

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Modes of Masculinity:

Entertainment, Politics, and the Jewish Men of Vienna's Press, 1837-1859

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy
in History

by

Lindsay Alissa King

2020

© Copyright by
Lindsay Alissa King
2020

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Modes of Masculinity:

Entertainment, Politics, and the Jewish Men of Vienna's Press, 1837-1859

by

Lindsay Alissa King

Doctor of Philosophy in History

University of California, Los Angeles, 2020

Professor David N. Myers, Chair

From the 1830s through the end of the 1850s, with a brief respite in 1848, the press of Vienna was censored by the Habsburg state. Despite censorial restrictions, Viennese journalists expanded the press industry during these years such that by the end of the 1850s the Habsburg capital was home to a major, flourishing commercial press. In the midst of these developments, the majority of Viennese journalists labored to define journalism as a wholly masculine profession—one in which women might participate as readers but would rarely work as contributors. Thanks to this effort, most people came to believe that the “ideal” journalist ought to be male and ought to behave according to specific norms that were viewed as masculine.

Simultaneous to the rise of the masculine press, a growing group of young Jewish men arrived in Vienna from other Habsburg provinces in search of new professional and social opportunities. For social and economic reasons, many of these Jewish men became involved in

the local press. Despite ongoing discrimination by the state, many of these Jewish men quickly became well-known journalists and newspaper editors. By the 1840s the association between “Jew” and “journalism” had been adopted at a colloquial and professional level: people connected the profession of journalism with Jewish men.

With the association between Jewish men and journalism in mid-nineteenth-century Vienna in mind, this dissertation explores two intertwined questions. First, what forms of masculinity came to be associated with the image of the journalist between 1837 and 1859, and how did the norms change? Second, what role did Jewish men, as leading Viennese journalists and newspaper editors, play in shaping forms of masculinity in journalism during this period? In asking these questions, I am able to explore the possibility that Jewish men of the mid-nineteenth century were not only participants but in fact forerunners who defined and shaped the attitudes and behaviors associated with journalists in Vienna. Broadly, this allows me to investigate how minorities or discriminated populations could become leading representatives of specific modes of behavior among a majority population in the nineteenth-century Habsburg Empire.

The argument presented in this study is twofold. First, Jewish male journalists in Vienna sought to gain entry in Viennese professional and social circles by adopting masculine practices that were considered desirable for members of the Viennese professional middle class of the mid-nineteenth-century. During this period, when anti-Jewish sentiment among the professional middle class was relatively low, those Jewish men who successfully negotiated and deployed these practices were often able to find acceptance and respect in non-Jewish professional circles. Second, as Jewish journalists became leaders in the press industry, they used journalism as a venue to publicly broadcast their masculine behaviors. In so doing, they increasingly came to define the forms of masculinity that dominated the image of the journalist. Jewish journalists

were, therefore, crucial participants in the effort to define journalism as a male pursuit and the effort to determine how manliness, or masculinity, was articulated through the press in mid-nineteenth-century Vienna. In the 1830s through the 1850s, many Jews were viewed by their professional, non-Jewish peers as positive examples of appropriate masculinity in journalism. This was the case even as Jews increasingly had to counter anti-Jewish, hostile claims about their masculinity after the 1848 uprisings. This study explores four modes of masculinity—the “literary man,” the “popular man,” the “political man,” and the “business-man”—that dominated perceptions of the figure of the journalist between 1837 and 1859 and the involvement of Jewish men in developing these modes.

The dissertation of Lindsay Alissa King is approved.

John A. McCumber

David Sabean

Sarah Abrevaya Stein

David N. Myers, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2020

Table of Contents

List of Figures	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Vita	xi
Introduction	1
<u>Part One: 1837-1847</u>	
Chapter 1: The Literary Man: Ludwig August Frankl and Elite Journalism	32
Chapter 2: The Popular Man: Moritz Gottlieb Saphir and the <i>Humorist's</i> Feminine Content	91
<u>Part Two: 1848-1859</u>	
Chapter 3: The Political Man: The Partisan Journalism of 1848	144
Chapter 4: The Business-Man: The Shift to “Commercial Journalism” and the Rise of the Manager	202
Conclusion: Feminization and Vilification in the Fin-de-Siècle	264
Bibliography	277

List of Figures

Figure 1	Ludwig Frankl in uniform as an Academic Legionnaire (Source: Ludwig August Frankl, <i>Erinnerungen</i> , 1910)	164
Figure 2	Carl Spitzer (Source: <i>Oesterreichisches Central-Organ für Glaubensfreiheit, Cultur, Geschichte und Literatur der Juden</i> , April 4, 1848)	170
Figure 3	Cartoon in the <i>Wiener Katzenmusik</i> depicting editor Sigmund Engländer dressed as a prisoner of the “press-law jail” (Source: <i>Wiener Katzenmusik</i> , July 15, 1848)	187
Figure 4	Josef Sigmund Ebersberg as a “Jew eater” (Source: <i>Wiener Katzenmusik</i> , July 7, 1848)	196
Figure 5	A typical first page of an issue of <i>La Presse</i> (Source: <i>La Presse</i> , December 1, 1836)	212
Figure 6	A typical first of an issue of Zang’s <i>Presse</i> (Source: <i>Die Presse</i> , December 2, 1848)	213
Figure 7	A sample advertisement page in the <i>Presse</i> (Source: <i>Die Presse</i> , November 29, 1849)	214
Figure 8	“How Mr. Dr. Landsteiner of the <i>Presse</i> writes and who sits in his inkwell” (Source: <i>Wiener Katzenmusik</i> , August 22, 1848)	235
Figure 9	Advertisement in the <i>Lloyd</i> for a public telegraphy demonstration in 1849 (Source: <i>Der Lloyd</i> , November 29, 1849)	244

Acknowledgements

I have many people to thank for seeing me through the long process of writing a dissertation. The city of Los Angeles, which has been my home over the past years, has provided necessary distraction, but my doctoral advisor, David N. Myers pushed me toward constantly renewed focus and scholarly clarity. Above all, I thank him for teaching me the value of asking probing questions and for taking a stand on the issues that matter most. I would also like to thank my committee members. I am grateful to Sarah Abrevaya Stein for continually offering me crucial professional advice and stimulating, if at times daunting, comments on my work. I thank David Warren Sabeau for his attention to all features of my writing, big and small, and for opening his home for a writing group at a time when deadlines were the only way that I was successfully able to complete a dissertation chapter. I am thankful to John McCumber for transforming the way that I read the texts of German-speaking writers of the nineteenth-century. In addition to my doctoral advisor and committee members, I want to thank Professors Arnold Band, Katsuya Hirano, William Marotti, and Debora Silverman for serving as valued teachers and readers during my time at UCLA. Finally, I am grateful to the UCLA Department of History staff, especially Ann Major and Hadley Porter, for keeping me sane, paid, and, at times, fed over the past seven years. I would certainly have quit graduate school year ago were it not for their endless patience with my many emails.

I want to thank the archivists and institutions where I conducted research, including the Austrian Haus-, Hof, und Staatsarchiv; the Central Archive for the History of the Jewish People; the Reuters Archive; and the Wien Bibliothek im Rathaus. I am particularly grateful to the UCLA Alan D. Leve Center for Jewish Studies for their multi-part funding of my study, as well as to the individual families who donated to the UCLA Department of History, providing me

research funding for three years while at UCLA. I am especially grateful to Abigail Green and Simon Levis Sullam for organizing the 2016-2017 Oxford Seminar for Advanced Jewish Studies in which I participated and to the other members of the seminar group. In addition, I benefited from the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, which provided me funding during that time. Workshops at the UC Berkeley Department of History, the Israel Institute for Advanced Studies, and UCLA Department of History offered me important opportunities to get feedback on chapter drafts.

I am grateful to many fellow graduate students, who not only read my work carefully but also provided me company as close friends during my time at UCLA. Thank you to Michael Casper, Talia Graff, Alma Heckman, Jason Lustig, Kelly McCormick, Chris Silver, Mariko Takano, Sarah Walsh, Marjan Wardaki, and Jack Wilson. I am also deeply appreciative of the members of David Sabeau's 2017-2018 writing group. For the many others whom I have failed to mention, I am thankful as well.

Finally, I want to thank my large family not only for insisting that I visit them often but for visiting me often as well. I hope that this dissertation is far from the main way that I am able to express how much their continued support, love, and company have meant to me in the past seven years. I want to give special note to my grandfather, Professor L. Robert Stevens, who has been editing my written work since I was a child and continues to do so today. My greatest debt of gratitude is to my husband and fellow historian Kevin Holt Richardson, who possesses the rare quality of being equally enthusiastic about discussions of historical theory and the many more mundane forms of happiness around which we have centered our lives. My thanks to him for having the energy and the eagerness to create a more fulfilling life than I had imagined for myself. Finally, I want to offer a word of gratitude to our son, whose impending birthdate and

many kicks in utero have kept me motivated to finish this dissertation over the past thirty-five weeks. To my husband, son, and family members, these words are insufficient.

Vita

Education

- 2015- Ph.D. Candidate, History, University of California, Los Angeles
Dissertation Title: “Modes of Masculinity: Entertainment, Politics, and the Jewish Men of Vienna’s Press, 1837-1859”
- 2015 M.A., History, University of California, Los Angeles
- 2012 M.A., Jewish Civilization, Hebrew University of Jerusalem
- 2009 B.A., International Relations, University of Pennsylvania

Presentations

“Fake News, Media Bias, and the Problem with Facts in the Rise of the Commercial Press.” Historical Epistemology Conference. UCLA. May 19, 2018.

“Abraham Geiger and the Gendering of *Bildung*.” Guest Lecture for Course in Modern Jewish Thought. UCLA. November 2, 2017.

“The Celebrity and Her Critics: Making Vienna’s Liberal Journalists in the 1840s.” American Historical Association Pacific Branch Conference. California State University, Northridge. August 5, 2017.

“‘Our Fair Readers’: Jewish Journalists and New Inclusivity, Vienna, 1837-1848. Oxford Seminar in Advanced Jewish Studies. Oxford University. February 27, 2017.

“Jews of the Viennese Press and the Ideal Male Aesthete, 1837-1848.” Slager Jewish Student Centre. Oxford University. February 26, 2017.

“The Superstar and Her Critics: The Case of Vienna’s Entertainment Papers.” UCLA Jewish Studies Colloquium. UCLA. January 6, 2017.

“Inclusivity, Exclusivity, and Making Journalism: Jews in Vienna’s Press, 1837-1859.” UC Berkeley/LMU Munich Ph.D. Workshop. University of California, Berkeley. December 14, 2016.

“New Orders, Self-Discipline, and Practices of Subjective Reframing.” UCLA-Haifa Graduate Workshop in Jewish History. UCLA. March 11, 2015.

“Abandonment or Opportunity? The Limits of Discourse on Jewish Immigration to America from the Austrian Empire, 1848/49.” UCLA-Haifa Graduate Workshop in Jewish History. Haifa University. March 23, 2014.

Fellowships, Awards, and Grants

- 2017 Oxford Seminar for Advanced Jewish Studies, Dorset Fellowship, Oxford University
Kahn Fellowship, UCLA Department of History
Department of History Research Travel Grant, UCLA
- 2016 Kahn Fellowship, UCLA Department of History
Bluma Appel Academic Year Research Travel Grant, Alan D. Leve Center for Jewish Studies, UCLA
Department of History Research Travel Grant, UCLA
- 2015 Monkarsh Family Fellowship, UCLA Department of History
Roter Fellowship, Alan D. Leve Center for Jewish Studies, UCLA
“Jews on the Move” Seminar Fellowship, Israel Institute for Advanced Studies
Graduate Summer Research Mentorship Fellowship, UCLA
- 2014 1939 Club Research Stipend, UCLA
Roter Fellowship, Alan D. Leve Center for Jewish Studies, UCLA
- 2012-2013 Monkarsh Family Fellowship, UCLA Department of History
Roter Fellowship, Alan D. Leve Center for Jewish Studies, UCLA
- 2009 Director’s Prize for Methodological Creativity in Senior Thesis, University of Pennsylvania

Introduction

For a long time, when all Israel was writing journalism, I did not want to resolve to write an article for the public, despite many suggestions [that I should do so]. But Herr Löbenstein[, an editor], the all-powerful Robespierre, urged me on for so long that I worked up a political article for him. My happiness was not small when my published work lay before me.¹ -Benjamin Kewall, Viennese Jewish journalist, private diary entry dated August 28, 1848

Until the recent discovery of his diary, Benjamin Kewall was an obscure Viennese Jewish journalist from the revolution of 1848. Though he was also a minor figure in his own day, his observations about the uproarious political events in Vienna of 1848 and the hope that filled Jewish communities that same year tell an important story about the prominence of Jews in Vienna's press industry. While it was an exaggeration to suggest that "all Israel was writing journalism," Kewall's recollection cited above, from a diary entry penned on August 28, 1848, noted that Jews did play a significant role in the press, so much so that many Jewish men felt impelled to take up the quill, even if they had no previous experience. But the role of Jewish men in Viennese journalism—indeed, in German-language journalism across Europe—was by no means a phenomenon new to 1848. Jews were already embedded in the young industry many years before the revolution.

Jewish men participated in Europe's journalism industry from the late eighteenth century. From that time onward, Jews, like many other individuals, began to demand access to power and privileges held only by the wealthy aristocracy, and journalism in turn became a key avenue for public political expression for many of the middle-class participants in these new political movements. Journalism, nonetheless, was not a democratic platform. It was dominated by men,

¹ Benjamin Kewall, *Erlebte Revolution 1848/49: Das Wiener Tagebuch des jüdischen Journalisten Benjamin Kewall*, eds. Wolfgang Gasser and Gottfried Glassner (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), 168. Diary entry from August 28, 1848.

mostly Christian members of the middle class, and the writings produced by these journalists reflected the limited and restricted pool. Despite the Christian majority, however, a sizeable number of Jewish men managed to find entry into the new industry.

For social and economic reasons that will be explored below, journalism was an attractive profession for many young Jewish men across Europe, and by the 1830s, when a handful of newspapers in Europe's major capital cities finally began to turn a profit as literacy expanded and printing technology improved, several well-known newspapers came to be edited and owned by Jewish men. By the 1840s the association between "Jews" and "journalism" had been adopted at both a colloquial and a professional level in European cities. The identification of Jews with journalism had become so great that German liberal writer Jakob Venedey concluded in 1846 that the whole matter of "Jewish emancipation [was] tied closely with the conditions of the German press" since freeing the press, where so many Jews worked, would be one step toward freeing Jews.²

During the mid-nineteenth century, what it meant to *be* a journalist was not static. Journalists were sometimes satirical writers, sometimes news-oriented, and sometimes poets and short-story writers. "Journalist" was a dynamic category that initially only partly incorporated the qualities journalists today seek to embody. One term for a category like this is "subjectivity": a set of externally visible behaviors, attitudes, and qualities that come to be associated with a particular social group.³ In the same way that we might associate well-developed muscles, high

² Jakob Venedey, "Venedey und Schuselka über die deutschen Juden," *Die Grenzboten* (Leipzig), 1846, 4, 289.

³ One recent example of this usage is Sven-Erik Rose's book *Jewish Philosophical Politics in Germany, 1789-1848* (Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2014), 7. Daniel Boyarin has also used this term productively, explaining that one of his scholarly goals is to detail "an ethnography of male subjectivity" that will allow us to understand how the categories and qualities associated with being masculine have changed through time. This aim is close to the methodological goal of my project. See Daniel Boyarin, *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 11.

pain tolerance, competitiveness, or even Blackness with American football players, certain mutable qualities became “attached” to and “detached” from the image of the journalist in the nineteenth century.

This dissertation investigates the role that Jewish men, who were leaders in the press industry and often symbolized journalism for a broader public, played in shaping what it meant to be—or behave like—a journalist in Vienna of the mid-nineteenth century. I argue, first, that many Jewish men who sought professional and social acceptance in non-Jewish middle-class society adopted specific masculine behaviors associated with “proper” middle-class professional men in Vienna. Jewish men who successfully negotiated codes of masculinity—codes that matched the political and social needs of the time—found themselves able to integrate into existing social groups. Second, as Jews, these men had social and economic incentives to work as journalists, and they quickly found themselves occupying leadership positions in the press industry. As they became key players, they used journalism as a venue in which to perform these middle-class masculine behaviors in a public fashion. Meanwhile, the press industry itself came to be widely associated with Jewish men. As a result of these twin developments, Jewish men increasingly came to define the shifting forms of masculinity that dominated the image of the journalist in Vienna between 1837 and 1859. Jewish journalists were, therefore, crucial participants in the effort to define journalism as a male pursuit and the effort to determine how manliness, or masculinity, was articulated through the press in mid-nineteenth-century Vienna.

I examine the journalism written by Jews and their close Christian collaborators in the Habsburg capital, beginning in 1837, when satirical journalist Moritz Gottlieb Saphir founded his paper the *Humorist*, to the end of the 1850s, at the conclusion of the first decade of the Viennese “commercial press.” I look primarily at the public writings produced by these men in order to

understand how they were viewed by their professional peers, readers, and state censors. My research focuses on journalism written by Jews as well as by Christians in papers edited by Jews, and I look at newspapers intended for a general, non-Jewish audience.

In the mid-nineteenth century, men from the growing middle class dominated the press, and, as a result, what it meant to be a journalist was closely connected with what it meant to be a middle-class, educated man. In the early decades of the nineteenth century, middle-class journalists were rarely exclusively journalists—most received at best supplemental income from their newspaper contributions. Since journalism was not yet the purview of a group of trained professionals, a wide swath of men from the university-educated middle class contributed in some fashion to journalism. It was not uncommon for a newspaper to publish the work of a lawyer, a scholar, and a nineteen-year-old student in one issue, and many middle-class men across Europe aspired to have their words made visible to the rest of the middle-class, male public that comprised the majority of newspaper audiences.

For nineteenth-century journalists, equally important as one's class status was the matter of one's gender. The quality that connected the vast majority of journalists throughout the nineteenth century and long into the twentieth was the common gender of newspaper editors and contributors. They were, of course, men. The press was above all viewed as a man's sphere (even when journalists' masculinity was called into question). On the occasion that a woman's writing was published, it was usually bracketed as "women's work," to account for the writer's "mediocrity." The masculine quality of the press was so pronounced that at times the press appeared to constitute the middle-class, educated man, rather than the other way around.

This dissertation is divided into four "modes" of masculinity in journalism that Jews and

their Christian co-workers at Jewish-run papers pioneered in Vienna between 1837 and 1859. I explore how the qualities associated with journalists' masculinity shifted during these years. Key to my argument is that Jews were not poor imitators of European middle-class society and masculine posturing, as antisemites would have it.⁴ Nor were they endeavoring to integrate into what was an already-formed, fixed Viennese culture.⁵ Instead, Jewish men developed modes of masculinity in journalism that were formative to the press industry as whole, constantly negotiating and setting standards of behaviors that were in flux. As a result, Jewish journalists were involved in perpetuating processes of patriarchal and class-based oppression, even as they themselves were subject to social and state-based anti-Jewish discrimination.⁶ I attend to both sides of the coin.

My attention to the Jewish role in developing masculinity in journalism has two primary motivations. First, studying Jewish participation in cultivating forms of masculinity that were adopted by wide groups of men can provide new insight into the tools and means by which Jewish middle-class men integrated into, failed to integrate into, or served as leaders in the

⁴ See Paul Reitter's discussion of one typical anti-Jewish belief that Jewish journalists merely "mirrored" or "imitated" real and authentic European culture. This argument stemmed in part from the opinion that journalism was merely a derivative literary form. Reitter focuses primarily on the latter third of the nineteenth century. Paul Reitter, *The Anti-Journalist* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008), 31-67.

⁵ On this point see Benjamin Maria Baader, Sharon Gillerman, and Paul Lerner, introduction to *Jewish Masculinities: German Jews, Gender, and History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012), 8, 9.

⁶ I am indebted to the argument developed by Jonathan Hess in his article "Beyond Subversion: German Jewry and the Poetics of Middlebrow Culture." Hess remarks that recent Jewish scholarship has sought to demonstrate how German Jews resisted hegemonic German culture by means of an array of social and cultural tools. Although Hess appreciates this scholarly direction, he suggests that, by assuming that Jews always resisted German culture, historians have missed important ways in which German Jews operated in harmony with German society, contributing to it in formative ways. In this dissertation, I conclude that in order to understand German Jewish standards of masculinity in the German press, it is important to view the problem from the angle that Hess describes: the ways in which German Jews contributed to rather than resisted gendered norms in the Viennese urban setting. See Jonathan M. Hess, "Beyond Subversion: German Jewry and the Poetics of Middlebrow Culture," *The German Quarterly* 82, no. 3 (2009): 316-335. For a similar methodological approach, see also Rose, *Jewish Philosophical Politics in Germany, 1789-1848*, especially 12.

growing urban environment of European cities. In this sense I think of masculinity not as a symptom but as a constructive apparatus that could be deployed to shape one's public and private reputation. Second, although masculinity, a category I will discuss below, has received more attention from historians in recent years, it is still an under-researched field. I believe that by revealing masculinity as a dynamic category, exploring its valence as a tool for integration, subordination, and rebellion, we are better equipped to understand how and why forms of masculinity change over time. This allows us to perceive the ways that some versions of masculinity have been used to reinforce hierarchies and uphold inequalities.

This story takes place in Vienna. As in Prussia and many other European states, the Habsburg state imposed censorship regulations during the period under investigation here (with a brief respite in 1848). Despite the fact that Habsburg censorship was tighter on most points than it was elsewhere, Viennese men were nevertheless able to build a flourishing press industry during the mid-nineteenth century. While by the metrics of Paris or London newspaper production in Vienna before 1848 was low, journalists in Vienna were far from uninformed about new trends in journalism. They innovated crafty ways to get around censorship, to appeal to new audiences, and to cultivate what they labeled the "the public sphere." They also maintained Europe-wide professional networks that allowed news to circulate and newspapers to cross-pollinate.

I chose to focus on Viennese journalism not because Vienna is unique but because, on the contrary, it is in many ways representative of trends in journalism, masculinity, and the careers of educated Jewish men. While I pay close attention to the specificities of the Habsburg context, many of the elements I discuss had rough corollaries in other cities: censorship, a growing

middle class, and new reading audiences became important factors in shaping the industry across the continent, not only in Vienna. In addition, though we know a good deal about Jews in Viennese journalism from the 1860s on—after the founding of the Viennese *Neue Freie Presse* in 1864—we know much less about the early roots of Jews in journalism. This is the case despite the fact that the *Neue Freie Presse* was both a product of and a reaction to an entire generation of journalism, spearheaded by Jewish men, that had preceded it. It is also the case despite the fact that the association between Jews and journalism in Vienna took shape long before the end of the century. We know little about these precursors. This dissertation explores the early history.

Jewish Entry into Viennese Journalism

The exact number of Jewish residents in Vienna from the late 1830s to the eve of uprisings in March 1848 is unknown. Official and anecdotal estimates differ, with the number hovering somewhere around 4,000, that is, 0.9 percent of the city's total population.⁷ Jewish residence in Vienna had been sharply controlled, even after Joseph II's Toleranzpatent of 1782 granted Jews the right to live in Vienna. The Toleranzpatent still severely limited the number of Jewish families who could obtain official residence in the capital city. Decades later, when Ferdinand I took power after Franz II's death in 1835, the state adopted a more flexible attitude toward a number of issues, including migration to the capital and censorship of the press. It was after Ferdinand's coronation that small but growing numbers of single Jewish men in their late teens or early twenties began moving to Vienna to study at the university and to seek new economic and social opportunities. Many of these men moved from provinces where the Jewish

⁷ Robert S. Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph* (Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1989), 38-41 and Marsha L. Rozenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914: Assimilation and Identity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983), 17.

population was much higher: Moravia, Hungary, and Bohemia.⁸ As recipients of student passes, some men were legally permitted to remain in the city for the duration of their studies. Other Jews stayed in Vienna by renewing their temporary residency cards biweekly, and Ferdinand I's administration usually overlooked this practice when Jews seeking renewal came to the police-run Jewish Bureau with bribe money.⁹

The young Jewish men who moved to Vienna typically spoke German, ascribed to liberal or reformed Jewish religious practices or were indifferent to religion altogether, and belonged to the first generation of Jewish students who had attended state-run German schools rather than Jewish parochial schools. They aspired, above all, to join the ranks of Vienna's middle-class, male *literati*, populated by writers, playwrights, and scholars who had begun to espouse liberal principles rejecting the old aristocratic privileges. In the 1830s and 1840s, young Jewish men adopted practices of masculinity considered "proper" for middle-class professional men in Vienna as a means to become included in middle-class male society. These gendered practices included engaging in public or academic writing, speaking elevated or scholarly German, wearing forms of dress common to the middle class, and reading the works of philosophers and poets who were admired by middle-class men of the time. Perhaps most importantly, as liberalism became the mainstream political doctrine of Viennese male *literati* and the symbols and practices of German culture came to be associated with liberal expression in the Habsburg capital, many young Jews affiliated themselves with German culture and incipient national expression, which consisted largely of forms of all-male political and social activity.

Unlike most Christian men of the middle class, Jewish men faced ongoing discrimination

⁸ Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph*, 38.

⁹ Max Grunwald, *Vienna* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1936), 85-87.

by the state. Not only was Jewish residence in Vienna restricted, even after Ferdinand I was coronated in 1835, but Jews were barred from working as civil servants and professors.¹⁰ For the young Jewish men who moved to Vienna in the hopes of joining the ranks of the Viennese literati, this restriction erected an obstacle. Most of the non-Jewish literati, even if they published poetry or wrote plays, made their money through employment as civil servants, scholars, and clerks. Exclusion from these professions presented a major disadvantage for young Jewish men. Journalism, therefore, was an enticing career option. An unguilded industry, journalism had fewer barriers to entry than other professions or trades. For young Jewish men, journalism presented a double opportunity: Jews could establish their names in Vienna in a public and visible way, and they could, occasionally, make a little money. This was even more the case if Jews worked as editors, rather than merely journalists. Although Jews and Christians alike sought to use journalism for these purposes, discrimination against Jews pushed a disproportionate number of Jewish men into the industry.

By the early 1840s, thanks to a combination of the popularity of their writing styles and their concerted efforts to cultivate relationships with middle-class and Habsburg leaders in Vienna, a number of Jewish men had acquired positions as newspapers editors and other prominent roles in the Viennese press, and as these journalists became press leaders, they began to shape and reshape forms of masculinity that were associated with the image of the journalist. From 1837 to 1848, the two principal representatives among Viennese Jewish journalists were Moritz Gottlieb Saphir and Ludwig August Frankl. Both became major players in local journalism and pioneered new norms of gendered behavior among their fellow journalists. Their qualities as journalists and the modes of masculinity in journalism they espoused, however,

¹⁰ Grunwald, *Vienna*, 401, 402.

differed.

Born in 1795 to poor Jewish parents, Saphir belonged to an older generation of European Jewish journalists. From a small town outside Buda, Saphir attended a Jewish religious school as an adolescent, but he later quit and devoted his attention to secular subjects. He became involved from a young age in journalism in Pest, and in the 1820s he moved to Vienna where he was employed as a writer at the *Theaterzeitung*, the oldest theater newspaper in the city. Through the 1820s and early 1830s, he spent time in Vienna, Berlin, Munich, and Paris, working as a theater critic. Unlike most members of the later generation of Jewish journalists, Saphir converted from Judaism in 1832, though he remained embedded in Jewish social circles his whole life. Saphir eventually returned to Vienna in 1834. There he founded and edited what would become the most infamous and well-read satirical and humorous paper in the city. Saphir would edit his paper, entitled the *Humorist*, until his death in 1858. During its years of publication, the *Humorist* was met with equal parts criticism and respect from fellow journalists. Saphir made many enemies and many friends, but unwavering was his dual devotion to local cultural life and his commitment to publishing notoriously harsh theater reviews. As much as he was mocked for writing “light” humorous material, his theater reviews and his expertise on all forms of stage entertainment garnered wide admiration among his fellow journalists. His reputation grew to legendary proportions in Vienna, and, as a leader in journalism, he inspired a whole generation of young journalists who mixed satire and humor with biting criticism.

Ludwig August Frankl departed from Saphir’s example, and it was Frankl who galvanized what would become the most well-known group of Jewish journalists in the Habsburg capital. Frankl, who hailed from a small town in Bohemia, was born in 1810 to poor Jewish parents like Saphir. Unlike Saphir, however, Frankl was educated in secular schools—a

Piarist gymnasium and later a Piarist college. Soon after he completed his education at the Piarist institutions, he moved to Vienna to pursue medical studies at the university. However, he quickly demonstrated that his real aspiration was to become a poet and writer, and by the early 1830s, after earning the approval of the Franz II by writing a book of poems lauding the Habsburg throne, Frankl found himself in good standing across the city and a regular invitee to aristocratic salons and male literary club meetings, where he would read his work.

Frankl published poetry in several journals and annual albums, and, after a short stint as interim editor of an existing paper, Frankl was granted permission in 1842 to found his own paper, which he named the *Sonntagsblätter*. The *Sonntagsblätter* became one of the most respected journals among the literary elite in Vienna. At the *Sonntagsblätter* Frankl employed and published the work of many young writers, including many Jews. Frankl's example inspired a whole generation of young Jewish men. Best known among them were Moritz Barach, Adolph Dux, Sigmund Engländer, Eduard Hanslick, Moritz Hartmann, Isidor Heller, Siegfried (Isaac Solomon) Kapper, Siegmund Kolisch, Leopold Kompert, and Eduard Mautner. All of these writers were born between 1815 and 1828, and all except Engländer and Barach—who were both born in Vienna—came from either Bohemia or Hungary. Although they could speak provincial languages, they, like Frankl and Saphir, wrote almost exclusively in German. As had Frankl, they had been educated in German schools, rather than Jewish schools. Hartmann, Kapper, Heller, and Kompert had actually been friends before arriving in Vienna, when they all lived in Prague and met regularly at a local pub to discuss their writing.¹¹ In fact, they were so intimate with each other that Kapper eventually married Hartmann's sister in 1854. The religious

¹¹ Louise Hecht, "Self-Empowerment of Jewish Intellectuals in the Habsburg Monarchy," *Religions* 8, no 6 (2017), doi:10.3390/rel8060113.

practices of these young journalists oscillated between Saphir's and Frankl's. While Saphir had converted, Frankl remained closely tied to Vienna's reform community. He was employed from 1838 onward as the Jewish community's archivist, and he occasionally contributed to Jewish publications, especially later in life. Like Frankl, Kompert remained active in Jewish reform circles in Vienna, as did Heller and Barach in the 1840s. The others were more indifferent to Jewish practices, though they all counted other writers of Jewish heritage as their closest friends and often wrote stories that turned on Jewish themes. Their religious practices aside, however, they all engaged in masculine behaviors associated with the "proper" middle-class man, described above.

Many of the Jewish journalists of the 1840s, including those mentioned, achieved fame, popularity, and respect as journalists among the general population in Vienna at a time when discrimination against Jews was still perpetuated by the state and Jewish integration into city life was hardly guaranteed. Indeed, many young Jewish journalists of the late 1830s and 1840s became integrated into local professional and social networks to a degree rarely experienced by Jews in previous generations. They participated in literary clubs, traveled to meet colleagues and likeminded journalists in other German cities, were in demand as contributors to many of the city's newspapers, and found their work well reviewed by local critics.¹² The work of journalists and writers like Ludwig Frankl, Leopold Kompert, Moritz Hartmann, and Siegfried Kapper proved popular among a wide urban audience, far beyond the confines of Vienna, and many of the Jewish journalists served as elected officials and leaders of revolutionary bodies during the

¹² Louise Hecht, in a recent article about Jewish journalists of this period, concluded that "already during the Vormärz period, these Jewish intellectuals enjoyed a high level of social integration." This was aided by the fact that, because the Habsburg state did not permit Viennese Jews to form a state-recognized community, like that of Protestants and Catholics, many young Jews were able to live and work in Vienna without experiencing "surveillance by Jewish religious elites, as . . . was still the case in established[, state-recognized] Jewish communities, especially Moravia." See *ibid.*

uprisings of 1848, at a time when journalists had gained broad local support and power.¹³ As a result of their attaining local respect and leadership roles in the press, these journalists were central players in determining the forms of masculinity that came to be associated with the image of the journalist in the late 1830s and 1840s. The reasons for Jewish journalists' success integrating into the city's elite literary circles and the forms of masculinity they advanced in the press comprise the subject of Part One of this dissertation.

Coming as little surprise to Vienna's authorities and to local liberal men, revolution broke out in the Habsburg capital in March 1848. Censorship was rescinded by mid-March, and the city's press industry underwent a rapid transformation. Building on their connections to the Jewish journalists of the previous decade, a new generation of young Jews took up leadership positions in Vienna's revolutionary press of 1848. Among these were many Jewish students and radical thinkers. Meanwhile, the behaviors associated with the proper middle-class man also shifted from the pre-1848 period, as middle-class, male liberals founded a civil militia and began agitating for representation in the newly formed government bodies. The new Jewish journalists, who, like their predecessors, became leaders in the revolutionary press, played a central role in developing and exhibiting gendered modes of behavior that came to define the image of the journalist that dominated the city that year.

From 1848 onward episodes of anti-Jewishness directed at Jewish journalists increased,

¹³ Of these writers, Kompert achieved the most fame during his day. See Florian Krobb, "Reclaiming the Location: Leopold Kompert's Ghetto Fiction in Post-Colonial Perspective," in *Ghetto Writing: Traditional and Eastern Jewry in German-Jewish Literature from Heine to Hilsenrath*, eds. Anne Fuchs and Florian Krobb (Columbia: Camden House, 1999), 41-53 and Jonathan M. Hess, "Leopold Kompert and the Work of Nostalgia: The Cultural Capital of German Jewish Ghetto Fiction," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 97, no. 7 (2007): 576-615. The work of Adolf Kober and Salo Baron is still unparalleled in terms of their authors' comprehensive overview of Jewish political involvement in 1848. Their articles both contain lists of Jews elected to office and those who participated in political movements. See Salo W. Baron, "The Impact of the Revolution of 1848 on Jewish Emancipation," *Jewish Social Studies* 11, no. 3 (1949): 195-248 and Adolf Kober, "Jews in the Revolution of 1848 in Germany," *Jewish Social Studies* 10, no. 2 (1948): 135-164.

as did the rhetoric of political anti-Jewishness in the new conservative journalism that debuted that year.¹⁴ Despite the fact that support of Jewish emancipation was a bellwether for liberal attitudes in 1848—William McCagg called the uprisings a “Judeophile revolution”—anti-Jewishness of 1848 was used as a tool with which those who opposed Jewish involvement in the press industry could chastise “radical” or “unruly” Jewish journalists.¹⁵ Shulamit Volkov has theorized that in late-nineteenth-century Europe antisemitism became a “cultural code” that functioned as a symbol for anti-emancipatory political ideology: by the last two decades of the century, supporting antisemitism was a way of publicizing one’s affiliation with an “anti-socialist, anti-democratic, anti-emancipatory” worldview.¹⁶ In the mid-century antisemitism had not yet been transformed into a universally identifiable cultural code, but, following Volkov’s framing, in 1848 and afterward, it did serve as a tool that allowed individuals to indicate their position on a range of issues, including liberalism, capitalism, population growth, and immigration. In the wake of the uprisings, it became common for some individuals to deploy anti-Jewish rhetoric as shorthand for their position on these issues, blaming Jews and especially Jewish journalists for a host of “bad” ideologies—anarchy, radicalism, capitalism—to which they were opposed. By the 1850s, anti-Jewishness came to be associated with reactionary rightists, anti-capitalists, and those who supported absolute monarchy. Jewish journalists from

¹⁴ I use the term “anti-Jewish” rather than “antisemitic” in order to distinguish between the anti-Jewish attitudes of the early and mid-nineteenth century that were motivated and informed by a range of issues, including traditional Christian attitudes and anxiety about new economic changes in Europe. “Antisemitism,” on the other hand, better refers to developments of the latter half of the century, when anti-Jewish individuals began to apply pseudoscientific notions of race and Jewish racial or biological difference to their anti-Jewish beliefs. On this topic, see Gavin I. Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Antisemitism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

¹⁵ William O. McCagg Jr., *A History of Habsburg Jews, 1670-1918* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 83-101.

