drama, Mosenthal came to be known as the “Jewish Schiller.” After Mosenthal's death, his play continued to find resonance for a period of time, especially in English-speaking countries, and at the beginning of the twentieth century, there were even several film adaptations of his theater piece.⁵⁵

Deborah tells the story of a secret love between a young Jewish woman and a non-Jewish man in a small town in the Austrian province. Social conventions and prejudices prevent public acceptance of this relationship and ultimately bring about its demise. Mosenthal charged (if not perhaps overcharged) *Deborah* with lofty, tragic emotions, and without the outstanding performances of the actresses, who in this specific case were non-Jewish, the play never would have reached the stage of the Vienna Burgtheater or any other renowned theater. What was remarkable about the depictions was that they elicited in the audience a strong empathy for the experiences of the Jewish protagonist, including her despair at the prejudices and the stubbornness of the predominantly Christian world in which she lived. In other words, the play was able to achieve its particular effect because the non-Jewish actors were so attuned to their roles that they gave sensitive, insightful performances. The drama thus provides a vivid example of the formation of cultural meaning by both Jews *and* non-Jews. Their cooperation, as Jonathan Hess writes, produced an “affective community” that, at least for a short time, showed solidarity with a Jewish figure.⁵⁶

Another example of how non-Jews participated in the depiction of Jewishness in popular culture is the 1863 novel *Der lange Isaak* (The long Isaac), written by Julius von Wickede (1819–96), who was the scion of an old German aristocratic

family. His novel, an example of formula fiction (*Trivialliteratur*), takes place during the Napoleonic wars. Isaac, a Jewish peddler, takes advantage of the mobility inherent to his profession to spy on the movements of French troops. His “German patriotism” is even surpassed by that of his daughter Rebekka. A rabbi introduces her to the masterpieces of German literature, which arouses in her a love of German culture.⁵⁷

We could categorize *Der lange Isaak* as a work of Jewish literature. The Jewish self-understanding of the protagonists and the treatment of Jewish questions would speak to this inclusion, even if the author of the novel was not Jewish. But we could also consider the text a product of German culture, and there would be convincing reasons for such a decision. But neither of the two categorizations would do the work justice; the notion of both of these two ostensibly discrete categories is predicated on the possibility of precisely defining and thus also distinguishing between what is Jewish and what is German.⁵⁸ Such dichotomous indicators are fundamentally problematic and, above all, do not apply to this specific case. Rather, *Der lange Isaak* is another example of the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of clearly separating Jewish and non-Jewish cultural areas, which, however, is a precondition for the acculturation narrative. Thus, von Wickedé’s novel also calls into question the overall utility of the concept of Jewish cultural adaptation.

Lacunae in the Jewish Press

Another important reason that explains why scholars in Jewish studies and related disciplines have thus far scarcely investigated the topic of Jews in Viennese popular culture may have something to do with the coverage of Jewish newspapers and journals of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Jewish press reported on popular cultural events only sporadically and superficially—if at all. Because scholars often analyze only Jewish (rather than general) print media as part of their work on Jewish life in Vienna, they gain only a one-sided picture of Jewish cultural activities.⁵⁹ Even if they employ general newspapers as sources in their research, they tend to focus mostly on high-profile newspapers primarily devoted to high culture.⁶⁰ Such publications contain hardly any news or reporting related to Jews in popular culture. The central question that I wish to raise in this section is: why did the Jewish press in Austria neglect Jewish engagement in popular cultural activities?

As I mentioned earlier, the sometimes subversive nature of popular cultural entertainment provides a possible explanation for the neglect in the Jewish press to report on such cultural activities and events. I now turn my attention to additional aspects that may have been decisive factors in why the Jewish press chose to report on some events and ignored others. I contextualize the news coverage

that appeared in Jewish media within the larger framework of the reception of newspaper media among the Viennese Jewish population.

Differentiating between Jewish and Non-Jewish Newspapers

Scholarly focus on Jewish newspapers, or even on high-brow general newspapers, does not necessarily lead to incorrect assertions about the life of Viennese Jews. The most accomplished studies undertaken thus far have not incorporated insights available in the Viennese popular press, which advertised the performances of Jewish popular artists.⁶¹ If we are to be critical of this approach, however, we might point out that it has led to the assumption that there was no connection between Jews and Viennese popular culture and that there is therefore no need to research this particular aspect of Jewish history.⁶² As a result, there have been few scholarly studies dedicated to this topic, which in turn has strengthened the idea that Jews were generally disinterested in popular culture. It is a classic case of circular logic that has only served to cement misconceptions. Due to this oversight, at least an entire aspect of the history of Viennese Jews remains unexplored.

Investigating Jewish newspapers inevitably raises the question of how to define them. What exactly distinguishes Jewish newspapers from non-Jewish media, and does a juxtaposition between the Jewish and non-Jewish press even do the topic justice? In the following, I consider Jewish newspapers and magazines, including *Die Wahrheit*, *Bloch's Oesterreichische Wochenschrift*, the *(Neue) National-Zeitung*, *Die Welt*, and other print media that were dedicated to strengthening Jewish ethnic and cultural awareness, to promoting Jewish religious concerns, and to communicating news of particular interest to the majority of Jews. The particular orientation of the Jewish media outlets thus distinguished them from the general (non-Jewish) press. Occasionally, non-Jewish media also reported on events that were primarily relevant for a Jewish readership. Such events include, for example, elections to the executive committee of the Jewish communities in Hernals, Ottakring, and Neulerchenfeld, which appeared in print in the *Wiener Vororte-Zeitung* (Newspaper of the outlying districts of Vienna).⁶³ However, the reporting of such information in non-Jewish media was more likely to be the exception rather than the rule in communicating the news.⁶⁴

In referencing the specific focus of their reporting, I call attention to the widely accepted circumscription of Jewish newspapers.⁶⁵ We can trace this idea back to an article by Margaret T. Edelheim-Muehsam, published in the first edition of the *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* in 1956. She asserts, "If we speak of the German-Jewish press, we refer to the periodicals published by Jews for Jewish readers, with special emphasis on Jewish problems. This does not exclude that any paper may have occasionally been published by non-Jewish authors, nor that non-Jews read the paper."⁶⁶

Viennese Jewish newspapers explicitly established their specific scope in their program implementations. For example, in its first issue from 1 January 1899, the newspaper *Die Wahrheit* declared that it would “foster all things capable of awakening and preserving Jewish life.”⁶⁷ *Die Wahrheit* confirmed that it would focus on Jewish themes and concerns. The statement indicates only implicitly that it would report on general social events, insofar as they concerned Jewish interests. Many Jewish national and Zionist media were even more explicit in their commitment to reporting specifically on Jewish matters. *Die Welt* stated, “Our weekly newspaper is a ‘Judenblatt’ [a Jewish newspaper]. . . . *Die Welt* will be the news outlet of the men who wish to lead Judaism from this moment in time to better times in the future.”⁶⁸ The publication then focuses solely on Jewish interests—specifically Jewish Zionist interests.