¹⁶ Shulamit Volkov, “Antisemitism as a Cultural Code: Reflections on the History and Historiography of Antisemitism in Imperial Germany,” *The Leo Baeck Year Book*, 23, no. 1 (1978): 43.

1848 on were increasingly attuned to these developments and found it sometimes necessary to defend themselves before the public.

Despite the fact that the Habsburg regime reinstated censorship in late 1848 after the revolution was suppressed, Vienna's press industry after 1848 grew quickly. Expanded advertising privileges boosted production and revenue for journalists and editors, and the censorship authorities no longer prevented journalists from writing about economic and in some cases political issues. Prompted by these developments, a new generation of Jewish journalists took up leadership positions, while many of the previous generation—the members of which were still young—left Vienna after the revolution or transitioned to other forms of literary production. Unlike the previous generations, these journalists, including Gustav Heine, Leopold Landsteiner, Jakob Löwenthal, Moritz Szeps, and Eduard Warrens, had typically spent years outside Vienna, cultivating relationships with political and economic elite in major cities like Paris, St. Louis, and Trieste. Heine, Löwenthal, and Warrens, for example, maintained close relationships with Habsburg leaders. Warrens was actually invited to take over management of an existing Viennese newspaper at the behest of a Habsburg minister. These new Viennese journalists tended to view their own roles as journalists as equally literary and administrative. In fact, by the end of the decade, many Jewish journalists considered their duties as newspaper administrators more important than all other responsibilities. They wrote less frequently, instead prioritizing the need to cultivate relationships with advertisers and hire subeditors. As in the decade before, Jews were integral to the changes that transformed journalism. While advertising, mass circulation, and newspaper administration became crucial parts of the press industry, Jewish journalists in Vienna led the movement that transformed the image of the journalist to include new masculine images of managerial power and commercial achievement. Part Two of

this dissertation explores the changes that came about in 1848 and the subsequent decade.

Masculinity: The Theory

A host of scholars have pointed out that masculinity always takes shape in relation to femininity. Masculinity cannot be invoked without simultaneously, if silently, invoking its foil. At the same time, one version of masculinity also operates in relation to other masculinities. The masculinity associated with White Americans, for example, might in many ways differ from the masculinity associated with Black Americans. As with masculinity versus femininity, differing masculinities do not always hold equivalent power. They are related to each other hierarchically and contextually, along class-based, religious, racial, and other categorical lines.

Much of the research on masculinity as an analytical category, in Joan Scott's formulation, comes out of the field of sociology.¹⁷ Sociologist Raewyn Connell's work on "hegemonic masculinity" and "multiple masculinities" is perhaps the most significant theory to have shaped the field of masculinity studies. In her 1987 text *Gender and Power*, Connell argues that in a given context, a version of masculinity tends to become "hegemonic" in relation to other masculinities as well as in relation to femininity.¹⁸ Drawing from Gramscian theory of hegemony, Connell suggests that a form of masculinity becomes hegemonic as it comes to be viewed as normative by means of subordinating other masculinities and femininity as a whole. To elaborate the example given above, she argues that behaviors associated with white, middle-class masculinity have become hegemonic with respect to black, working-class masculinity in the twentieth-century United States insofar as white masculinity is often viewed as normative,

¹⁷ Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986): 1053-1075.

¹⁸ Raewyn Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), 183-186.

versus “non-normative” black masculinity. Connell’s theory offers an explanatory mechanism for how different masculinities intersect with race, class, and other categories.¹⁹ In addition masculinities do not always exist for themselves but become a means by which class or racial hierarchies are expressed, echoing Volkov’s theory of antisemitism as a cultural code that stands in for a broader ideology. According to this logic, the middle class might exercise and express its power over the working class by means of subordinating working-class masculinities.

Connell points out that hegemonic masculinity exists at a societal level. Few men live up to the idealized norms of hegemonic masculinity, but they are nevertheless complicit in upholding the hegemon by benefiting from its existence. In other words, writes Connell, “The public face of hegemonic masculinity is not necessarily what powerful men are, but what sustains their power and what large numbers of men are motivated to support.”²⁰ However, the qualities associated with hegemonic masculinity—and by extension subordinate masculinities—do emerge out of practice. Even if not all men conform to hegemonic masculinity at all times, the cumulative power of repeated behaviors is the basis for the content of the hegemonic masculinity as a category.²¹

Connell’s theory has provoked a broad debate on the nature of masculinity and has seen wide application in history and social sciences.²² One of the theory’s main criticisms is levied by

¹⁹ Raewyn Connell and James W. Messerschmidt, “Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept,” *Gender and Society* 19, no. 6 (2005): 830 and Raewyn Connell, *Masculinities* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 75.

²⁰ Connell, *Gender and Power*, 185.

²¹ Connell, *Masculinities*, 71-76.

²² Connell and James Messerschmidt offer an abridged review of scholarly work that has deployed the concept of hegemonic masculinity in their article: Connell and Messerschmidt, “Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept,” 833-835.

scholars who contest the assertion that norms of masculinity and femininity emerge from practice. Instead, sociologists Margaret Wetherell and Nigel Edley, Patricia Yancy Martin, and Mimi Schippers argue that the idealized version of masculinity or femininity is initially constituted at a discursive level and only then affects daily behaviors and assumptions. “I think,” writes Martin, “we have to know the substance of societal gender norms and/or ideologies to which people orient practice.”²³ In other words, it is only after these norms are known to individuals that they are then able to decide which gendered practices to mobilize in their daily lives. The content of hegemonic masculinity thus organizes social practice, as Schippers describes it.²⁴ Wetherell and Edley have pointed out that this configuration gives individuals the opportunity to conform to and diverge from hegemonic practices depending on the context and according to what best suits them in a given interaction.²⁵ This allows them to easily explain deviations in behavior and uneven practices of hegemonic masculinity.

My work borrows elements from each of these positions. Because journalism in mid-nineteenth-century Vienna in toto was viewed as a masculine sphere, the norms that constituted the image of the journalist were coded as masculine as well. I explore forms of masculinity, pioneered by Jewish leaders in the press, that came to dominate the image of the journalist. While I use Connell’s framework in order to uncover the qualities, practices, and behaviors that came to be associated with the “normative” masculinities in journalism, I also study the ways that the characteristics associated with the normative journalist changed over time and the role

²³ Patricia Yancey Martin, “Why Can’t a Man Be More Like a Woman? Reflections on Connell’s *Masculinities*,” *Gender and Society* 12, no. 4 (1998): 472.

²⁴ Mimi Schippers, “Recovering the Feminine Other: Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Hegemony,” *Theory and Society* 3, no. 1 (2007): 85-102.

²⁵ Margaret Wetherell and Nigel Edley, “Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary Positions and Psycho-discursive Practices,” *Feminism and Psychology* 9, no. 3 (1999): 335-356.

that Jewish leaders in the press played in motivating and shaping these changes between 1837 and 1859. As increasing numbers of individuals associated “journalism” with “Jewishness,” Jewish journalists were central figures in constructing versions of masculinity that dominated perceptions of the figure of the journalist, as these forms of masculinity shifted over time.

I argue, following Connell, that masculine practices in journalism could be strategically employed to subordinate not only femininities that men determine to have exceeded the “proper” feminine sphere but also masculinities they deem inferior. Thus, I describe examples of social subordination—outright insults and mockery—between men that do not necessarily feminize or emasculate the target. Rather, the individual who levied the insult, sought to punish his target by claiming that his opponent had a form of *masculinity* that was “inappropriate” for the sphere of journalism. To call another journalist a bully or anarchist might seem ungendered to our ears, but in the mid-nineteenth century, these epithets would have been reserved for men alone. They would have been deployed by men who aimed to castigate other men for practicing the “wrong” masculine form. As Connell and others remind us, many of the insults were motivated by class-based tension and, at times, religious hierarchy and economic anxiety, problems that I will explore in depth.

In my own usage, discourse functions as a form of practice. I do not necessarily distinguish the practices of articulated speech from daily habits or forms of self-fashioning. I focus in many places on the language used by journalists, but at the same time, I do not assume that individual men were always “conscious” of the ramifications of their behaviors or that they were capable of self-fashioning in ways that had predictable results. I pay close attention to the outcomes and implications of their public writings, and I am less interested in making an argument about their interior consciousness vis-à-vis gender hierarchies. In historical terms I

argue that Jewish journalists of mid-nineteenth-century Vienna sought to portray themselves as practitioners of the best form of masculinity in journalism, but, as they became leaders in journalism thanks to the social and economic conditions that pushed them into the industry, they became authors of new masculinities in journalism. Their own “self-awareness” of this process was uneven.

I draw the phrase “self-fashioning” directly from Paul Reitter’s use of it in his book on the self-fashioning of fin-de-siècle Viennese Jewish journalist Karl Kraus. Reitter suggests that Kraus developed a persona that allowed him to mock antisemitic public figures and the commercialization of the press.²⁶ Indirectly I am inspired by the innovations of Judith Butler and other scholars of performative gender.²⁷ These theorists remind us that behaviors and practice are also fitted into a complex network of cultural codes that can be categorized by class, gender, race, and religion—among other qualities—that form a complicated and non-linear hierarchy. When I speak about “self-fashioning” I do not refer to a matrix of “conscious” attitudes and actions taken by Jewish men of the mid-nineteenth century. Rather, I confine myself to their behaviors in the sphere of journalism, and I believe that they, much like contemporaries of today, were only occasionally aware of the ways in which their actions fit into hierarchies and categories of the mid-century.

²⁶ Reitter, *The Anti-Journalist*.

²⁷ Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble* (New York: Routledge, 1990). Nigel Thrift’s work on “non-representational theory” is also important for my method here. “Non-representational theory” concerns a new way of visualizing selfhood. Thrift seeks to find a new language with which scholars can engage the “subject,” without resorting to unstable or prescriptive, humanistic versions of the “self.” Instead, Thrift suggests that an imagined “self” is constituted within a historical and contingent field of bodies, nature, and materials objects. Within this field, practices and habits shape the imagined unitary self, which humans assume is real. His theory departs from Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of “habitus” because, for Thrift, the field of practice is infinitely malleable, shifting, and re-representable. My own interest in non-representational theory stems from an effort to understand the performance of self in a way that is neither conscious nor unconscious, that relies on unpredictable and quickly changing historical circumstances. See Nigel Thrift, *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect* (London: Routledge, 2008).

Jewish Masculinity

The study of Jewish masculinity is a small but growing field. The long-time classic on Jewish masculinity in Europe is Sander Gilman's book *The Jew's Body*. *The Jew's Body* tells the story of late-nineteenth-century antisemitism from the perspective of the Jewish male body.²⁸ How, asks Gilman, were Jewish men's bodies perceived to be different because of their Jewishness, and how did this shape Jewish self-perception? Gilman focuses primarily on Europe of the fin-de-siècle. He demonstrates how Jewish men were pathologized, criminalized, and feminized in various ways, as antisemitic representations linked Jewish men to out-of-control sexuality, deformed feet, unmanly penises, blackness, and other "negative" qualities. Gilman also shows the historical lineages of these stereotypes. Many are rooted as far back as the medieval or early modern period, and some found at least limited support in the early nineteenth century. At the same time, Gilman stresses that the ramping up of popular antisemitism that suggested that Jewish men had the "wrong kind" of masculinity came at the end of the nineteenth century with the rise of political parties built on antisemitic platforms.

Six years after Gilman published *The Jew's Body*, rabbinics scholar Daniel Boyarin followed Gilman's assessment of Jewish masculinity in fin-de-siècle Europe with a new set of questions about the same period. In *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man*, Boyarin aims to uncover the ways in which new, nineteenth-century European masculinity, characterized by reason over emotion, physical strength, and participation in militarized nationalism movements, transformed and reshaped Jewish masculinities. Unlike Gilman, Boyarin investigates how European ideals of masculinity were admired and adopted, rather than rejected, by Jewish men, who used these new ideals to reshape

²⁸ Sander Gilman, *The Jew's Body* (New York: Routledge, 1991).

Jewish culture and politics. While Gilman discusses the negative representations of Jewish men by non-Jews, Boyarin explores how new norms of European masculinity were taken up by Jews.

Boyarin argues that traditional features of Jewish masculinity, constructed in the walls of Jewish houses of study (where only men were welcome), included “gentleness and delicacy” that were not deprived of sexuality.²⁹ He contends that with the rise of the modern state, modern nationalisms, emancipation debates, and assimilationist projects in the late nineteenth century, Jewish men abandoned traditional Jewish “gentle” masculinity for the “muscle” Jews of the fin-de-siècle, as they aimed to gain acceptance in European society of the nineteenth century. Like Gilman, much of Boyarin’s evidence derives from the final third of the nineteenth century, when widespread feminization of Jewish men took hold.

Both Gilman and Boyarin’s work provided stimulus for the growing field of the history of Jewish masculinity. Boyarin and Gilman successfully demonstrate the connection of the virulent antisemitism of late-nineteenth-century Europe to the rise of nationalism and to the subordination of Jewish masculinity. They also introduced the gendered Jewish body as an important symbolic site for non-Jews and Jews during the same period. However, recent scholarship has moved beyond the questions introduced by Gilman and Boyarin. A volume edited by Benjamin Maria Baader, Sharon Gillerman, and Paul Lerner, entitled *Jewish Masculinities: German Jews, Gender, and History*, explores themes and questions beyond the fin-de-siècle. Baader, Gillerman, and Lerner offer a compelling case for moving away from a model that diametrically opposes “Jewish” and “German” cultures since neither of these categories were fixed in the first place. They stress that gender dynamics among Jews and non-Jews in modern Germany were multidirectional and cannot always be evenly categorized as

²⁹ Boyarin, *Unheroic Conduct*, 23.

“German” or “Jewish.” Jewish masculinity was not merely reactive to German masculinity—as Boyarin seems to indicate, nor was German masculinity a pre-determined, static set of characteristics—as Gilman’s work sometimes suggests.³⁰ They also point out that a successful study of masculinity cannot be undertaken without incorporating questions about the category of femininity.³¹

Benjamin Maria Baader’s contribution to the same volume is instructive. Echoing Boyarin, Baader illustrates how qualities such as a gentleness, sensitivity, and domesticity were characteristics that a number of well-respected mid-nineteenth-century German rabbis sought to cultivate in Jewish men. Baader then departs from Boyarin, suggesting that during the mid-nineteenth century, these qualities were considered by non-Jewish men to be in keeping with ideas about the “proper masculinity” for the middle class—not opposed to them. In other words, gentleness, sensitivity, and domesticity were qualities non-Jewish men believed were extensions of their masculinity, in distinction from the unemotional, aloof version of masculinity that took hold later in the century. Baader argues that a key difference between the non-Jewish interpretation of these characteristics and Jewish rabbis’ interpretation was that for the rabbis, these qualities were coded as *feminine* rather than masculine. Nevertheless, the rabbis encouraged Jewish men to foster these *feminine* characteristics in themselves. That is to say, for non-Jews, such qualities were masculine; for Jewish rabbis, they were feminine but good for Jewish men.³²

³⁰ Baader, Gillerman, and Lerner, introduction to *Jewish Masculinities: German Jews, Gender, and History*, 7-9.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 4-6.

³² Benjamin Maria Baader, “Jewish Difference and the Feminine Spirit of Judaism in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Germany,” in *Jewish Masculinities*, eds. Benjamin Maria Baader, Sharon Gillerman, and Paul Lerner (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012), 50-71.

My own work picks up on some of these new theoretical and historical lines of inquiry. First, I move away from the fin-de-siècle to the early and mid-nineteenth century, when debates about masculinity and relationships between Jews and non-Jews were markedly different than they were in the latter third of the century and into the twentieth. I also agree with Baader, Gillerman, and Lerner, who point out that the widespread feminization of Jewish men that would characterize the end of the century was much less pervasive in the earlier period.³³ While my research suggests that Jewish men were occasionally feminized, it was also true that middle-class journalists were as likely to criticize non-Jewish men of other classes for having “improper” masculinity or for being feminine as they were to criticize Jews. Most importantly, I pay attention to incremental and historically specific changes in masculinity in journalism. Masculinity did not mean the same thing from year to year. Rather, contextual changes, such as legal, political, and economic developments, shifted the content and focus of masculinity for everyone.

My key intervention in the debate about Jewish masculinity concerns the relationship between the masculinity of Jewish journalists and that of non-Jewish journalists in Vienna’s press between 1837 and 1859. If Viennese society of the latter third of the nineteenth century witnessed increased antisemitism that led to the widespread feminization and the attempted marginalization of Jewish men and the masculinities antisemites believed they possessed, Viennese society of the mid-nineteenth century revealed a different situation. Jewish men, often newly arrived in Vienna, sought to adopt masculine behaviors prevalent among Viennese literati and middle-class elite as a way to seek integration into existing middle-class, male circles.

³³ Baader, Gillerman, and Lerner, introduction to *Jewish Masculinities*, 1, 2 and Baader, “Jewish Difference and the Feminine Spirit of Judaism in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Germany,” 51.

Financially and professionally restricted as a result of discriminatory laws, Jewish men were pushed into the field of journalism, which served as a legally accessible portal to middle-class life in Vienna. Thanks to a variety of factors that will be discussed, from the 1830s onward, Jews increasingly became press-industry leaders, while the association between “Jewish man” and “journalism” became commonplace in Viennese society. As a result, Jewish journalists found themselves not adopting existing forms of masculinity, but rather shaping and constructing the shifting forms of masculinity associated with the image of the journalist during this period. Unlike the *fin-de-siècle*, in the years between 1837 and 1859, Jewish men on the whole were not primarily feminized, resented, or mocked for the gendered qualities they espoused, as many of the historians discussed above have described was the case at the end of the nineteenth century. Instead, many Viennese Jewish journalists of this period were respected and admired for their masculine qualities. Thus, Jewish men in Vienna of the mid-nineteenth century played a fundamental role in shaping and altering masculinities associated with journalists, for Jews and non-Jews alike. Jewish journalists of Vienna during this period are best viewed as important contributors to new modes of masculinity in journalism, rather than primarily as the targets of widespread feminization or gendered critique.

The Habsburg Context

An older generation of scholarship has portrayed the decades under investigation in this dissertation as twin periods of political and social conservatism. The first period, extending from the overthrow of Napoleonic rule in Europe and the rise of the repressive Metternichian system was characterized by strict censorship and repression at the hands of the Habsburg bureaucracy led by Clemens Metternich. The second period, following the uprisings of 1848, was termed the era of “neo-absolutist” rule, with the suppression of revolutionary movements and the re-

imposition of conservative, absolutist governance under Franz Josef and Interior Minister Alexander Bach. Accordingly, the 1830s through the 1850s, with the brief exception of 1848, have been viewed as years of relative political quietude and enforced passivity.

More recently, a new generation of scholars has begun to revise this position. New work suggests that the old image of the mid-nineteenth century as a period of political, social, and to some degree economic conservatism was derived from the views of nineteenth-century witnesses writing retrospective accounts. Instead, scholars like John Deak, Christopher Clark, Pieter Judson, and Katherine Arens argue that these decades witnessed a notable rise in economic and industrial infrastructure investment, state-supported industrial change, political education and activism, and adaption to modern imperial governance. Judson suggests that, despite repressive state measures, liberal movements developed apace in the Habsburg Empire and especially its cities in the 1840s. He also contends that the Habsburg state put considerable resources into major publicly funded industrial projects and likewise supported privately funded, liberal or free-market undertakings in the 1840s and 1850s.³⁴ Katherine Arens revises the image of the Habsburg Empire as a doomed enterprise, suggesting that many Habsburg residents of the mid-nineteenth century imagined the empire not as a compilation of failed nation-states but as an imperial system that represented hope for and a paradigmatic example of a modern European civilization, while the rest of Europe was crumbling under the pressure of new nationalisms.³⁵ Christopher Clark and Robert Evans suggest that the Habsburg state of the 1850s was not “backward” or anti-progress as older scholarship suggested. Instead, the state was well attuned to

³⁴ See Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016).

³⁵ Katherine Arens, *Vienna's Dreams of Europe: Culture and Identity Beyond the Nation-State* (New York: Bloomsburg, 2015). See also John Deak, *Forging a Multinational State: State Making in Imperial Austria from the Enlightenment to the First World War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015).

modern methods of governance like press management and economic liberalization as a means to discourage revolutionary attitudes.³⁶ These revisionary scholars have convincingly argued that both Habsburg residents and the Habsburg state experienced rapid political and social change based on modern processes of liberalization and capitalization, rather than a three-decade period of static or retrogressive conservatism.

This dissertation builds on the terrain cleared by the new generation of scholars. Like these historians, I argue that many Habsburg residents, particularly those in Vienna, were well aware of and up-to-date on political movements and new political ideas. I suggest that even via the limited modes of writing that they were permitted under censorship, they were able to disseminate and debate political ideas and found seminal liberal networks and institutions through coded language and literary societies, which will be discussed in Chapter One. Instead of exploring how state-governed censorship and other repressive policies restricted political and social change, I investigate how these institutions informed and shaped political and social change in particular ways.³⁷

While this perspective allows me to view Viennese journalists as much more politically active than previous scholars might have contended, I also seek to engage the gendered elements of their activities. Few scholars of mid-nineteenth-century Habsburg history have attended to the question of gender among middle-class, male groups. Fewer still have looked at masculinity as a category. Although liberal politics of mid-nineteenth-century Vienna occasionally gestured to

³⁶ Christopher Clark, "After 1848: The European Revolution in Government," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 22 (2012): 171-197 and R. J. W. Evans, "From Confederation to Compromise: The Austrian Experiment, 1849-1867," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 87 (1995): 135-167.

³⁷ One model for this kind of scholarship is the work of Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, who writes about the constitutive role of the Catholic censor in shaping Jewish texts in sixteenth-century Europe. See Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, *The Censor, the Editor, and the Text*, trans. Jackie Feldman (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005).

women or members of the lower classes, many of the political viewpoints hailed by Viennese journalists were as exclusionary as they were inclusionary.³⁸ Just as journalists hoped to expand the power of middle-class men, they also sought to restrain and restrict the power of other groups, including women, artisans, and peasants.

Chapters

This dissertation is organized into chapters that I have labeled “modes of masculinity.” Each chapter details a “mode” or form of masculinity that was taken up by Viennese journalists and, in particular, by Jewish men, during a specific period of time. Part One explores two modes of masculinity, which I have termed “literary masculinity” and “popular masculinity,” that emerged in the late Viennese Vormärz, the decade that preceded the uprisings of 1848. Part Two examines what I call the “political masculinity” and the “business-man masculinity” that were common in journalism from the period of uprisings and legal uncertainty in 1848, through the 1850s, when the city witnessed a simultaneous reapplication of censorship policies and a new surge in liberal economic processes encouraged by the state. I conclude with a brief reflection on the rise of political antisemitism, the emergence of the mass press, and the widespread feminization of Jewish journalists by the fin-de-siècle.

Chapter One, “The Literary Man,” concerns the *Sonntagsblätter*, a weekly journal printed in Vienna from 1842 to 1848, edited by Ludwig August Frankl, a poet, journalist, and active member of the Jewish community in Vienna. In this chapter I explain how the stringent censorship regulations of Vormärz Austria encouraged a form of liberal and literary masculinity that was best expressed in Frankl’s journal. The *Sonntagsblätter* was a preeminent literary

³⁸ Pieter Judson is one of the few scholars who has discussed exclusionary liberal politics in the context of Vienna. See Pieter M. Judson, *Exclusive Revolutionaries: Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848-1914* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996).

journal of its day, and it became a wellspring and training ground for aspiring Jewish writers as well as a mouthpiece for elite art and theater criticism in the city. Frankl and the men who wrote for him believed that the proper masculinity of the journalist ought to be articulated through his aspiration toward liberalism and literary success.

Chapter Two, entitled “The Popular Man,” leaves behind the elite *Sonntagsblätter* and explores the Viennese Vormärz from the perspective of the *Humorist*, one of the city’s most popular newspapers. The *Humorist*, edited by converted Jew Moritz Gottlieb Saphir, was popular in two senses. First, it boasted a large reading audience for the Vormärz, and, second, it printed an array of “light” and humorous content in contrast to the serious material of the *Sonntagsblätter*. The *Humorist* both mirrored and satirized the elite, liberal version of masculinity articulated by the *Sonntagsblätter*. On one side Saphir wrote harsh criticism and sought to portray himself as a major contributor to Vienna’s intellectual life. On the other side, the *Humorist* gained more readers by printing a range of “light” material, such as jokes, celebrity gossip, and women’s columns—none of which would have ever appeared in the *Sonntagsblätter*. I argue that Saphir practiced a form of masculinity that sought to balance audience-attracting commercial strategies with elements of the literary masculinity espoused by Frankl.

The third chapter, “The Political Man,” moves from the Vormärz into the revolutionary period of 1848. The journalists of that year, at all points on the political spectrum, believed that the repeal of censorship in March had transported them from political immaturity to political maturity: in their formulation, they had “become men.” Led by a coalition of Jews and non-Jews, radical and moderate journalists of 1848 envisioned the male journalist as a central political figure. They believed above all that the journalist had finally entered the “political” realm, a realm they imagined to be exclusively occupied by men. Both radical and moderate journalists

advanced a mode of masculinity that embraced martial behaviors embodied in the civil militia. Parallel to this change, however, was the appearance of a new anti-Jewish “reactionary” journalist who rejected the “unruly” masculinity of Jewish radicals. In one of the first sustained anti-Jewish episodes in the history of Jewish journalism in Vienna, Jewish moderates and radicals had to defend themselves from anti-Jewish and rightwing claims that they were improper men. This chapter excavates a wide range of newspapers published between March and October of 1848, emphasizing the opposed masculinities of Jewish radical journalists and that of their reactionary opponents.

While Chapter Three explores the 1848 press of the Left and the Right, Chapter Four, “The Business-Man,” identifies the 1848 repeal of restrictions on advertising as the impetus for the quick expansion of the press industry in Vienna. This chapter investigates the role of a new generation of Viennese Jews who pioneered big commercial journalism in the Habsburg capital from 1848 through the 1850s. These men included Leopold Landsteiner, Eduard Warrens, Ignaz Kuranda, and Moritz Szeps, among others. I argue that their perception of masculinity in journalism departed from the literary or partisan version of masculinity articulated by their predecessors. Instead, they sought to embody a form of masculinity in which their success as men was tethered to their commercial rather than intellectual endeavors. While early in this transition, commercial journalists explored a form of masculinity that relied on provoking and participating in public disputes, by the mid-1850s, the commercial journalist adopted leadership and administrative roles in his newspaper, receding to some degree from public light and focusing on the internal maintenance of the growing business. By the late 1850s, the business-man had become a manager.

The story after the 1850s is one about which we have more historical knowledge. The

commercial press transformed into what scholars and nineteenth-century contemporaries labeled the “mass press.” Audiences reached the tens and later hundreds of thousands, and readers were presented with scores of options when it came to reading materials. For Jews, anti-Jewishness ramped up quickly, and some newspapers joined the ranks of anti-Jewish, anti-democratic hawks to sell papers and promote political platforms. On the other hand, a new generation of Jewish journalists in Vienna—the most well-known among them Karl Kraus, Theodor Herzl, and Victor Adler—responded to these developments in different ways.

Yet until far into the twentieth century, journalism was still viewed primarily as of men’s making, even if audiences included vastly more women by that time. This dissertation examines the early roots of middle-class masculinity in journalism but remains attentive to the fact that many decades passed before the idea that journalism ought to be the exclusive purview of middle-class man began to be widely questioned. Likewise, it is only in recent years that the category of masculinity has undergone a process of historicization, though such a process is long overdue. That masculinity can now be viewed as at best a construct designed to inform public life and, at worst, a construct that restricts and inhibits diverse male expression and underscores hierarchies between them, is an important milestone. This dissertation aims to continue this work.

Part One: 1837-1847

Chapter One

The Literary Man: Ludwig August Frankl and Elite Journalism

The first theater review of Vienna's newly founded weekly the *Sonntagsblätter* (the Sunday Paper) began with the following half-page reflection on the state of theater in the Habsburg Empire:

The once negative qualities and virtues of critics and journals—love of truth and fairness—have now unfortunately become positive. Every journal, every critic, who today wants to enter the reading world, dispatches a prodigious herald with seven-league boots, with a gleaming weapon and a shimmering shield, with the most alluring, eye-opening words: “I will be true, I will be fair. I will praise the good and rebuke the bad!” . . . As the virtue of an honest woman and the integrity of an honest man cannot be discussed, so an honest theater critic's love of truth should not be mentioned. It is self-evident!

The writer continues:

That we grant to theater all too much importance, that we treat it as a significant life question, that we give it much too much time- and paper-robbing seriousness and diligence, that is another malady of our world and newspaper activities! If one were to read the reports in the papers of our provincial and capital cities, one would believe that we have no other pursuit and concern, no other desires and hopes, no other thoughts and feelings than theater, that the health and well-being of the land and humanity depend on the business of comedy alone!

And yet, concludes the writer:

But we can do nothing but let out a deeply felt “Ach!” And “O!” about our comedy-Zeitgeist in general, and another deeply felt [Ach!] that we are unable to cast [the comedy Zeitgeist] off, that we must help critically illuminate the tumultuous, crazy, and animated stage life [*Coulissen-Leben*], that we cannot stand idly beside the great, tottering theater construction, developed over millennia. And so, according to the old tradition, to the old custom, the modest curtain of our suburban theaters quietly and solemnly becomes the appropriate sublime subject [of our criticism].¹

These opening remarks would serve as guiding principles for the *Sonntagsblätter* during the

¹ “Vorstadt-Theater,” *Sonntagsblätter* (Vienna), Jan. 2, 1842. Although this theater section is anonymous, it was almost certainly written by Ludwig August Frankl. Not only does the text resemble Frankl's writing voice, but it was also common for the editors of many journals to write anonymous articles in their own papers.

years of its existence from early 1842 until 1848. Although many newspapers of the time began theater reviews in a manner similar, with lengthy preambles on the nature of theater and art, the *Sonntagsblätter*'s review stands out because of the stress that the critic places on the social positions and the relationships that govern Vienna's local audience, its local theater critics, and the theater critics of the *Sonntagsblätter*:

1. The reviewer calls a prevailing rhetorical strategy used by local Viennese critics into question. He mocks the practice of refusing to publicly dispute a critic's "love of truth." This practice, suggests the writer, implies that critics are inherently objective observers and never partial, an assumption that this writer does not accept. At the same time, in pointing to this problem, the writer ironically positions himself as potentially more truth-loving than his fellow critics.²

2. The reviewer then executes a rapid sleight of hand. He initially suggests that theater is given too much attention in Viennese public forums or by audience members and that this attention creates the false illusion that theater is of great public consequence, but then he immediately follows this assertion with the paradoxical claim that the critic *must* perform the crucial public service of upholding the "tottering" institution. The resulting position is ambiguous. Is the theater trivial and over-attended? Or are critics performing a necessary public service in supporting it?

3. Together, claims one and two create an intellectual and artistic hierarchy that would frequently reappear in the *Sonntagsblätter*. According to *Sonntagsblätter* journalists, the lowest rungs of this hierarchy were occupied by the "tottering" artistic world: its performers, its uninspired creators, and its audience. Above these lower rungs were the city's critics, responsible

² Even though the review was published anonymously, I use male pronouns here because critics were always men.

for, but often incapable of reforming the problems in the artistic world. Finally, upon the highest rung stood the *Sonntagsblätter* critics, more discerning than their competitors, the best arbiters of taste, and tireless laborers on behalf of the simultaneously too trivial and yet all-important artistic sphere. The theater, for *Sonntagsblätter* critics, was a contradictory site. It was, on one hand, a place filled with lesser ranks—bad actors, bad musicians, and low-class audience members, who created or solicited content that reproduced this vapid world. It was also a place, however, that, with the aid of the right kind of a critic, could be transformed into an instrument in service of the same public that had diluted it.

Driven by criticism like this example, the *Sonntagsblätter* developed and maintained a reputation as one of the most elite art-critical journals in Vienna from its founding in 1842 until its suppression by the state in 1848.³ Ludwig August Frankl, a Jewish journalist who founded the paper, sustained this reputation by hiring contributors who cultivated public personas as “proper” literary, middle-class men by following a set of practices that shaped their reputation as journalists. There were three major components to this set of practices. First, *Sonntagsblätter* journalists described themselves above all as men of letters—literary men—rather than “mere journalists,” as one former *Sonntagsblätter* writer worded it.⁴ Contributors portrayed themselves

³ For evidence of this reputation, see Eduard Hanslick, *Aus Meinem Leben*, vol.1, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Allgemeine Verein für deutsche Literatur, 1894), 102, cited in Barbara Boisits, “Die Bedeutung der *Sonntagsblätter* Ludwig August Frankls für die Wiener Musikkritik,” in *Ludwig August Frankl (1810-1894)*, ed. Louise Hecht (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2016), 180; Siegfried Kapper (pseu. Dr. Rakonitzky), “Ludwig August Frankl,” in *Libussa. Jahrbuch für das Jahr 1850*, ed. Paul Alois Klar (Prague: C. W. Medan, 1850), 416-418; Moritz Saphir, “Kritische Epigonen über Jenny Lind in Wien. Jenny Lind, Bevor Ich Sie Gehört,” *Der Humorist* (Vienna), April 28, 1846; and Joseph Tuvora, *Briefe aus Wien* vol. 2 (Hamburg: Hoffinan und Campe, 1844), 44 (originally published anonymously). Contemporary scholar Barbara Boisits also recently argued that the *Sonntagsblätter* was one of the most important sources of music criticism in Vienna in the 1840s. See Boisits, “Die Bedeutung der *Sonntagsblätter* Ludwig August Frankls für die Wiener Musikkritik,” 180.

The *Sonntagsblätter* was printed through 1848, until it was suppressed, like many other entertainment papers, in October 1848. Between March 1848 and October 1848, the content of the *Sonntagsblätter* visibly changed from what it had been in previous years. These changes will be dealt with in Chapter Three.

⁴ Sigmund Engländer, “Vorwort,” *Der Salon* 1 (Vienna), 1847.

as writers, poets, critics, and literati instead of journalists, voicing an assumption that “journalists” pandered to popular taste and commercial interest. They imagined themselves to be connoisseurs of good taste, unyielding to vulgar demand. Second, the literary persona was also gendered and classed. For *Sonntagsblätter* contributors, a proper member of the literary elite ought to be a middle-class man. According to this view, male members of lower classes as well as women could not be expected to produce tasteful literary work or hold elite critical opinions, and *Sonntagsblätter* journalists reinforced this belief on a weekly basis. Third, for *Sonntagsblätter* journalists, the middle-class masculinity appropriate for journalists was defined by the ability to contribute to the literary sphere in a way that buttressed the hierarchy that placed literary men at the apex.

Promoting the image of the “literary man” was a good strategy for the *Sonntagsblätter*. In the 1840s the *Sonntagsblätter* was viewed by Viennese readers as one of the city’s most elite papers, thanks to the efforts of its editor Frankl, along with its contributors, many of whom were young Jews, who sought to make their name among the literary and professional elite in Vienna. As these journalists adapted the practices of Vienna’s literati for the platform of the press, they began to define the image of the “elite journalist” as commensurate with the “literary man.” While the journalists used the emerging image of the literary man to enhance the status of the paper, “literary masculinity” became one of the most successful masculine archetypes among journalists in Vienna of the 1840s. Journalists across the city aspired to portray themselves as literary, tasteful, and critical by writing fiction, publishing articles, and penning theater reviews.

Perhaps the most surprising element of the *Sonntagsblätter*’s success in educated, male circles of Vienna was that both its editor and a high percentage of its contributors were Jews, many of them active in the local Jewish community. Although Jews were subject to state-

enforced discrimination in the city, Jewish journalists at the *Sonntagsblätter* became leading figures of the local press and professional male society. Adopting the practices of Vienna's literati was a key tool for promoting Jewish integration, and, in turn, the Jewish journalists of the elite *Sonntagsblätter*—who became well-known and widely admired in Vienna—were key players in adapting and promoting literary masculinity as an ideal among journalists. Under Frankl's tutelage, Jewish men, together with their close Christian colleagues at the paper, were frontrunners in personifying what their professional peers believed was the “model” version of masculinity in journalism. At the *Sonntagsblätter* Jewish journalists rarely represented themselves qua Jews. Instead, they articulated and elaborated the codes of behaviors associated with the literary man. By cultivating this reputation, they found themselves full-fledged members of Vienna's local middle-class elite.

Founding the *Sonntagsblätter*

Already a beloved figure of Vienna's literary scene by the year of the journal's founding, Ludwig August Frankl had achieved recognition and popularity in Vienna as a poet about a decade before he founded the paper. Frankl was part of a new generation of men who came to Vienna in the 1820s and 1830s to study at the university and to participate in the growing literary community. Frankl came from the small town of Chrast, Bohemia. He was, like many of the new arrivals, Jewish—the son of parents who, “by means of continual thrift” had purchased a small house and later sent their son to attend a Piarist gymnasium in Prague.⁵ Unlike some of the other migrants, Frankl apparently never considered converting to Christianity, and he also maintained liberal Jewish practices from his early education and through the rest of his life. In 1828 Frankl

⁵ Ludwig August Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, ed. Stefan Hock (Prague, J. G. Calve'sche k. u. k. Hof- und Universitäts-Buchhandlung: 1910), 46.

moved to Vienna to take up medical studies at the University of Vienna, and he quickly began making his way into the city's glittery literary circles. That year he published his first poem, which appeared in historian and bureaucrat Joseph von Hormayr's (c. 1782-1848) yearly magazine the *Archiv für Geographie, Historie, Staats- und Kriegskunst*.⁶

By the 1830s the *Wiener Zeitung* was already publishing announcements about poems that Frankl had contributed to almanacs and poetry collections, but the piece that definitively launched Frankl's career was the *Habsburglied* (Habsburg Song), an epic poem published in 1832. The *Habsburglied* was dedicated to Crown Prince Ferdinand and lauded the imperial history of the Habsburg crown in enthusiastic terms, lingering on the description of Joseph II, as was de rigueur among the Viennese liberally minded men of that time. The editors of the state-managed *Wiener Zeitung* loved the poem, running advertisements for it for over a year.⁷ Its publication led to a reception with the crown prince, who gave Frankl a decorated snuffbox as a memento of his efforts to honor the imperial regime.⁸ Though it was initially financially difficult, after the publication of the *Habsburglied*, Frankl was a regular invitee to local literary salons,

⁶ Hormayr was the Habsburg state historiographer for twelve years from 1816 to 1828, during which time he wrote prolifically on Habsburg historical subjects. Throughout this entire period he also ran into numerous troubles with the Censorship Authority for issues in his historical texts. Charles Sealsfield (pseu. Karl Postl) an Austrian expatriate, who returned to Vienna for a visit and wrote an account of his trip in 1828, described Hormayr's travails:

He fell into disgrace for writing one of the most harmless productions, which, however, did not coincide exactly with the views of the Government. All his own and his uncle's endeavors in the Tyrol, could not appease Imperial suspicions; and he remains stained with the greatest crime in Austria—liberalism!—though he has since produced a number of historical essays and a Plutarch, in which he proves that all the Austrian monarchs were models of heroism and virtues, even Albert I. and Ferdinand II. not excepted!!”

See Charles Sealsfield, *Austria As It Is: or, Sketches of Continental Courts* (London: Hurst, Chance, and Co., 1828), 211. For Hormayr's employment records, see the *Hof- und Staats-Schematismus des österreichischen Kaiserthums* (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1816-1828). On his conflict with the Censorship Authority, see Donald E. Emerson, *Metternich and the Political Police* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968), 161, 162 and Alan Sked, *Metternich and Austria: An Evaluation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 153, 154.

⁷ For the *Theaterzeitung* review, see F. C. Weidmann, “Aus der literarische, Welt,” *Allgemeine Theaterzeitung und Originalblatt* (Vienna), March 7, 1832.

⁸ Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 164-166.

usually hosted in the homes of Vienna's aristocracy, and he became an increasingly well-known writer to elite middle-class and aristocratic men of the Habsburg capital. In 1841, after a short stint as editor at another local paper, Frankl received state permission to print his own journal, one of the coveted permits granted after the 1835 coronation of Ferdinand I. On January, 2, 1842 the first issue of the *Sonntagsblätter* appeared in print.

Frankl had also been closely connected to the Jewish community—still unofficial since Habsburg law restricted its obtaining state-recognized status—since his arrival in the Habsburg capital. In 1838 Frankl became the community archivist, which provided him a salary and a residence permit that would prove stabilizing to his life in Vienna. As editor of the *Sonntagsblätter*, Frankl made the decision to publish the work of many young, aspiring journalists, and his paper developed a reputation for printing cutting-edge work. Not coincidentally, many of the young journalists whose work he ran were Jews. Jewish writers like Siegfried Kapper, Leopold Kompert, Sigmund Engländer, Eduard Mautner, Adolph Dux, and Isidor Heller wrote for the *Sonntagsblätter* and eventually became important literary personalities in the city. The paper, however, was never a “Jewish” paper. It was explicitly intended for a general German-speaking audience, and, although Jewish contributors sometimes wrote on Jewish themes, none of them foregrounded their status as Jews. They were, instead, “literary men” above all. As a result the reputation that the *Sonntagsblätter* developed for nurturing the careers of young Jews was overshadowed by its reputation as the most literary and elite source of journalism of its day as Frankl seamlessly intertwined the work of young Jews and young Christians.

The Literary Man: Supporting and Critiquing State Authority

Why did *Sonntagsblätter* journalists turn to the masculine ideal of the “literary man”?

The answer to this question is tied to issues of state power during this period. Censorship of written and published texts in the Habsburg Empire intersected with the rise of liberal political ideas, and journalists, typically middle-class, educated men who supported the tenets of liberalism, found themselves in the middle of this intersection. As liberals, journalists wanted to advertise their provocative political beliefs in the pages of their papers, but as recipients of hard-to-obtain permits to print newspapers, they had to respect the boundaries of censorship and express at least a semblance of support for the state. Literary masculinity as practiced at the *Sonntagsblätter* afforded journalists the possibility of both criticizing and supporting the Habsburg regime. For this reason, the persona of the literary man proliferated at the *Sonntagsblätter* and elsewhere, opening a window for Frankl and other Jewish journalists to successfully position themselves at the center of educated, middle-class society in the Habsburg capital.

I. Supporting the State

Although Frankl demonstrated interest in poetry and playwriting from a young age, the choice to follow this professional path was not without external logic. The same is true for his decision to found an art and literary journal. In the Habsburg Empire the state Censorship Authority restricted political and news-reporting press. This policy encouraged the growth of a belletristic and art-critical press. From the early years of the nineteenth century when censorship was most stringent in the empire, applications to found journals that would feature theater, art, music, and literature criticism, as well as short stories, poetry, and travel accounts were more likely to be approved than other kinds of periodicals, especially political papers. From the Congress of Vienna until 1848, Vienna produced only three real political papers, each of which

was managed by the state.⁹ As a result, the majority of journalists working in Vienna contributed in some fashion to the belletristic press, what editors called the “entertainment press.”

“Entertainment papers” appeared in Vienna in two major waves. The first of such entertainment papers was the *Wiener Theaterzeitung* (Viennese Theater Newspaper, 1806-1848), founded by Adolf Bäuerle (1786-1859) in 1806. Bäuerle, whom nineteenth-century encyclopedist Constantin Wurzbach called “the king of the newspaper press,” provided one of the most enduring forums for aspiring writers of Vienna.¹⁰ The *Theaterzeitung* was quickly followed by the *Sammler* (the Collector, 1809-1846) and the *Wiener Moden-Zeitung* (Viennese Fashion Newspaper, 1816-1849, later titled simply the *Wiener Zeitschrift*). Though there were stylistic differences, all of these papers featured a range of similar articles, including style columns, romantic poetry, and fiction. Several additional papers appeared for brief stints over the subsequent two decades, but it was not until the mid-1830s, after the coronation of Ferdinand I and his decision to relax censorship practices, that the Habsburg Censorship Authority granted another round of permits. From the mid-1830s through the early 1840s, the *Zuschauer* (the Spectator, October 1835-1857), followed by the *Oesterreichisches Morgenblatt* (Austrian Morning Paper, 1836-1848), the *Telegraph* (1836-1838), the *Humorist* (1837-1862), the *Adler* (the Eagle, 1838-1844), the *Allgemeine Wiener Musik-Zeitung* (General Viennese Music Paper, 1841-1848), and the *Sonntagsblätter* (1842-1848) appeared, providing Viennese audiences with a wider selection of entertainment news to read.

In his memoirs Ludwig Frankl devoted nearly as many pages to excoriating the old

⁹ The most of important of these was the *Wiener Zeitung*, published since 1703 and still in print today. Beginning in 1810 it was the official newspaper of the Habsburg regime.

¹⁰ Constantin Wurzbach, “Saphir,” *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, vol. 28 (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1874), 215.

Vormärz censorship regime as he dedicated to telling his life's story. Frankl explained the censorship regime of the Habsburg Empire in the following manner: Austria's monarchs, first Franz II and later Ferdinand I, were lovers of literature, who delighted in reading the creative works of their subjects.¹¹ Frankl demonstrated this assertion by recounting the day that he received the commemorative snuffbox from Crown Prince Ferdinand in honor of *Habsburglied*. Chancellor Clemens Metternich, on the other hand, was concerned primarily with preserving peace in the empire at any cost. This did not mean that he was anti-literary on principle. Rather, he enforced repressive legislation of the press as a means to preserve political quietude. In his personal life he behaved quite differently. Metternich, wrote Frankl, considered himself a man of letters and even harbored liberal sympathies.¹² Less to be respected was Chief of the Vienna Police Joseph Sedlnitzky (1778-1855), under whose authority the Censorship Authority fell. A petty man, Sedlnitzky was passionate and exhaustive in his enforcement of the censorship laws. Nothing was too trivial to be excised by the censors, and Sedlnitzky had no interest in things literary.¹³ He "tortured" Vienna's few literary groups with arbitrary punishment, hoping they would eventually shutter their doors. The lowest rung was reserved for the censors themselves, responsible for the day-to-day operations of the Censorship Authority. They were shallow, inconsistent, and, above all, stupid.¹⁴

By Frankl's account censorship in Austria was the product of an incompetent and trivial bureaucracy, put in place to prevent the collapse of law and order, and an unfortunate obstacle to

¹¹ Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 138-173.

¹² Frankl wrote that Metternich "once said to a trusted diplomat, 'Luckily my police have no idea how liberal my thinking is. Otherwise, they would have long ago denounced me to the emperor.'" *Ibid.*, 209.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 246-255.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 181-193.

literary production. Frankl rendered the monarch magnificent and magnanimous, while he painted bureaucrats and policemen as narrow-minded employees. For Frankl censorship was the defining feature—and frustration—of the Vormärz. Whether or not Frankl would have written an “entertainment paper” if the conditions of censorship had been different is not clear, but the fact that his decision to do so was informed by the reality of censorship is evident.

Frankl’s perception and preoccupation with censorship were not unusual among his Vormärz contemporaries. Dramatist Johann Nestroy (1801-1862) once likened the censor to “a crocodile waiting on the banks of the stream of ideas to bite the heads off the poets swimming in it,” an allegory that has since become representative of Vormärz literary attitudes toward the regime.¹⁵ Nestroy famously challenged the censor’s boundaries in his parodic and often bawdy plays, which as a rule could only be performed at Vienna’s commercial theaters, never its court theaters.¹⁶ Franz Grillparzer (1791-1872), who became as well known for his drama as Nestroy for his comedy, described the position of Viennese’s writers and playwrights, especially those who had no connections in the Austrian regime, as one of “extreme distress.”¹⁷ Grillparzer’s difficulty getting his play *König Ottokars Glück und Ende* mounted constitutes one of the most well-known cases of what was perceived as censorial arbitrariness at the time.¹⁸ In 1845 Eduard

¹⁵ On Nestroy, see, Robert Justin Goldstein, “Summary,” in *The Frightful Stage*, ed. Robert Justin Goldstein, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 281. Nestroy translation from Katherine Arens, *Vienna’s Dreams of Europe: Culture and Identity beyond the Nation-State* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 155.

¹⁶ W. E. Yates, “Sex in the Suburbs: Nestroy’s Comedy of Forbidden Fruit,” *The Modern Language Review* 92, no. 2 (1997): 379-391.

¹⁷ Grillparzer quoted in R. John Rath, *The Viennese Revolution of 1848* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1957), 11.

¹⁸ For an analysis of this episode, see Katy Heady, “Too Nice a King for the People?: Franz Grillparzer’s *König Ottokars Glück und Ende*,” in *Literature and Censorship in Restoration Germany* (Rochester: Camden House, 2009), 118-169. Heady compares two separate manuscripts of the play that were censored for the court Burgtheater and the commercial Theater an der Wien, respectively. She concludes that censorship was to some degree arbitrary when it came to individual sections of text but that overall censors had identifiable concerns that differed based on the expected audiences at the two theaters.

Bauernfeld (1802-1890), another dramatist with whom Grillparzer was friendly, and Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (1774-1856), an esteemed Austrian diplomat and writer and a friend of Frankl, co-authored a petition that offered a set of proposed changes to existing law. Nearly all the local newspaper editors were signatories.¹⁹ In historian John Rath's formulation, it was the Censorship Authority upon which Viennese writers "heaped their severest criticism."²⁰

The lives of Viennese writers and journalists were punctuated by the work of the censors, as censors worked to edit and "correct" every document that was legally published or performed in the empire, from daily newspapers to theatrical works to most forms of advertisement. All periodical press in Austria underwent prepublication censorship, a cumbersome, lengthy affair. The process was supposed to weed out material deemed offensive by the state. According to the 1810 law that was the basis of censorship, material to be excised fell into four categories: text and print that was contrary to religion, that was opposed to morality, that was dangerous to the state, or matter that was "libelous, slanderous, or obviously mischievous."²¹ Religion, especially references to Christianity and Catholicism, could not be mentioned in the press or popular books. This applied not only to the content of written material, but also to idiomatic turns of phrase. Frankl, for instance, reported that the phrase "O God" was changed to "O Heaven" in plays mounted at the commercial theaters, and "Jesus" was switched to "God" at the court

¹⁹ The text of the petition is reprinted in "Denkschrift über die gegenwärtigen Zustände der Zensur in Oesterreich," in *Denkwürdigkeiten der Österreichischen Zensur vom Zeitalter der Reformazion bis auf die Gegenwart*, Adolph Wiesner (Stuttgart: Verlag von Adolph Krabbe, 1847), 409-422.

²⁰ Rath, *The Viennese Revolution of 1848*, 9.

²¹ This formulation originally appeared in 1795 law entitled "Zensurvorschrift vom 22. Februar 1795." The text of that law is reprinted in Julius Marx, *Die österreichische Zensur im Vormärz* (Munich: Verlag R. Oldenbourg, 1959), 72.

Burgtheater.²² The second category, immorality, was a code word for sexual content, and censors were often at pains to keep up with the many evolving euphemisms and double entendres that permeated the press and theatrical productions. As Lisa de Alwis has demonstrated, words like “*Ding*” (thing) and “*probiren*” (to taste, using the German spelling common to the early nineteenth century) were considered problematic words for censors, and the more a word was excised, the more this encouraged the development of new codes, which in turn required censorship.²³ The process was never-ending.

The subject of politics in printed work was obviously out of the question, but material that was deemed dangerous to the state extended far beyond overtly political articles. Alan Sked has shown that works of history, political poetry, and philosophy were treated on a case-by-case basis. Historical works were often given more restrictive censorship classifications, and some, particularly those that dealt directly with Austria, were banned altogether.²⁴ Material about contemporary history in Austria was difficult to get approved at any level.

Material that was likely to be read or viewed by a “popular” audience of lower-class men and women was subject to the most stringent censorship.²⁵ As a result, novels, booklets, plays, and the periodical press bore the brunt of the cumbersome censorship process. This meant that, while permission to print entertainment papers was more easily granted than for political papers,

²² Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 191.

²³ Lisa De Alwis, “Censorship and Magical Opera in Early Nineteenth-Century Vienna,” (dissertation, University of Southern California, 2012), 37.

²⁴ Anastasius Grün’s (pseudonym for Alexander Auersperg) volume of political poetry *Spaziergänge eines wiener Poeten* was banned, as was Heine’s book of poetry *Deutschenland, ein Wintermärchen*, and similar works by Moritz Hartmann. Ranke’s work *Die römische Päpste* was forbidden, as were the world histories by Friedrich Christoph Schlosser and Karl Friedrich Becker. The fifth volume of the *Political History of Imperial Austria*, by Julius Franz Schneller, was also banned. Examples appear in Sked, *Metternich and Austria: An Evaluation*, 153-155.

²⁵ See Sked, *Metternich and Austria: An Evaluation*, 155.

the content of the entertainment press was carefully scrutinized. Despite the fact that entertainment papers were closely monitored, they flourished during the Vormärz period in part because it was simply easier for middle-class men to gain permission to publish them.

Habsburg censorship law had an important consequence for journalists and writers: the law erected a limited pathway to official political privilege—access to forbidden texts—based on a series of conditions. Meeting these conditions thus became an important goal for the non-aristocratic population that had little formal political privilege, and the public venue of the entertainment press was a convenient forum through which journalists could demonstrate their fulfillment of these conditions. In other words, the fact that entertainment papers were read closely by state authorities gave aspiring writers a public forum through which to “speak to the state.”

The path to official political privilege set by the Censorship Authority was tied to a hierarchy built on class, gender, and occupation. The censorship law of 1810 outlined the way in which different types of written works were to be treated and who could have access to them. The law divided reading materials into two categories: “academic books,” on one side, and “pamphlets, youth and popular writings, [and] entertainment books,” on the other.²⁶ All printed works were to be given one of four classifications. The categories denoted who was permitted to read a source and where a source could be printed and reproduced. Printed material classified as *admittur* could be read by everyone, distributed freely, and reprinted in newspapers. *Transeat* could be sold and distributed, but it could not be reprinted or announced in newspapers. *Erga schedam* was the first of the highly limiting classifications. According to the law, the label *erga*

²⁶ “Zensurvorschrift vom 14. September 1810.” The text of the law is reprinted in Marx, *Die österreichische Zensur im Vormärz*, 73-76.

schedam was supposed to indicate works in which “offensiveness outweighed the good and the charitable.” Such material could be read only by businessmen and scholars who were given permission, revocable at any time, by the police authority. Finally, the police awarded the *damnatur* to publications that sought to “subvert state or morality.” Anyone who wanted to be able to read such works was required to apply. The law also added an extra label for unpublished manuscripts, which were often traded among literary men of the day to avoid a text’s being given one of the four permanent labels. A manuscript could be given the classification *toleratur*, a designation that indicated that the document was appropriate only for the “educated” [*gebildet*] and never the “uneducated” [*ungebildet*].²⁷ This kept manuscripts out of the hands of most working-class men, artisans, and women.

The distinctions in the law subdivided the population by level of education, by profession and class, and by gender since neither women nor workers had access to higher education. The hierarchy privileged educated men above all others. Most educated middle-class and aristocratic men typically enjoyed legally permitted access to works that were classified up to the level of *erga schedam*. For example, the Legal-Political Reading Club, Vienna’s preeminent men’s middle-class reading society, had standing permission to read these books and made many available to their members, but joining the Legal-Political Reading Club meant one needed not only to be a man, but also to conform to ideas about the “proper” middle-class man of the time.²⁸ Moreover, in practice, censors were much more inclined to attempt to enforce strict regulations on spaces like the theater, which were open to lower class individuals and women, than they

²⁷ Ibid. See also Lothar Höbelt, “The Austrian Empire,” in *The War for the Public Mind*, ed. Robert Justin Goldstein (Westport: Praeger, 2000), 218, 219.

²⁸ Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 280, 281.

were to raid the private libraries of middle-class or aristocratic men and their reading societies. That happened—but less frequently. The higher an individual ranked on this scale, the more the government turned a blind eye toward his reading habits.

II. Critiquing the State

While entertainment journalists often sought to demonstrate their allegiance to the state in order to gain the official privileges afforded them in censorship law, they also aimed to express their provocative liberal opinions in their public writings. However, if journalists wanted to convey political messages in their work, they usually had to do so in a coded fashion, using the language and genre available to them: the entertainment press. Entertainment press journalists, therefore, had to find a way to express their often liberal views in the literary language permitted to them by the Censorship Authority.

Despite expressions of anguish to which Viennese writers often resorted to describe it, censorship in practice worked entirely differently than the law might suggest. Rather than limiting the circulation of information, the Habsburg Censorship Authority failed to prevent Vienna's journalists and writers from gaining access to knowledge. Historians Julius Marx, Lothar Höbelt, and Alan Sked make this point in their work on Habsburg censorship.²⁹ Instead of adopting the view commonly held by nineteenth-century contemporaries that Metternich intended to render Austria the "China of Europe," Julius Marx suggests that the primary goal of the regime was not to hermetically seal the empire (implied in the problematic comparison to

²⁹ Marx, *Die Österreichische Zensur im Vormärz*, 5-10; Höbelt, "The Austrian Empire," 211-238; and Sked, *Metternich and Austria*, especially 139-164. Recently, Katy Heady has argued that censorship was at times arbitrary in its decision-making regarding individual passages, though not in its thematic concerns. See Heady, *Literature and Censorship in Restoration Germany*, 160, 161.

China) but rather to preserve its political and social status quo.³⁰ In other words, the aim was not to shut down all literary activity but instead to ensure that individuals would only read literature “appropriate to their status.” This meant that literature intended for the widest consumption—the press and the theater, especially—were subject to the closest surveillance.³¹ It also meant the elite middle-class men were motivated to cultivate public personas that elevated their personal status.

Although it aimed to maintain a status quo, the state faced continual resistance, and by the 1840s the resistance could no longer be controlled. By then liberal ideas had traveled around Europe, and Vienna’s middle-class professional men, especially elite journalists, often adopted liberal positions.³² Most middle-class and aristocratic men of Vienna had access to all kinds of political information and news. They traveled within the empire and abroad; formed societies that made smuggled literature readily available; and maintained broad, elite networks across Europe. If that was the case at the beginning of Metternich’s tenure, after the death of Franz II and the coronation of Ferdinand I in 1835, the Censorship Authority became even more lenient when it came to the activities of middle-class men. By the 1840s *bürgerlich* voluntary associations and secret societies, based on those founded elsewhere, were part of Vienna’s political landscape. Moreover, the demographic makeup of Vienna’s middle class was becoming increasingly diverse: not only native Viennese Catholics, but Protestants, Jews, and men from the

³⁰ Marx, *Die österreichische Zensur im Vormärz*, 6, 7. The comparison of the empire to the “China of Europe” is credited to Ludwig Börne, among others, and is quoted in Sked, *Metternich and Austria*, 123 and Norbert Bachleitner, “The Politics of the Book Trade in Nineteenth Century,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 28 (1997): 95.

³¹ Sked, *Metternich and Austria: An Evaluation*, 154, 155.

³² Pieter Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2016), 142-145.

provinces joined the Viennese scene as the state began overlooking forms of illegal residence in the city.³³

Political activity in Vienna before 1848 has captured the attention of only a few recent scholars. Most scholarship on politics in nineteenth-century Vienna focuses on the period after 1848, in particular from the late 1860s and early 1870s, in the wake of the founding of the state of Germany, the Austrian Dual Compromise with Hungary, and the rise of conservative politics in Vienna. Jonathan Kwan's recent work on the liberal party in the Habsburg Empire from the February Patent of 1861 until 1895 fills an important gap on the institutional history of the party and the history of liberal thought in nineteenth-century Austria, along with John Boyer's study on the rise of conservative politics and the Christian Social Party from 1848 through 1897.³⁴ Both mention pre-1848 roots of the developments they describe, but neither spends time discussing the earlier period. Pieter Judson's work constitutes one of the few in-depth historical inquiries on the issue of Viennese political activity of the Vormärz period. His recent book *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* reassesses older historical accounts that maintained that Viennese residents were mostly politically uninformed and apathetic prior to the uprisings of 1848. Judson demonstrates that, contrary to this older view, many Viennese residents were politically up-to-date and already able to advertise and advocate for their political positions within the legal and social strictures of the Vormärz.³⁵

³³ The state became especially lenient in the case of Jewish illegal residence in Vienna from the 1830s. See Max Grunwald, *Vienna* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1936), 185-187; Robert S. Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph* (Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1989), 26; and Gerson Wolf, *Geschichte der Juden in Wien (1156-1876)* (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1876), 142, 143.

³⁴ John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995) and Jonathan Kwan, *Liberalism and the Habsburg Monarchy, 1861-1895* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

³⁵ Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 103-154. Judson also argues that the Habsburg state was not, as previous scholars have suggested, antagonistic to development nor did it lag behind in infrastructural investment. By the 1840s the

Liberalism of the Vormärz was not strictly a set of political doctrines aimed at modifying state structure. In the context of pre-1848 Vienna, liberalism signified a wider worldview in which new social groups, increasingly the educated, male, urban middle class—writers, artists, and journalists in particular—no longer believed that they fit within the old legal order. They agitated for rights of citizenship and the abolition of the aristocratic estate in ways that would privilege their lifestyles as middle-class urban residents. Their immediate goals called for loosening censorial restrictions for the elite, the legalization of political assembly, and political representation for the male middle class, though individuals disagreed about what ought to be the boundaries of suffrage. Open discussion of liberalism was part of educated social life in Vienna, even if it had to be represented in cultural production in a covert way. It is also important to remember that the moment that uprisings broke out on March 13, 1848, the middle-class of Vienna was immediately overcome with revolutionary fervor. Joyous proclamations in support of press freedom, freedom of assembly, and constitutionalism appeared in newspapers and pamphlets that seemed to emerge overnight, and journalists, artists, and writers were central actors in the political events. This enthusiasm did not appear ex nihilo. The quick uptake of explicit political themes bespoke a public that was already well versed on these matters.³⁶ Although political division in the middle class existed in the Vormärz, there was also broad consensus among educated professionals that a new legal order, one based on rights instead of privileges, was mandatory.

state had already collaborated with private investors to launch major technological projects designed to expand private commerce and cater to military needs, simultaneously opening trade laws to encourage industrial growth. Judson blames Cold War-informed thinking for the inaccuracies of the older body of scholarship that described the Habsburg state as a site of “‘economic backwardness’ in ‘eastern’ Austria, when compared to the character of economic development that railway construction in ‘western’ France, Belgium, and the German states had powered.” See Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 109, 112-120.

³⁶ See Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*, 135, 136 on this point.

The liberal doctrine that called for ending the exclusive privileges of the aristocracy and expanding the civil right of middle-class men to participate in state decision-making appealed to many Viennese journalists. Liberalism was especially attractive to Frankl and the young Jewish men who wrote for the *Sonntagsblätter*. Although the Jewish population of Vienna is not known, it had likely doubled or even quadrupled, from around 1,000 or 2,000 to 4,000 between 1830 and the mid-1840s.³⁷ While the number of Jewish residents in the city was still relatively low, many of the new Jewish residents belonged to the first generation of young Jewish men who had been educated in state-run Normalschulen and Gymnasiums, rather than Jewish parochial schools, and had moved to the city to take up studies at the university.³⁸ When they arrived in Vienna, they were required to report to the “Jews’ office,” a division of the police, to obtain and renew residency passes. Many of these young men were classified as students or temporary residents, for which they paid special taxes, but by the 1840s, the state turned an increasingly blind eye toward Jewish residents in the city. Many of the incoming Jewish students, who were able to reside in Vienna legally upon payment of a fee, began overstaying their permits, and temporary residents bribed police officers to renew their passes on a biweekly basis.³⁹

Even though the situation for Jews, particularly young male students, in Vienna was improving, Jews were nevertheless subject to state-enforced discrimination. Not only were many Jews forced to extend their residency by buying off the police, but many also paid discriminatory taxes. They were barred from working as university professors or civil servants, a major financial

³⁷ Marsha L. Rozenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914: Assimilation and Identity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983), 17.

³⁸ Hillel Kieval, *Languages of Community: The Jewish Experience in the Czech Lands* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 66, 67.

³⁹ Grunwald, *Vienna, 185-187*; Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph*, 26; and Wolf, *Geschichte der Juden in Wien (1156-1876)*, 142, 143.

hindrance for those men who had come to the capital to study at the university.⁴⁰ For these reasons the doctrines and lifestyle associated with liberalism were compelling for many Jews, who wanted the expansion of political rights to educated, middle-class men to include Jews. The promise that men like themselves might acquire rights that would render discriminatory laws pertaining only to Jews obsolete was understandably attractive. Removing professional and economic barriers would open many doors for young Jews who aimed to integrate fully into the circles of urban literati in Vienna, and many Jews thus became ardent supporters of limited suffrage for the middle-class men and outlawing religious discrimination.

For Frankl, his co-religionists, and many of their Christian collaborators at the *Sonntagsblätter*, liberalism was central. *Sonntagsblätter* Jewish writers like Isidor Heller, Sigmund Kolisch, Karl Beck, and Moritz Hartmann traveled, studied liberal ideas, and published anonymous articles outside the empire. They were also occasionally surveilled by the police and were known to have sometimes attended meetings of the liberally inclined Leipzig Writers' Club.⁴¹ Many *Sonntagsblätter* contributors participated in liberal events and political meetings during their travels. Frankl was a close friend of Ignaz Kuranda (1811-1884), an Austrian Jewish expatriate who, from Leipzig, published the *Grenzboten*, the most important liberal newspaper for German-speaking Austrian men in the 1840s, and *Sonntagsblätter* contributors all regularly read Kuranda's paper, which was frequently smuggled across the border by being used as

⁴⁰ Grunwald, *Vienna*, 401, 402.

⁴¹ See the description of a state report filed by the Austrian diplomat in Leipzig, Joseph Alexander von Hübner, in Karl Glossy, introduction to *Literarische Geheimerberichte aus dem Vormärz*, ed. Karl Glossy (Vienna: Verlagsbuchhandlung Carl Koenig, 1913), cv, cvi. See also Glossy's transcriptions of Austrian police reports in the same volume, 89, 253. Most original police reports were lost or damaged beyond the point of legibility in the Justizpalast Fire of 1927 so Glossy's earlier transcriptions of some of the reports are one of the best existing sources available today.

packing material for consumer products.⁴²

Three primary historical contexts led to the development of a form of middle-class masculinity in journalism that held literary intelligence as sufficient justification for one's right to political power: first, the fact that censorship law required journalists to demonstrate support for the state; second, the fact that the same law erected a path to political privilege for individuals who could prove that they were upstanding members of the educated, male, middle class; finally, the rise of liberal politics among journalists who opposed elements of the Habsburg regime. Portraying oneself as a "literary man" in entertainment journalism was not only legally permitted by censorship law, but it also provided a way for journalists to demonstrate to the state their conformity to the educated, male ideal that the law set out. At the same time, the often abstract language of literature allowed liberal journalists to express political views regarding their aspirations for middle-class male power in a coded or subdued fashion that could be overlooked the censors. The literary man of the entertainment press was thus a means to both support and critique the state. The journalists of the *Sonntagsblätter*—most especially its Jewish editor and Jewish contributors—were key to developing the literary man ideal and, in the 1840s, they were its best practitioners.

"The Literary Man" Versus "The Journalist"

In 1847, Sigmund Engländer (1828-1902), a young Jewish journalist with a feisty reputation who had been a regular contributor to the *Sonntagsblätter*, obtained permission to start his own literary monthly. He opened the inaugural issue with the following mission statement:

We will never deal in slapstick comedy at the expense of taste, but we will also never

⁴² Curt Schmitt, "Ignaz Kuranda's *Die Grenzboten* (1841-1848): A Case Study of *Vormärz* Journalism and Identity" (dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2003), 75.

take up the schoolmaster's rod in order to give the appearance of intellectualism. Intellectual stimulation through serious conversation and humor [*Ernst und Scherz*], interpretation of life through art, impartial evaluation of personalities that the current day or contemporary times bring to the fore, and sharp criticism of new [artistic and literary] production[—these tasks we will do] in order to maintain a rigorous concept of art and *to thereby ensure that our literature does not sink to mere journalism [Journalistik]*—that is our guiding goal.⁴³

The comparison between “literature” and “journalism,” in which journalism was depicted as a debased aberration of high art, was an opinion that Engländer had encountered previously during his work at the *Sonntagsblätter*. In Ludwig Frankl's opinion, his own “real” literary work was his poetry. Journalism, for Frankl, was merely the “bread-earning branch” of literature, a literary form that did little more than help a writer earn his bread.⁴⁴ *Sonntagsblätter* writers, expressed in particular by its Jewish contributors, believed that journalism ranked lower on the literary hierarchy than other forms of writing. Part of the problem, for these journalists, concerned the state of journalism in Vienna. *Sonntagsblätter* contributors believed that journalism in general was a low form of writing but that Viennese journalism was even more degraded than it was elsewhere. One of the causes of this state of affairs, they reasoned, was censorship. On several occasions, Frankl was even able to address his frustration with censorship and its effect on journalism within the pages of the paper itself. In 1843, for instance, Frankl wrote a poignant “letter” to Mountain Prince Rübezahl, a mythical Bohemian spirit, begging to be given permission to discuss the “misfortune, that calls all hearts to sympathy and aid,” referring to a famine that had occurred that year in the mountains of Western Bohemia. The “Mountain Prince Rübezahl”—a euphemism for the Censorship Authority—had wrongfully permitted only the foreign paper the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* to report on the famine. Frankl was

⁴³ Sigmund Engländer, “Vorwort,” *Der Salon* 1 (Vienna), 1847. Italics mine.