Selective Reporting in the Jewish Press

With regard to the programmatic establishment of news reporting, we might expect that Jewish media overlooked events that involved Jews if these events did not entail specific aspects of Jewish religion or culture or if they were of no relevance to larger portions of the Viennese Jewish community. We can see the legitimacy of this argument in the example of the affair surrounding the suicide of the Jewish merchant Heinrich Löwy at the beginning of 1899. The man who committed suicide was the owner of a commission business located in the city center of Vienna. He made his living by purchasing goods from a Bohemian supplier and reselling them to Viennese businessmen. Unfortunately, and to his detriment, Löwy’s customers included members of a gang of swindlers and racketeers. Moriz Rosenberger, Samuel Schmilowitz, Sigmund Kohn, Samuel Weiss, and several others started sham businesses, which they outfitted with goods from Löwy. They failed to pay him, but they nevertheless sold the goods to other merchants. Löwy was thereby driven to ruin. He saw suicide as the only way out of his misery. On the last day of 1898, he arrived home late for lunch—the main meal of the day. His family was already sitting at the table, waiting for him. After entering the apartment, he walked wordlessly past his wife and children, opened a window in an adjoining room, and plunged from the fourth floor to the courtyard below. Heavily injured, he was carried to the apartment of the caretaker living on the ground floor, where those helping the seriously injured man awaited the ambulance. Löwy succumbed to his injuries while in the hospital.⁶⁹

The newspapers were full of reports of his tragic death in the first few days of January. He seemed to symbolize the powerlessness of individual people in the face of criminal activities. Despite his diligence and a degree of business acumen, Löwy was unable to prevent his social collapse. The bottom line seemed to be that bourgeois virtues offered no protection against unfeeling fellow citizens. But although the perpetrators, as well as the injured party, were all Jews and although

the situation might have been considered an “intra-Jewish affair,” the Jewish media ignored this case.

The self-proclaimed scope of the Jewish press helps explain why they ignored the Löwy affair. But their declaration of scope and intent does not answer the question why Jewish media devoted themselves to such a specific policy and thus chose a very restrictive line of reporting. What moved these Jewish newspapers to ignore some of the everyday experiences of Jews, and thus also popular cultural entertainment culture? There are essentially two reasons for this phenomenon.

The first reason may have been the desire to halt or even reverse the clearly discernible decline in traditional forms of Jewishness and the diminishing observance of Jewish religious rules and customs.⁷⁰ It was believed that this trend was the result of various influences, such as interdenominational marriage.⁷¹ To be sure, the press was not the only medium that made it its task to counteract this development. Both the Viennese Jewish Museum and Jewish folk culture were committed to a goal similar to that of Jewish newspapers.⁷² All of them were concerned, among other goals, with conveying so-called Jewish values and attitudes to those Jews who had already distanced themselves from Judaism or were on the verge of doing so.⁷³ The intent was to make their readers familiar with a sense of Jewishness with which they could identify. At a time when newspapers became increasingly affordable and, as a result, a mass medium, they became a key component of an extremely attractive and likely effective strategy for pursuing this goal.⁷⁴

Given that many Jews were firmly rooted in their surroundings, were in close contact with non-Jews, had non-Jewish neighbors and colleagues, attended events and frequented coffeehouses and engaged in other leisure activities with them, and were often as affected by everyday occurrences as non-Jews, the attempt on the part of Jewish newspapers to connect Jews to their religion and culture would have probably been more successful if they had not simply ignored everyday life, but rather had presented it from a Jewish perspective and reconciled them with Jewish values.⁷⁵ Some Jewish physicians adopted this approach at about the same time, as they interpreted the observance of Jewish religious rites and practices as beneficial to one’s health. In doing so, they combined Jewish practices with a value of central importance to the middle class (*bourgeoisie*) at the time.⁷⁶ Jews who felt that they belonged to the middle class and had alienated themselves from their religion on account of this allegiance were able to return to Judaism without having to abandon a secular lifestyle. The Jewish press could—and perhaps even should—have followed in the footsteps of these Jewish doctors in order to reach Jews who were indifferent to Judaism.⁷⁷ The Jewish media, however, failed to do so.

If the narrowly focused reporting undertaken by Jewish media contributed little to strengthening Jewish self-understanding, we may reasonably assume that there were reasons for the oversight. We may infer this from the fact that the Jew-

ish press not only ignored events, even those that involved Jewish participants, if they had no relation to Jewish religious or cultural life, but Jewish newspapers also often ignored everyday events that demonstrably influenced the Viennese Jewish community, or at least large swathes of the Jewish community—events that they might well have reported on according to their own publishing policies. We can see this illustrated in two examples that I discuss below. Subsequently, I formulate and substantiate a thesis explaining why these omissions in Jewish newspapers occurred.

The first example involves a case of fraud against banker Albert Vogl. He was accused of wresting an oral last will and testament from a mentally incapacitated client, Georg Herz Taubin, on his deathbed. Vogl was a well-known personality in Vienna and maintained many friendships and acquaintances among socially respected circles. He was the owner of a currency exchange office located at Vienna's most respected business address, am Graben, which he had founded with money he had made in New York. His business, however, was not particularly successful. He speculated in the stock market, lost money, and was rescued from bankruptcy by the intervention of a handful of Viennese banks. Vogl's accumulated debts were seen as the motive that drove him to profit fraudulently at Taubin's expense.⁷⁸

The fact that a person as illustrious as Vogl had to appear as a defendant in court was in itself a minor sensation. The contemporary media with their multi-page reports on the trial gave the affair an additional touch of the spectacular. The biography of the alleged fraud victim, Georg Herz Taubin, also contributed to the interest. He had immigrated from Russia and possessed a small fortune that enabled him to lead an extravagant lifestyle in Vienna, well outside of established social conventions. He was considered an eccentric, on account of his clothes, his manner of speaking, and especially his behavior. At the same time, according to newspaper reports, he had a reputation for being well-read and was said to have even studied the Talmud. However, it was also said that a meaningful conversation with him was scarcely possible, as his education was too superficial and his knowledge too diffuse. Those who associated with him were usually suspicious of his idiosyncrasies and sometimes worried about how these idiosyncrasies would affect them. He is said to have led a "life inclined toward wild orgies" and also to have been "devoted to drunkenness in a boundless manner."⁷⁹ His alcoholism was seen as the cause of his mental disintegration, which manifested itself not only in radical mood swings but also in delusions of persecution and megalomania. He allegedly told the Zionist and later delegate to the Imperial Assembly (Reichsrat) Isidor Schalit (1871–1954) that he was the Greek god Zeus and had come to punish people.⁸⁰ While he was perceived to be an affectionate person during the short phases when he was sober, he was reputed to have been insane while in a drunken state, berating the people around him and regularly demanding sex from his domestic servant.

To the surprise of the general public, the defendant succeeded in convincing the court that Taubin, who was apparently in a state of incoherence on his deathbed, temporarily regained his mental faculties and clearly articulated the wish that his entire fortune be bequeathed to Vogl.⁸¹ In any case, the accused was acquitted.