⁴⁴ Frankl, “Pro Domo Nostra,” *Sonntagsblätter* Feb. 5, 1843.

understandably incensed about the enforced silence, and this restriction confirmed his belief that Viennese journalism was impaired in part by an external force.⁴⁵

Despite frustration with censorship laws, *Sonntagsblätter* writers argued that the poverty of Viennese journalism had more than one origin. Frankl's statements in his letter to the mythical mountain prince are indicative of this secondary source. Frankl wrote:

Our journals, these paper telegraphs report breathlessly when people stretch themselves like a horse before the carriage of a local female dancer, when a garland is tossed to a local female singer, when a virtuoso demonstrates his finger acrobatics to a piano-weary . . . audience. We know everything!, except that about which we know nothing.⁴⁶

Frankl's frustration with the limitations issued by the censor's office is palpable, but, at the same time, so is his annoyance at the trivial topics taken up in local papers. For Frankl, the tendency to report celebrity gossip and lowbrow artistic happenings rather than more "serious" topics was not merely a result of censorial restrictions. The *Sonntagsblätter* was equally critical of Viennese newspapers for caving to popular taste in art, theater, and music at the expense of "highbrow" subjects. Nikolay Fürst (1779-1857), an occasional non-Jewish contributor to the paper, described this problem historically. Journalism, he argued, had once been an important mirror of artistic and literary life and discussed widely in the city's elite salons. By the 1840s, however, it had been reduced to something akin to twenty-first-century tabloids: obsessed with celebrity gossip, with *pikant* (gratuitously dramatic) performance, with farce and burlesque over high quality theatrical production, and with the virtuosic singer's trill and the dancer's leap.⁴⁷ In short,

⁴⁵ Frankl, "An den Bergfürsten Rübezahl!" *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 26, 1843. See also Frankl, "Pro Domo Nostra," *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 5, 1843, in which he responded to international criticism of Viennese journalism by claiming that foreign journalists unfairly critiqued Viennese newspapers without understanding the limited and constrained conditions under which they worked. Frankl countered foreign criticism by arguing that his paper had striven to present the most elite fine art criticism and literary material.

⁴⁶ Frankl, "An den Bergfürsten Rübezahl!" *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 26, 1843.

⁴⁷ Nikolay Fürst, "Wiener Ansichten. Literarische Soirés und die Journalistik. VII," *Sonntagsblätter*, Nov. 5, 1843. Frankl made a similar argument in "Wie das Schrifttum im Nachtheil ist," *Sonntagsblätter*, March 1, 1846.

Viennese journalism had become infected by the popular instead of acting as a prism for the elite.

The situation Fürst depicted put journalism broadly and the *Sonntagsblätter* specifically in a delicate place vis-à-vis the dictates of censorial law. Censorial law was supposed to restrict and prevent certain kinds of conversations, especially those regarding current events and political problems within the boundaries of the empire. This meant that journals turned to permitted literary and artistic topics (like the singer's trill and the dancer's leap) more frequently than they might have otherwise, but the law, in granting access to "educated" individuals, also deepened a chasm between high- and lowbrow artistic production. In its attempt to critique restrictive censorial measures, *Sonntagsblätter* writers wound up reinforcing the high/low dichotomy written into the law.

Regardless, even if Frankl sought to portray the *Sonntagsblätter* as an elite exception to the bad journalism in Vienna, there was a paradox at the heart of his message. While the writers for the *Sonntagsblätter* continually criticized Viennese journalistic production, they were themselves engaging in the very practice they critiqued. This was partially for economic reasons. Journalism was a small enterprise, but over the course of the next three decades, it became an increasingly important industry. It had fewer barriers to entry than other fields. Although many newspaper contributors did have university degrees, a university degree was not required for participation. Journalism was also not a guilded trade. Moreover, although not every paper did so, many newspapers paid their contributors a small remuneration for submissions, either on a per-page basis or as a small salary to regular contributors. Because journalistic work could usually be produced more rapidly than longer forms of writing, journalists who wrote prolifically

could expect semi-regular payment. Journals were in any case the primary venue for the publication of short stories and poetry.

The few barriers to entry, along with the possibility to earn some extra income was one of the reasons that young men were increasingly attracted to journalism in the 1840s, but the attraction was much more pronounced for young Jews. Jewish men, who had come to the city seeking university education, often had trouble finding work outside of private tutoring, and journalism provided a venue through which they could earn occasional money. More importantly, journalism gave them a place to make their voices and names known in the city and to develop public personas they hoped would facilitate their careers at a time when other avenues were closed to them. As new Jewish arrivals to Vienna began to hear that Frankl was willing to feature their work, they flocked to the paper. As Jewish men learned to behave according to the codes of literary masculinity, they increasingly found themselves drawn to journalism as a profession since it opened doors to social integration.

Despite these advantages, journalism in Vienna of the 1830s and 1840s was hardly big business. Except in the case of the *Wiener Zeitung*, which was permitted to run advertisements, revenue came exclusively from reader subscriptions, and subscription numbers were low. The *Theaterzeitung* enjoyed the highest rate of subscription, with somewhere between 2,000 and 4,000 subscribers, depending on the year and the source of the report. The *Theaterzeitung* was followed in size by the *Humorist*, the *Wiener Moden-Zeitung*, and the *Zuschauer*. According to a *Zuschauer* subscription list, it had approximately 2,000 subscribers in 1846, and contemporaries reported that the subscription numbers of the *Wiener Moden-Zeitung* and the *Humorist* were roughly equivalent to that of the *Zuschauer*. The *Sonntagsblätter* always had many fewer subscribers, despite the fact that it was generally considered among, often the most elite paper in

the city.⁴⁸ Paper subscriptions cost between ten and twenty-five Gulden, a tolerable sum for the upper middle class but difficult for the lower middle class and far beyond the financial capacities of the working class.⁴⁹ Subscribers were typically members of the aristocracy, the royal family, and the elite *Bürgertum*, as well as reading clubs.⁵⁰ Before 1848, only a small percentage of

⁴⁸ The number of subscribers each paper had is impossible to determine because most evidence is anecdotal and inconsistent. Papers had quarter-year, half-year, and full-year subscribers, as well as readers who bought issues individually, which further complicated the question. Subscription rates, moreover, should not be confused with readership. Readership was typically much higher than subscription rates since many people read communal copies in coffee shops or in the club rooms of societies to which they belonged. Using the available anecdotal information, it may be said that papers that had over 1,500 subscribers were considered larger papers. Those that fell below that number—usually even lower than 1,000—were considered smaller papers. Sources generally agree that the *Zuschauer*, the *Wiener Theaterzeitung*, the *Wiener Moden-Zeitung* (later called the *Wiener Zeitschrift*), and the *Humorist* were the “big” papers, and all others were smaller papers. We can see from the *Zuschauer*’s subscription list from 1846 that it had about 2,000 subscribers. The *Theaterzeitung*’s exact subscription numbers cannot be determined, but sources suggest that it was the largest entertainment paper, with a subscription rate of somewhere between 2,500 and 4,000 subscribers. The *Humorist* and the *Wiener Moden-Zeitung* likely had somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000 subscribers. Most other papers, including the *Sonntagsblätter*, tended to have less than 1,000 subscribers. For subscription rates, see the *Zuschauer*’s subscription list from 1846, *Zuschauer*, “Verzeichniß der Abonnenten des ‘Wiener Zuschauers’ 1846,” 1846, which lists about 2,000 subscribers. Johann Springer, lawyer and professor at the University of Vienna, reported in 1840 that “the *Theaterzeitung*, the *Humorist*, the *Military Newspaper*, the *Österreichische Zuschauer*, and the *Wiener Modezeitung* [the *Wiener Zeitschrift*]” had the most subscribers among the domestic newspapers. See Johann Springer, *Statistik des österreichischen Kaiserstaates*, vol. 2 (Vienna: J. P. Sollinger, 1840), 349, 350. Another report from 1840 stated that the *Theaterzeitung* was said to have about 3,000 subscribers, but the anonymous writer estimated this instead at approximately 2,500. The writer believed that the *Humorist* had about 1,500 subscribers. See Alexander Weillowsky, “Briefe über Wien,” *Zeitung für das elegante Welt* (Leipzig), March 5, 1840. Frankl in his memoirs stated that the *Theaterzeitung* probably had around 4,000 subscribers, and the *Wiener Moden-Zeitung* had approximately 1,700 subscribers. See Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 114-116. Finally, a report from 1837 states that when Saphir returned to work for the *Theaterzeitung* in 1834, before he opened the *Humorist*, the subscription rate of the *Theaterzeitung* increased by a thousand, from 3,000 to 4,000 subscribers, upon his return since Saphir was so popular. See anon., “Saphir und die Wiener Zeitung,” in *Bilder-Conversations-Lexikon für das deutsche Volk* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1837), n. p. The subscription numbers for smaller papers are more difficult to figure, but the anonymous article published in the *Zeitung für das elegante Welt* in 1840 stated that the *Wanderer* had about 700 subscribers and categorized it, along with all but the aforementioned larger newspapers, as a smaller venue. In a book he wrote and published anonymously in 1844, journalist Joseph Tuvora argued that the *Sonntagsblätter* was one of the most artistically elite papers, but nevertheless had a low subscription rate. See Tuvora, *Briefe aus Wien* vol. 2, 44. In addition, the numbers of individually sold newspaper issues (purchased in imperial post offices or book stores) for 1841 are extant, and these numbers reflect the same conclusion as the anecdotal evidence just provided: the *Theaterzeitung*, the *Zuschauer*, the *Wiener Moden-Zeitung*, and the *Humorist* were the empire’s most frequently purchased papers, while other papers were bought much less often. For the list of individually purchased papers, see Table 50, in *Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie für das Jahr 1841* (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1844).

⁴⁹ Subscription prices were frequently advertised in the newspapers themselves. Prices were typically listed as annual, half-year, and quarterly rates, as well as by individual issue. There was also usually a small discrepancy between prices for provincial subscribers and those located in Vienna.

⁵⁰ See the *Zuschauer*’s subscription list from 1846, *Zuschauer*, “Verzeichniß der Abonnenten des ‘Wiener Zuschauers’ 1846,” 1846.

writers lived off of their literary work alone. In 1822 only twenty-two of some five hundred local writers listed belletristic writing [*schöne Literatur*] as their main form of employment. Nearly all writers were also professionals of law or medicine, or, more commonly, they worked as civil servants or teachers.⁵¹ In the 1830s and 1840s even editors often had to find more than one source of income.⁵² Contributors were subject to more challenging circumstances. They were often not compensated for minor reports like news and gossip articles. The later renowned music critic Eduard Hanslick (1825-1904), who got his start as a young critic at the *Sonntagsblätter*, actually said that he was too “well bred” to demand such payment.⁵³ Writers, especially those who were already popular, could expect higher compensation for novella-length stories, usually published serially, but only the most prolific and well-known writers published more than one or two longer stories per year. Compensation for criticism, genre portraits, and the like from little-known writers was typically low, amounting, for a set of articles, to barely more than the cost of a newspaper subscription.⁵⁴ Writers frequently had to explicitly request payment as well.

⁵¹ Bachleitner, “The Politics of the Book Trade in Nineteenth-Century Austria,” 101.

⁵² Moritz Saphir at the *Humorist*, for example, continued to publish a range of literary works, and he hosted an annual musical salon, which was popular and widely attended. Frankl, too, published his own poetic works during his tenure at the *Sonntagsblätter*. He also served as the archivist for the Jewish community in Vienna.

⁵³ Hanslick, *Aus Meinem Leben*, vol. 1, 103. Journalist Johann Peter Lyser made a similar statement in an article published in the *Wiener Moden-Zeitung* (then titled the *Wiener Zeitschrift*). See Johann Peter Lyser, “Eine Antwort,” *Wiener Zeitschrift* (Vienna), April 20, 1846.

⁵⁴ With few exceptions, newspapers rarely advertised the amounts they were willing to pay contributors. Johann Peter Lyser noted that he had been paid for his work at the *Gegenwart*, *Humorist*, the *Sonntagsblätter*, the *Wiener Allgemeinen Musikzeitung*, and *Wiener Zeitschrift* (the *Moden-Zeitung*). Though he was not paid for “small articles,” he received 15 Gulden per printed page from the *Wiener Allgemeine Musikzeitung*. He had already received from the *Musikzeitung* the very high sum of 6 Friedrich d’Or (approximately 50 Gulden) per page for two short stories, each of which were no longer than a page and a half. See Lyser, “Eine Antwort,” *Wiener Zeitschrift*, April 20, 1846. The *Theaterzeitung* advertised in 1831 that it paid the “considerable remuneration” of 16 thaler (approximately 30 Gulden) for novellas, short stories, and literary articles written by already famous writers. Payment for other types of submissions were to be considered on a case-by-case basis. See “Ankündigung,” *Allgemeine Theaterzeitung und Originalblatt* (Vienna), Nov. 26, 1831. As discussed above, Eduard Hanslick did not expect or demand payment from Frankl for his work at the *Sonntagsblätter* until he had already been working there for two years. When he “gathered courage” and finally asked Frankl for remuneration, Frankl told him that he was owed 8 Gulden for his work (which Frankl paid in the form of 2 ducats). See Hanslick, *Aus Meinem Leben*, vol. 1, 103, 104. Boisits

Hanslick, for example, recalled that he wrote at the *Sonntagsblätter* for free until he heard from another contributor that Frankl would give payments when pressed. Johann Peter Lyser (1804-1870) wrote that he did not expect compensation for “small articles” but that he “never wrote any lines for free,” in reference to longer contributions. The *Wanderer* even had a reputation for not paying at all and simply publishing the work of wealthy and already established writers.⁵⁵ In other words, journalism from its beginning was a competitive industry. Editors had to work hard to gain readers, and contributors had to work hard to get published and even harder to get paid.

Still, in the 1830s and 1840s journalism was the primary entry point into the money-making literary world, the “bread-earning branch” of literature, as Frankl described it.⁵⁶ If it was difficult to make a living for yourself in journalism, it was even more difficult to do so before making a name for yourself in the papers. There are few cases of writers who did not begin their careers as journalists. This economic reality, which demanded that aspiring writers use the increasingly popular journal in order to making a living, existed in clear tension with censorial law, which drew a sharp divide between the elite scholar and the unlearned masses. Young men wanted to enter the literary industry, which devalued journalism, in order to secure their own social status with respect to the state and with respect to emerging liberal male associations, but they also had practical concerns that required them to make a living. They thus faced the conflicting need to participate in popular journalism while also cultivating their own image as

mentions both this episode and the “open secret” that was music critic Alfred Julius Becher’s constant money troubles, owing to the difficulty in obtaining regular payment from Frankl, in her article, “Die Bedeutung der *Sonntagsblätter* Ludwig August Frankls für die Wiener Musikkritik,” 159. Moritz Barach (pseu. Märzroth) paid Franz Fitzinger 6 Gulden for his contributor to Barach’s album *Brausepulver*, published in 1847. Franz Fitzinger to Moritz Barach, April 13, 1847, Teilnachlass Moritz Barach, Wienbibliothek im Rathaus, Vienna, Austria.

⁵⁵ Weillowsky, “Briefe über Wien,” March 5, 1840.

⁵⁶ Frankl, “Pro domo nostra,” *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 5, 1843.

writer of elite literature. This is part of the reason that many Jews contributed short stories and poetry to newspapers since these genres of writing could be viewed as literature proper rather than journalism.

The solution for most *Sonntagsblätter* writers was to portray themselves consistently as “literary men” first and foremost and journalists secondarily. This allowed the *Sonntagsblätter* to earn revenue associated with a journalistic enterprise, without becoming associated with “tasteless” journalism. *Sonntagsblätter* writers worked hard to portray their own work as elite, often at the expense of other local journals that they believed had caved to popular taste. When an anonymous submission on the subject of “Journalism and Young Poets” criticized “low” [*niedrig*] journals for failing to cultivate the talent of young, promising poets, Frankl peppered the article with editor’s footnotes intended to clarify for the reader that the *Sonntagsblätter* in no way should be categorized alongside these “low” journals. The anonymous writer accused Viennese journals of bastardizing good poetry by printing cheap, knockoff versions, in which the original “outpouring of poetic spirit had been dragged through excrement in the most humiliating way and pelted with filth.”⁵⁷ The writer also blamed journalistic obsession with virtuosos for claiming attention that would otherwise be given to good poetry. He accused local journalists of failing to even comprehend the mind of a poet: “He, who only has eyes and ears for the pirouette of a female dancer, for the trill of a female singer, an inclination for the banal joke of a local comedian, how should he understand what takes place in the heart of a young poet?”⁵⁸ Frankl, who as editor had made the decision to run this article, added nine footnotes to the two-page

⁵⁷ Anon., “Journalistik und junge Poeten. Literarisches Memento. Mit Anmerkungen von der Redaktion begleitet,” *Sonntagsblätter*, June 19, 1842.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

article in order to remind the reader that this argument was only to be applied to “low” journals (and, therefore, by definition not the *Sonntagsblätter*).

German Comedy and the Status of German Men

As early as the first issue of the *Sonntagsblätter*, the journal’s contributors, Jews and non-Jews alike, raised the question of the future of German comedy. The issue was discussed in the same inaugural theater review cited at the beginning of this chapter. After the preamble on the subject of the “tottering theater construction,” the anonymous reviewer wrote two short paragraphs about the latest productions at Vienna’s three privately run theaters.⁵⁹ Concluding with a mediocre review of an English play that had been mounted in German on New Year’s Eve at the Theater an der Wien, the reviewer lamented:

A translation on New Year’s Eve! Evil!—theatrical omen! The wretched translations! First they maimed and killed our German comedies limb for limb, and now they kill off our consumptive burlesque muse or rather they will partially necrotize it. The tree of local burlesque must take root in the soil of the fatherland; the exotic-dramatic grafted branches will never produce flowers or fruit.⁶⁰

The depth of the critic’s frustration with what he perceives as the preponderance of comedy in translation and the failure of German comedic writers to produce good work is palpable. He depicts German comedic production as degenerating, wasted, and unproductive, while the comedies themselves are unrooted, grafted cuttings that have no depth. The reviewer partially blames this state of affairs on the local popularity of foreign comedy and the ready supply of German translators.

Frankl would make this same argument in a review of the now obscure dramatist

⁵⁹ 1840s Vienna was home to five theaters, two of which were run by the state and three of which were privately run. The two court theaters, the Hofburgtheater (sometimes just called the Burgtheater) and Theater nächst dem Kärnthnerthore, were located within the official boundaries of the city. The three commercial theaters, the Leopoldstadt Theater, the Josephstadt Theaters and the Theater an der Wien, were located in the suburbs (*Vorstädte*).

⁶⁰ Anon., “Vorstadt-Theater,” *Sonntagsblätter*, Jan. 2, 1842.

Roderich Benedix's play *Doktor Wespe*, published in the journal in 1843:

The talent for writing a pithy, principled, funny comedy, with authentic characters, seems to vanish more and more. . . . Every period of time, with its events, its contrasts, and its ideas is like a chemist's test tube filled with different materials; add to that heat—in our analogy the passionate enthusiasm of the writer—and a new result emerges. Those writers who are fortunate enough to enthusiastically reach the filled test tube of the time [*Zeit-Retorte*] first will always say and produce the most significant things. To the followers remains the mass, with its already very scant intellectual content with which they deal. Today's German comedy writers appear to be among the latter group, which is why so little original work has emerged.⁶¹

In the page-long theater review, Frankl actually had little to say about the play itself. *Doktor Wespe*, wrote Frankl, was not in fact a comedy at all but was merely a “burlesque.” As far as theatrical productions went, the burlesque was a low art form, though Benedix managed to pleasingly amuse the audience, which was more than could be said for other burlesque writers. These observations, however, were afterthoughts for Frankl. Frankl's main concern, articulated through the laborious analogy of the chemist's test tube, was the poor state of German comedy, especially when compared to contemporary work elsewhere in Europe. Benedix was one example, in a succession of examples, of the failure of German comedians to produce creative and generically pure work.

Frankl and several other *Sonntagblätter* contributors would repeat this argument many times during the entire period of the *Sonntagsblätter*'s publication from 1842 through 1848. Frankl first took up the issue in a March 1842 review of Eugène Scribe's play *Une Chaine*, which had just been mounted in German translation at the Burgtheater. Beginning with a quip about German comedians, Frankl then offered a list of general observations about comedic theater before getting to his specific thoughts about Scribe's play. Frankl excoriated Viennese comedians by contrasting the requirements of the genre of tragedy against those of comedy,

⁶¹ Frankl, review of *Doktor Wespe* by Roderich Benedix, *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 19, 1843.

accusing Vienna's "burlesque" writers of portraying "awkward, clumsy" comedic scenarios that failed to represent "humans with flesh and blood," a phrase that Frankl would reiterate often as chief editor of the *Sonntagsblätter*. While the French had great comedic "ingenuity," German writers were left scrambling to collect Scribe's disposed "rags."⁶² So egregious was this problem that in the *Sonntagsblätter* the word "translator" would become synonymous with a sell-out who gave up authentic artistic work for lucrative imitation.

Whatever the concrete problems with German comedic production were, anxiety about the state of German comedy served an important purpose for the *Sonntagsblätter*. By expressing their own concern about the future of the genre, *Sonntagsblätter* writers were able to distinguish themselves as careful and moderate arbiters of good art. Frankl also made a point of differentiating the critics at the *Sonntagsblätter* from other local critics. The average Viennese critic, wrote Frankl, was more preoccupied with reporting the details of "every failed burlesque" than with cultivating and writing about good quality theatrical and literary production.⁶³ *Sonntagsblätter* writers, instead, discerned the difference between authentic art and "grafted branches." *Sonntagsblätter* critics were therefore not only good critics but the best critics. This position allowed the critics to conform to the hierarchy laid out in the censorship law, which privileged good taste, education, and the male professional, keeping the *Sonntagsblätter* in good standing with the Habsburg regime.

That the concern was specifically about *German* comedy was not incidental. Expressing their worries about the future of German comedy was a way for *Sonntagsblätter* writers like

⁶² Frankl, review of *Fessel*, by Eugène Scribe, translated to German by Theodor Hell, *Sonntagsblätter*, March 27, 1842.

⁶³ Frankl, "Wie das Schrifttum im Nachtheil ist," *Sonntagsblätter*, March 1, 1846.

Frankl to articulate anxiety about the future of German middle-class men. In this way the journalists were able to voice a liberal critique of the state, by coding their concern in the language of literature, even as they upheld the hierarchy and dictates of censorial law. The failure of national expression in literature, believed *Sonntagsblätter* writers, represented the failure of middle-class men to improve their social position as a group.

While both Jewish and Christian journalists at the *Sonntagsblätter* expressed anxiety, Jewish writers were the most vocal in using the question of the future of German art to mount a critic of the status of German men. Decrying what he perceived as a lack of interest in German national culture among German men, Jewish journalist Heinrich Landesmann (1821-1902) wrote for the *Sonntagsblätter*: “Germany has the good fortune to be in fashion in France[. It is] good fortune because we therefore hope that this fashion will be obtained from Paris and then Germany will also start to be German.”⁶⁴ Landesmann’s article in this issue was preceded by a poem by Jewish journalist Eduard Mautner (1824-1889), entitled “Nemo in patria profeta” (“A prophet is never respected in his homeland”), which alluded to the difficulty that German writers felt they encountered in obtaining respect and recognition in German cities among other German men.⁶⁵

By the 1840s German cultural national expression in Vienna was linked to the development of middle-class, male voluntary organizations and student societies. Among the best known of these groups were the Legal-Political Reading Club (Juridisch-Politischer Leseverein), founded in 1840; Concordia, founded in 1841; and the Men’s Singing Club

⁶⁴ Heinrich Landesmann, “Ein Franzose über deutsche Poesie. Freiligrath, Heine, Zedlitz, Lenau,” *Sonntagsblätter*, Dec. 3, 1843. Heinrich Landesmann (1821-1902) was born to Jewish parents in Moravia. He would later adopt the pseudonym “Hieronymous Lorm” and became known as one of the best feuilleton writers in Vienna from 1848 onward. See Chapter Four.

⁶⁵ Eduard Mautner, “Nemo in patria profeta,” *Sonntagsblätter*, Dec. 3, 1843.

(Männergesang Verein), founded in 1843. Besides these legal groups, there also existed a network of “secret” illegal student and national societies.⁶⁶ The Reading Club, Concordia, and the Men’s Singing Club were well known to and well attended by Vienna’s emerging middle-class, male literati, and artists, including a number of Jews.

Frankl and other contributors to the *Sonntagsblätter* were members themselves, and Frankl fondly described many of these organizations in his memoirs. To varying degrees these groups were viewed with suspicion by the state.⁶⁷ Though the Reading Club had been granted the right to exist directly from the Ferdinand I, Metternich and Chief of Police Sedlnitzky kept close tabs on it because its members largely drew from the educated, professional middle class, which promoted liberal goals.⁶⁸ The club also saw itself as an advocate for the press and interpreter of the same.⁶⁹ Student societies, banned by the state, were considered the greatest threat to the status quo, so much so that the Reading Club was given legal sanction only when its prospective members agreed to exclude students.⁷⁰ For the *Sonntagsblätter*, concern about German comedy

⁶⁶ The Habsburg state was especially wary of “secret,” nationalist clubs in light of the uprisings that occurred in the Italian states from 1820 and 1821 and again in 1830 and the alleged participation in these uprisings of members of the Carbonari and Young Italy. Alan Sked, *The Decline and Fall of the Habsburg Empire, 1815-1918* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2001), 43-45, 52, 53, and Sked, *Metternich and Austria: An Evaluation*, 170-177.

⁶⁷ Eduard Hanslick, *Aus Meinem Leben*, vol.1, 3rd ed., 150.

⁶⁸ Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 276-288.

⁶⁹ On the group’s founding, see Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 276-288. Frankl wrote that the group’s charter members wanted the organization to function as a mediator of the press, much like similar clubs that existed in other European cities. The announcement about the founding of the group that appeared in the *Wiener Zeitung* reflected this goal. See anon., “Literarische Nachrichten. Juridisch-politischer Leseverein in Wien,” *Wiener Zeitung* (Vienna), Dec. 5, 1841. Metternich’s memoirs make it clear that he was deeply wary of the periodical/daily press and its intervention in political events about which, he believed, journalists and lay people did not possess enough information to write. See Clemens Lothar Wenzel Metternich-Winneburg, *Mémoires, documents et écrits divers laissés par le prince de Metternich*, vol. 6 (Paris: E. Elon, 1883), 44, 152.

⁷⁰ Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 314-322, 277. See also Sked’s overview of the state’s anxiety about student groups in particular: Sked, *Metternich and Austria: An Evaluation*, 128-135. It is also important to note that in 1848 the suspicion of the government regarding the disruptive political activities of the student groups and to a lesser degree the other voluntary associations proved to be not unfounded when student groups played an important role in launching the revolutionary events of 1848 and many (though by no means all) of the literary and artistic elite who

allowed its writers to articulate, albeit in a manner approved by the censors, their affiliation with these liberal, German men's groups and their anxiety about their future. Indeed, for the educated men who wrote and read the paper, anxiety about German literary production could hardly fail to conjure up associations with the local German literary (liberal) societies.

Expressing German national comradery was an activity mostly restricted to middle-class men. The activities in which these groups engaged ranged from drunken acting games to more subdued literary discussions. All of the groups participated in national staging of one sort or another, often in the form of singing or other debaucherous games at local taverns. Friedrich Kaiser (1814-1874), who founded Concordia when he was a young and aspiring dramatist, recalled that in honor of popular playwright Franz Grillparzer's joining the group, Concordia writers, painters, and musicians collaborated on an elaborate artistic display with which to greet Grillparzer. The rest of the meeting consisted of an hours'-long game in which participants, Grillparzer included, were supposed to prove "that Kisfaludy [a celebrated Hungarian poet] was a far greater poet than Grillparzer," but, instead of using actual words, they had to speak according to the "sound" of Hungarian, English, Russian, or German.⁷¹ The Men's Singing Club's activities consisted chiefly in the performance of national songs in theaters and concert halls and organized hikes during which members sang aloud. The activities of the Legal Political Reading Club were more sedate. Its purpose was to invite foreign guests to give lectures, which "replaced strictly banned books," and to compile a library of books that ranged from the "most strictly forbidden to those restricted to *erga schedam*, in which even books that had not yet

participated in the other clubs were crucial to staffing the National Guard, the Reichstag, the Frankfurt Parliament, and the offices of the liberal newspapers that were founded that year.

⁷¹ Friedrich Kaiser, "Friedrich Kaisers erste Begegnung mit Grillparzer und Gründung der 'Concordia,'" in *Grillparzers Gespräche und die Charakteristiken seiner Persönlichkeit durch die Zeitgenossen*, vol. 3, ed. August Sauer (Vienna: Verlag des Literarischen Vereins in Wien, 1906), 208, 209. Original document written in 1869.

received a censorial classification appeared.”⁷² It was founded as the Austrian counterpart to groups that existed in other state capitals. The announcement that appeared in the *Wiener Zeitung* describing the club’s purpose defined it as a body that would serve a national function by mediating the press for the public.⁷³

Membership of these associations varied somewhat, but it consisted, principally, of men from the middle-class literary, artistic, and theatrical elite, including both Jews and non-Jews of the *Sonntagsblätter*. The membership of Concordia was made up of the city’s most respected and celebrated male poets, dramatists, painters, musicians, and writers.⁷⁴ All of these groups to some degree sought to create a space that was outside the purview of the censors and advocated for expanding political power beyond the aristocracy to include the male middle class. The language of nationhood became one medium through which this political agenda was advanced, but it was also promoted through the other features of association activities and characteristics. The physical spaces where meetings were held were important. In his account of the founding of Concordia, Friedrich Kaiser recalled the difficulty he had finding an appropriate space in which to host meetings and the elaborate furnishings arranged in the bar where meetings finally took place.⁷⁵ Women and members of the lower classes were excluded from these groups, on principle

⁷² Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 281.

⁷³ Anon., “Literarische Nachrichten. Juridisch-politischer Leseverein in Wien,” *Wiener Zeitung*, Dec. 5, 1841. Frankl more fully elaborates on the national function of the group in Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 276-288.

⁷⁴ A membership list can be found in the Ludwig August Frankl von Hochwart Nachlaß, Foliobox 712, Wienbibliothek im Rathaus. Members included Carl Carl (1789-1854, actor and theater director), Ignaz Franz Castelli (1780-1862, dramatist and poet), Johann de Pian (1813-1856, painter), Franz Fritsch (pseu. Franz von Braunau, 1779-1870, dramatist), Franz Grillparzer (1791-1872, dramatist), Carl von Holtei (1798-1880, actor and writer), Ludwig Löwe (1795-1871, actor), Heinrich Marr (1797-1871, actor and theater director), Johann Nestroy (1801-1862, actor and dramatist), and Josef Staudigl (1807-1861, singer), as well as Frankl. For additional names of members, see Giacomo Meyerbeer’s description of his interaction with members of the group in Giacomo Meyerbeer, *The Diaries of Giacomo Meyerbeer*, vol. 2, trans. and ed. Robert Ignatius Letellier (London: Associated University Press, 2001), 186-190.

⁷⁵ Kaiser, “Friedrich Kaisers erste Begegnung mit Grillparzer und Gründung der ‘Concordia,’” 207, 208.

and for financial reasons. In Ludwig Frankl's account, only the Men's Singing Club was more or less "democratic" since its members included male craftsmen along with middle-class professionals, though by definition it excluded women.⁷⁶ Concordia and the Reading Club cultivated environments of artistic and scholarly elitism. Concordia was so exclusive that it even denied admission to the prominent editor of the satirical (and definitely middlebrow) newspaper the *Humorist*, Moritz Saphir.⁷⁷ Literature and theater were taken seriously by members of these groups, as were drunken tavern games, celebrity-studded poetry readings, and musical performances.⁷⁸

While the liberal male goals of these groups opposed stringent Austrian censorship and while associations of this sort were founded as middle-class male alternatives to old aristocratic power, the members of these clubs nevertheless relied upon the state-sponsored social hierarchy written into censorial law as well as the modes of public speech permitted by law. Using theater, literature, and artistic or scholarly elitism as a platform from which to critique the formal political restriction of power to aristocratic and governmental elites ironically paralleled the hierarchies set up in censorial law, against which middle-class writers agitated.

The *Sonntagblätter's* elite reputation is the best example of how individuals who had fashioned themselves as "literary men" relied upon and underscored the law. The

⁷⁶ Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, 303, 304.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 270 and Kaiser, "Friedrich Kaisers erste Begegnung mit Grillparzer und Gründung der 'Concordia,'" 213.

⁷⁸ In his diary Giacomo Meyerbeer, the composer whose "grand operas" were wildly popular but critically controversial in the operatic world of the 1830s and 1840s, described a fancy event that Concordia hosted in his honor during his stay in Vienna in 1846. "The most stimulating" among the "poems and epistles . . . praising my artistic career and fame," wrote Meyerbeer, "was a poem by [Eduard] Bauernfeld and a dialogue, 'Gluck und Lanner,' by Frankl and Castelli." Moreover, continued Meyerbeer, "This genuinely cordial and truly artistic occasion ended only at two o'clock in the morning." From Meyerbeer, *The Diaries of Giacomo Meyerbeer*, vol. 2, 190. Diary entry originally from Dec. 29, 1846.

Sonntagsblätter's long-waged complaint about the state of German comedy, which sought to elevate the status of its own critics above others, mimicked and thus reinforced the hierarchy outlined in censorship law. National expression might have been, on the one hand, code for the expansion of middle-class, male power, but it was also code for artistic, literary, and scholarly elitism, a hierarchy that was already incised in Habsburg legislation. Moreover, the German nationalism that was expressed by these groups as a manifestation of one's "good taste" and talent in art, scholarship, literary text, and theater, was not a popular discourse. It was instead an exclusive discourse, tethered to a hierarchy that excluded women and lower-class men, a hierarchy that the Censorship Authority wanted to foster, not thwart.

Alan Kahan's work on liberalism as a doctrine of exclusivity is instructive here since literary and artistic elitism were linked with liberal attitudes in Vormärz Vienna.⁷⁹ Kahan argues that liberalism across Europe was from its beginning an ideology premised on prohibiting women and lower-class men from obtaining civil rights. Kahan maintains that the historiographical emphasis on liberalism as an expansionary, emancipatory doctrine obscures the real tendency toward exclusion that was considered part and parcel of liberalism for the movement's adherents. Following Kahan's understanding of liberalism, the national liberal tradition of Vienna's literary journals like the *Sonntagsblätter* had built into their makeup the exclusion of non-middle-class men and women of all classes.

For Frankl and *Sonntagsblätter* contributors in particular there was another issue at play in the question of German comedy: the parallel problem of the decline of visible social differentiation and the erosion of generic distinctions in artistic production. In a review of Franz

⁷⁹ Alan S. Kahan, *Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Europe: The Political Culture of Limited Suffrage* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Fritsch's play *Beruf und Liebe*, Frankl began with nearly the same words he would use a year later in his review of Benedix: "The poetic comedy, I think, both fiction and drama, vanishes more and more."⁸⁰ This articulation is identical to the expressions about the future of German comedy that we have just discussed, but he added an elaboration on why he believed that comedy was in jeopardy. It could be, Frankl mused, the result of "social conditions" that were "depleted," or, alternatively, the cause might have been the replacing of traditional clothing that marked class and social rank with "uniform clothing that does not differentiate between social orders." In other words, the real question was the matter of social and literary distinction. In Frankl's view the evaporation of markers of social distinction negatively impacted artistic production. Despite the fact that Frankl was both a Jew and non-noble—each an obstacle to social mobility in pre-1848 Vienna—his position here advocates for preserving visible social difference.