This case is noteworthy not only due to its outcome, but also because it generated interest exclusively in the general, non-Jewish press. Indeed, the Jewish press ignored the trial altogether, despite the fact that all personalities involved were Jewish, including Vogl, Taubin, and his relatives, who fought for their share of the inheritance and accused Vogl of inheritance fraud. Admittedly, the “Vogl affair” did not promote Jewish concerns and did not contribute to strengthening Jewish religious interests, which were considered prerequisites for reporting in the Jewish media. However, the coverage in many non-Jewish daily newspapers had such an unequivocally antisemitic tone that it could be reasonably expected that the Jewish press would respond to it, as was the case with many newspaper assertions that were far less antisemitic. To be sure, not all newspapers were as explicit as the *Deutsches Volksblatt*, which described the case as an “affair” in which “Jewish greed and avarice play a leading role.”⁸² But despite examples of greater subtlety in dealing with antisemitic stereotypes, many other print media outlets came forward with biased, antisemitic reporting.⁸³

Taubin’s eccentric nature had brought him into contact with a number of prominent Jews, all of whom served as witnesses in court. As a result, the trial was of direct interest to at least some Viennese Jews and for this reason garnered the keen attention of another part of the city’s Jewish population. Perhaps the most dazzling personality on the witness stand was Theodor Herzl. Taubin had met with him because Taubin had offered to support his Zionist movement financially. Herzl, however, recognized Taubin’s lack of mental stability and refused further contact with him. Nevertheless, he had to testify before the court.⁸⁴ In addition, Taubin regularly donated to Jewish charities. This devotion also brought him into contact with various illustrious members of the Viennese Jewish community. All of Taubin’s enterprises were mentioned during the trial, and various individuals were questioned about them. However, only non-Jewish newspapers reported on the case.

Another case that the Jewish media ignored, despite the fact that it drew the attention of a considerable number of Viennese Jews, was the robbery and murder of second-hand dealer Israel Kessler. One winter day in January 1902, shortly before noon, a man entered Kessler’s shop while Kessler was alone and killed him with a hammer. The murderer nabbed Kessler’s wallet, which was filled with cash. He then walked out of the store in no apparent hurry, probably so as not to attract attention. One of Kessler’s acquaintances saw the assailant leave the store but assumed he was a customer. Only when Kessler’s servant arrived to fetch her employer for lunch was the murder discovered.⁸⁵

The killing horrified the people of Vienna. For several days, the crime dominated the city’s news cycle, and all of Vienna seemed to be on a hunt for the mur-

derer. A roving mob apprehended suspicious people who resembled the widely circulated description of the perpetrator, harassed them, and handed them over to the police. The police also wished to cultivate the appearance of doing everything they could and in turn combed public houses, hotels, and mass quarters in search of the suspect. Although this search led to the arrest of several wanted criminals, Kessler's killer remained at large.⁸⁶ Single women were particularly frightened. They notified the police at the slightest noise. A public announcement was made offering a considerable reward if information led to the perpetrator's arrest. This circumstance further fueled the general sense of uncertainty. A state of emergency prevailed throughout the city. Ultimately, the authorities were able to make the crucial breakthrough in their investigation. The police identified the murderer as Johann Woboril, a railroad employee, and arrested him a short while later in Bohemia.⁸⁷

All the citizens of Vienna fell under the spell of the news of this case. Jews felt particularly affected by the bloody deed, as Johann Woboril seemed to exhibit animosity toward them. Indeed, there was no convincing evidence that he had murdered the shop owner on account of antisemitic sentiment. But the fact that one day before the crime Woboril had told strangers that he would like to give "the Jew [meaning Kessler] a few slaps" was interpreted as an antisemitic motive.⁸⁸ Representatives of the Jewish religious community and various temple associations attended Kessler's funeral, as if to honor someone famous. The media thus stylized Kessler as a Jewish victim of his non-Jewish environment. Rabbi Taglicht had to interrupt his eulogy several times because tears stifled his voice.⁸⁹

In this sense, we may assert that Kessler's murder deeply moved and disturbed the Jewish community in Vienna. Nevertheless, almost nothing was reported about him in the Jewish media. The reason for this, however, can hardly lie in their specific program for reporting. Although it may justify the omission of the Löwy affair, it does not explain why Jewish newspapers ignored the cases surrounding Kessler and Vogl. I argue that these latter two cases were ignored because the publishers of Jewish media were aware that Jews gained information about everyday life in Vienna, including the two criminal cases, from general (non-Jewish) newspapers. Therefore, there was no need for the Jewish press to repeat such news. This also applies to popular cultural performances, which sometimes even had a direct connection to religious Jewish culture. The Jewish newspapers neglected to report on such events because the general press devoted space to such performances and Jews read these newspapers.

The Reception of General Newspapers by Jews

It comes as no surprise that Jews read non-Jewish media. After all, Jews had higher than average participation in the newspaper industry in terms of their percentage of the population.⁹⁰ Important media sources such as the *Neue Freie*

Presse, the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, the *Wiener Sonn- und Montagszeitung*, and the *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung* had Jewish owners or publishers. Even the tabloid *Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt* was one of these publications. We must also not forget that a considerable number of journalists and editors were Jewish.⁹¹ The feature pages (*Feuilleton*), an indispensable component of quality newspapers, owed its high standard to Jewish engagement.⁹² And finally, there is considerable evidence, including diary entries and literary references, that suggest or indicate that Jews read general newspapers.⁹³ The participation of Jews in the press was a well-known and sometimes exaggerated fact, as antisemitic slander regarding Jewish manipulation of public opinion demonstrates.⁹⁴

In this sense, it is by no means a stretch to argue that Jews resorted to the general (non-Jewish) press to keep up to date with events that took place in their immediate environment. In a concrete sense, however, my thesis focuses not on Jewish intellectuals and “high” culture mavens, but rather on ordinary, poorer, and sometimes very religious Jews in Vienna—that is, the portion of the Jewish population that made up the majority of those who attended popular cultural events and who had a particular stake in consuming news about them. And the topic of how these Jews consumed various media remains an under-researched area. Despite this scholarly lacuna, we may reasonably assume that they read general (non-Jewish) newspapers. We may draw this conclusion at least in part from the establishment of Jewish newspapers throughout the nineteenth century in the German-speaking world that were aimed at traditionally minded Jews. These initiatives in new media outlets sought to prevent religious Jews from reading not only the liberal Jewish but also the non-Jewish press.⁹⁵ They therefore must have exhibited a certain willingness to resort to non-Jewish media. This may have been the case among the poorer and religious Jews of Vienna at the turn of the twentieth century and may have ultimately been one of the reasons why Jewish newspapers generally omitted news about popular culture. We might therefore conclude that Jewish newspapers to a large extent would have reproduced only news items that were already familiar to readers.

In light of this discussion, how do we substantiate the thesis that ordinary—and even Orthodox—Jews read general newspapers? The main explanation for the specifically Jewish focus of the Jewish press hinges on this larger pattern of the Jewish consumption of non-Jewish media. These Jews did not typically leave behind memoirs or journals that might indicate how and what media they consumed during their lifetime. Due to a lack of data from this realm, I must substantiate my thesis further by investigating other avenues. In the following, I discuss four types of evidence that support my claim that this portion of the Jewish population read general, non-Jewish newspapers.

For the first example, let us refer back to the Kessler case. Jewish newspapers essentially provided no coverage of the case. We find an exception to this omission in the Jewish newspaper *Oesterreichische Wochenschrift*, which briefly dealt

with the case, calling it an antisemitic act. In a follow-up, the paper published a note about the difficulties that Kessler's wife was having with the insurance company with which her husband had arranged a life insurance policy prior to his death.⁹⁶ These two references to the Kessler murder case in this paper did not give the reader any information regarding what had happened. That is, this example of reporting in the Jewish press only makes sense if readers were already aware of the crime. This means that Jewish readers must have also read non-Jewish newspapers and must have therefore also been consumers of general media targeted at larger audience. The report on the widow Kessler's problems with the insurance company appeared exclusively in the Jewish *Oesterreichische Wochenschrift*. In this sense, the newspaper filled in blanks, supplying information not covered by the general press, which wrote nothing about this particular aspect of the case.

The second piece of evidence concerns advertisements in general newspapers that specifically targeted Jewish readers. We can identify this specificity in advertisements that refer to Jewish religious customs or attitudes. For example, some non-Jewish newspapers advertised where customers could buy matzah, or unleavened bread. The product was advertised in Hebrew letters, which would have been illegible for most non-Jewish readers.⁹⁷ We find another example in the weekly newspaper *Wiener Caricaturen* (Vienna caricatures), which praises the products from "Berg's Selchwaren-Produktion" (Berg's salted and smoked meats), a company based in the Vienna-Meidling neighborhood, indicating that their products were kosher.⁹⁸ Clearly, these products were marketed specifically to Jews. The same applies to an announcement for a kosher restaurant in the Ottakringerstrasse that appeared in the Vienna *Vorort* newspaper.⁹⁹

This does not mean that general newspapers were riddled with a variety of advertisements specifically addressing Jews. At times, businesses tried to garner Jewish consumers through advertisements designed specifically for Jewish newspapers. This was the case, for example, with Kunerol, a type of margarine.¹⁰⁰ An advertisement in the *Wiener Sonn- und Montagszeitung* described it as a cost-effective and worthwhile substitute for butter and lard. Jews who wanted to adhere (at least partially) to religious dietary laws might have felt that such advertisements addressed them personally—but we can only speculate as to how individual readers responded to such efforts. At the same time, the Jewish magazine *Oesterreichische Wochenschrift* also advertised Kunerol. This ad states that the product was manufactured under the supervision of the rabbis of Mattersdorf and Huszt and was therefore kosher.¹⁰¹ The Cologne-based company Stollwerck pursued a similar sales strategy, advertising in the Jewish press that their chocolate and cocoa were "produced under supervision and with the certificate of the Orthodox rabbinate of Bratislava."¹⁰² Both companies attempted to address potential Jewish buyers through Jewish-specific media.

Precisely because different versions of the same advertising campaigns appeared in both Jewish and general newspapers, it is striking that advertisements

specifically targeting a Jewish audience also appeared in the non-Jewish press. These ads make it clear that Jews—and sometimes very religious, Orthodox Jews—read and consumed non-Jewish media. We can see further evidence of this phenomenon in an advertisement that can be found in an 1870 edition of the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*. In it, the “exchange office Jos. Kohn & Komp” featured its slogan, “May God bless Kohn in Vienna.”¹⁰³ This slogan refers to the Jewish custom of being blessed by the *kobanim* in the synagogue during the High Holidays.¹⁰⁴ This ad would not have made sense if the company that paid for it had not been trying to reach potential Jewish customers.

The third piece of evidence that supports my thesis that Jews read general newspapers can be found in the *Volkssänger* scene and its performances. At times, audiences would have understood aspects of these performances only if they were aware of the larger events that unfolded in everyday life in Vienna. An example of such an event was the “Jellinek affair,” to which the Budapest Orpheum Society alluded in some of their pieces. Edmund Jellinek had embezzled almost five million crowns (*Kronen*) in his capacity as an official of the state bank (*Länderbank*). He had invested the money in industrial ventures and tried his hand at stock market speculation. He escaped imminent arrest at the end of September 1902 by fleeing to Krems via Saint Pölten, a town in Lower Austria. There, on the banks of the Danube, he disappeared without a trace. Although some evidence suggested he committed suicide, police suspected that Jellinek had only faked his death,¹⁰⁵ which is why they continued their intensive search for fugitive.

In the following days, the rumor spread that Jellinek had boarded a ship and was sailing overseas. According to another story, he had been spotted in London.¹⁰⁶ Austrian readers outside Vienna also closely followed news of the Jellinek affair. A reward of 1,000 crowns for information leading to Jellinek’s arrest also certainly contributed to public interest in the case. Given this atmosphere of suspicion, it comes as no surprise that strangers who exhibited conspicuous behavior were sometimes suspected of involvement in the affair. In the Upper Austrian town of Enns, for example, police arrested a man who spent an unusually large amount of money. The police believed that the man was Jellinek, who had changed his appearance and adopted a new identity.¹⁰⁷

Ten days after Jellinek’s disappearance, a body was discovered in the Danube. After initial doubts, authorities were able to make a positive identification. Jellinek had been found. The body was taken to Kirchberg am Wagram, where a funeral was organized for him with the help of the Viennese Jewish Community (Israelitische Kultusgemeinde Wien, or IKG).¹⁰⁸

The Jellinek affair dominated the the Austrian media for over a week and a half. In part, descriptions of Jellinek’s escape were drawn out over several pages, complete with illustrations. In contrast, the Jewish press devoted nary a line to the Jellinek case. As I have argued above, this comes as no surprise because Jewish newspapers devoted themselves to Jewish—that is, religious—culture. After all,

this case of fraud had nothing to do with Judaism. Even Jellinek's Jewishness could not evoke a mention from the Jewish media. Only an antisemitic response to the case would have put the Jellinek affair on their radar.¹⁰⁹

A few months after the Jellinek affair, the Budapest Orpheum Society brought the farce *Der kleine Kohn* (Little Kohn) to the stage (for details on the content of the play, see chapter 4). In the play, Leopold Kohn, treasurer of the Spitzer bank, is accused of embezzling money. At one point in the performance, Marcus Spitzer speaks to a police officer about Kohn, saying, "There has never been such a Jellinek before."¹¹⁰ Caprice, the author of the play, uses the name Jellinek as a synonym for a crook. Such a reference only makes sense if the ostensibly majority Jewish audience of the Budapest Orpheum Society was aware of the Jellinek case. But this also means that their audience must have followed the reports that appeared in the non-Jewish press. The Jellinek affair was part of the everyday Jewish perspective, even if the Jewish media did not write about it.

A fourth and final piece of evidence elucidating my thesis that ordinary—even Orthodox—Jews read general newspapers includes newspaper reports containing clearly religious references and even advertisements referring to Jewish cultural life. For example, an article from March 1904 announced the restoration of the Währing Jewish cemetery and informed relatives of the deceased that they should communicate any changes they wish to make to the graves to the religious community.¹¹¹ In this case, the announcement targeted a Jewish audience, as it was unequivocally a religious matter. Because Jewish newspapers made it their goal to address Jewish concerns, one might assume that this piece of news would have been within their purview. However, the Jewish newspapers omitted reporting on it. As such, Jewish readers only learned about the cemetery restorations if they consumed general media.

We see a similar pattern in announcements advertising the Lemberg Singspiel Society, a theater company from Galicia. The group performed in Leopoldstadt, where a considerable number of eastern European Jewish immigrants resided. Lemberg Singspiel Society performances sometimes had a clearly religious context.¹¹² The "Polish," as they were called, at times performed plays by well-known Yiddish authors, such as Abraham Goldfaden (1840–1908) or Joseph Lateiner (1853–1935).¹¹³ Announcements for the programs of these performances sometimes emphasized that theatergoers could expect "strictly ritual food" as part of the entertainment. Such advertising thus also addressed religious Jews as potential audience members.¹¹⁴

Although Lemberg Singspiel Society performances thematized Jewish cultural life, the Jewish press did not make any mention of these cultural activities. This lacuna corroborates my thesis that Jewish newspapers sometimes failed to report on issues with clear references to Judaism if the general press already allocated sufficient print space to them. Maybe Jewish newspapers did not wish to be redundant and instead focused on reporting that readers could find nowhere else.

As it stands, the coverage in Jewish and general news outlets overlapped and complemented each other to some extent. And this overlap was probably the reason why there were hardly any reports related to popular cultural performances in Jewish print media.