Ambiguity was a problem for many *Sonntagsblätter* critics, many of whom were interested in delineating genre and maintaining generic purity. This was the case for both the paper's Jewish and non-Jewish contributors. While Frankl and other writers accused comedians of sinking toward burlesque or leeching off foreign material, they were worried about a host of other art forms. For example, they believed that modern painting as a whole had not yet penetrated the German cultural sphere, and the question of the decline of German poetry became a topic nearly as ubiquitous as the matter of German comedy.⁸¹ Frankl printed articles lamenting

⁸⁰ Frankl, review of *Beruf und Liebe*, by Franz Fritsch (pseu. Franz von Braunau), *Sonntagsblätter*, May 22, 1842.

⁸¹ Anon., "Journalistik und junge Poeten. Literarisches Memento. Mit Anmerkungen von der Redaktion begleitet," *Sonntagsblätter*, June 19, 1842; anon., report on Chr. Kuffner's *Gesammelte Schriften*, *Sonntagsblätter*, Dec. 3, 1843; Frankl, "Die mediceische Venus und der toskanische Bauer," *Sonntagsblätter*, July 1, 1844; Frankl, "Weltschmerz und Immermann, Eine Silhouette," *Sonntagsblätter*, Aug. 7, 1842; N. Fürst, "Wiener Ansichten. Literarische Soirés und die Journalistik. VII," *Sonntagsblätter*, Nov. 5, 1843; and Albert Rimmer, "Ost und West," *Sonntagsblätter*, July 24, 1842.

the condition of church music, historical painting, and genre painting, and he was concerned to carefully explain the boundaries of each.⁸² His contributors wrote pieces that critiqued the “impurity” of or debated the boundaries of historical and landscape painting, revues, Viennese printmaking, and German fiction by women, among other artistic and literary genres.⁸³ The ongoing fascination with differentiating, defining, and purifying genres mirrored the work of social differentiation to which Frankl pointed in his review of *Beruf und Liebe*. Rudolf Eitelberger von Edelberg (1817-1885), one of the paper’s few aristocratic contributors and a well-known professor of art history, even drew a direct link between these two sites of differentiation:

According to its nature, art is interested in the plurality of conditions that govern life. Systems of government, religion, climate, and racial circumstances give to life its actual form and to art its unique expression. . . . Therefore all artistic production appears precisely like limbs of a great organism.⁸⁴

Later in the article he clarified that these “limbs” refer to genres of art: “The historical painter has the task of understanding and producing an inherently significant story or religious or secular content. Likewise the genre or landscape painter has the no less important task of representing

⁸² Frankl, “Die religiöse Musik der Gegenwart, Ein aphoristische Betrachtung,” *Sonntagsblätter*, March 27, 1842; Frankl, review of “König Renés Tochter,” play by Henrik Hertz, *Sonntagsblätter*, July 11, 1847; and Frankl, “Stoff zum Malen und zum Meißeln,” *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 13, 1842. See also the argument developed by Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, which suggests that in various historical moments “the ranking of literary genres or authors in a hierarchy analogous to social classes” is evidence of a “more complex cultural process whereby the human body, psychic forms, geographical space and the social formation are all constructed within interrelating and dependent hierarchies of high and low.” See Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986), 2.

⁸³ Anon., review of “Der Zauberschleier” by Franz Xaver Told, *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 13, 1842; anon., review of “Tschingis-Chan,” *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 20, 1842; X. Dusch, “Die diesjährige Kunstausstellung in Wien,” *Sonntagsblätter*, May 5, 1842; Rudolf Eitelberger von Edelberg, “Die Wiener Kunstausstellung im Jahre 1847,” *Sonntagsblätter*, March 28, 1847; Eitelberger von Edelberg, “Ueber den Kunstverein,” *Sonntagsblätter*, June 7, 1846; Ludwig Mielichhofer, “Über Landschaftsmalerei,” *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 6, 1842; Joseph Plank, “Musikalischer Wochenbericht,” *Sonntagsblätter*, June 7, 1846; Plank, review of the opera “Das Wolkenkind” by Emil Titl, *Sonntagsblätter*, Dec. 5, 1847; and B. Siegländer, “Topographie in Wien,” *Sonntagsblätter*, May 12, 1844.

⁸⁴ Eitelberger von Edelberg, “Ueber den Kunstverein,” *Sonntagsblätter*, June 7, 1846.

civil life and rural nature.”

Central to genre as presented in the *Sonntagsblätter* was the importance of maintaining the visibility of stratification and differentiation and, no less crucial, the visibility of the critic as arbiter of these differences. The outcome of this hand-wringing was not the illumination of artistic problems in the German cultural sphere of the 1840s. Rather, this rhetorical posture situated the journal’s contributors as authorities and arbiters of genre in a way that paralleled and reinforced the concept of boundaries fundamental to censorial law, while also promoting the political position of middle-class men. Censorship in Austria, inefficient as it was, was rooted in the maintenance of boundaries denoted by the appropriate distribution of “moral,” “religious,” and “political” content to different groups. It categorized these groups according to level of education and profession. In articulating a critique of art and art genre that positioned *Sonntagsblätter* writers as masters of delineation, *Sonntagsblätter* writers, consciously or not, were reinforcing principles upon which censorship was based.

Yet even as they reinforced state law, *Sonntagsblätter* critics were able to critique it as well. As they supported the social hierarchy embedded in censorship, *Sonntagsblätter* writers, both Jews and non-Jews, stressed their own worthiness to occupy the higher rungs of the ladder. It was not merely that they hoped to maintain social distinctions. Instead, they advocated, albeit in a coded language through their self-fashioning as literary men, for transitioning from a social order based on privileges to one based on class and gender. By laboring to prove their critical and literary superiority, calling for a strengthened German culture, and promoting their work in German men’s organizations, *Sonntagsblätter* writers hoped to equalize the power of educated, middle-class men and render distinctions based on religion and old feudal orders obsolete.

The Urban Man and the Young Jewish Journalists of the *Sonntagsblätter*

The on-going analogy between “poor” German literary production and anxiety about the status of German men was expressed stridently by Jewish and non-Jewish contributors to the *Sonntagsblätter*. The same is not the case, however, for the political and social messages contained in the short stories published at the *Sonntagsblätter*. Although several non-Jewish short-story writers made their names in the journal, it was the Jewish contributors who dominated the genre and achieved the most recognition for this work. It is through the genre of short stories that many Jewish men were best able to cultivate reputations as “literary men” in ways that contributed to their social and political goals in Vienna.

Besides theater and literary criticism, the *Sonntagsblätter* published stories or poetry in every issue of the paper. In early 1842, shortly after the paper was founded, it had already come to enjoy a reputation as an excellent source of cutting-edge fiction. This came in part thanks to a contact Frankl made during his seventeenth-month tenure as editor of the *Oesterreichisches Morgenblatt* before he founded the *Sonntagsblätter*. While at the *Morgenblatt* Frankl received a submission by the previously unknown writer Josef Rank (1816-1896). Rank, like Frankl, was from a small town in Bohemia and had moved to Vienna to study at the university at the age of twenty-one. Though Rank was not Jewish—later critics would assume that he was—the parallels between his biography and Frankl’s are hard to miss, and the pair quickly developed a good relationship. It was Frankl who encouraged Rank to write about the village life of small-town Bohemia.⁸⁵ Rank’s first submission to the *Morgenblatt*, which Frankl printed in December 1840, was entitled “Manners and Customs of the German-Bohemians on the Western Border.”⁸⁶ Rank

⁸⁵ Wurzbach, “Rank,” *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, vol. 24, 338.

⁸⁶ Josef Rank, “Sitten und Gebräuche der Deutschböhmen an der westlichen Grenze,” *Oesterreichisches Morgenblatt* (Vienna), Dec. 7, 1840.

reprised the column twice, each time describing a folk ritual practiced in West Bohemia. He continued to contribute similar articles until Frankl left his position at the *Morgenblatt* in order to found the *Sonntagsblätter* in 1842.

Rank's work appeared in the inaugural issue of the *Sonntagsblätter*, under a title that riffed off his early articles for the *Morgenblatt*: "Manners and Customs in Untersteyermark" (a province of the empire that is now present-day Slovenia). He went on to contribute several short stories about Bohemian life to the *Sonntagsblätter*, and in early 1843 he completed a book-length collection entitled *Aus dem Böhmerwalde*, which was published in Leipzig and available in Viennese bookstores. *Aus dem Böhmerwalde* contained a series of essays on the nature of the German "Volk" living in Bohemia, stories of their "manners and customs," and transcribed sheet music with the lyrics in dialect. It was an immediate success in Vienna. Frankl ran a glowing review, as did the *Zuschauer*.⁸⁷ The critic at the *Humorist* wrote:

The brilliant writer of "Habsburgliedes," Ludwig August Frankl, calls this portrayal of customs *Aus dem Böhmerwalde* in his "Sonntagsblätter" a national [*vaterländisch*] book beyond reproach. I agree completely [*aus vollem Herzen*], and I candidly confess that this portrayal of the setting of the imagined forest, its inhabitants, its manners and customs, its afflictions and its joys, every description should be regarded as equal to the kind [that appear] in Walter Scott's novel set in the Scottish Highlands."⁸⁸

Josef Rank's transformation into a local literary celebrity turned out to be a boon for the *Sonntagsblätter*, and for Frankl, Rank's work marked the beginning of a larger editorial project.⁸⁹ The same year that Rank published *Aus dem Böhmerwalde*, Berthold Auerbach (1812-1882), a

⁸⁷ Anon., "Bibliographie. 'Aus dem Böhmerwalde' von Joseph Rank," *Sonntagsblätter*, May 28, 1843 and Leopold Fürstедler, "Literatur. *Aus dem Böhmerwalde*. Von Joseph Rank.," *Der Österreichische Zuschauer* (Vienna), Aug. 4, 1843.

⁸⁸ Heinrich Levitschnigg, "Literarisches," review of *Aus dem Böhmerwalde*, by Josef Rank, *Der Humorist*, June 1, 1843.

⁸⁹ For example, Tuvora, *Briefe aus Wien* vol. 2, 21.

Jewish writer from a small German town in the Black Forest, published a set of collected tales titled *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten* (Black Forest Village Stories). Auerbach's work met with success in Germany and Austria. By June of 1843 *Sonntagsblätter* literary critic Albert Rimmer (1818-1855) labeled Rank and Auerbach's works representatives of a new literary genre. In an article entitled "Literary Provincialism," Rimmer argued that German national character, unlike that of the "English, Russians, or French," was "splintered into hundreds of provincial spirits."⁹⁰ Thus in order to stimulate the development of German nationhood ("*Nazionalität*"), Rimmer called for the production of artistic and literary works on provincial subjects,

like [writer Ernst] Willkomm portrays for us the Lusatians with their national dualism, [writer Alexandre] Weill portrays Alsace with its Germanic and Romanic antagonism, or Rank [depicts] the German peasant in the Bohemian forest, and likewise as Auerbach illuminates in novels for the literary world the dark Black Forest about which we know nothing except for their wooden clocks. . . .⁹¹

Rimmer believed that the work of Auerbach, Rank, and others should be grouped together in the same literary genre. Shortly thereafter, *Sonntagsblätter* journalists, along with a growing body of critics from other German-language newspapers, dubbed the new genre "Volk literature" or "village stories."

In short order the *Sonntagsblätter* became known to writers as the place to go if they wanted their Volk stories published and to readers as the best source of recent additions to the genre. Inspired by the "villages stories" of Auerbach and Rank, a new generation of young Jewish men, who hailed mostly from the Habsburgs provinces, began trying their hand at the new genre. By the mid-1840s they had achieved popularity across the city. Over the course of the paper's publication, Frankl printed village stories, Volk poetry, and mythological tales by Jewish

⁹⁰ Albert Rimmer, "Der literarische Provinzialismus," *Sonntagsblätter*, July 30, 1843.

⁹¹ Ibid.

writers Moritz Hartmann (1821-1872); Eduard Breier (1811-1886); Adolph Dux (1822-1881); Isidor Heller (1816-1879); Leopold Kompert (1822-1886); Eduard Mautner (1824-1889); Moritz Barach (1818-1888), better known by his pseudonym Märzroth; and Siegfried Kapper (1821-1879). With few exceptions these writers had grown up in the provinces and typically in small towns. Nearly all of these men had been born in Hungary or Bohemia, where they wrote for provincial periodicals in their late teens or early twenties, and later moved to Vienna to study. It was no surprise that many of these men followed a similar literary path. Indeed, some of these individuals had known each other and worked together in the years before their arrival in Vienna. The best example is Hartmann, Heller, Kapper, and Kompert, who were all close friends from their time together in Prague. In Prague they met regularly, along with Adolph Meissner, a non-Jew whose Volk stories Frankl also published, at a local pub to exchange writings.⁹² The group was so close that Kapper later married Hartmann's sister in 1854. Eduard Mautner, too, spent time in Prague and became friendly with Hartmann and Meissner.⁹³

The immediate reason that Jewish writers met with quick success in the field of Volk stories is that they were able to produce stories that were at once “exotic” and “nostalgic” for the Viennese reading public. Most of the writers created stories about their provincial origins, settings that resonated with the Viennese population of the 1840s, which was expanding rapidly due to internal migration from the other provinces. When Adolph Dux wrote tales of Hungary and Kompert produced tales about Bohemia, these stories triggered nostalgic feelings in a broad segment of the Viennese audience. The enthusiastic response encouraged editors to keep running

⁹² Louise Hecht, “Self-Empowerment of Jewish Intellectuals in the Habsburg Monarchy,” *Religions* 8, no 6 (2017), doi:10.3390/rel8060113.

⁹³ Wurzbach, “Mautner, Eduard,” *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, vol. 17, 158.

this kind of content. But Jewish writers could also capture the audience with the “exotic” Jewish themes that they often included in their writing. Christian readers typically had little familiarity with Jewish rituals and practices. Descriptions of Jewish holidays, lifestyles, and mythological tales were common topics for the Volk stories, and their “mysterious” flavor engrossed the non-Jewish public. The combination of nostalgia and exoticism worked well for Jewish Volk story writers, whose work was met with acclaim throughout the city and in other German cities as well. For example, Leopold Kompert’s collection of stories *Aus dem Ghetto* (From the Ghetto), published in 1848, was almost uniformly heralded by critics across the Habsburg Empire and the German states.⁹⁴ Its publication inspired a new body of Jewish writers to begin composing “ghetto stories.”

Besides the popularity of the stories and their ability to produce successful contributions to this genre, Jews had another reason to write Volk literature, one that related to their efforts to portray themselves as “literary men” in local Viennese representation: the Volk story was an ideal venue for portraying its author as a member of the urban professional (and thus male) society par excellence. This point is evidenced by the fact that, although Volk story writers published mostly in newspapers, the perception that they were primarily “story writers” or “poets,” a perception they fostered themselves, exists even today, as most historians overlook the fact that these men wrote for and were employed primarily by newspaper editors. Recent literary scholarship has interpreted Jewish Volk stories according to three main theories, and none of these bodies of scholarship have evaluated these writers from the perspective of the periodical press. Richard Cohen argues that Jewish Volk stories were intended to conjure bittersweet emotions in their

⁹⁴ Jonathan Hess has a good overview of the reception of Kompert’s work. See Jonathan M. Hess, “Leopold Kompert and the Work of Nostalgia: The Cultural Capital of German Jewish Ghetto Fiction,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 97, no. 4 (2007): 576-615.

Jewish readers, allowing them to identify with but also feel distance from their past.⁹⁵ Cohen's argument details what the experience of reading one of these stories might have been for a Jewish reader, but it says little about a non-Jewish audience, which comprised the majority of the *Sonntagsblätter's* readership. Florian Krobb deviates from this approach, and, using the work of Leopold Kompert, places the genre of Jewish Volk stories in a post-colonial context, contending that Jewish writers used Volk literature in an effort to "subvert" Christian literary trends and Volk representations.⁹⁶ However, while this may be true in some cases, it does not account for the wide popularity that the stories received among Christian audiences and the common critical belief that the stories adequately met the needs of Viennese urban audiences who wanted to learn about provincial life, as Albert Rimmer suggested.

Most recently, Jonathan Hess departed from the approaches of both Cohen and Krobb. Instead, Hess suggests that the stories should be read as efforts to locate middle-class values within villages and provincial Jewish families. They were meant to provide evidence to non-Jewish readers that Jews everywhere practiced middle-class habits and aspired to middle-class ways of life. The tales were intended to signal to the urban reading public that provincial life successfully prepared Jews for proper middle-class life in the city. Like Krobb, Hess looks primarily to the work of Leopold Kompert to make his argument. Hess suggests that Kompert's stories were a vehicle through which he was able to publicly frame the village as a quintessential site of middle-class values.⁹⁷ Hess's argument conforms with the efforts, discussed above, of

⁹⁵ Richard I. Cohen, *Jewish Icons: Art and Society in Modern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 154-185.

⁹⁶ Florian Krobb, "Reclaiming the Location: Leopold Kompert's Ghetto Fiction in Post-Colonial Perspective," in *Ghetto Writing: Traditional and Eastern Jewry in German-Jewish Literature from Heine to Hilsenrath*, eds. Anne Fuchs and Florian Krobb (Columbia: Camden House, 1999), 41-53.

⁹⁷ Hess, "Leopold Kompert and the Work of Nostalgia: The Cultural Capital of German Jewish Ghetto Fiction," 576-615.

Sonntagblätter contributors to portray themselves as ideal members of the middle-class society. It also explains why Jews might have been especially attracted to the genre since it allowed them to communicate to a broad Christian audience that *Jewish* families rightly belonged to the middle class.

At the same time, Hess's argument does not deal with another important feature of many of the stories, a feature that clarifies the literary masculinity that *Sonntagsblätter* contributors sought to cultivate. Although the stories that appeared in the *Sonntagsblätter* indeed portray provincial life as educated and bourgeois, this view obscures another aspect of Volk material. The bulk of the material in the stories often depicts a bleak, impoverished, or frightening image of provincial life. This is true even if the inhabitants are educated in the values of the urban middle class. One of Kompert's early contributions to the paper, entitled "The Schnorrer" is a good case in point.⁹⁸ The main goal of the story was to depict Jewish communities as charitable to their impoverished co-religionists. However, the majority of the text focuses on the large numbers of poor, homeless Jews who were said to roam the Bohemian countryside, moving from village to village. According to the text, Bohemia was not only a site of charity; it was also a site of extreme poverty. Many of Kompert's other submissions are similar. In one article, for example, he offered a series of unbelievable tales from Jewish Bohemia about strange deaths, animated bodies, and creepy ghost stories.⁹⁹

Eduard Mautner's article "A Purim in Prague" offers another example of the dark tone often used to depict provincial life. "A Purim in Prague" is framed as a first-hand account of a

⁹⁸ Leopold Kompert, "Die Schnorrer," *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 15, 1846.

⁹⁹ Kompert, "Legende aus dem Ghetto," *Sonntagsblätter*, Sept. 5, 1847.

young man visiting Prague's Jewish ghetto to celebrate the holiday of Purim. The narrator, possibly Mautner himself, begins his journey, after finishing a drink, by walking through the "dark, melancholy houses" of Prague before arriving at the ghetto.¹⁰⁰ Some minutes later he joins a festive party inside one of the houses. He visits two parties that evening. Following Hess's argument, the narrator is concerned to portray the parties as fashionable and middle-class. At the second party, for instance, partygoers are serenaded by "the most modern dance music, waltzes by Lanner and Strauss and quadrilles by Musard," and they dance among "a richly set buffet" and "fragrant, unusual flowers in two precious porcelain vases." Still, however detailed and deliberate these descriptions appear, they are not the subject of the story. The subject of the story begins with the narrator's first and only dance of the evening and his observation about the young woman with whom he dances:

I don't know if all people have a sharp eye for misfortune, for deep, inner suffering of the soul, [but] I do. I spoke not a word to this masked woman, and I saw in her eyes that a deep, gnawing grief wore upon her young, beautiful life.¹⁰¹

A rose then falls from the woman's richly ornamented hair:

Leave it!" she said to me [the narrator, with whom she is dancing], with a melancholy, trembling voice. "Leave it! Like this flower falls from my hair, so fall happiness and hope, one after the other, from the once rich garland of my life. . . ."¹⁰²

The narrator cannot shake this short encounter from his mind, and some time later that night he returns to the house where he danced with the young woman. There, a clandestine observer of a private family scene, he discovers the source of the woman's grief. She married a non-Jewish man against the will of her parents, and, although she has since begged forgiveness,

¹⁰⁰ Eduard Mautner, "A Purim in Prague," *Sonntagsblätter*, March 3, 1844.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

her father will no longer acknowledge her. The story concludes with the narrator's pained statement: "It was my first and only Purim night. On the next, my friends went to the ghetto without me—I could not. I would have imagined behind each mask a broken heart crying."

This story illustrates the complex contradictions at work in the Volk literature genre. The title of this story, "A Purim in Prague," suggests that it might be an ethnographic description. Per Hess, the Jewish homes of the Habsburg provinces that appear in the story are identifiably middle-class. However, written in the hyperbolic language of romanticism, the story is unmistakably painful and dark. Grim themes of this sort appear in much of the Volk literature that was printed in the *Sonntagsblätter*. Along with stories about young love, Josef Rank wrote about strained familial relationships, alcoholism, the dangerous threat of outside intrusion into village life, and painful goodbyes between parents and departing sons.¹⁰³ Jewish writers described the dangers of intermarriage or anxiety about transgressing Jewish law, as well as many of the same themes Rank treated in his work.

As in "A Purim in Prague," Volk stories often depicted a main character who was an urban visitor to the provinces, one who remained distant from provincial life, even if he was born and reared there. For Volk literature written in first person, narrators were almost uniformly represented as such an outsider. These narrators were typically men educated in the city, influenced by literary trends that shaped his depictions of the town life and made him prone to flowery descriptions common to Romantic diction. In addition, it was usually difficult to tell whether these first-person accounts were fictional or actual descriptions of experiences that the real-life author had had. In cases in which the article was not written in first person, the material

¹⁰³ For example, Rank, "Aus dem Böhmerwalde. Indessen starb das Kind der Mutter," *Sonntagsblätter*, Nov. 5, 1843 and Rank, "Die Auswanderung in das Banat 1827," *Sonntagsblätter*, May 28, 1843.

was frequently written as a form of reportage, with the author himself far removed from the setting of the story. That the author-cum-narrator was a literary, urban man who had become professionally—if not emotionally—distant from the provinces is an unmistakable conclusion.

Provincial literature in the *Sonntagsblätter* was not merely a depiction of romanticized, fictionalized provincial life, nor was it exclusively an attempt to make provincial life appear urbanely middle class. It was also a way to separate the scientific, enlightened urban world from the darkened world of the provinces. Similarly, it was a literary technique that allowed the storyteller to adopt the persona of an educated professional vis-à-vis provincial characters. He was emotional, but only when appropriate: when in the throes of compassionate sympathy for a young woman, for example. The stories rarely portrayed provincial life as completely negative, but they nevertheless deployed imagery, motifs, and framing devices that associated provincial life with pain, separation, sadness, and distance. Urban life, especially Viennese life, therefore appeared central, connected, and bright. Meanwhile, journalists were able to fashion themselves as literary men—urban, professional short story writers, rather than less desirable identities as journalists or Jewish migrants from the provinces.

The question regarding why Jewish men in particular were attracted to the genre remains unanswered. The fact that the Jewish provincial upbringing of many of these writers could be read as both nostalgic and exotic for a Christian audience in Vienna is only part of the picture. In comparison to Catholic migrants from the provinces, Vienna-dwelling Jews were doubly foreign in the capital city. Not only were they required to learn the way of life in the imperial seat, but they also faced the need to overcome stereotypes that their non-Jewish peers might have held about their ability to assimilate into literary and professional male circles. Thus for Jews, the effort to depict oneself as familiar with and compassionate to provincial life—as would befit a

law-abiding imperial subject—but also distant from and more highly educated in comparison to village residents was paramount. For Jewish writers, the non-Jewish entertainment press—especially the elite *Sonntagsblätter*—was the ideal venue in which to make this argument since most of the Viennese male literati read it and respected its contributors.

The Volk genre was a convenient way for Jewish men to fashion themselves as permanent and well-integrated men of Vienna who were fully knowledgeable about city life, at a time when Jewish residence in Vienna was hardly guaranteed by law. Portraying themselves outsiders or merely visitors to the provinces, in contrast, magnified their self-image as full-fledged urban residents. Their writing styles and their successful efforts to contribute to an increasingly popular new genre typified the masculinity that middle-class journalists of the Vormärz were supposed to embody: an urban and urbane middle-class man who might have familiarity with the “harsh conditions” of provincial life but had long since departed it for the propriety of the Habsburg capital. The Jewish writers who contributed to the Volk literature genre experienced literary success in Vienna thanks to their ability to negotiate and contribute to the ideal literary masculinity that demanded its practitioners portray themselves as literary, urban men, first and foremost.¹⁰⁴

Frankl, Virtuosos, and Improper Masculinities

From the fall of Napoleon until the events of 1848, Europe witnessed a rise in the number of traveling musicians, vocal performers, and dancers who visited the continent’s performance venues.¹⁰⁵ Solo performance by the 1820s had become an accepted form of entertainment, and

¹⁰⁴ Louise Hecht describes the high degree of integration that many of these young Jewish writers experienced. See Hecht, “Self-Empowerment of Jewish Intellectuals in the Habsburg Monarchy.”

¹⁰⁵ The number of “virtuosic” performers rose during the Restoration period. Recently, Žarko Cvejić offered three major explanations for this development across Europe, particularly in the large German, Austrian, French, and English cities. First, these cities experienced relative political quietude during this period. Second, travel became easier. Finally, technological innovation in instrument quality and design facilitated musical production and

many performers, often quite young, were soon making circuits of Europe's cities everywhere, delighting and astonishing audiences with technical mastery of their art. Critics across Europe were expected to respond to these developments and review these performances.

In the view of *Sonntagsblätter* writers, the hysteria for virtuosic performers, encapsulated in term "Lisztomanie" (mania for pianist Franz Liszt) or "Lind-Enthusiasmus" (enthusiasm for singer Jenny Lind), belied lowbrow enthusiasm rather than an elite interest in pure art. Yet while many of the writers voiced this opinion, Frankl became captivated with making this point in the paper. Frankl first expressed his anxiety about the Viennese public's obsession with virtuosity shortly after the paper's founding. In February 1842 Frankl wrote that the local obsession had reached a "feverish condition by the early 1840s."¹⁰⁶ In the article entitled "Are Virtuosos Artists?," Frankl concluded that virtuosos ought not to be considered artists. They were simply executors of the composer's desires, rather than artistic creators themselves.¹⁰⁷ Frankl applied the term "virtuoso" to any individual who, in his opinion, merely replicated, and often badly at that, the demands of the composer or writer. Frankl believed it was only the composer or writer who was the true artist. He accused the Viennese public of fawning over "talent," rather than hard-worked creativity, and his contributors fell in line with this position.

Frankl's argument was hardly original among contemporary music journals across Europe. In "Are Virtuosos Artists?" Frankl was rehearsing an argument that had already begun to

education. See Cvejić, *The Virtuoso as Subject: The Reception of Instrumental Virtuosity, c. 1815-1850* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), 12, 13. Michael Gamper argued that during this period many individuals also began to rely on traveling performance and ticket sales as their primary means of income, which became possible as the press advertised upcoming performances and audience size grew. See Gamper, "Der Virtuose und das Publikum: Kulturkritik im Kunstdiskurs des 19. Jahrhunderts," in *Virtuosität: Kult und Krise der Artistik in Literatur und Kunst der Moderne*, ed. Hans-Georg von Arburg (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2006), 70.

¹⁰⁶ Frankl, "Sind Virtuosen Künstler?" *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 6, 1842.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

gain traction in the best journals in Paris, Leipzig, and London. The rise in the number of traveling instrumental performers coincided with the emergence of the modern music journal (and thus the music critic) roughly between 1815 and 1848, and by the 1840s critical opposition to the “popular quality” of performance was ubiquitous in music criticism.¹⁰⁸ Two years before the founding of the *Sonntagsblätter*, Richard Wagner wrote an article on the topic published in Paris for the *Revue et Gazette Musicale*, which was at that time the preeminent Parisian music journal.¹⁰⁹ Wagner, like Frankl would later, suggested that the virtuoso’s only significance was in his ability to perfectly articulate the creative vision of the composer.¹¹⁰ Wagner and a host of other critics sought to favorably contrast the “independence of the composer” to the “virtuoso’s trade,” imbedding in these metaphors his beliefs about the nature of their respective artistic tasks.¹¹¹ As Žarko Cvejić has pointed out, most critics did not consider virtuosos bad by definition but instead appraised them according to a number of arbitrary categories related to their masculinity, their ability to adequately “interpret” a piece, and their capacity to master and

¹⁰⁸ On the topic of instrumental virtuosity in mid-century Europe, see Susan Bernstein, *Virtuosity of the Nineteenth Century: Performing Music and Language in Heine, Liszt, and Baudelaire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998); Cvejić, *The Virtuoso as Subject: The Reception of Instrumental Virtuosity, c. 1815-1850*; Dana Gooley, “The Battle against Instrumental Virtuosity in the Early Nineteenth Century,” in *Franz Liszt and His World*, ed. Christopher J. Gibbs and Dana Gooley (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 73-111; Paul Metzner, *Crescendo of the Virtuoso: Spectacle, Skill, and Self-Promotion in Paris during the Age of Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); and Hans-Georg von Arburg, ed., *Virtuosität: Kult und Krise der Artistik in Literatur und Kunst der Moderne* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2006).

¹⁰⁹ Originally published as “Du métier de virtuose et de l’indépendance des compositeurs,” *Revue et Gazette musicale* (Paris), Oct. 18, 1840. It was later written in German and published as “Der Virtuos und der Künstler,” *Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen*, by Richard Wagner, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Verlag von E. W. Fritzsche, 1871), 207-222. The French and German texts, however, have significant differences, though the arguments presented remained similar. I have referenced the French text.

¹¹⁰ On the masculinization of the image of the virtuoso, see Cvejić, *The Virtuoso as Subject: The Reception of Instrumental Virtuosity, c. 1815-c. 1850*, 214-261. Cvejić argues that the 1840s image of the virtuoso was by definition male, even when female performers like Clara Wieck Schumann and Marie Moke Pleyel were under review.

¹¹¹ See *ibid.*, 109-113.

control a musical instrument (one form of masculine expression).¹¹² A key component of this debate was critical anxiety about the popularization of music and the desire of elite critics to distance themselves from popular movements.¹¹³

Anti-virtuosity, like the decline of German comedy, was a core position of the *Sonntagsblätter*. Led by Frankl, a host of journalists, including regular contributors Adolph Dux and Albert Rimmer and the paper's music critic Josef Plank, wrote prolifically on the topic between 1842 and early 1848.¹¹⁴ In the only scholarly analysis of the *Sonntagsblätter*'s position on virtuosity, Barbara Boisits argues that the campaign against virtuosity was one of the stances that made the journal the most important venue for music criticism in Vienna before 1848.¹¹⁵ This is undoubtedly true. But this was not a debate about virtuosity qua virtuosity. The tendency to celebrate the composer at the expense the "popular" virtuoso established a familial link between the work of the composer and the work of the critic. It likewise drew distance between

¹¹² Ibid., 93-148, 223-235. In the 1840s, much of the debate coalesced around the major performers Franz Liszt (pianist) and Nicolò Paganini (violinist). There is a significant body of scholarship on the topic of Liszt as virtuoso. For a selection of this scholarship, see Bernstein, *Virtuosity of the Nineteenth Century*; Dana Gooley, *The Virtuoso Liszt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); and Cécile Reynaud, "Berlioz, Liszt, and the Question of Virtuosity," in *Berlioz: Past, Present, Future: Bicentenary Essays*, ed. Peter Bloom (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2003), 105-122.

¹¹³ Gamper, "Der Virtuose und das Publikum: Kulturkritik im Kunstdiskurs des 19. Jahrhunderts," 60-82.

¹¹⁴ Examples of articles on virtuosity in the *Sonntagsblätter* appear through the entire period of the newspaper's publication, until its transition to a different kind of newspaper after March 1848. Frankl often penned pieces on the subject, but the newspaper's other writers were also enthusiastic about the issue. For a selection of articles on virtuosity, see Albert, "Das Virtuosenenthum," *Sonntagsblätter*, March 2, 1845; Adolph Dux, "Josi, der Geiger, Genrebild aus dem ungarischen Volksleben," *Sonntagsblätter*, Sept. 6, 1846; Dux, "Von den Virtuosen in der Musik," *Sonntagsblätter*, March 7, 1847; F, "Unverbürgte Nachrichten aus der Musikwelt," *Sonntagsblätter*, Sept. 10, 1843; Frankl, "Beethoven und Virtuosen," *Sonntagsblätter*, Dec. 25, 1842; Frankl, "Sonnenfinsterniß und Luftballon, Franz, Franziska und Jenni," *Sonntagsblätter*, April 26, 1846; Frankl, "Töchter und Musik," *Sonntagsblätter*, May 15, 1842; Frankl, "Von den Virtuosen," *Sonntagsblätter*, March 8, 1846; Frankl, "Wie das Schrifttum im Nachtheil ist," *Sonntagsblätter*, March 1, 1846; Nordmann, "Holzschnitte zu Zeitfragen: Virtuosen und Enthusiasten," *Sonntagsblätter*, May 5, 1844; Josef Plank, "Für Musik," *Sonntagsblätter*, March 27, 1847; Albert Rimmer, "Künstler und Virtuosen," *Sonntagsblätter*, July 6, 1845; and Vincenz Siegländer, "Humoristische und sehr ernsthafte Skizzen aus der Mappe eines Malers geschnitten: der malende Virtuose," *Sonntagsblätter*, Feb. 25, 1844.

¹¹⁵ Boisits, "Die Bedeutung der *Sonntagsblätter* Ludwig August Frankls für die Wiener Musikkritik," 180.

the critic and popular taste.¹¹⁶ In the same way that the *Sonntagsblätter* lamented the cheap taste of poor comedians and lesser critics, inveighing against virtuosos had the goal of elevating the *Sonntagsblätter*'s position with respect to an audience charmed by mere talent, placing *Sonntagsblätter* critics on level with composers, the "true artists."

Frankl was the obvious muscle behind this campaign, and his decision to promote anti-virtuosity immediately affiliated the journal with the most elite music journals across European cities. Not only did the *Revue et Gazette Musicale* in Paris object to virtuosity, but so did a host of other papers: *La France Musicale* in Paris; the *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung*, in Leipzig; Robert Schumann's *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, also in Leipzig; *The Musical World*, in London; and the *Harmonicon*, in London.¹¹⁷ This strategy appears to have had the desired effect on the *Sonntagsblätter*'s status as an elite journal as it was singled out as one of the few Viennese critical journals to have international worth.¹¹⁸ Frankl's support for this project underscored the bid made by *Sonntagsblätter* critics to be viewed as proper literary men in an international community of literati by reinforcing the notion that audience members moved by virtuosity ranked below a critic who had "true" knowledge of art.

In expressing an anti-virtuosic opinion, *Sonntagsblätter* critics were able to criticize non-middle-class and other "improper" masculinities. Barbara Boisits points out that Frankl associated virtuosity with childishness or masculine immaturity and femininity. Indeed, Frankl excoriated mothers for forcing their ungifted daughters to practice the piano for hours, and the

¹¹⁶ Here I am inspired both by Boisits and by Michael Gamper, who argues that some critics linked "vulgar" performances with "vulgar" audiences. See Gamper, "Der Virtuose und das Publikum: Kulturkritik im Kunstdiskurs des 19. Jahrhunderts, 60-82.

¹¹⁷ Cvejić, *The Virtuoso as Subject: The Reception of Instrumental Virtuosity, c. 1815-c. 1850*, 93-148.

¹¹⁸ Hanslick, *Aus Meinem Leben*, vol. 1, 102 and Kapper (pseu. Dr. Rakonitzky), "Ludwig August Frankl," in *Libussa. Jahrbuch für das Jahr 1850*, 416-418.

Sonntagsblätter frequently ran tongue-in-cheek announcements about prodigy children on tour.¹¹⁹ *Sonntagsblätter* writers believed that in most cases virtuosos were amateurs who lacked proper training in their art form. Exceptions were made only for great performers like Liszt and Paganini.¹²⁰ Frankl, moreover, associated virtuosity with opportunism and lowbrow taste. In an 1843 satirical poem Frankl parodied a father giving advice to his son about finding a career.¹²¹ When the son complained to this father that he was unable to write or compose music because he lacked focus, the father recommended that his son become a virtuoso. When the son asked how one might become a virtuoso, the father argued that the way to virtuosity was to avoid studying or working too hard. Virtuosity, he claimed, can be developed by traveling internationally, going to concerts, and giving out free tickets to your performances. This list, written tongue-in-cheek, drew attention to what Frankl viewed as the cheap methods by which virtuosos and their crafty promoters created a fan base and achieved popularity. In other words, according to Frankl, virtuosity uses cronyism—like handing out free tickets—rather than real effort as a means to social mobility. In associating virtuosity with amateurism, childishness, femininity, and opportunism, writers who were anti-virtuosic articulated and advocated for social stratification that privileged the educated or “mature” man, who could be identified by their elite literary and artistic taste.

¹¹⁹ The journal once announced that a concert featuring a young virtuoso who played the violin while balancing on a tightrope had taken place in Königstadt. See Anon., “Musikalische Signale. Modernes Virtuosenenthum,” *Sonntagsblätter*, April 7, 1844.

¹²⁰ Boisits cites violinist Henri Vieuxtemps, beloved by Alfred Julius Becher, a long-time critic at the *Sonntagsblätter*, as another example of an “acceptable” virtuoso. She also includes sisters Teresa and Marie Milanollo, who were favorites of both Becher and Frankl. See Boisits, “Die Bedeutung der *Sonntagsblätter* Ludwig August Frankls für die Wiener Musikkritik,” 163, 164. Frankl also praised the talents of opera singer Jenny Lind, while nevertheless expressing his opinion that she was merely a virtuoso, not an artist. This case is discussed at length in Chapter Two.

¹²¹ Frankl, “Werde Virtuose, Sohn!” *Sonntagsblätter*, Jan. 15, 1843.

The *Sonntagsblätter* took up other positions that sought to distinguish between highbrow and lowbrow art and in turn privileged a specific form of middle-class masculinity. Several of the *Sonntagsblätter* writers satirized street music for the “degenerating” effect it had on musical production and its corruption of the sonic quality of the city’s landscape.¹²² A number of other articles identified street music with “gypsies” (*Zigeuner*), a strategy that exoticized street music and placed it firmly outside the boundaries of the middle-class, German concert hall. In an 1846 short story, Adolph Dux, a young Hungarian Jewish man who wrote several articles on “gypsies” for the *Sonntagsblätter*, even managed to link together the question of “gypsy music” and “virtuosic music.” In his “genre portrait” Dux compared the music of a fictional leader of a gypsy band to the music of a virtuoso who had been hired to entertain the daughter of a great baron who lived at a local castle.¹²³ (Both musicians were men). In Dux’s account the gypsy knew that his music was superior to the music of the virtuoso, which he described as a music that “is sick and neither laughs nor cries.” But in spite of his musical superiority music, the gypsy’s fortune was not good either: he spent most of his day staring wistfully at the castle and its beautiful resident, to whom the gypsy had no access. In both cases the musicians were failures. The virtuoso, while permitted to perform in elite spaces, filled these spaces with mediocre sound. The gypsy’s music might have been vigorous, but he was condemned to play only in the village,

¹²² In one article, the contributor, who signs only with the initials DIS, related the following anecdote (which appears to be autobiographical): upon sitting down to begin his work for the day, a writer is immediately brought to quick “despair” by the noise of a street barrel organist outside his window. When the writer fails to muffle the noise by closing the window and then stuffing cotton in his ears, he peers outside only to discover that another street musician had joined the first! It is no wonder that the story began with a parody from Goethe’s poem the “Sorcerer’s Apprentice”: “Woe is me! Woe is me! And yet another and still another!” See DIS, “Die Leiemänner in Wien,” *Sonntagsblätter*, July 3, 1842. On representations of barrel organists, see also Richard Rotter, “Gruppen und Gestalten aus dem Wienerleben. Eine Verkäuferin. Ein Bildermädchen. Eine Gattin,” *Sonntagsblätter*, Dec. 13, 1846 and Friedrich Uhl, “Gruppen und Gestalten aus dem Wiener Leben. Der Mann mit dem Leierkasten,” *Sonntagsblätter*, April 26, 1846.

¹²³ Dux, “Josi, der Geiger, Genrebild aus dem ungarischen Volksleben,” *Sonntagsblätter*, Sept. 6, 1846.

never before a “real” audience, and thus he could never earn the privilege of being reviewed by a professional music critic.

Similar to the question about the future of German comedy, the *Sonntagsblätter* position on virtuosity both aligned with the imperial censorship law and reinforced its hierarchy based on gender and education, while also allowing the paper’s journalists to call for expanding political power to the male middle class. On one side, Frankl, Dux, and others used the language of anti-virtuosity to demonstrate publicly that they belonged to the “educated” ranks denoted in censorship law and that they agreed with the hierarchy the law outlined. On the other side, by raising an issue that appeared in journals around European cities and was espoused by important middle-class elites, the journalists could also claim affiliation with growing liberal movements and middle-class institutions internationally. They even demonstrated their own ability to thwart the restrictions of censorship by articulating a good knowledge of debates that appeared in other European papers.

Pioneers of the Literary Man: Jewish Integration into Literary Life

This chapter has recounted several of the most important strategies that *Sonntagsblätter* journalists successfully deployed to develop public personas as “literary men,” that is, educated members of the male middle-class, who believed they were qualified to rights of citizenship and state power. This account focused on the efforts of both Jews and non-Jews at the *Sonntagsblätter*, where Jewish editor Ludwig Frankl, published the work of both groups on a weekly basis. As the *Sonntagsblätter* acquired its reputation as one of the city’s most elite and tasteful papers, its contributors reaped the benefits. Frankl became known for launching the careers of men who would become major players in Vienna’s journalistic and literary scene, including both Jews and non-Jews. A later report lists twenty-seven names of young writers

whom Frankl supported and who eventually became important figures in the city. Of those, nearly half were Jews.¹²⁴

In 1840s Vienna self-promotion as a literary man could put an aspiring writer in good standing with peers around the city. The codes of masculinity with which it is associated—distancing oneself from provincial life, promoting the values and worth of German male society, expressing distaste for “lowbrow,” or “feminine” and “immature” performers and solidarity with “true artists”—was an effective way to gain entry into Vienna’s social and political world, for Jews and non-Jews alike. However, as the case of the *Sonntagsblätter* makes clear, for Jews self-fashioning as a literary man was best done through the periodical press, which they had an easier time accessing and through which they occasionally earned money at a time when employment was difficult for Jews in the Habsburg capital. Christians, on the other hand, had numerous fields in which they could self-fashion in this way, for instance, as professors, theater directors, or civil servants, positions that were difficult if not impossible for Jews to attain. Because the *Sonntagsblätter* became the key venue in Vienna that promoted the image of the literary man and because the *Sonntagsblätter*, moreover, came to be associated with the rise of Jewish journalists in the city, the Jewish journalists of the paper played a crucial role in transforming the norms that defined the “literary man” into what contemporaries believed ought to be standard behaviors and practices of the best journalists of Vienna in the 1840s.

The *Sonntagsblätter* did not merely replicate existing forms of masculinity. It also created the very image that it perpetuated, the attitudes and behaviors that came to be associated with “literary masculinity” in journalism in 1840s Vienna. The *Sonntagsblätter* was a leader in determining perceptions about how journalists ought to behave in this period. These perceptions

¹²⁴ Siegfried Kapper (pseu. Dr. Rakonitzky), “Ludwig August Frankl,” in *Libussa. Jahrbuch für das Jahr 1850*, 417.

emerged out of the journalists' need to both support state censorship and critique the old social orders upheld by the state in favor of liberalism. The image of the "literary man," modeled by Frankl, his co-religionists at the *Sonntagsblätter*, and a number of their Christian colleagues in Vienna, became the most efficient means by which to achieve these goals. Likewise, it became the most well-known set of norms with which "the journalist" was associated in the 1840s.

Chapter Two

The Popular Man: Moritz Gottlieb Saphir and the *Humorist's* Feminine Content

If the *Sonntagsblätter* was for a time Vienna's most elite paper in the field of art and literary criticism, Moritz Gottlieb Saphir's paper the *Humorist*, founded in 1837, was the most popular. The paper was popular in two senses. First, it had a relatively high circulation of between 1,500 and 2,000 subscribers, an enviable number for Vormärz papers in Vienna. Second, Saphir chose to print not only serious theater criticism, but also a wide selection of "popular" or "lowbrow" journalism, ranging from celebrity gossip to jokes and riddles to satire and to fashion pieces. If the former version of popularity gained Saphir a modicum of respect from fellow Viennese journalists, the latter form of "lowbrow" popularity created problems for Saphir's reputation in the Habsburg capital where journalistic masculinity informed by serious and elite literary production reigned supreme.

Moritz Gottlieb Saphir (1795-1858) pursued a version of masculinity that differed from the elite literary masculinity, epitomized by Ludwig Frankl and the *Sonntagsblätter* contributors. Instead of aiming to restrict his newspaper to an elite male audience, Saphir made the decision to attract as many readers to the *Humorist* as possible. This meant, for one thing, appealing to women. While this strategy resulted in his having more commercial success than other editors, it also meant that Saphir's political credentials as a liberal and as a reputable man were sometimes questioned by fellow members of the Viennese literary and journalistic world for whom popularity was anathema to liberalism. Saphir countered this suspicion by launching an effort to demonstrate that literary and artistic merit could coexist with his popularizing strategy at the paper. Key to this effort was Saphir's relentless work to suppress and restrict female production in the literary sphere, even while he encouraged female consumption of literature and journalism.

The form of masculinity in journalism exemplified by Saphir, which I have termed the “popular man,” combined an approach that sought commercial growth by incorporating humor and lowbrow reporting with harsh, sometimes defensive theater criticism and the imposition of tight boundaries on female and lower-class male production in the public sphere. Though Saphir was a unique figure in Vienna, this form of masculinity was not without precedent. Like other pioneers of satire and sharp wit in Europe, Saphir had been born to a religious Jewish family and eventually converted to Protestantism—in Saphir’s case later in life at the age of thirty-seven, only five years before he founded the *Humorist*. Saphir had become friendly with Heinrich Heine and Ludwig Börne, both men of Jewish heritage who embraced satire as one of their main methods of communication and public speech. He also influenced several young Jewish writers, most notably Leipzig-resident Eduard Maria Oettinger, who founded the popular *Leipziger Charivari*, a newspaper styled on the *Humorist*, as well as Moritz Barach, better known by his pseudonym Jakob Märzroth, a Vienna-based poet who learned to incorporate humor in his work while contributing to the *Humorist*. Unlike Ludwig Frankl and many of the *Sonntagsblätter*’s Jewish contributors, Saphir belonged to an older generation of Jewish writers. Born in the eighteenth century, Saphir faced greater obstacles as a Jew than did those Jewish men who moved to Vienna in the late 1830s and 1840s, when the Habsburg state was more amenable to Jewish residence in the city. Saphir modeled decision-making more common to the earlier generation of Jewish men: he used satire and at times ruthless personal attacks to defend his own social position and, ultimately, he chose to convert so that he would not face state-sponsored discrimination against Jews (though his conversion did not spare him from social discrimination).¹

¹ See Deborah Hertz’s article on this generation of German Jewish men. She contends that this generation tended to convert more often, sometimes experienced depression and social isolation, and often engaged in combative

Saphir's popular masculinity in journalism became an important form of masculinity in Vienna, facing off against the serious and elite literary version of the *Sonntagsblätter* and other newspapers. While Jewish journalists at the *Sonntagsblätter* typically experienced successful integration into elite middle-class society in Vienna, Saphir's reception in these circles was more mixed. On one side, because of his image as a "popular" man, Saphir faced criticism from his literary peers and occasional outright exclusion from male literary groups. In some cases this criticism was accompanied by anti-Jewish insults, direct and indirect. On the other side, Saphir became a fixture in Vienna. He hosted humorous musical "academies," during which he read satirical poetry and hired Europe's most famous performers to declaim or sing, and the academies were widely attended and beloved by his fellow critics. Likewise, it was evident that, despite the reputation of the paper, most literary men of the city read the *Humorist* and respected Saphir's opinions about local theater productions.

The tension between Saphir's supporters and his detractors demonstrates that the preferred literary masculinity of Vormärz Viennese journalists, as epitomized at the *Sonntagsblätter*, could in fact accommodate some level of difference. Despite his popular reputation, Saphir's efforts to continually push for restricting female production in the public sphere were a successful counterweight to his equally strong efforts to print "lowbrow" or "feminine" material, allowing him integration, albeit contested, into literary male circles in the city and forcing the literary masculinity in vogue to be more flexible. Moreover, the relative success Saphir experienced also reveals that even Jews with non-normative gender practices

arguments between themselves as a result of anti-Jewish discrimination. Her research focuses on German Jewish men of note in Berlin, with an emphasis on Heinrich Heine. Deborah Hertz, "Männlichkeit und Melancholie im Berlin der Biedermeierzeit," in *Deutsch-Jüdische Geschichte als Geschlechtergeschichte*, eds. Kirsten Heinsohn und Stefanie Schüler-Springorum (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2006), 276-292.

could gain respect and acceptance in non-Jewish elite male circles during this period in Viennese history. However, because Saphir differed from other men—in encouraging lowbrow or female readership and publishing “popular” journalism—he had to work doubly hard to “counteract” these actions by constantly re-articulating his desire to lock women out of literary and artistic production. While Saphir enjoyed limited acceptance as a popular journalist in Vienna, it was simply much easier for Jews of the time to conform to the well-known norms of the “literary” masculinity as did the majority of Jewish men who wrote for the *Sonntagsblätter*.

By the time that Saphir was granted permission by the Habsburg state to found the *Humorist* in 1837, his Europe-wide notoriety had already gained him a significant following. Born in 1795 in a small town outside Buda to poor Jewish parents, Saphir initially pursued religious studies in Pressburg and Prague as a young man. After some time in Prague, he made the acquaintance of priest, with whom he began to discuss secular subjects. Shortly thereafter, Saphir made the decision to leave Prague for Pest, close to his hometown. In Pest Saphir worked as a contributor for the newspaper *Pannonia*, while publishing short stories in Yiddish, and he was eventually able to move to Vienna in the 1820s. Upon his arrival in Vienna, Saphir secured a job as a contributor and theater critic for Adolf Bäuerle at the popular *Wiener Theaterzeitung*.² By the early 1820s, Bäuerle was indisputably the most successful entertainment paper editor, and the *Theaterzeitung* had had the highest number of subscribers among all entertainment papers since its founding 1806. Despite his paper’s commercial success, Bäuerle was widely scorned by the city’s literati for being a “sycophant” of the repressive Habsburg state as playwright Eduard

² Moritz Gottlieb Saphir, *Meine Memoiren und anderes* (Leipzig: Verlag von Philipp Reclam jun., 1887?), 1, 41-45.

Bauernfeld would label him.³ Bäuerle, many of Vienna's elite writers believed, cared little about politics or art and had no qualms kowtowing to censorship officials if it would benefit his paper.

Saphir's work at the paper quickly marked him as a polemical figure. His reviews were biting, exaggerated, and acerbic—but they also attracted readers. In a short span he was printing articles in several other papers as well. In spite of his popularity, Saphir rapidly poisoned his relationship with Vienna's theatrical and literary elite, and he decided to leave Vienna for Berlin in 1825. Once in Berlin he was granted permission in 1826 to edit the *Berliner Schnellpost*, wherein he immediately made it clear that he would not take a gentler critical approach than he had in Vienna, and he proceeded to satirize local celebrities and institutions and to offer the same kind of cutting reviews he had in the Habsburg capital. Although the tactic earned him few supporters among the elite literary crowd, his paper was so popular among local readers and, surprisingly, in the royal family, that he was given permission to start another paper in 1827, which he entitled the *Berliner Courier*.⁴ Not long after, Saphir became embroiled in one of the biggest disputes he had yet experienced when he insulted the widely loved young singer Henriette Sontag. The conflict led to a prolonged “pamphlet war,” during which he lost the favor of Friedrich Wilhelm III and decided to move to Munich.⁵ In Munich Saphir continued his journalistic career in a similarly inflammatory manner as the editor of several satirical papers.⁶ In

³ Eduard Bauernfeld, *Aus Alt- und Neu-Wien*, in *Gesammelte Schriften von Bauernfeld*, by Eduard Bauernfeld, vol. 12 (Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1873), 139.

⁴ Jefferson Chase, *Inciting Laughter: The Development of “Jewish Humor” in 19th Century German Culture* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000), 35, 48, 49; Mary Lee Townsend, *Forbidden Laughter* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1992), 35, 36, and Constantin Wurzbach, “Saphir, Moritz,” *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, vol. 28 (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1874), 213-232.

⁵ On this incident, see Chase, *Inciting Laughter*, 20-63; Saphir, *Meine Memoiren und anderes*, 4; and Townsend, *Forbidden Laughter*, 40, 41.

⁶ Saphir, *Meine Memoiren und anderes*, 4.

1832 Saphir once again made the decision to pursue his work in another city, and he moved to Paris, where he met and befriended Ludwig Börne and Heinrich Heine, fellow Jewish writers and satirists with whom Saphir's contemporaries and historians would long associate Saphir.⁷ That same year Saphir converted to Protestantism, a decision he satirized in his memoirs.⁸ Only two years later he obtained permission to return to Vienna, where he quickly took up his old post at the *Theaterzeitung*.

By 1834 Saphir's reputation had grown to European proportions. It was reported that when the public found out that he was reengaged by Adolf Bäuerle, the number of subscribers to the *Theaterzeitung* shot up from 3,000 to 4,000 practically overnight.⁹ Three years after his return to Vienna, Saphir was finally given a concession to open his own entertainment paper. Fittingly entitled the *Humorist*, an indicator of the tone the newspaper would take, the first issue of the paper appeared on January 2, 1837, headlined by a satirical sketch penned by Saphir himself. The paper would become one of the longest running papers of the mid-century—in print from 1837 to 1862, surviving Saphir by four years. Saphir remained the editor until his death. The *Humorist* was usually four pages long and ran four to six times weekly, depending on whatever annual contract Saphir had negotiated with the state. For the first time in his life, Saphir also decided to settle permanently in a city. Except for periods of prolonged travel, undertaken to cultivate relationships with European writers and artistic celebrities, and a short stint in Baden bei Wien during the tumultuous events of 1848 (for which he was skewered by the radical press),

⁷ The best examples of this historiographical association are Chase, *Inciting Laughter* and Townsend, *Forbidden Laughter*. See also Lothar Kahn's article for a brief overview of the friendship: Lothar Kahn, "Mortiz Gottlieb Saphir," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 20, no. 1 (1975): 247-257.

⁸ Saphir, *Meine Memoiren und anderes*, 15, 16.

⁹ Anon., "Saphir und die Wiener Zeitung," in *Bilder-Conversations-Lexikon für das deutsche Volk* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1837), n. p.

Saphir remained in Vienna.

From its first issue the *Humorist* proved to be cut from the same cloth as Saphir's previous editorial initiatives. Like other entertainment papers the *Humorist* published a range of genres, including short stories, criticism, industrial reports, and poetry, but the *Humorist* also ran significantly more satirical and tongue-in-cheek material than any other extant paper in Vienna. Indeed, the inaugural issue began with one of Saphir's trademark humorous sketches: a multipage extended joke, often intended to poke fun at city life, city or state institutions, or a specific individual. Saphir had already pioneered this sort of writing in Berlin and Munich, and his readers had come to expect it. The *Humorist* also ran *Tagesneuigkeiten*, "daily news," a genre of reportage that, unlike its name suggests, functioned less as a daily news column than as a social column for celebrity and local gossip. Saphir sometimes titled this the "tutti frutti" column.

The majority of scholarly work that has focused on Saphir and his literary oeuvre deals with Saphir's brand of humor while he was in Berlin. Jefferson Chase, who wrote about Jewish humor in the nineteenth-century German context, argues that Saphir, along with Ludwig Börne and Heinrich Heine, were paradigmatic Jewish jokesters in the first third of the century. Chase contends that in the German-speaking context, non-Jews often held derogatory views about "Jewish humor" and sought to distinguish appropriate (non-Jewish) "*Humor*" from inappropriate (Jewish) "*Witz*." Saphir responded to antisemitic accusations that he wrote only vulgar or meaningless *Judenwitz* by claiming that the tools and methods of *Judenwitz* comprised his genre of specialty. Thus instead of retreating from the public sphere or changing his style when he was met with insults, Saphir doubled down on his brand of satirical humor.¹⁰ Chase draws upon the

¹⁰ Chase, *Inciting Laughter*, 20-63.

work of Sander Gilman, who wrote that nineteenth-century non-Jews often believed that the language and modes of writing used by Jews was degenerate and inappropriate for public speech. In a short passage on Saphir, Gilman underscores Chase's argument that non-Jewish local elites in Berlin, incensed by Saphir's satire against them, used antisemitic stereotypes of Jewish speech to attack Saphir. Although Saphir eventually converted, Gilman argues that he never changed his satirical or humorous style of writing as an effort to escape the antisemitic assumptions levied on him by critics.¹¹ Finally, Mary Townsend attempts to make sense of Saphir's humor in the context of a range of Jewish and non-Jewish humorous writers of the period. She does not deal with anti-Jewishness—in fact, she notes that in Saphir's biggest scandal, anti-Jewishness does not seem to have played a role. Instead, she argues that Saphir's style was characterized by silly and largely apolitical mockery of local cultural institutions, like the theater, and personal disputes between Saphir and local literati. She contends that Saphir often “indulged in innocent humor for the sake of entertaining.”¹²

Although these scholars convincingly demonstrate that Saphir adopted a distinctive style of humor and reputation for caustic attacks during his stay in Berlin from 1825 to 1829 and that he experienced anti-Jewish abuse in response to these techniques, none of the scholars discuss Saphir's work upon his return to Vienna. Meanwhile, conditions in Vienna overlapped and diverged from those Saphir faced in Berlin. Although Prussia had strong censorship regulations that had many of the same restrictions that applied in the Habsburg Empire, censorship in the Habsburg Empire was much tighter, and political commentary and personal attacks had to be made in a more circuitous manner. More importantly, it was only after his return to the city in

¹¹ Sander Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 146, 147.

¹² Townsend, *Forbidden Laughter*, 9, 15-68, 175-177.

1834 that Saphir embarked upon what would become the most stable, commercially successful, and prolific period of his life with the founding of the *Humorist* in 1837. In addition, throughout his career Saphir wrote more than humorous pieces or ad hominem attacks, a fact that is especially evident in his work at the *Humorist*, where he contributed prolific theater criticism and poetry and where his hand as an editor shaped the paper from cover to cover. This material must be incorporated into an understanding of Saphir's literary goals and strategies.

None of the scholarship considers the role that masculinity played in shaping Saphir's decision-making or reputation, but the expectations placed on journalists, middle-class public figures, and especially Jewish men to conform to specific codes of masculinity were stringent and in frequent flux, as discussed in Chapter One. Saphir's version of masculinity departed from the norm in Vienna, which was set by journalists like Ludwig Frankl. Still, the popular masculinity that Saphir practiced in Vienna shaped the cultural and political world of the Vormärz professional middle class. Without exploring the question of popular masculinity, it is difficult to understand what Saphir and his newspaper signified for the Viennese public.

Cultivating a Female Readership (and Other Uses for Female Content)

In a number of ways, the *Humorist* was indebted to older examples of Viennese journalism, as Saphir aimed to borrow models of journalism that had gained acceptance in the city's male middle class. Both the "*klatschmaschine*" (gossip machine), as one disparaging critic called the *Theaterzeitung* (1806-1848), and the *Wiener Zeitschrift* (1816-1848), served as models for the *Humorist*. Like both older papers, Saphir chose to write in a tone more familiar than highbrow. One way of achieving this tone was the editorial habit of speaking directly to the paper's audience members. Adolf Bäuerle at the *Theaterzeitung* and Friedrich Witthauer (1793-1846), editor of the *Wiener Zeitschrift*, had long before begun addressing their "*Leser*" (male

readers) directly, by way of second-person, informal comments. In the *Theaterzeitung* and the *Wiener Zeitschrift*, the use of such direct addresses fostered a familiar, colloquial tone, which made the experience of reading their papers different from reading more formal newspapers and texts. Saphir went significantly beyond the efforts of Bäuerle and Witthauer in speaking directly to his male readers. Saphir began frequently talking to his Leser in his signature humorous columns, which were already written in the slightly conspiratorial language of local, insider humor for which he became known, and the *Humorist's* use of the direct address to male readers surpassed its usage in the *Theaterzeitung* and the *Wiener Zeitschrift* soon after the *Humorist's* founding.¹³

The editors of the *Theaterzeitung* and the *Wiener Zeitschrift* were not only interested in the male reader. Both papers had begun addressing the female reader (*Leserin*, pl. *Leserinnen*), a discursive strategy that was nearly unknown to the Viennese public before the founding of these papers.¹⁴ From 1806 and 1816, respectively, the *Theaterzeitung* and the *Wiener Zeitschrift* had also been tailoring some content to female readers. This was especially the case at the *Wiener Zeitschrift*. The mission statement of the *Wiener Zeitschrift*—originally the *Wiener Moden-Zeitung* (Viennese Fashion Paper)—addressed both male and female readers, and it specifically noted that the paper would cover women's fashion.¹⁵ From its first issue the *Wiener Zeitschrift* began publishing full-page colored prints of women dressed in the latest “Viennese Style.” This

¹³ The *Wiener Zeitung*, the official newspaper of the Habsburg regime, surpassed all the local papers in its usage of the word “Leser,” but this was largely because the word was used in book advertisements, which none of the other papers had permission to print. For this reason, I have omitted it from my discussion here.

¹⁴ The *Wiener Zeitung* also used the word “Leserinnen” in the context of book advertisements. I have omitted this from my analysis as discussed in the previous footnote.

¹⁵ “Plan und Zweck des Wochenblattes,” *Wiener Zeitschrift* (Vienna), Jan. 4, 1816.

illustrative feature would appear weekly for the duration of the *Zeitschrift*'s publication.¹⁶

When Saphir founded the *Humorist*, the *Wiener Zeitschrift* had already been in print for twenty-one years. It became apparent that Saphir's editorial attention to the female reader would not only parallel the methods used in the *Wiener Zeitschrift* but would also quickly eclipse them. From 1837 until the lifting of censorial restrictions in 1848, Saphir directly addressed his female readers 263 times, strikingly more than did the *Wiener Zeitschrift* (84 times) and the *Theaterzeitung* (38 times) during the same period. Even more noticeable than the use of the direct address were the *Humorist*'s "women's columns," which appeared in the paper from its first issue. Inside these women's columns—entitled alternatively the "Women's Salon," the "Style Bazaar," and the "Women and Fashion Courier," the *Humorist* ran content that featured or was addressed to women, girls, fictional female characters, and femininity in the abstract. Short stories were notable in this regard. Indeed, although most stories ostensibly showcased male protagonists, female characters were often more central to the stories' themes, messages, and plots.

In both the *Wiener Zeitschrift* and the *Theaterzeitung*, direct addresses to the papers' female readers were usually accompanied by a possessive adjective and nearly always a formulaic one, like "my fair female readers." Saphir maintained this custom. "My female readers," "fair female readers," "dear female readers," and "beautiful female readers" were standard combinations. "Be not surprised, my beautiful female readers," wrote one contributor to the *Humorist*, "when I repeat: yes, the waltz was indeed invented in our time!"¹⁷ Before offering

¹⁶ During some periods, the prints appeared every other day. These images nearly always featured women, though occasionally they showed an array of individual pieces of female clothing, like women's hats. Men appeared in only a few instances.

¹⁷ —g. "Musikalisches," *Der Humorist*, Jan. 29, 1838.

the solution to a riddle that had appeared in a previous issue, Saphir teased “his” female readers, “Aren’t you a little curious, my fair female readers, what the solution to the last charade is? When I tell you, you will exclaim: ‘That is insanity!’”¹⁸ In another example, a short-story contributor interjected mid-story to proclaim, “I must now interrupt this scene . . . The high, restless beating of the heart in the heaving breast must be for the delicate female readers too poetic, too romantic, too quixotic!”¹⁹ In contrast “male reader” often appeared without an accompanying adjective, and, when such an epithet was included, it was typically “dear” or “friendly,” absent the sexual or patronizing overtones of the adjectives used to describe women. The adjectives paired with “female readers” were intended to complement the female-oriented content that would immediately follow the use of the second-person address to women. Addresses to the male reader, on the other hand, did not always precede a specific type of content, which meant that, discursively, the male reader was less predetermined than his female corollary.²⁰

Addressing the paper’s male and female readers was important for establishing the colloquial tone for which the *Humorist* and its editor in particular came to be known, but the

¹⁸ Saphir, “Der Plauderer am Kaffeetisch,” *Der Humorist*, Jan. 5, 1839.

¹⁹ J. M. Rgl., “Eine Heirath aus Furcht,” *Der Humorist*, Jan. 21, 1847.

²⁰ Franco Moretti’s study on the frequency of definite versus indefinite articles that precede female characters in the titles of popular British novels of the nineteenth century (e.g. *The Democrat*, *The Woman* versus *A Democrat*, *A Woman*) is instructive here. In his work Moretti calculates the frequency of definite articles (*The Democrat*, *The Woman*) and indefinite articles (*A Democrat*, *A Woman*) that appear in the titles of thousands of popular nineteenth-century British novels named for female characters. Moretti theorizes that when the female characters were intended to be an archetype familiar to the reading public, the title was preceded with the definite article. When they were supposed to be unfamiliar or behaved unexpectedly, the title was preceded with the indefinite article. In the first half of the nineteenth century, titles describing women were more likely to begin with “the,” but this changed dramatically by the end of the century, when women, suggests Moretti, began to be viewed as less predictable and, as a group, in the process of transformation. See Franco Moretti, “Style, Inc. Reflections on Seven Thousand Titles (British Novels, 1740-1850),” *Critical Inquiry* 36, no. 1 (2009): 134-158. In the case of Vormärz Vienna, entertainment journalists demonstrated a definite tendency to assume that they could predict and understand their female readers and characters.

invocation of the female reader also performed another function. It alerted the reader that humorous, satirical, or “light” material was to follow. This was evident from the first article of the paper’s first issue. Penned by Saphir, the article began by speaking to the paper’s female readers: “Fear not, my fair female readers, there are dragons of entirely outstanding education, nice dragons, chivalrous dragons, polite dragons of the world.”²¹ What followed was a thinly veiled satire about the “dragon” that was employed as “co-worker” to Saphir at the *Humorist*. When the dragon recommended that Saphir print all kinds of nonsensical stories and humorous articles, it became difficult to miss the satirical jab at the state’s censors, who preferred that newspapers be filled with “innocent,” apolitical material. In this case the appeal to the female reader had little to do with actual female readers but instead cued the audience to the fact that the material to follow would be characterized by humor and satire.

The *Humorist*’s byline, printed on the paper’s masthead from January 1837, promised that it would be “a magazine for frivolity [*Scherz*] and serious content [*Ernst*], art, theater, social life [*Geselligkeit*], and moral content [*Sitte*].”²² The paper was not intended to be an exclusively comedic venue; rather, it would offer both “frivolity” [*Scherz*] and “serious content” [*Ernst*]. The use of the direct address to the paper’s female readers proved to be an important rhetorical strategy for separating these two categories. Invoking the female reader or labeling a particular piece of writing as a “women’s” column usually highlighted for the reader that the material to follow belonged in the category of *Scherz*. There were some exceptions—for instance, when the *Humorist* occasionally reported on women’s charitable organizations (usually to scold them for misbehaving in one way or another)—but the exceptions were rare. The male reader could be

²¹ Saphir, “Der große Drache als fest engagierter Mitarbeiter,” *Der Humorist*, Jan. 2, 1837.

²² “Eine Zeitschrift für Scherz und Ernst, Kunst, Theater, Geselligkeit, und Sitte.”

invoked in a much wider variety of contexts, both humorous and serious. In the paper's inaugural issue, the same one in which the humorous article on the dragon-censor appeared, an anonymous contributor prefaced what was described as a translation of an article originally printed in the London-based *Magazine of Domestic Economy* with the appeal "Every female reader will laugh at this!"²³ The subsequent article turned out to be not a translation but rather a parody of an article that described the "art" of cooking potatoes in solemn, stately terms. The *Humorist's* parody was intended to ridicule the original article's equating artistic production with cooking, as if that were almost as bad as equating a "female cook" with a "female artist."²⁴ In the *Humorist* there was no doubt that cooking was the *Scherz*, the female subject, and that art was the *Ernst*, the male subject.

The invocation of "Leserinnen" introduced a range of "frivolous" topics, including fashion, humor, domesticity, local or celebrity gossip, jokes, and satire. When musician and occasional journalist Franz Johann Král (1823-1912) addressed the paper's female readers in a fragmented and humorous sketch entitled "Just Plain Funny!" his use of the direct address connoted not only the domestic, but also the comedic nature of his subject and his tone: "I am forty-six years old, (that, my gentle female readers, is poetic liberty. I will be just twenty-six in 1844, the coming year). I have a gentle, good wife, (that is also not true, I am still unmarried)." In the second installment of the story, he continued, "To the beautiful female readers of the 'Humorist' I share with you in confidence that I have very little sense for married and domestic life, and I would like to marry, if. . . ."²⁵ Král's decision to address elements of "Just Plain

²³ Anon., "Polytechnikum. (Die Kunst Erdäpfel zu kochen.)," *Der Humorist*, Jan. 2, 1837. The parody was most likely written by Saphir.