Variations in the Interpretation of Events

In summary, a review of Jewish newspapers indicates that religious issues, their associations and organizations, and the need to defend against antisemitism were of considerable significance to the Jews of the Habsburg metropolis. This seems to imply that Viennese everyday life was not relevant to the city's Jewish population. However, we must juxtapose this claim with evidence that they read and received general media. It suggests that Jews, at least a majority of them, exhibited considerable interest in their social environment. They did not live secluded in their own world, nor did they display indifference to events outside their immediate everyday milieu. And because Jews consumed general media, I argue that Jewish newspapers were able to concentrate their news coverage on those areas that the general press did not cover. At any rate, Viennese popular culture was not one of these areas. For this reason, historians who only analyze Jewish media in their research on the history of Viennese Jews find little evidence of their involvement in popular cultural activities. This circumstance is likely to be one of the reasons why scholars have tended to neglect this topic in their studies.

The media consumption habits of Viennese Jews allow us to see that they were informed about current events and were familiar with social trends, standards of value, and intellectual ideas. Like non-Jews, they took interest in contemporary discourses and also helped shape them. And their everyday expectations may have been similar to those of non-Jews in many ways. Nevertheless, differences remained between them. These differences manifested themselves in many ways and were not necessarily based on religion. We see one of these differences at the beginning of the twentieth century in the interpretation of cantor performances in Viennese synagogues, about which both Jewish and non-Jewish newspapers wrote. A comparison of respective reports reveals clear distinctions in the interpretation of these performances.

The singing skills and performances of cantors have often inspired worshippers. But what traditional Jews perceived as a novelty in nineteenth-century Vienna, however, was the spectacular character associated with many such performances and the reactions of some worshippers who saw them only as entertainment, divorced from any religious content. Some Jewish newspapers strongly condemned this development. They warned that the synagogue would become a theater or concert hall and that many people would only attend to be entertained.¹¹⁵

This criticism was formulated, for example, on the occasion of the performance of a Hungarian cantor in the Leopoldstadt Temple. The cantor in question

had originally applied for a position at the Ottakring Temple in the sixteenth district of Vienna and had been invited to deliver a trial presentation. He amazed the audience with his vocal virtuosity and was also invited to demonstrate his skills in the second municipal district. The sole deciding factor here was the cantor's artistic ability, which is precisely how synagogue visitors perceived the performance. During the service, the audience members loudly expressed their approval and applauded the Hungarian guest.¹¹⁶

At times, the organizers contributed to worship services featuring an illustrious cantor being misunderstood as a special cultural event. This misunderstanding arose when they asked visitors for an entrance fee. The atmosphere during some cantor presentations was sometimes so exuberant that critics drew comparisons between these performances and ancient Roman spectacles.¹¹⁷ Announcements that well-known cantors were to sing attracted the masses, hence the comparison with Rome. In response to this phenomenon, *Die Wahrheit* reported in 1900 that "one [sees how] every Friday evening hundreds and thousands, not only from the lower classes, but also from the middle and upper classes, rush to the Leopoldstadt Temple . . . just in time to score a seat to enjoy the anticipated treat for the ears."¹¹⁸

Jewish newspapers objected to how these special cantor appearances ostensibly neglected the religious dimension. Commentators criticized the tendency among audience members to understand these events merely as entertainment, comparable to theatrical and similar performances. By contrast, non-Jewish media viewed the cantor appearances as mere cultural events. We see this for example in an announcement in the entertainment section of the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* from July 1901 advertising the Galician cantor Baruch Schorr.¹¹⁹ In the opinion of *Die Wahrheit*, Schorr's performance was thereby reduced to a mere leisure activity, one of many opportunities for amusement.

In the case of the cantor presentations, varying narratives collided. We can understand the different approaches to reporting the same event as a Jewish/non-Jewish struggle for the interpretation of cultural events. At the same time, we may also see it as further evidence of the coexistence between Jews and non-Jews. The advertisement in the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* may have addressed both Jewish and non-Jewish readers as potential audience members for cantor performances. We know that non-Jews sometimes attended Jewish services in order to be edified by the cantors' singing, as was the case when Salomon Sulzer appeared in the Viennese City Temple.¹²⁰

Throughout this study, I analyze archival evidence related to numerous interpretations of the same event or, as in the instance just discussed, I investigate how various newspaper articles portrayed the same occurrence. In particular, I investigate the question of whether we can or must interpret certain acts and occurrences as antisemitic or, on the other hand, as a characteristic of intimate Jewish and non-Jewish contact. In doing so, I demonstrate to what degree a par-

ticular historical perspective can influence the assessment of Jewish–non-Jewish relationships and how controversial this assertion can in fact be.

Notes

1. Barbara Hahn, *Die Jüdin Pallas Athene: Auch eine Theorie der Moderne* (Berlin: Berliner Taschenbuch, 2005), 121; Moshe Rosman, *Founder of Hasidism: A Quest for the Historical Ba'al Shem Tov* (Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2013 [first edition 1996]), 56f.
2. Martin Schenk was born in Vienna. He made his debut in 1881 at the Deutsches Theater in Budapest and subsequently performed at various venues throughout Europe. In 1884, he switched to vaudeville, performing first as a member of the *Establissement Drechsler* in Vienna, before taking the stage again in Budapest. After performing in Cologne, Munich, Danzig, and other places, he was engaged with the *Budapester Orpheumgesellschaft*. Later, he moved to the *Gartenbau* variety show, where he garnered considerable success as a director and comedian. See *Das Variété* 17 (25 February 1903): 1.
3. *Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt* [IWE in subsequent citations] 266 (25 September 1904): 18.
4. Mel Gordon and Erik Jan Hanussen, *Hitler's Jewish Clairvoyant* (Los Angeles: Feral House, 2001), 7–8.
5. The language in this quotation is reminiscent of the anti-Jewish polemic that Richard Wagner (1813–83) expressed in his 1850 essay *Das Judentum und die Musik* (Judaism in music). In this essay, he writes that “the Jew who is innately incapable . . . of articulating himself to us artistically . . . [has] nonetheless been able to attain mastery of public taste in the most widespread of modern art forms, i.e., music” (Gottfried H. Wagner, “Nietzsches Dynamit in der Bewertung des Judentums und Wagners Antisemitismus,” in *Rudolf Kreis, Nietzsche, Wagner und die Juden* [Würzburg: Königshausen and Neumann, 1995], 12).
6. For more on this, see Sander L. Gilman, *Inscribing the Other* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991). At times, *mauscheln* (speaking Yiddish or Yiddish-inflected German) was also associated with anatomical characteristics attributed to Jews. See Bernhard Blechmann, “Ein Beitrag zur Anthropologie der Juden” (published medical dissertation, Dorpat, 1882), 11.
7. *IWE* 205 (25 July 1904): 4.
8. For more on Modl, Pick, and Krakauer, see below.
9. For more on this stereotype, see Jay Geller, “Of Mice and Mensa: Anti-Semitism and the Jewish Genius,” *Centennial Review* 38, no. 2 (1994): 361–85.
10. See Eleonore Lappin, “Jüdische Lebenserinnerungen: Rekonstruktionen von jüdischer Kindheit und Jugend im Wien der Zwischenkriegszeit,” in *Wien und die jüdische Erfahrung 1900–1938: Akkulturation, Antisemitismus, Zionismus*, ed. Frank Stern and Barbara Eichinger (Vienna: Böhlau, 2009), 35.
11. Harpists were the cultural predecessors of the *Volkssänger*. The *Volkssänger* had replaced them in the entertainment industry by the end of the first third of the nineteenth century. See Hans Hauenstein, *Chronik des Wienerliedes: Ein Streifzug von den Minnesängern über den lieben Augustin, den Harfenisten und Volkssängern bis in die heutige Zeit* (Klosterneuburg: Jasomirgott, 1976), 35–70.