²⁴ Ibid. For the original article parodied in the *Humorist*, see the cookery column in *The Magazine of Domestic Economy*, vol. 2 (London: W. S. Orr and Co., 1837), 113.

²⁵ Franz Johann Král, "Nur Lustig!" *Der Humorist*, Oct. 7 and 9, 1843.

Funny!” to the paper’s female readers functions to excuse the domestic, familiar content of the article. It is not that Král needed to explain the presence of poetic license to his female readers but rather that he wanted to label his humorous use of poetic license as a *feminine* comedic device.

The *Humorist*’s women’s columns served a purpose similar to directly addressing the paper’s female readers. Women’s columns typically featured reports on style, home life, local gossip, and jokes, and they were frequently, though not always, written tongue-in-cheek. Women’s columns, like the use of “*Leserinnen*,” indicated the presence of journalistic levity and satire, in contrast to the paper’s more serious material.²⁶ Theater and literary criticism were rarely addressed to the paper’s female readers, nor were they published in women’s columns. Even if satire was not directed at women, writers sometimes used stereotypes about women as conduits for satire, material that typically appeared in a women’s column. For instance, one of the *Humorist*’s most frequent satirical targets was the austere scientific language that was becoming increasingly common in popular scientific albums and almanacs. Poking fun at the concept of biological classification, an anonymous contributor, noted only by his initials, wrote: “Each season has its flowers: the spring has the violet, the summer the rose, the fall the dahlias, and the winter the women. The women are the true flowers of winter. . . . There is a botany of women, just like there is a botany of flowers. One must classify the blondes, the brunettes, the reds in the order that nature itself has assigned.”²⁷ An earlier example, a women’s column with

²⁶ For example, one anonymous contributor wrote, in a column entitled the “*Ladies Courier*,” that “our female readers will not begrudge us when we make the meaning of individual gems known to them.” What followed was a list of gemstones and associated symbolism and appeared to serve no other function than reporting on a curious—and feminine—topic. Anon., “*Symbolik der Edelsteine*,” *Der Humorist*, July 8, 1843.

²⁷ N.R., “*Die Winter-Blumen*,” *Der Humorist*, Oct. 27, 1838.

the subtitle “Physiognomic Dictionary” consisted of a description of feminine facial features and their associated personality traits. The article culminated with a prescription:

A smile is the ornament of figure. If you withdraw your mouth faintly at the corners, this is a disdainful smile; an exceptionally wide smile is a bitter, often cruel smile; curve it toward the lower part of your face and you have a voluptuous, naughty, bitchy face; a raised smile is a sensible smile. If you want, young female readers, to put the swarm of colorful butterflies that flutter around you to the test, then allow yourself to smile at them (that shouldn't be too hard); how your heart will be indignant about the deception! All vice emerges from a mouth that laughs, just as all virtue comes from beautiful eyes that cry.²⁸

Although both of these articles appear in a women's column, neither take women as their primary object of satire. Instead, both poke fun at scientific discourse—and use the “feminine” label and, in this case, the female body to indicate the presence of Scherz in the paper.

Although the invocation of the “Leserin” and the abundance of what might seem to be “feminine content” meant that Saphir appeared to be attracting a robust female audience, it was not only women whom he hoped to win over as readers using these tactics. Identifying “light” content by calling it “feminine” bracketed certain topics, creating a safe zone that allowed men to read this material in a way that purposely distanced them from it. This permitted them to preserve their own self-image as serious (masculine) rather than frivolous (feminine), while nevertheless “indulging” in the light material that shaped the *Humorist's* popular approach. If men enjoyed reading this content, being told upfront that it was intended for women gave them a chance to read it without feeling that their own masculinity was debased. Even if the *Humorist* was viewed as a lowbrow paper, the copious citations and quotations from the paper that were reprinted in other Viennese newspapers provide evidence that men were reading it on a daily basis.

²⁸ Anon., “Physiognomischer Diktionär. Der Kopf,” *Der Humorist*, Feb. 27, 1837. The tone of this article indicates that it was likely written by Saphir.

The choice to include “feminine content” for women and men was a strategic commercial decision for Saphir. His paper, along with the *Wiener Zeitschrift*, the *Theaterzeitung*, and eventually the *Zuschauer*, which was founded shortly before the *Humorist*, were the four most successful papers in the late 1830s and 1840s in terms of subscription numbers. Not surprisingly, they were also the four papers that published women’s material. However, it was the *Humorist* that led these papers in providing “light” content and addressing female readers explicitly, and, as a result, out of the editors of these four papers, Saphir acquired the most pronounced reputation as a lowbrow journalist, rivaled only occasionally by Adolf Bäuerle, his old boss at the *Theaterzeitung*.

Though the *Humorist*’s theater reviews, music and literary criticism, occasional news reportage, and short stories were important components of the paper, it was the paper’s humorous content—its Scherz—that distinguished it from other papers. Because much of this material was articulated by means of discourse on women and to women, this meant that it was the women’s content that gave the *Humorist* its identifiable tone. The *Humorist* was never a “woman’s paper,” but it used “women” as a medium for the style of writing that made it unique. To a large degree, this type of writing was chiefly associated with Moritz Saphir himself, who authored the majority of the paper’s humorous content, and it became central to Saphir’s local reputation.²⁹ Although Saphir had a loyal band of supporters, many individuals who considered themselves “elite” writers derided Saphir for his attention to trivialities, jokes, and women’s topics. The German literary critic Rudolf Gottschall (1823-1909) summed up this perception of Saphir in a volume on German literary history published two years after Saphir’s death. “Saphir’s satire,”

²⁹ One of the best sources for general assessments of Saphir’s style of writing and that of the *Humorist* generally appears at the end of the long bibliographical entry for Saphir in Constantin Wurzbach’s *Biographisches Lexikon*. See Wurzbach, “Saphir, Moritz,” *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, vol. 28, 227-231.

wrote Gottschall, “tended toward well-trodden, trivial subjects: doctors, women, theater and adopted its political weather according to the barometer of public conditions.”³⁰ Likewise, an anonymous commenter on German-language journalism wrote in 1844, on the topic of the series of “serious” literary papers like the *Sonntagsblätter* that had been founded in the early 1840s:

The new editors, unlike the older editors, do not have in mind mostly the female audience or the female reader, who only wants to be fed bonbons and snacks. Few new altars have recently been erected for this fraction of the reading public. Most new papers demonstrate, through their content and their form, that they are turning toward men. Called forth by the positive, serious direction of today, this journalism is finding encouragement, albeit from external factors: the always increasing reading clubs [*Lesevereine*] . . . that are being sponsored by the elite among educated [*gebildet*] men in large and small cities.³¹

Although this reporter did not mention Saphir by name, there is no doubt that he aimed to contrast the new, masculine papers of the early 1840s with the “feminine” papers that had been founded earlier, chief among them the *Humorist*.

In the same year that he founded the paper, Saphir commemorated his forty-third birthday by imagining himself describing the *Humorist* as it would appear forty-three years into the future. Characteristically, the result was humorous. In his imagined “Women’s Salon” (as the women’s column of 1837 was titled) he contrasted the *Humorist*’s “Women’s Salon,” with an actual women’s salon, the highbrow social event that had been popular among Vienna’s elite for some decades:

The “Women’s Salon” occupied not an insignificant amount of space in last year’s “Humorist!! But the features of the “Humorist” were not appropriate for the mirrored wall of a women’s salon! He [the *Humorist*] found no response in this salon, and, as often as he entered with the hat of hope under his arm, adorned with nothing more than a heart full of endless longing and a breast of inexpressible devotion, he left, just as unnoticed as when he entered!³²

³⁰ Cited in *ibid.*, 228.

³¹ Anon., “Tagebuch. II. Unsere Zeitschriften,” *Die Grenzboten* (Leipzig), 1844, 1, 281.

³² Saphir, “Der Dreiundvierzigste Jahrgang des Humoristen,” *Der Humorist*, Feb. 6, 1837.

In this short parody Saphir acknowledged the distance between the *Humorist* and the exclusive space of the aristocratic women's salon and instead located the *Humorist* and its own "Woman's Salon" column in the popular, public space. Personifying the paper's women's column in the form of a naive adolescent boy, Saphir poked fun at the *Humorist*'s failed attempt to gain access to elite society.³³ He could not even enter the salons of elite women! The parody subtly indicates that Saphir recognized that his masculinity was perceived differently than it was for other journalists and writers because of his attention to so-called feminine topics. Unlike Ludwig Frankl, who, after publishing the *Habsburglied*, received numerous invitations to attend and declaim at local aristocratic salons, Saphir's gendered practices, such as his "Women's Salon" columns, sometimes rendered him "unfit" to participate in certain groups.

Anti-Jewishness and Other Criticisms of Saphir's Popular Masculinity

Saphir's "lowbrow," "feminine" approach to much of the *Humorist*'s form and content raised suspicions about his status as an upright literary and liberal man, both qualities that were considered de rigueur elements for educated men of the middle class in Vienna, as discussed in Chapter One. Criticism of Saphir ranged to suggesting that he lacked honor or was in some way feminine to outright suspicion of his commitment to liberal causes. The complaints were motivated by a sense that Saphir did not follow the codes of "normal" male journalists, that he preferred to revert to humor and jokes, instead of participating in serious debate, filling his paper with trivialities. This suspicion had actually preceded his founding of the *Humorist*. For example, before Saphir became friends with Heine, Heine remarked in a letter to his colleague Moses

³³ This is one of many occasions when Saphir would openly describe the *Humorist* as a non-elite newspaper. For another example, see Saphir, "Erklärung zur Zeit," *Der Humorist*, Jan. 23, 1847.

Moser in 1825:

The Saphir of whom you talk about appears to still be very unpolished. . . . Humor [*Witz*] alone is worth nothing. Only when humor is set on a serious foundation is it bearable to me. That is why the humor of [Ludwig] Börne, Jean Paul, and the fools in *Lear* are so powerfully effective. Ordinary humor is merely intellect's sneeze, a hunting dog that pursues his own shadow, a redcoated ape who gawks at himself between two mirrors, a bastard that madness conceived with reason on a whim in a public street!³⁴

Heine's comments that likened Saphir's humor to an "intellect's sneeze" foreshadowed some of the assumptions about him that would be made in Vienna. As early as 1834, when he returned to Vienna to take up his old job at Bäuerle's "noise machine," Saphir found himself the "only" Viennese writer excluded from the liberal Viennese literary club that met at the local bar Stern, a consequence of a veto vote by dramatist Franz Grillparzer, which was seconded by Eduard Bauernfeld.³⁵ Both Bauernfeld and Grillparzer hated Saphir, and Bauernfeld, who expressed doubt about Saphir's commitment to liberal causes, went so far as to caricature Saphir in two of his plays.³⁶ Saphir was also excluded from the salons hosted by Baron Joseph Hammer-Purgstall, a respected scholar who held literary and scientific meetings for Vienna's educated elite in his home.³⁷ When the literary club reconstituted itself as Concordia in 1841, Saphir again found himself excluded, unlike nearly all other writers, Jews included. Many liberal literati in Vienna and abroad suspected, wrongly, that he had been hired as an agent of Metternich's secret police to spy on the liberal literary activities of his fellow journalists.³⁸ Others argued that Saphir

³⁴ Heinrich Heine to Moses Moser, July 1, 1825. Quoted in Lothar Kahn, "Mortiz Gottlieb Saphir," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 20, no. 1 (1975): 247.

³⁵ Bauernfeld, *Aus Alt- und Neu-Wien*, 132.

³⁶ Bauernfeld, *Aus Alt- und Neu-Wien*, 139. The two plays in which he caricatured Saphir were *Bürgerlich und romantisch* (1835) and *Der literarische Salon* (1836).

³⁷ Ludwig August Frankl, *Zur Biographie Franz Grillparzer's* (Vienna: A. Hartleben's Verlag, 1884), 9.

³⁸ See description of a state report filed by the Austrian diplomat in Leipzig Joseph Alexander von Hübner, in Karl Glossy, introduction to *Literarische Geheimberichte aus dem Vormärz*, ed. Karl Glossy (Vienna: Verlagsbuchhandlung Carl Koenigshausen, 1913), cv, cvi. See also Karl Glossy's transcriptions of an Austrian police

was driven only by greed—a nod toward his effort to attract a broad readership, and they believed that Saphir could be easily bribed for good reviews and favorable press coverage.³⁹ Dramatist Heinrich Laube believed that Saphir’s writing was feminine and that his humor was “arbitrary” and pointless, a similar accusation levied by Joseph Tuvora (1811-1871) in his critique of Viennese journalism published in 1844.⁴⁰ In one case critic and café-owner Heinrich Adami (1807-1895) appealed to the state in 1838 against Saphir. Adami claimed that, after ridiculing Adami’s favorable opinion of playwright Johann Nestroy (whom Saphir disliked) in the *Humorist*, Saphir planned to print an ad hominem attack on Adami’s café. In a formal letter to the police bureau, Adami argued that this kind of “dishonorable” behavior was typical for Saphir and that Adami felt compelled to write for himself a “public and masculine” defense of his “bürgerlich business,” implying that Saphir did not have the decency to follow norms of respectability among middle-class, *bürgerlich* business owners (that is, men).⁴¹ Suspicions about Saphir’s political leanings and his corresponding status as an honorable and appropriately masculine man continued to be raised despite the fact that Saphir himself aimed to join liberal clubs and even signed Eduard Bauernfeld’s 1845 petition to the state calling for less restrictive censorship laws.

The debate about whether to allow Saphir to join the liberal Leipzig Writers’ Club lasted

report: report from April 4, 1843, in *Literarische Geheimberichte aus dem Vormärz*, 67-69. See also the transcriptions of reports from May 4, 1843 and May 24, 1843 in the same volume.

³⁹ On the rumors of bribery, see the bibliographical entry for Saphir in Constantin Wurzbach’s *Biographisches Lexikon*: Wurzbach, “Saphir, Moritz,” 218.

⁴⁰ Heinrich Laube, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, vol. 3 (Stuttgart: Hallberger’sche Verlagshandlung, 1840), 323, 324; Laube, *Heinrich Laubes gesammelte Werke*, vol. 4, *Reisenovellen 1* (Leipzig: Max Hesses Verlag, 1908), 194; and Joseph Tuvora, *Briefe aus Wien* vol. 2 (Hamburg: Hoffman und Campe, 1844), 32-40.

⁴¹ Angriffe in der *Humorist*, Polizei Hofstelle, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv.

for days, even though most Viennese journalists were already members, and when Saphir was finally permitted to join and was eventually allowed to give a serious lecture, most members did not understand how he had obtained permission to give a talk in the first place. The liberal leaders of the club would not explain. No one seemed to think that Saphir would have anything useful to say about how pan-Slavism was harming German journalism, the proposed topic of his lecture, and rumors circulated that Heinrich Laube had goaded him into doing it since it would make for rousing entertainment.⁴²

Throughout the 1840s, “elite” journalists and critics of Viennese journalism in general frequently targeted lowbrow journalism as contrary to the social aims of the Viennese literati class. Because censorial restrictions typically prevented direct attacks in one newspaper about another (conflict over theater and art criticism was excepted), Saphir and the *Humorist* often went unmentioned. However, it was clear that complaints about the low level of Viennese journalism were often directed at Saphir and occasionally other editors who addressed a female audience.⁴³

Because Saphir deviated from the norms expected of elite literary men for Vormärz Vienna, he faced anti-Jewish attacks to a degree not experienced by most other members of the city’s Jewish literary elite. This occurred despite Saphir’s having converted in 1832, two years before he returned to the Habsburg capital and five years before he founded the *Humorist*. The most notable of the anti-Jewish attacks on Saphir in Vienna came after he wrote a series of negative reviews of Franz Grillparzer’s plays. Besides excluding him from several liberal literary

⁴² Anon., Austrian police report from May 24, 1843 in Leipzig, in Karl Glossy, ed., *Literarische Geheimberichte aus dem Vormärz*, 89, 90.

⁴³ For example, anon., “Journalistik und junge Poeten. Literarisches Memento. Mit Anmerkungen von der Redaktion begleitet,” *Sonntagsblätter*, June 19, 1842.

clubs in Vienna, Grillparzer composed a set of epigrams targeting Saphir, in which he linked Jewishness to opportunistic theater criticism and to cowardice. Grillparzer read these epigrams aloud at one of the salons hosted by the scholar Joseph Hammer-Purgstall, from which Saphir was barred. Some years later, Ludwig Frankl, who was already editing the *Sonntagsblätter* and employed by the Jewish community in Vienna, gave his own interpretation of this conflict. Frankl, however, was firmly ensconced in elite Viennese literary circles, and he was a friend and admirer of Grillparzer. Unlike Saphir, Frankl had had little trouble fitting into Vienna's elite spheres. Frankl was clearly at pains to represent Grillparzer in a favorable light, without severely criticizing Saphir. He argued that Grillparzer was not anti-Jewish. From his private conversations with Grillparzer, reported Frankl, it was evident that Grillparzer was merely anti-convert.⁴⁴ Frankl's statements aside, Grillparzer's behavior makes clear that Saphir's conversion did not prevent him from suffering anti-Jewish abuse. This set of events stands in contrast to those Jewish journalists at the *Sonntagsblätter* who did not convert but rarely experienced anti-Jewish criticism since they "properly" negotiated the codes of literary masculinity.

Much of the criticism of Saphir can be mapped onto common anxieties held by elite writers about women, femininity, and female participation in artistic and literary spheres: that Saphir's humor was without depth, that it lacked political integrity or political meaning, that Saphir was opportunistic and more committed to financial gain than to the quality of his journalism. Anti-Jewishness, in this way, functioned as a means by which to punish Saphir for his deviation from the paradigmatic model of the "proper" journalist. Historian Shulamit Volkov's argument that anti-Jewishness is sometimes used as a code to indicate a view that

⁴⁴ Frankl, *Zur Biographie Franz Grillparzer's*, 8-15.

includes but is not restricted to anti-Jewish attitudes is useful here.⁴⁵ For individuals like Grillparzer, anti-Jewishness provided a language through which to highlight Saphir's "failure" to follow the standards of the middle-class elite men of the 1830s and 1840s. Middle-class elite men policed these standards because they believed they were crucial to their efforts to demonstrate to the state that they deserved the rights of modern citizenship, the core liberal tenet for literary men of Vienna's Vormärz. Policing the public sphere was a constitutive task for the liberal mission men, not a tangential or apolitical process.⁴⁶

Saphir's experience with anti-Jewishness was unlike that of his Jewish contemporaries who belonged to the same social and professional categories as he did. Frankl and other young Jewish writers like Siegfried Kapper, Sigmund Kolisch, Sigmund Engländer, Adolph Dux, Eduard Mautner, and a host of others, rarely if ever experienced public anti-Jewishness at the hands of other literary figures in Vormärz Vienna, for whom Jewish emancipation would become a central goal during the parliamentary debates of 1848. The diverging experience between Saphir and other more "elite" Jewish men, who wrote "serious" literature, illustrates the way that anti-Jewishness was used as a weapon wielded in order to chastise individuals who did not fully adopt gendered and classed norms of the period. Ludwig Frankl, as discussed in Chapter One, not only carefully followed gendered norms, but in fact epitomized literary masculinity in Vienna. Saphir simply did not. Not surprisingly, more young Jewish men opted to contribute to the *Sonntagsblätter* than to the *Humorist*.

⁴⁵ Shulamit Volkov, "Antisemitism as a Cultural Code—Reflections on the History and Historiography of Antisemitism in Imperial Germany," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 23 (1978): 25-46.

⁴⁶ On this point see Pieter M. Judson, *Exclusive Revolutionaries: Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848-1914* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996), especially the first chapter, and Alan S. Kahan, *Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Europe: The Political Culture of Limited Suffrage* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Curiously, one piece of evidence that demonstrates how anti-Jewishness was used to reprimand individuals who did not fall in line with the norms of the literary man is the fact that Saphir himself sometimes made antisemitic comments about men whom he accused of failing to live up to the principles of liberal, literary masculinity! Even as Saphir was mocked for his failure to accord with these ideals, he poked fun at others for the same reason. As discussed above, even though he wrote some “light,” “feminine” material, Saphir worked hard to satisfy the other demands of literary masculinity in other ways, a point that will be elaborated below. This meant that Saphir sometimes criticized other writers for their own failure to live up to these standards. For example, one anonymous report, published in Leipzig to avoid Habsburg censorship, lambasted Saphir for his criticism of Jewish journalist Alexandre Weill (1811-1898), whom, the anonymous writer reported, Saphir decried for being motivated, “in wheeling and dealing haggling style [*mauschelnd Schacherstile*],” by money alone and easily bribed.⁴⁷ These were well known anti-Jewish innuendos, and Saphir’s insult resembled the same critique he often received, that he cared more about profit than quality and that he would stoop to vulgar means to increase his earnings. Anti-Jewishness served as a means to accuse a rival of failing to conform to the norms of the middle-class, literary man, but, as Saphir’s case clarifies, anti-Jewishness was not always wielded in a unidirectional way.

I. Countering The “Popular” Reputation: Regulating Women’s Production in Public

Contrary to the opinions of many of his peers, Saphir was not antagonistic to male, middle-class, liberal principles. In fact, he worked hard to integrate into middle-class male circles, by laboring to counter the “popular” image he acquired as a result of his choosing to

⁴⁷ Anon., “Saphir gegen Weill,” *Zeitung für die elegante Welt* (Leipzig), Jan. 3, 1844. See also Sander Gilman’s discussion on the anti-Jewish connotation of the word “*mauscheln*” and accusations that Saphir engaged in this very mode of “wheeling and dealing” in Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred*, 139-148.

cater to a female audience for financial reasons. One of the main ways that Saphir responded to his reputation was by adopting a strict attitude when it came to limiting the inclusion of women in the production side of literary, journalistic, and artistic material. He expressed his opinion that women's contributions should be suppressed through the broad range of "serious" content he chose to publish in the *Humorist*. Precisely because the *Humorist* spent so much time on the subject of women, its efforts to suppress female activity in literary and artistic spheres was among the most sustained and energetic of Vienna's newspapers, a seeming contradiction to the effort the paper spent in attracting female readership. The serious content, such as theater and literary reviews and short stories, played a crucial role in articulating this strict position. The *Humorist's* campaign to reduce female production in the "public sphere" was forceful and unrelenting, a reliable buttress to the ongoing effort to elevate the position of the male literati of Vienna.

The question of what constituted the "public sphere" for nineteenth-century writers has been the subject of extensive historical debate, but, for contributors to the *Humorist* and, indeed, for more Viennese journalists of the Vormärz, the concept of the public sphere (*Öffentlichkeit*) was not an ambiguous concept. Viennese journalists frequently used the word "Öffentlichkeit" to refer to their own profession writ large: not only journalism, but artistic work, public performance, political debate, writing, and scholarship were all contained under the rubric of *Öffentlichkeit*. By definition, private or domestic speech and women's speech in general were to be excluded from the public sphere. Men, moreover, believed that the public sphere was supposed to be an edifying place, where "civilization" was enriched and improved, but also a place that needed protection to prevent it from becoming destructive and disordered, with social

boundaries running past their borders and chaos ruling.⁴⁸

Men, especially journalists, believed that as public speakers they not only constituted the appropriate public sphere but that it was their job to protect it. This, they thought, was their responsibility not only qua journalists but qua men. Journalists often disagreed on the specifics required for regulation, but the one area of agreement among male Vormärz journalists was on the question of gender. With near consensus male journalists believed that it was their duty as connoisseurs of art and as men to discourage and prevent the majority of women and girls from entering the public sphere. In their opinion preventing women from contributing to the public sphere added to the general social good, but the issue was more complex than that. Most journalists agreed that banning women entirely from the so-called public sphere would not only be impossible but also undesirable. Exceptional women could enrich the public sphere. Dancers Marie Taglioni (1804-1884) and Carlotta Grisi (1819-1899), for example, and writer Karoline Pichler (1769-1843), were widely loved and approved by male journalists in Vienna. But male-approved female writers, dancers, singers, and actors were anomalies. Most women, according to male journalists, ought to remain in the private sphere.

For Vormärz journalists the public sphere was tantamount to masculinity: the “serious direction of today” embodied by the new order of masculine journalists envisioned by the anonymous writer of 1844.⁴⁹ It was not enough to ban women and femininity from the public

⁴⁸ See Curt Schmitt’s useful discussion of the concept of “Öffentlichkeit” as used in Vienna-expatriate Ignaz Kuranda’s journal the *Grenzboten*. Schmitt argues that “Öffentlichkeit,” for *Grenzboten* writers, was a prescriptive term used to describe an ideal of political and intellectual transparency and national progress. This is applicable for Viennese journalists and writers as well, who believed that artistic and literary progress needed to be prescribed for general social health. Schmitt also notes that women’s literary or political writings were usually discounted by men as legitimate contributions to Öffentlichkeit. See Schmitt, “Ignaz Kuranda’s *Die Grenzboten* (1841-1848): A Case Study of *Vormärz* Journalism and Identity,” 34-46.

⁴⁹ Anon., “Tagebuch. II. Unsere Zeitschriften,” *Die Grenzboten*, 1844, 1, 281.

sphere. Rather, they were antithetical to it. Moreover, those few women who were approved by male journalists were only accepted, according to the justifications of Vormärz journalists, because they served as public models of femininity that were important in the effort to regulate women.

Susanne Kord's exploration of censorship and women's writing in the Vormärz illustrates the conceptual merging of the "public sphere" and "masculinity." She began her study by investigating how Habsburg and German censors treated works written by women, but she discovered that hardly any material by women had actually been censored, despite the fact that women did produce written work. Censorship, concluded Kord, was a man's privilege. Women were not censored but rather suppressed.⁵⁰ Kord's observation is especially evident in Vienna where it became a point of masculine pride to boast about harsh treatment at the hands of censorship authorities.⁵¹ Indeed, Charles Sealsfield (1793-1864), a nineteenth-century Austrian expatriate living in London, wrote of playwright Franz Grillparzer in the wake of his first negotiation with the Habsburg Censorship Authority:

Neglected and harassed, the poor fellow accepted, after his return from Italy, the appointment of poet of the Imperial Burgtheatre, with a salary of 2000 florins (2001. sterling); a sum sufficient in Vienna for a single gentleman to live upon in a rather fashionable style. . . .

A more fettered being than an Austrian author surely never existed.⁵²

⁵⁰ Susanne Kord, "The Curtain Never Rises: Femininity and Theater Censorship in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Germany," *The German Quarterly* 70, no. 4 (1997): 358-375.

⁵¹ Writer Friedrich Kaiser's (1814-1874) recollection of the first time he met playwright Franz Grillparzer is instructive. Kaiser recounts being impressed by Grillparzer's long diatribe about the difficulties of being in the theater business because of the constant frustrations perpetuated by the Habsburg Censorship Authority. Friedrich Kaiser, "Friedrich Kaisers erste Begegnung mit Grillparzer und Gründung der 'Concordia,'" in *Grillparzers Gespräche und die Charakteristiken seiner Persönlichkeit durch die Zeitgenossen*, vol. 3, ed. August Sauer (Vienna: Verlag des Literarischen Vereins in Wien, 1906), 213. Original document written in 1869.

⁵² Charles Sealsfield, *Austria As It Is: or, Sketches of Continental Courts* (London: Hurst, Chance, and Co., 1828), 209. One Florin was equivalent to one Gulden. I have used Gulden throughout this dissertation.

Sealsfield evidently did not perceive the irony of describing Grillparzer as “neglected and harassed” by the Habsburg state at the very moment that he was to accept a handsome salary and enviable post from that same state. Women did not have the chance to earn the respect that came with being “neglected and harassed” by the authorities, much less the opportunity to be rewarded with a salary for their silence. Women were merely viewed as external to the public.

As discussed above, the reputation that the *Humorist* garnered for catering to women gave extra impetus for Saphir and his contributors to clarify beyond doubt that they believed that women should be excluded from the public sphere. In other words, in seeming contradiction to its image as a site of women’s content, the *Humorist* was one of the places where women’s production of artistic and literary content was most forcibly discouraged. Moreover, the mere fact that the *Humorist* often talked about women gave its writers ample space to discuss the “appropriate” social position of women. Writer Franz Fitzinger’s (1800-1871) story “The Female Pianist,” published in installments in 1840, illustrates the *Humorist*’s approach. The story begins at the close of a successful private piano recital given by a young, non-noble girl named Klementine in an aristocratic home. One audience member, Baron Hohlfeld, takes particular notice of the young “female virtuoso.” Flanked by her aunt, Klementine accepts the praise lavished upon her by the baron, and the aunt explains that their goal is for Klementine to “be publicly [*öffentlich*] heard” in a concert. The baron responds joyously: “To publicly produce [*öffentlich produzieren*]! I am swimming in ecstasy! You can’t fail to [earn] a laurel wreath! Auntie, embrace me!”⁵³ Shortly thereafter, the baron discusses with his sister his intention to marry the young female artist [*Künstlerin*], in spite of the fact that Klementine has no estate. Meanwhile, Klementine’s male piano instructor Theodor Wiese expresses his reservations about

⁵³ Franz Fitzinger, “Die Pianistin,” *Der Humorist*, Feb. 5, 1840.

Klementine's decision to "publicly produce."

The drama escalates when the baron arranges Klementine's first public performance. Klementine is to appear as a guest pianist during a concert given by the famed "Female Singer M." Wiese is stunned by what he believes to be a rash decision made by the baron and the aunt to arrange for Klementine to perform in public, and he exhorts Klementine to hard practice and constant study.

The story concludes predictably. Instead of marrying the baron, who plies Klementine with lavish gifts, Klementine falls in love with her piano teacher, Theodor, whom Fitzinger now refers to by his first name. In advance of Klementine's concert, however, Theodor expresses a fear regarding their union:

You love me, dear Klementine, and therefore I must be frank with you about my feelings. Indeed, you will perform and triumph, like the baron said. You will perform again and again; you will sail from triumph to triumph. This is assured to you by your great skill, your inclination for art, and your charm. But your husband will only have [*besitzen*] a female artist, not a housewife, because you will be bound to your art, which will only be adored if you sacrifice your gifts at the altar of the public sphere [*Öffentlichkeit*]. Your children will have no mother because the unearthly sounds of [piano] strings will drown out the pious, innocent babbles of your small ones, and they will only be heard when the piano goes silent. Only a small portion of love, leftover from your art, will remain for them. . . .⁵⁴

Theodor's impassioned plea does not go unanswered. In the final installment of the story, Klementine rejects the baron's wealth, his promises of fame, and the planned concert with the meaningful pledge: "I can now never perform, and, indeed, I will never in my entire life perform before the public [*öffentlich spielen*]."⁵⁵

In the context of the *Humorist's* agenda for women, Fitzinger's story operates completely

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

unambiguously. Its meaning and implications, even those that could not be stated publicly because of censorial restrictions, would have been transparent to any frequent reader of Vienna's entertainment papers. First, Klementine was being reared—or controlled—by her aunt, another significant figure for short story writers of the day. Aunts, in many short stories that appeared in the *Humorist* and elsewhere, often represented failed feminine figures. Aunts never learned the behaviors that befitted young girls, and, consequently, they endangered the proper feminine socialization of their nieces.⁵⁶ A performer raised by a failed woman, Klementine already faced significant challenges to her femininity. Second, the baron, with his promise of vast wealth, security, and a full performance schedule, represented for Klementine the allure of becoming a courtesan. For much of the nineteenth century, it was common for many of Europe's most elite female performers to refuse traditional marriages and instead engage in strategic alliances, often sexual, with members of Europe's royal and noble families. Many of Europe's lower-class female performers, especially dancers, were often forced to rely on prostitution at various points in their career.⁵⁷ The sexual implication in Baron Hohlfeld's exclamation "I am swimming in ecstasy" was not incidental, and, in Fitzinger's account, an alliance between the baron and the young virtuoso would put Klementine's sexual purity at risk.

Aside from the threat that the baron and the aunt represent, Fitzinger indicates throughout the story that the primary risk Klementine faces is the possibility of "publicly producing," that is, entering the "public sphere." Female entrance into the public sphere threatens not only Klementine herself but also Theodor, the middle-class, artistically educated man who would have

⁵⁶ For another example of the aunt as a failed feminine figure, see Johann Heinrich Mirani, "Champagner-Wirkung," *Der Humorist*, Jan. 24-31, 1840.

⁵⁷ See Kelly Deirdre, *Ballerina: Sex, Scandal, and Suffering Behind the Symbol of Perfection* (Vancouver: Greystone Books, 2012).

come closest to representing the demographic of most contributors to the *Humorist*, including Fitzinger himself who worked as minor civil servant and composed poetry as his main passion. Klementine's decision to perform publicly would also endanger her children, as Theodor explained in his appeal to Klementine to forgo her career. In Fitzinger's account Klementine must both marry Theodor and reject the stage in order to ensure her salvation, and the story concludes with Klementine's oral pledge that she will never enter the public.

Fitzinger's tale efficiently encapsulates the *Humorist's* approach to women and girls. While women could consume music, they could not create it, except in extraordinary cases. The consequences envisioned by *Humorist* writers for girls and women who chose to produce art and literature were often disastrous—usually prostitution or death. To girls who chose to follow the “proper path” by becoming wives and mothers outside of the “public sphere,” the *Humorist's* writers promised blissful futures.⁵⁸ For example, August Schmidt, writer, founder of the Men's Singing Club of Vienna, and later editor of the *Musikzeitung* (Music Newspaper) from 1841, published a short story for the *Humorist* in which he juxtaposed these two female futures.⁵⁹ In his story one Lieutenant Kreuzenegg is faced with two parallel destinies. The first path would lead Kreuzenegg to a happy marriage with a young, beautiful, and “dallying” girl named Therese, from a small village.⁶⁰ The other future finds Therese dead and Kreuzenegg swindled out of his money and health by a flirtatious dancer-cum-prostitute who performs in a back-alley hall in a

⁵⁸ In my analysis I am indebted to the work of Silva Federici in *Caliban and the Witch*. Federici argues that with the rise of capitalism, women's labor—rearing children and running a household, for example—was concealed and mystified as natural, non-productive labor that was, consequently, non-deserving of a wage. This is precisely the process for which Viennese journalists were campaigning in the pages of Vormärz entertainment papers. See Silvia Federici, *Caliban and the Witch* (New York: Autonomedia, 2004), especially Chapter Two.

⁵⁹ August Schmidt, “Die Todte als Brautwerberin,” *Der Humorist*, Feb. 19-26, 1838.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

large city. In Schmidt's account the line between life and death was marked by the difference between "dallying" (*tändeln*) and "flirting" (*kokettieren*), domesticity and female public performance.⁶¹

The agenda to suppress female participation in the public sphere was not limited to the short stories that Saphir ran in the *Humorist*, nor was the focus exclusively on the question of female artistic or literary pursuits. The *Humorist* also emphasized that female political and social organization ought to remain confined to a narrow terrain. Saphir sometimes used the women's column to chastise women for acting out of their proper spheres. One edition of the column entitled the "Ladies Courier," for instance, lambasted a women's organization in Berlin for concentrating on international affairs rather than tending to social problems at home. Indeed, wrote the contributor using the pseudonym "Pilot," the women's organization had sent "the most beautiful blonde, brunette, etc." women to "the harem of the Turkish Pasha" as part of a religious effort toward conversion and in order to distribute "writings on the emancipation of women." Instead of focusing on these efforts, admonished the writer, "women of Berlin [and] women of Germany" should spend their time improving impoverished conditions in Berlin.⁶² Saphir also made women the subject of his humorous articles. In one, he reproduced a satirical poem he had written for one of his academies. In a "bagatelle" entitled the "Women's Society-Project

⁶¹ In nineteenth-century fiction, dancers often posed as stand-in figures for prostitutes, but the association of dance with prostitution was not merely fictional. Recent scholarship reveals that lower-ranked dancers were often sex workers in some capacity, generally as a result of extreme financial hardship. Dancers across Central and Western Europe tended to be from the lowest economic strata, for whom dance combined with sex work became one means of providing subsistence, though it was often insufficient. Only in rare cases, like those of the most famous ballerinas, did dance actually provide an avenue for social mobility. See Kelly, *Ballerina: Sex, Scandal, and Suffering Behind the Symbol of Perfection*. Viennese fictional accounts of dancers, however, ignore the actual financial difficulties that young women faced and instead portray their turn to prostitution merely as the result of bad choices and lapsed moral judgment.