12. Josef Koller, *Das Wiener Volkssängertum in alter und neuer Zeit. Nacherzähltes und Selbsterlebtes* (Vienna: Gerlach and Wiedling, 1931), 8.
13. For more on “Judenlisi,” see *IWE* 77 (19 March 1903): 12.
14. Gertraud Pressler, “Jüdisches und Antisemitisches in der Wiener Volksunterhaltung,” *Musicologica Austriaca* 17 (1998): 78.
15. If this is true, historians who do not adhere to an essentialist interpretation of Jewishness must ask whether they can reference the artists listed in this register within the framework of a study of Jews in popular culture. How did their Jewishness manifest itself to legitimize such an approach? Did they identify with Jewish culture or religion, or did they show special solidarity with the Jewish community? Perhaps they were indifferent or even hostile to Judaism? Did they perceive themselves as Jewish artists? For more on this controversial point, see Ernst H. Gombrich, *Jüdische Identität und jüdisches Schicksal: Eine Diskussionsbemerkung* (Vienna: Passagen, 1997).
16. Theophil Stengel and Herbert Gerigk’s *Lexikon der Juden in der Musik: mit einem Titelverzeichnis jüdischer Werke* (Berlin: B. Hahnefeld, 1940) serves as an important reference source.
17. For more on Emanuel Müller’s activities as the artistic director of the Halls of Nestroy (Nestroy-Säle), see chapter 2.
18. “Ein totesagter und ein wirklich gestorbener Volksänger,” *Die Bühne* 2, no. 13 (5 February 1925): 35.
19. Koller, *Volkssängertum*, 96.
20. Ernst Weber, “Die Wienermusik der Jahrhundertwende bis 1914,” in *Wien: Musikgeschichte I* (Volksmusik und Wienerlied), ed. Elisabeth Th. Fritz and Helmut Kretschmer (Vienna: LIT, 2006), 260.
21. Pressler, “Jüdisches,” 63–82. The author provided personal confirmation that she works from the assumption that Kriebaum was Jewish.
22. See Felix Czeike, *Historisches Lexikon Wien*, vol. 3 (Vienna: Kremayr & Scheriau, 1994), 614.
23. Hans Pemmer, “Volkssänger F. Kriebaum 50 Jahre tot,” *Wiener Zeitung* 166 (20 July 1950): 5. My own inquiries at the Vienna Israelite (Jewish) Community as well as an independent search of records of past conversions have not produced any contrary results.
24. On this, see Eddy Portnoy, “Superman Is a Glatt Goy,” *Marginalia Review of Books*, <https://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/superman-is-a-glatt-goy/> (accessed 12 January 2019). A particularly illustrative example of this phenomenon appeared on 3 November 2016 in *Forward* magazine. In it, the author of the article attempts to demonstrate that the Swedish pop group ABBA has a special closeness to Judaism, expressed, among other things, in the group’s name (Hebrew for “father”). See Seth Rogovoy, “The Secret Jewish History of Abba,” *Forward*, 3 November 2016, http://forward.com/culture/353049/the-secret-jewish-history-of-abba/?utm_content=culture_Newsletter_MainList_Title_Position-1&utm_source=Sailthru&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Automated%20Culture%202016-11-05&utm_term=Arts (accessed 12 January 2019).
25. Andrew Ross, *No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 231.
26. See Amalie Kraftner, “Von der Budapester Orpheum-Gesellschaft,” *Oesterreichische Wochenschrift* [*OW* in subsequent citations] 1 (6 January 1899): 9.
27. *IWE* 42 (12 February 1907): 6.

28. Alexander Krakauer (1866–1894) was born in Hungary. He attended the Technische Hochschule in Vienna and received a musical education at the same time. His compositions were interpreted by the most famous and important *Volksänger* of his time, such as Edmund Guschelbauer (1839–1912) and Alexander Girardi (1850–1918). At the end of his life, he was plagued by a lung disease that he wanted to have cured in the spa town of Bad Gleichenberg. He died on his journey there. See Theophil Antonicek and Alexander Krakauer, “Skizze einer Würdigung,” in *Volksmusik – Wandel und Deutung: Festschrift Walter Deutsch zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Gerlinde Haid, Ursula Hemetek, and Rudolf Pietsch (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2000), 566–67.
29. Antonicek and Krakauer, “Skizze einer Würdigung,” 567–68.
30. There may have been a difference here between Vienna and Berlin, where a positive portrayal of family played a prime role, at least in the performances held at the Herrnfeld Theater. See Stefan Hofmann, “Bürgerlicher Habitus und jüdische Zugehörigkeit: Das Herrnfeld-Theater um 1900,” *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts* 12 (2013): 446.
31. See Daniel Boyarin, *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 33–80. See also chapter 4 of this study.
32. Marline Otte also discusses this point, if perhaps from another perspective, in her path-breaking study *Jewish Identities in German Popular Entertainment, 1890–1933* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 15–16.
33. Anna Drabek, et al., *Das österreichische Judentum: Voraussetzungen und Geschichte* (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1982). In particular, see also the *Studia Judaica Austriaca* series published by the Association of the Österreichisches Jüdisches Museum Eisenstadt (Austrian Jewish Museum Eisenstadt).
34. Former UN secretary general Kurt Waldheim ran for president of Austria in 1986. Over the course of his campaign, it was made public that he concealed in his biography certain aspects of his past, namely that he had been an officer in the German Wehrmacht during World War II. Waldheim’s actions and the fact that large parts of the Austrian government and the Austrian public defended him provoked fierce criticism from outside the country, in particular from the World Jewish Congress. On this, see Cornelius Lehn-guth, *Waldheim und die Folgen: Der parteipolitische Umgang mit dem Nationalsozialismus in Österreich* (Frankfurt: Campus, 2013), 91–152.
35. For more on the initial activities of the Jewish Museum, see “Das Jüdische Museum der Stadt Wien 1993/94. Chronik,” in *Wiener Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte, Kultur und Museumswesen* (Vienna: Christian Brandstätter, 1994/95), 187–93.
36. Gerald Lamprecht, “Die österreichischen jüdischen Museen im zeitgeschichtlichen Kontext,” in *Zeitgeschichte ausstellen in Österreich: Museen – Gedenkstätten – Ausstellungen*, ed. Dirk Rupnow and Heidemarie Uhl (Vienna: Böhlau, 2011), 217–20 [213–35].
37. Gerhard Bodendorfer, “Ein Forschungsinstitut für ‘Jüdische Kulturgeschichte’ in Salzburg?!” in *Jüdische Studien: Reflexionen zu Theorie und Praxis eines wissenschaftlichen Feldes*, ed. Klaus Hödl (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2003), 51–72.
38. Marsha L. Rozenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867–1914: Assimilation and Identity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983); Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews, 1867–1938* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Robert S. Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph* (Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1990).

39. Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 102; Rozenblit, *Jews of Vienna*, 7. The difference between assimilation and acculturation is usually considered a different degree of adaptation. Assimilation leads to a total absorption of the assimilating part of the population in society, while acculturation usually indicates only cultural adaptation that preserves structural differences, in particular group consciousness (see Rozenblit, *Jews of Vienna*, 3–5).
40. An example of a recent (also excellent) study that employs the concept of assimilation without critical distance, without considering the critical engagement with the notion in the past twenty years, is Elana Shapira and Moses und Herkules, “Ein Beitrag des jüdischen Bürgertums zur Gestaltung der Ringstraße und des Praters,” in *Ringstrasse: Ein jüdischer Boulevard*, ed. Gabriele Kohlbauer-Fritz (Vienna: Amalthea, 2015), 161–88.
41. An early example and perhaps the most important study on this topic is Till van Rahden, “Mingling, Marrying, and Distancing: Jewish Integration in Wilhelminian Breslau and Its Erosion in Early Weimar Germany,” in *Jüdisches Leben in der Weimarer Republik / Jews in the Weimar Republic*, ed. Wolfgang Benz, Arnold Paucker, and Peter Pulzer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1998). See also Klaus Hödl, “Jewish Culture in Historical Studies,” in *The Routledge Handbook to Contemporary Jewish Cultures*, ed. Laurence Roth and Nadia Valman (London: Routledge, 2014), 83–94.
42. Wolfgang Schmale, ed., “Kulturtransfer,” in *Wiener Schriften zur Geschichte der Neuzeit*, vol. 2 (Vienna, 2003).
43. Klaus Hödl, “Zum Wandel des Selbstverständnisses zentraleuropäischer Juden durch Kulturtransfer,” in *Kulturtransfer in der jüdischen Geschichte*, ed. Wolfgang Schmale and Martina Steer (Frankfurt: Campus, 2006), 57–82.
44. A pathbreaking publication that integrates these new approaches is the collected volume *Cultures of the Jews*. See David Biale, ed., *Cultures of the Jews: A New History* (New York: Schocken, 2002).
45. For more on the concept of “emergence,” see Paul E. Meehl and Wilfried Sellars, “The Concept of Emergence,” *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 1 (1956): 239–52; Steven C. Pepper, “Emergence,” *Journal of Philosophy* 23 (1926): 241–45.
46. This does not mean that there are no differences between Jewish and non-Jewish cultural spheres. Such an assertion would be a *contradictio in adjecto*. However, these differences are not predetermined, but are to a large extent bound by context and are the result of concrete processes of negotiation or have been, as one sees for example in the case of religion, deliberately normalized. On this point, the American historian Sharon Gillerman asserts, “One of the intellectual problems one sometimes encounters within Jewish Studies generally, and in German Jewish Studies in particular, is that it too often presumes to know what Jews and Jewishness are.” She argues that there are instead “culturally negotiated, shifting, and contingent meanings of Jewishness.” Sharon Gillerman, “Muscles by Mail: Jewishness and the Self-Made Man in Post–World War I America” (paper presented at the workshop “Jews and the Study of Popular Culture” at the German Studies Association Conference, Arlington, VA, October 2015).
47. Steven E. Aschheim, “German History and German Jewry: Boundaries, Junctions and Interdependence,” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 43 (1998): 318–19. In addition see Scott Spector, “Forget Assimilation: Introducing Subjectivity to German-Jewish History,” *Jewish History* 20, no. 3/4 (2006): 349–361; Andreas Gotzmann, “Reconsidering Judaism as a Religion – The Religious Emancipation Period,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 7, no.4 (2000): 352–366.
48. Till van Rahden, *Juden und andere Breslauer: Die Beziehungen zwischen Juden, Protestan-*

- ten und Katholiken in einer deutschen Großstadt von 1860–1925 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2000).
49. Giesen, Bernhard, *Kollektive Identität: Die Intellektuellen und die Nation*, vol. 2 (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1999), 297.
 50. Nathaniel D. Wood, *Becoming Metropolitan: Urban Selfhood and the Making of Modern Cracow* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010), 196–97.
 51. See Christian Gschiel, Ulrike Nimeth, and Leonhard Weidinger, *Die Wiener Familie Rothberger* (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2010); Catharina Christ, “Jüdische k. und k. Hoflieferanten in der Textilbranche mit Niederlassung in Wien in der Zeit von 1870 bis 1938” (PhD dissertation, Vienna, 2000).
 52. Lisa Silverman, *Becoming Austrians: Jews and Culture between the World Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 82–84.
 53. On the *performative turn*, see Erika Fischer-Lichte, *Theater als Modell für eine performative Kultur: Zum performative turn in der europäischen Kultur des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Universitätsreden 46 (Saarbrücken: Pressestelle der Universität des Saarlandes, 2000); Doris Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften* (Hamburg: Rowohlt, 2006), 104–43; Klaus Hödl, *Wiener Juden – Jüdische Wiener: Identität, Gedächtnis und Performanz im 19. Jahrhundert* (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2006), 47–68.
 54. Koller, *Völkessängertum*, 149.
 55. Jonathan Hess, “Shylock’s Daughters: Philosemitism, Popular Culture, and the Liberal Imagination,” *Transversal* 13, no. 1 (2015): 30, [http://www.degruyter.com/dg/viewjournalissue.articlelist.resultlinks.fullcontentlink:pdfeventlink/\\$002fj\\$002ftra.2015.13.issue-1\\$002ftra-2015-0005\\$002ftra-2015-0005.pdf/tra-2015-0005.pdf?ac=j\\$002ftra.2015.13.issue-1\\$002fissue-files\\$002ftra.2015.13.issue-1.xml](http://www.degruyter.com/dg/viewjournalissue.articlelist.resultlinks.fullcontentlink:pdfeventlink/$002fj$002ftra.2015.13.issue-1$002ftra-2015-0005$002ftra-2015-0005.pdf/tra-2015-0005.pdf?ac=j$002ftra.2015.13.issue-1$002fissue-files$002ftra.2015.13.issue-1.xml).
 56. Hess, “Shylock’s Daughters,” 32.
 57. Brent Peterson, “Julius von Wickede and the Question of German-Jewish Popular Literature” (paper presented at the workshop “Jews and the Study of Popular Culture,” German Studies Association Annual Conference, Arlington, VA, October 2015).
 58. See also Andreas B. Kilcher, “Was ist ‘deutsch-jüdische Literatur’? Eine historische Diskursanalyse,” *Weimarer Beiträge* 45, no. 4 (1999): 487.
 59. We can see the extent to which historians tend to shy away from incorporating non-Jewish media into their research in the bibliography of the relevant publications.
 60. For example, see Leon Botstein, *Judentum und Modernität: Essays zur Rolle der Juden in der deutschen und österreichischen Kultur 1848 bis 1938* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1991).
 61. See the works of Marsha Rozenblit, Steven Beller, and Robert Wistrich that I have already mentioned.
 62. See the last note in the introduction.
 63. *Wiener Vororte-Zeitung* 43 (24 December 1876): [3].
 64. Occasionally, media outlets with a Jewish publisher or owner or with Jewish journalistic staff are also counted among the Jewish press. This was, for example, the case in an expert opinion that formed part of an application that I submitted to the Austrian National Bank to fund research on the topic “Jewish/non-Jewish points of contact in Vienna around 1900.” This kind of a categorization, however, is not entirely free from antisemitic notions. An antisemitic perspective, for example, would classify a newspaper that employed a Jewish journalist for a period of time as a *Judenblatt* (a “Jew paper”). See Mario Sauschlager, “Antisemitische Feindbilder: Darstellung jüdischer Studentenschaft

- in österreichischen Tageszeitungen 1890–1914” (PhD thesis, Vienna, 2014), 90. If the content of a newspaper’s reporting is the deciding factor in determining whether it is specifically Jewish or general, then the possibility of questionable categorization disappears.
65. Esther Schmidt, “Nationalism and the Creation of Jewish Music: The Politicization of Music and Language in the German-Jewish Press Prior to the Second World War,” *Musica Judaica* 15 (2000–2001): 12–18.
 66. Margaret T. Edelman-Muehsam, “The Jewish Press in Germany,” *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 1 (1956): 163.
 67. “Unser Programm,” *Die Wahrheit* 1 (1 January 1899): 1.
 68. “Programm,” *Die Welt* 1 (4 June 1897): 1.
 69. *Fremden-Blatt* 1 (1 January 1899), 4; and 3 (3 January 1899), 3.
 70. On this, see Joanna Merrill, “American Jewish Identity and Newspapers: The Medium That Maintained an Imagined Community through a Change in Identity” (bachelor’s honors thesis in history, University of Colorado, 2012).
 71. Rozenblit, *Jews of Vienna*, 114; Peter Honigmann, “Jewish Conversions—A Measure of Assimilation? A Discussion of the Berlin Secession Statistics of 1770–1941,” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 34 (1989): 3–39.
 72. Klaus Hödl, *Wiener Juden – Jüdische Wiener: Identität, Gedächtnis und Performanz im 19. Jahrhundert* (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2006), 71–90. On Jewish folklore, see Birgit Johler and Barbara Staudinger, eds., *Ist das jüdisch? Jüdische Volkskunde im historischen Kontext* (Vienna: Novographic, 2010).
 73. In this instance, Judaism was not understood merely as a religious community. This circumstance, as well as the partial comparability of the scope of Jewish newspapers with that of Jewish museums and folklore, clearly distinguishes the Jewish press from Protestant media, which also did not maintain comprehensive coverage.
 74. Ernst Bollinger, *Pressegeschichte II. 1840–1930: Die goldenen Jahre der Massenpresse* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz, 1996).
 75. On Jewish and non-Jewish interconnectedness, see Peter Schmidtbauer, “Zur sozialen Situation der Wiener Juden im Jahre 1857,” in *Studia Judaica Austriaca*, vol. 6 (Eisenstadt: Rötzer-Druck, 1978), 57–90. See also Charlotte Maria Toth, “‘Gemma schau, gemma schau . . .’ Vergnügen als Verpflichtung? Untersuchung zu den Freizeitträumen und Freizeitaktivitäten des Wiener Bürgertums in den Jahren 1890–1910” (MA thesis, Vienna, 1986); Mirjam Zadoff, *Next Year in Marienbad: The Lost Worlds of Jewish Spa Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); Christian Brandstätter, ed., *Wien 1900: Kunst und Kultur: Fokus der europäischen Moderne* (Vienna: Christian Brandstätter, 2005).
 76. John M. Efron, *Medicine and the German Jews: A History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 186–233.
 77. On the Jewish Renaissance, see Michael Brenner, *Jüdische Kultur in der Weimarer Republik* (Munich: Beck, 2000), 31.
 78. *IWE* 185 (9 July 1901): 2.
 79. *IWE* 185 (9 July 1901): 2.
 80. *Deutsches Volksblatt* [DV in subsequent citations] 4494 (10 July 1901): 9.
 81. *IWE* 185 (9 July 1901): 3.
 82. *DV* 4493 (9 July 1901): 2.
 83. See *Reichpost* 155 (10 July 1901): 7; and 156 (11 July 1901): 9–10.
 84. *Deutsches Volksblatt* 4494 (10 July 1901): 9.
 85. “Der Raubmord am Neubau,” *IWE* 27 (28 January 1902): 2.

86. "Der Raubmord am Neubau," *IWE* 27 (28 January 1902): 3.
87. "Der Raubmord am Neubau," *IWE* 30 (31 January 1902): 3–4.
88. "Der Raubmord am Neubau," *IWE* 28 (29 January 1902): 3–4.
89. "Der Raubmord am Neubau," *IWE* 29 (30 January 1902): 2.
90. Doris Mair am Tinkhof, "Die Juden in der Presse in Wien um 1900" (PhD thesis, Vienna, 2005).
91. Paul Reitter, *The Anti-journalist: Karl Kraus and Jewish Self-Fashioning in Fin-de-Siècle Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).
92. Hildegard Kernmayer, *Judentum im Wiener Feuilleton (1848–1903): Exemplarische Untersuchungen zum literarästhetischen und politischen Diskurs der Moderne* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1998).
93. Stefan Zweig, *The World of Yesterday: An Autobiography* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 39.
94. George E. Berkley, *Vienna and Its Jews: The Tragedy of Success, 1880s–1980s* (Boston: Madison Books, 1988), 153.
95. Robert Liberles, "The So-Called Quiet Years of German Jewry 1849–1869: A Reconsideration," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 41 (1996): 68.
96. *OW* 5 (31 January 1902): 67; and 8 (21 February 1902): 119.
97. Klaus Hödl, "Das 'Jüdische' in der allgemeinen Populärkultur," in *Konzeptionen jüdischer Identität und der Populärkulturdiskurs: Nicht nur Bildung, nicht nur Bürger: Juden in der Populärkultur*, ed. Klaus Hödl (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2013), 11. For the advertisement, see *IWE* 113 (26 April 1900): 17.
98. *Wiener Caricaturen* 19, no. 6 (5 February 1899): 10.
99. *Wiener Vororte-Zeitung* 22 (6 January 1876): 3; and 23 (21 January 1876): 4.
100. *Wiener Sonn- und Montagszeitung* 5 (3 February 1902): 4.
101. *OW* 11 (1902): 188.
102. *Jüdische Presse* 8 (1923): 47.
103. *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* 148 (30 May 1870).
104. Many thanks to Jeffrey Grossman and Armin Eidherr, who brought this to my attention.
105. "Die Defraudation bei der Länderbank," *IWE* 259 (20 September 1902): 3–4.
106. "Die Defraudation bei der Länderbank," *IWE* 259 (20 September 1902): 3.
107. "Jellinek-Spuk," *IWE* (evening addition) 265 (26 September 1902): 3.
108. "Die Defraudation bei der Länderbank," *IWE* 269 (30 September 1902): 6–8.
109. *DV* 4926 (20 September 1902): 1–2.
110. Caprice, "Der kleine Kohn," Niederösterreichisches Landesarchiv (Theaterzensur), Box 117/31 (1902), 87.
111. *IWE* 65 (5 March 1904): 6.
112. For example, *Die Opferung Isaaks* (The sacrifice of Isaac) was performed on 6 February 1904. See *IWE* 37 (6 February 1904): 16.
113. *IWE* 268 (27 September 1904): 14–15; and 191 (13 July 1902): 31.
114. *IWE* 60 (2 March 1902): 37.
115. *Die Wahrheit* 43 (1913): 3–4.
116. *Die Wahrheit* 14 (1905): 7.
117. *Die Wahrheit* 18 (1900): 3.
118. *Die Wahrheit* 18 (1900): 3.
119. *Die Wahrheit* 28 (1901): 6.
120. Hans Tietze, *Die Juden Wiens: Geschichte, Wirtschaft, Kultur* (Vienna: E. P. Tal, 1987), 157.