⁶² Pilot, "Pflicht eines Frauenvereines," *Der Humorist*, May 5, 1843.

Society,” Saphir mocked what he viewed as the over-zealousness of Viennese women for founding societies.⁶³ In the “Women’s Society-Project Society,” three women engage in a fictional conversation in which they try to select a mission for a newly established club. An “Anti-Men Society” one woman suggests, or perhaps better yet, a “Society Against Orthography”?

The *Humorist* took a particular interest in girls. In the first year of the paper’s publication, Saphir wrote an acrostic for the *Humorist*, which he entitled “The Golden ABCs for Girls.” The poem is based on the alphabet. One characteristic corresponds to each letter. Beginning with A for *Andacht* (devotion) and ending with Z for *Züchtigkeit* (chastity), Saphir proposed a set of qualities he believed behooved young girls. These qualities included friendliness, Germanness, love, domesticity, and meekness. “In feeling earnest [*innig*] about the good [and] the beautiful,” crooned Saphir, “girls are worthy of being crowned by the muses with their most beautiful garlands.”⁶⁴ In another case little-known writer Johann Buchta attributed the fact that “so many girls remain unmarried [and] so many men remain bachelors” to the folly of the girls themselves. Playing on rhyming words, he opined, “If girls would make and wear linen [*Leinwand*], rather than luxury [*Aufwand*], if they aspired toward what was beneficial [*Nutz*] instead of fine attire [*Putz*] and toward bread [*Brote*] instead of fashion [*Mode*],” then men would be more inclined to marry them.⁶⁵ New-fangled fashion and luxury, both ironically subjects of increasing prominence in Vienna’s entertainment papers, were thus to blame for making girls unfit for marriage.

The *Humorist*’s attention to women and to their relationship to the public sphere was not

⁶³ Saphir, “Der weibliche Vereins-Projekten-Verein,” *Der Humorist*, April 14, 1845. This was not a woman’s column, but its title makes it closely identifiable with the *Humorist*’s women’s columns.

⁶⁴ Saphir, “Das Goldene ABC für Mädchen,” *Der Humorist*, Sept. 11, 1837.

⁶⁵ Johann L. Buchta, “Gleichnisse und Vergleichen,” *Der Humorist*, Oct. 28, 1842.

unusual among Viennese press writers. In fact, the only difference between the stance of the *Humorist* and its Viennese competitors was one of quantity. Because the *Humorist* sought to increase its female audience by catering material to women, its writers felt compelled—and had the opportunity—to emphasize their agenda vis-à-vis female participation in the public sphere much more often than papers that claimed no particular public interest in building a female audience. From an editorial standpoint, Saphir remained committed to countering his public image as a “popular” or “feminine” man. Apart from this fact, the attitudes of Vienna’s papers toward women were mostly uniform. For example, Ludwig Frankl’s *Sonntagsblätter* ran a piece by Jewish journalist and poet Moritz Hartmann on the subject of marriage. French governesses, Hartmann believed, were turning girls away from modest German behaviors and toward wanton luxury, consequently putting healthy German marriages at risk and dooming young German girls to a “prostituted life.”⁶⁶ This article drew the same link between prostitution and decadence that the *Humorist* did and articulated the same anxiety about marriage that Johann Buchta expressed. Frankl also wrote a long, vitriolic article condemning mothers who let their ungifted daughters “hack” away on the piano for hours in pursuit of dangerous dreams of stage performance, rather than instructing their daughters in the art of reserved femininity (see Chapter One).⁶⁷ Theodor Scheibe, a prolific journalist who wrote for the *Humorist* and many of Vienna’s entertainment papers, wrote a short vignette for the *Wanderer* about a fictional girl named Natalie.⁶⁸ Like

⁶⁶ Moritz Hartmann (pseu. Geldern), “Weibliches Franzosenthum in Wien,” *Sonntagsblätter*, April 3, 1842. Moritz Hartmann (1821-1872) was a liberal Jewish poet and journalist born in Bohemia. Hartmann traveled extensively across the Habsburg and German lands, publishing in many of the leading papers. He eventually achieved political fame in 1848 when he joined the radical left as a delegate to the Frankfurt Parliament. This particular article was also republished in Austrian expatriate Ignaz Kuranda’s liberal journal *Die Grenzboten*, which was printed in Leipzig in order to avoid the Austrian censors.

⁶⁷ Frankl, “Töchter und Musik,” *Sonntagsblätter*, May 15, 1842.

⁶⁸ Theodor Scheibe (pseu. Ernst Rose), “Natalie,” *Der Wanderer* (Vienna), March 20, 1845.

August Schmidt's protagonist Lieutenant Kreuzenegg, Natalie is virtuously betrothed but dangerously flirtatious, and she faces a choice between two futures: "Indeed—Natalie was a flirt; but of course initially she only carried the seed of the poisonous weed. The thistle had not yet bloomed, and the rose was innocent." Upon the day of her wedding, however, Natalie rejected her pious betrothal and ran off to the city, where, as her abandoned fiancé laments, "she could perhaps shine—to be a flirt and to ruin so many men—to break three hearts"

Still, the fiancé remains devoted to Natalie, and he vows to find her, wherever she might be. Only months later does he locate her, alone and sick in a dank room in the city, writhing upon her deathbed. The implication that she has contracted a sexually transmitted disease is unmistakable. Scheibe thus concludes the story with an ominous warning: "Where flirtatiousness and sin are the beginning, misery is the song's ending. . . . Girls, draw a moral from the story!"

Scheibe's brief sketch parallels the same arguments laid out again and again in the *Humorist*. In spite of the *Humorist's* attitude toward female readership, its program on the subject of female public performance remained not only indistinguishable but in fact even stronger than the agenda as it was expressed in other newspapers. The nineteenth-century criticism that the *Humorist* was merely filled with feminine "bonbons," ignores the sinister political value of the contributors' statements about the "dangerous" role of women in the public sphere and the lengths that even editors like Saphir, who catered to women, went to suppress women's production. The campaign to curtail women's participation in the "public sphere" was advanced not alongside the periodical press's liberal agenda, discussed in Chapter One, that called for granting political rights to middle-class men and elsewhere during the Vormärz. Rather, it was central to Vormärz liberalism. As a result, when Saphir's position as an appropriate member of the male liberal-cum-literary class in Vienna was questioned, it was necessary for him to consistently run material that

displayed his commitment to policing the public sphere.

II. Countering The “Popular” Reputation: Regulating Women’s Employment

Although most of the women described and imagined in Vienna’s entertainment press were ordinary, journalists admitted that there were some exceptional women. Saphir, like his male contemporaries, occasionally wrote hyperbolic, overwrought, and even semi-sexual reviews of female performers who guest-starred in Vienna, and he, along with nearly all male journalists, believed that certain women had “earned the right” to “publicly produce.”⁶⁹

After bewitching Berlin audiences with her melodious voice, the highly anticipated opera singer Jenny Lind (1820-1887) arrived in Vienna in late April 1846 and gave her first performance as Norma in Vincenzo Bellini’s opera of the same name. Lind had been hired by Franz Pokorny, the new director at the Theater an der Wien, to give a series of productions as a guest singer. She had already been an occasional subject of the Viennese press, but Lind’s arrival and her leading role in three major operas over the course of a month prompted a nearly unprecedented outpouring of press attention. The press was beset by “Lind-Enthusiasmus,” which journalists described in pathological terms as a contagion contracted from Berlin.⁷⁰ Reviews of Lind’s performances flooded the local papers. Several writers compiled biographies of Lind, which were then advertised by the *Wiener Zeitung*, the only paper allowed to print advertisements. Gossip columns reported on Lind’s whereabouts in the city, and, as usual, the

⁶⁹ For a good example of Saphir’s hyperbolic reviews of female celebrities, see his review of the young dancer Fanny Elßler, in Saphir, “Theater-Salon,” *Der Humorist*, July 26, 1837.

⁷⁰ Franck, “Plaudereien und Glossen zwischen Licht und Dunkel,” *Wiener Zeitschrift*, April 9, 1846; Josef Plank, “Musikalischer Wochenbericht,” *Sonntagsblätter*, April 26, 1846; Saphir, “Der Raisonnirende Nothstift,” *Der Humorist*, June 22, 1846; and Th. Sober, “Erstes Auftreten der Dlle. Jenni Lind,” *Der Sammler* (Vienna), April 27, 1846.

Humorist began poking fun at the press, sick with Lind-Enthusiasmus.⁷¹

Vienna's theater and opera reviewers already had a long tradition of giving disproportionate attention to female stars in the city's productions. From the founding of the *Humorist* in 1837, Saphir and all the paper's critics had been ardent fans of Jenny Lutzer, an Austrian opera singer who performed in Vienna that year.⁷² Saphir wrote of Lutzer's voice that "no other sound that has refreshed me has revived me, no other sound that has emerged out of a breast did so without affectation, without violence, in a manner so youthful, so miraculously youthful, so bubblingly original, so jubilantly."⁷³ Although Lutzer was especially loved by the *Humorist*'s contributors, the effusive language Saphir used to describe her was not uncommon. The voices and theatrical qualities—and shortcomings—of female performers were often described in visceral and emotive terms in the *Humorist* and elsewhere, and young ladies in particular, referred to by the French term "demoiselle" (Dlle.), were described in sexualized, emotional, and sweet language.

While Lind was in Vienna, critics fawned over her. The *Österreichische Zuschauer* rarely

⁷¹ For example, J. J. Zanetti jokes in the *Wanderer* that "Anyone can calculate that among the 400,000 residents of Vienna, there are only seven individuals who are not Lind-Enthusiasts." See J. J. Zanetti, "Wiener-Mosaik," *Der Wanderer*, May 6, 1846. See also anon., "Der Lind-Enthusiasmus," *Wiener Zeitschrift*, May 26, 1846; Daniel Bardach, "Enthusiasmus!" *Der Wanderer*, May 9, 1846; Ignaz Lewinsky, Review of *Die Ghibellinen in Pisa*, *Wiener Zeitschrift*, May 16, 1846; Longinus (pseu.), "Gelinder Unsinn, den Lindenthusiasten Gewidmet," *Der Wanderer*, May 18, 1846; and Theophrastus Bombastus Spaltenfüller (pseu.), "Gungl und Gunkl! Eine Kritisch-ästhetischer Parallel," *Der Wanderer*, May 6, 1846.

⁷² Lutzer's first reviewer at the *Humorist* wrote, glowingly:

On this evening, she achieved, in the true sense of the word, a crown, which the greatest singers enjoy, in the great aria of the second act. Indeed, her entire performance was excellent, but it appeared to be overshadowed, so to speak, by the debut in the aria. All musical fields are exhausted in the composition of this motif, the artist [Lutzer] penetrated each one with equal triumph. Her indescribable, intensive musical richness and the lavish execution of the artistic performance produced a grand effect. We have no cause, therefore, to speak further of coloratura, melisma, modulation.

X. Y. Z., "Gastvorstellung der Dlle. Jenny Lutzer," *Der Humorist*, Jan. 9, 1837.

⁷³ Saphir, "Dlle. Lutzer, Dlle. Elßler," *Der Humorist*, July 22, 1837. Other newspapers were equally enthusiastic about Lutzer. One reviewer lauded Lutzer's execution of the aria of the second act: "The effect that the round sound of her voice, pure as a bell, her roulade, trills, staccato, etc. in this aria evoked was glittering." "K.K. Hofopertheater nächst dem Kärnthnerthore," *Der Wanderer*, Jan. 11, 1837.

deviated from hyperbolic praise.⁷⁴ In describing Lind's third guest appearance as Amina in Bellini's *La Sonnambula*, the *Zuschauer* reviewer described Lind as "charmingly girlish," "the essence of the purest, most precious love," "pure, elevated femininity" (*Weiblichkeit*).⁷⁵ The *Wiener Zeitung* followed a similarly favorable line. Journalist Johann Baptist Rousseau (1802-1867), in his review of Lind as Norma, wrote that she "presented herself in the most pleasing manner in a virginal, visionary, and prophetic form." She "is one of those beings who possesses, by the merciful hand of heaven, the gift of being [able to] ennoble and glorify beauty in rich abundance."⁷⁶ The *Wiener Zeitschrift* reviewer wrote that Lind, in her performance as Amina, "conceived of the unique art as if she were enveloping the entire role with a smooth, translucent veil, which she slid over the listener like a beautiful landscape [veiled with] an evening moonlight."⁷⁷

The sensational reviews obscured the anxiety that strained the press's obsession with Lind. While "Lind-Enthusiasmus" grew to hyperbolic dimensions, critics could actually agree on little about the performer.⁷⁸ The polarization among critics in the local press was not a mere disagreement about Lind's technical and dramatic capabilities, but it was specifically gendered

⁷⁴ See, for example, C. B., "Jenny Lind, in der Rolle der 'Norma,' ihrer ersten Gastrolle im Theater nächst der Wien," *Der Österreichische Zuschauer* (Vienna), April 25, 1846.

⁷⁵ W., "Dlle. Jenny Lind, als Amina in der 'Nachtwandlerin,' von Bellini," *Der Österreichische Zuschauer*, May 1, 1846.

⁷⁶ Johann Baptist Rousseau, "Jenny Lind," *Wiener Zeitung*, April 25, 1846.

⁷⁷ Bruno, "Wien. K.K. Priv. Theater an der Wien," *Wiener Zeitschrift*, May 23, 1846.

⁷⁸ A critic for the *Sammler* noticed the lack of agreement about Lind and wrote about it early in Lind's visit to Vienna in 1846. On the polarized opinions of Lind, the reviewer noted that "this one calls her strong, that one calls her weak; many praise the high technical accomplishment of [her] vocal approach, and yet more than a few find that her coloratura is not rounded enough." While this conflict first surfaced in Berlin, writes the critic, after Lind performed in Vienna, the Viennese audience, too, "split into many, previously anticipated fractions," and not only the general public, but the "critics likewise find themselves in a similar situation." See Sober, "Erstes Auftreten der Dlle. Jenni Lind," *Der Sammler*, April 27, 1846

debate. Criticism of Lind became a site where specific social tensions were aired. Although most reviewers believed that Lind had “earned” her right to appear in public, the debate about the impropriety of female production in the “public sphere” foregrounded Viennese criticism of Lind, and reviewers remained anxious about Lind’s public appearances. When it came to Lind and other major female celebrities, critics also expressed apprehension about the high incomes that these “exceptional” women earned, and they repeatedly satirized the fees paid to female celebrities, linking this money to rising ticket prices.

Saphir was one of the strongest voices in this debate. For Saphir, criticism of Lind was tied to the need to refute local “elite literary” opinion that he was an unmerited writer because of the nature of his “popular” journal. Saphir used Lind to demonstrate that his taste was superior to that of other critics and that his voice was more reasonable and moderate. He did this, first, by making the case that the critic had undisputed power over social boundaries, in particular the boundaries of femininity, and, second, by emphasizing the quality of his opinion against those of local rivals. Saphir’s criticism as well as the entire debate over Lind underscored the centrality of gender and female expression to male journalists’ political aspiration to gain power, status, and income in the city.

For most Viennese critics the most important question regarding Lind’s theatrical capabilities was her ability to “properly” embody femininity on stage. Many writers believed that her success in this regard was precisely the source of her talent. This was the case for the *Zuschauer*, where a reviewer wrote that Lind’s “pure, elevated femininity” was the centerpiece of her artistic contribution. After describing Lind’s “virginal” qualities for the *Wiener Zeitung*, Johann Rousseau went on to note that in her role as Norma, “Lind drew more from the girlish

side and consistently modeled in Norma the Celtic vestal virgin.”⁷⁹ The critic for the *Wanderer* wrote that “Lind as Norma is always and everywhere tender mother, sensitive woman; she remains both even in anxiety and anger; indeed [she is] the most beautiful feature of femininity,” and, for her role as Beatrice in Giacomo Meyerbeer’s *Die Gibellinen in Pisa*, another contributor praised the “ardor of feeling” with which she “could animate the loving girl.”⁸⁰ The *Sonntagsblätter* called her “sweet and cute.”⁸¹

Saphir’s response at the *Humorist* was more equivocal. In a series of three articles, Saphir was one of the first critics to satirize Lind-Enthusiasmus and to call the lavish admiration of Lind into question. In the first installment in the series, Saphir made fun of the hyperbolic praise bestowed on Lind by other local critics. Citing a number of reviews that had been published in other papers, Saphir came to the funny conclusion that, if he were to believe all of the reports, Lind must be “an apocalyptic form, wondrous and fabulous, with wings and scales, with a thousand eyes and a fiery tongue.”⁸² Saphir concluded with the apparently shocking confession that he had not actually attended the performance.⁸³ The article pokes fun at the extravagant praise showered upon Lind in the Viennese press and positions Saphir as the most moderate and therefore discerning of the city’s critics, the only critic who had enough moderation and reasonableness to wait until Lind’s second performance to see her.

⁷⁹ Rousseau, “Jenny Lind,” *Wiener Zeitung*, April 25, 1846.

⁸⁰ —r—, “K.K. Priv. Theater an der Wien,” *Der Wanderer*, April 24, 1846, and S., “K.K. Priv. Theater an der Wien,” *Der Wanderer*, May 15, 1846.

⁸¹ Plank, “Musikalischer Wochenbericht,” *Sonntagsblätter*, May 3, 1846.

⁸² Saphir, “Kritische Epigonen über Jenny Lind in Wien. Jenny Lind, Bevor Ich Sie Gehört,” *Der Humorist*, April 28, 1846.

⁸³ *Ibid.*

In the next installment Saphir conceded that Lind possessed enormous talent. “What [Lind] made unique in her first appearance,” maintained Saphir, “is artistic tranquility, the rejection of all means of violence, all vocal flirtation [*Koketterie*], everything that is forced, her return to unadorned beauty, her self-deference, administering what is given, without taking it for herself.”⁸⁴ Like the journalists of the *Zuschauer*, the *Wiener Zeitung*, the *Wanderer*, and the *Sonntagsblätter*, Saphir became convinced that Lind’s talent derived from her representation of femininity on stage. Saphir also transposed his review of Lind onto the *Humorist*’s position that flirtatious behavior was a gateway to improper female intrusion in the public sphere. If flirting represented inappropriate behavior, then Lind’s performance modeled the opposing coordinates: self-deprecation, quietness, and purity.

In the third and final installment of his series on Lind, Saphir leveraged his critical quill against Lind’s representation of the feminine in her portrayal of Norma. In *Norma*, the titular character, high priestess of the Druids, is said to have fallen in love with an enemy Roman governor and born him two sons before the opera begins. The opera poses Norma as a part tragic and part reprehensible figure, who at one point contemplates murdering her own children in order to hide the evidence of her transgression. In the final scene Norma is redeemed by an act of tragic self-sacrifice. According to Saphir, Lind mostly mismanaged the feminine elements of her portrayal of Norma:

I thought that Jenny Lind would interpret the entire role from the perspective of a loving woman, a tender mother, and that would speak for itself. Accordingly, when Sever [Norma’s Roman lover, according to the German libretto] calls out: ‘Medea!’ Norma would be very far from being a Medea; however, the still and ever-repeating reversals of inner maternal emotion [in Lind’s portrayal] were overbearing to the gentle disposition of [Norma’s] character. I would rather have seen Lind represent the character in a much milder, womanly [*frauenhaft*] way, for her to have shown the moments of vengeance and

⁸⁴ Saphir, “Kritische Epigonen über Jenny Lind in Wien. Jenny Lind, Nachdem Ich Sie Gehört,” *Der Humorist*, May 5, 1846.

of anger merely as moments and the execution of the character as a whole purely from the perspective of loving mother. But that did not happen. Lind performed the plot in the second act as a high tragedy, so heroically passionate, just like [opera singer Wilhelmine] Schröder-Devrient, who turned Norma into a crying Roman woman and into a raving, common woman. Likewise, Lind conceived of Norma completely tragically, oppressively tragically, but her execution was limited, reduced, and totally colorless. . . .

In the second act, one feature above all proved that Dlle. Lind did not position femininity as the fundamental tone of Norma. In the scene in which she wants to murder her children, she raises the dagger four times, and then drops it four times! Apart from the fact that this is contrary to all psychological truth, it is also contrary to all theatrical effect. A mother can brandish a dagger over the heart of her child only one time, and only one time can this have any effect on the stage.⁸⁵

This statement opposes the opinion Saphir developed in the second installment of the series.

While in the second installment, Saphir identified Lind as the personification of pure, unornamented, and, therefore, sincere femininity, in this third article, Saphir lambasted Lind for failing to exhibit precisely these qualities. Lind was too tragic, too dramatic, and too passionate to be a convincing feminine figure. More importantly, Saphir's self-asserted expertise on the subject of maternal impulse allows him to question Lind's abilities to act properly maternal and to translate that into theatrical technique.

Aside from the *Humorist*, several other papers raised the topic of Lind's ability to represent tragic figures on stage. Some critics agreed with Saphir that Lind had over-played the role to the point of melodrama, but others believed that her tragic acting had been successful. The *Zuschauer*, as might be expected, lauded Lind's tragic work. The critic for the *Sonntagsblätter*, however, departed entirely from Saphir's interpretation. Critic Josef Plank argued, unlike Saphir, that the role of Norma demanded high drama but that Lind had executed the role of "the aggrieved mother [in a manner] all too timid, too naïve, and, therefore, . . .

⁸⁵ Saphir, "Kritische Epigonen über Jenny Lind in Wien. Jenny Lind's Tragische Rollen: Norma und Beatrice," *Der Humorist*, May 16, 1846.

ineffective.”⁸⁶ The coordinates of this review were precisely opposed to those that Saphir offered. For the *Humorist*, the ideal Norma was supposed to be a gentle, composed figure, an image ruined by Lind’s high-tragic performance. For the *Sonntagsblätter*, Norma was supposed to be passionate and expressive, qualities Lind failed to capture for her quietness and her tenderness.⁸⁷

Nevertheless, although Plank and Saphir disagreed entirely about Lind’s success as Norma and the boundaries of the role, on the question of Lind’s representation of femininity, they were in agreement. First, Plank, Saphir, and the other critics cited above believed that Lind should be evaluated from the perspective of “femininity.” Second, they all agreed that the critic himself (and they were all men) was the appropriate arbiter of “femininity.” Finally, all of the reviews, even those that were at odds, compared melodious “gentleness,” “naivety,” “tranquility,” and “femininity” to “power,” “forced” vocal performance, and “strength.”

In the second installment of his series on Jenny Lind, Saphir not only wrote about Lind as a feminine performer, but he also discussed her status as an “artist.” He claimed that he would consider Lind “from the standpoint of totality,” not from the perspective of her “vocal school” but from her “school of art.”⁸⁸ From this point of view, wrote Saphir, “it is not a compliment when one says that Lind is an unconscious, a natural, an uninhibited singer, one led by fortune and luck, for whom everything is met with good luck!”—adding a dig at rival critics who frequently made these claims. Such qualities, according to Saphir, merely indicated “ability,” not

⁸⁶ Plank, “Musikalischer Wochenbericht,” April 26, 1846.

⁸⁷ It is also important to mention that many of the same adjectives used in this debate (“*zart*,” “*schön*” were the same epithets that often preceded “female readers” in the newspapers, which leaves little room for their interpretation outside a gendered framework.

⁸⁸ Saphir, “Kritische Epigonen über Jenny Lind in Wien. Jenny Lind, Nachdem Ich Sie Gehört,” *Der Humorist*, May 5, 1846.

yet “art.” Artistry, Saphir reasoned, is the result of “the deepest, most intellectual study.” What makes Jenny Lind “an artist [*Künstlerin*] through and through” is her “cultivated art, the most meticulous, relentless, restless study!”⁸⁹ Belaboring the point, Saphir argued that “natural” gift is tantamount to “apathetic” talent, and he concluded in a tone of high praise: “Jenny Lind is absolutely, in vocal performance and in drama . . . entirely the result of total art, or the most perfect result of art, and study and art have never created a priestess whose greatness is proclaimed in a more unique and lovely way than Jenny Lind herself.”⁹⁰

Saphir’s obsession with hard work over “natural” gift is a theme he shared with other critics and one that extends across his work, but here it is specifically connected to the dilemma of the professional, working woman.⁹¹ For Saphir, the labor of a performer, especially a female performer, was supposed to be invisible. Saphir reported that Lind’s great capacity as an opera singer and an actor was her ability to “present the artwork while making the workshop invisible”; she “gives us, as it should be in true art, the flower without displaying the pot.”⁹² In other words, Lind is supposed to appear “natural,” but only insofar as she explicitly hides the “workshop.” Moreover, continued Saphir, the purpose of Jenny Lind’s hidden labor is to blind the spectator to individuality, to remove Jenny Lind from her own work. She should appear, Saphir informed the reader, as if “she has no other purpose than to complete her mission, as if she wants nothing for herself, as if nothing is forced, nothing is artificial, nothing is coaxed.” Indeed, “her individuality

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Saphir was not the only critic who believed that Lind had earned the right to appear in public because of her hard work. See, for example, anon., “Jenny Lind,” *Wiener Zeitschrift*, March 14, 1846 and L. Engel, “Meyerbeer und Jenny Lind,” *Der Salon* vol. 2, 1847.

⁹² Saphir, “Kritische Epigonen über Jenny Lind in Wien. Jenny Lind, Nachdem Ich Sie Gehört,” *Der Humorist*, May 5, 1846.

should merge with her purpose, and what should remain for us is the purest enjoyment of art.”⁹³

In this formulation, Lind is left in a double bind. In order to complete the requirements for artistry, she must pursue the “deepest, most intellectual study,” but in order to fulfill the needs of the spectator (Saphir), she must make that labor invisible.

Although Saphir’s disdain for unstudied art extended across gender and genre boundaries, the double bind described here is gender-specific. According to Saphir, “Artificiality [*Unnatur*], which has become epidemic in the field of vocal performance . . . burdens our artistic age.” It seeks

to superimpose massive technical ability over ideal purpose, to indulge mania in forcible affect, to shock with screaming effects, to erect a Babylonian construction with flirtatious and makeuppued [*koketten und geschminkten*] vocal adornments, in order, thereby, to beat dead, with vocal-clubs and song-pistons, all sense of beauty in quiet moderation.⁹⁴

Contradicting his previous argument that true artistry is by no means natural, here Saphir poses *Unnatur*/artificiality as the outstanding problem unsettling art of the day, and he identifies artistic *Unnatur* as the degenerated female—flirtatious and makeuppued. Flirtatious artificiality, in Saphir’s account, is directly opposed to “what one, with *modesty* and clear moderation, with a sense of *pure beauty* and inner knowledge of the depths and the heights of art, within artistic *tranquility* and in the limits of aesthetic *beauty* and acceptability can produce.”⁹⁵ The opposing images of a flirtatious and makeuppued artifice and a modest, pure, and beautiful artistry correspond to the discursive binary that Saphir and other journalists constructed as a rubric of appropriate behavior for girls, just as they here inform good art and the good female worker. In

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid. Emphasis mine.

all cases, purity was supposed to be designated by hard—yet invisible—work, work that appears natural but never actually is.

On May 15, 1846, about halfway into Lind's stay in Vienna, an anonymous Viennese journalist submitted a short editorial to the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*. The article, printed beyond the borders of the Habsburg Empire in order to avoid the Habsburg police censors, detailed a complaint about the rising cost of theater tickets in Vienna. In order to make his point, the writer favorably compared the administration of theater director Carl Carl, who had managed the Theater an der Wien from 1825 until 1845, to the administration of Franz Pokorny, who took over the direction in April 1845 and was responsible for hiring Lind as a guest performer. According to the laudatory account of the anonymous writer, during his tenure Carl Carl managed to refurbish and renovate the theater, to hire talented local actors, and to get rich himself, all while still maintaining low ticket prices. The writer then claimed to “know exactly” how much many of the stars during Carl's tenure were paid, and he dutifully listed the amounts. When Pokorny took over the theater direction in 1845, he proved a less effective leader. He remodeled the theater in a “distasteful though new” aesthetic, and, instead of hiring local performers, he insisted on attracting “foreign and distinguished powers as guests,” including “[Johann Baptist] Pischek and Jenny Lind.” Instead of implementing these changes while maintaining stable ticket prices, Pokorny sharply raised prices for the spring season of 1846, doubling his own profit, all the while claiming to bring opera “for the enjoyment of the public.” The anonymous writer then explained that, because of the tremendous popularity of Lind, the theater was sold-out four to five times weekly—a major increase from the usual status quo—but instead of returning ticket prices to their usual level, Pokorny claimed for himself a tremendous

“Lind profit.”⁹⁶

The writer linked Pokorny’s desire for increased revenue to his decision to hire a female star. Although the writer also complained that Pokorny insisted on hiring international stars, the actual list the writers provided of actors whom Carl Carl hired during his tenure as director of the Theater an der Wien consisted of mostly male, international guests. In other words, the issue was less about local versus international than it was about gender. Anxiety about uncontrollable profit and unaffordable tickets arose when the anonymous writer coupled Pokorny’s decision to raise prices to his decision to hire Lind. Indeed, “Lind profit” functioned as a metonym for this writer’s unease with uncontrolled profit and concern about the decreased accessibility of art.

Journalists across Vienna repeatedly blamed new financial hardship on Lind and, specifically, on the high fees she charged. In fact, the concern preceded her first appearance on stage in Vienna. A month before she arrived in the city, the *Wanderer* ran a column that concluded with a speculation: “There is gossip that during the guest performances of the famous singer Miss Jenny Lind in the k.k. Private Theater an der Wien a seat on the second floor will cost 3 florins. What will a box or a seat in the orchestra cost?”⁹⁷ Saphir was a central figure in this debate. In March 1846, some weeks before Lind’s first performance in *Norma*, Saphir wrote a long editorial in the *Humorist* that made accusations similar to those described above in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.⁹⁸ Saphir was particularly concerned with the increase in season ticket subscriptions, arguing that, even if Lind’s guest stay in Vienna demanded high ticket prices,

⁹⁶ Anon., “Das gegenwärtige Tagsgespräch in Wien: die Eintrittspreise im Theater an der Wien betreffend,” *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* (Augsburg), May 13, 1846.

⁹⁷ L—s, “Cicerone von Wien und Seinen Umgebungen,” *Der Wanderer*, March 16, 1846.

⁹⁸ Saphir, “Bescheidene Anfrage, an eine Theater-Direktion, zu Welcher eine Journal-Redktion Berechtigt Ist,” *Der Humorist*, March 21, 1846.

season ticket subscribers should not have to pay the additional fee when they saw performances not featuring Lind.

In the March 1846 article, Saphir made the curious observation that “these enormous [ticket] prices” were even higher “than of the Kärnterthortheater in its Italian period, even when Fanny Elßler danced.”⁹⁹ Fanny Elßler, a wildly popular ballerina across Europe, first danced as an adult in Vienna in 1837. It is significant that Saphir, who in 1837 claimed he would give up his most prized paintings for “one of the shoes that Fanny Elßler had danced in,” found Elßler to be the most apt contrast to Lind.¹⁰⁰ Not only did comparisons between Elßler and Lind as money-earning performers abound in 1846, but Saphir had been interested in Elßler’s income as early as 1837. When Elßler performed at the Viennese Kärnterthortheater that year, Saphir published a glowing review of her performance, and he also complimented theater administration for successfully keeping ticket prices low. Although he first criticized the Viennese audience for expecting “artists like those of London and Paris but prices like those of Stockau and Neustädt,” he concluded by praising the theater’s director: “[With] all these considerations and still thousands that were likely considered, it is hard to believe how an administration could still bring an abundance of talent and performances such as female artists like Elßler, who were paid enormous sums, without raising prices for the public.”¹⁰¹ Though Saphir’s analysis of the theater was positive, he was anxious to call attention to Fanny Elßler’s substantial income. Some days later the *Humorist* also satirized the issue:

Fanny Elßler’s income! Treasurer, man with the damning glance! Arbiter over life and death, you who arbitrates over theater boxes and theater seats, over everything that lives

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Saphir, “Theater-Salon,” *Der Humorist*, July 26, 1837.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

in the orchestra section, that transpires in the galleries, and what flutters above in paradise; man, hero, demigod, do not forget my theater box.—I am only a writer of the third rank, but an enthusiast of the first rank!¹⁰²

It was not only the *Humorist* that expressed anxiety about the money earned by Lind and Elßler. Other newspapers made the same comments, not only about Lind and Elßler, but about other female celebrities like dancer Marie Taglioni.¹⁰³ Female celebrities were often the butt of lighthearted satire that mocked their high income, but the jokes were also deeply serious for male critics who portrayed themselves as beleaguered men of letters, for whom attending concerts and theatrical performances was a lifeline, as the repeated demand for reduced ticket prices demonstrated. For Saphir anxiety about women's income afforded him an opportunity to affiliate himself with the "serious" literary men of the city, despite his at times testy relationship with them. Indeed, efforts like these ultimately rewarded Saphir—despite occasional conflict and abuse. He also garnered respect and admiration, if somewhat tendentious, from his fellow men in the city.

Accommodating Popular Masculinity and Jewish Dilemmas

Along with his efforts to counter his popular reputation by constantly reminding readers of his strict opinions regarding the importance of maintaining boundaries around production in the public sphere, Saphir also cultivated close relationships with many of Europe's artistic elite

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ See, for example, anon., "Journalistik und junge Poeten. Literarische Memento," *Sonntagsblätter*, June 19, 1842 on the relationship between naïve young critics and the greediness of young female performers; anon., "Pesth-Ofner Kurier," *Humorist*, Jan. 23, 1845, on Marie Taglioni's income; anon., "Telegraph des Tages," *Humorist*, Jan. 22, 1847 on rising ticket prices in Berlin because of Pauline Viardot's guest appearance there; Charivari (pseu.), "Humoristisch-satirischer Auslagekaste," *Oesterreichisches Morgenblatt* (Vienna), June 28, 1843; M. G. Herbert, "Zwei Kränze," *Sonntagsblätter*, May, 31, 1846, a short story that links social inequality to "Lind-Enthusiasmus; L—s, "Plaudereien beim Gesellschafts-Kaffeh," *Der Wanderer*, March 16, 1846; Josef Plank, "Musikalischer Wochenbericht," *Sonntagsblätter*, June 7, 1846; and short reports in the *Wiener Zeitschrift*, May 19, 1846 and May 30, 1846. See also Sherry Lee Linkon's article on Lind's tour in the United States with P. T. Barnum and Linkon's analysis of male critics' obsession with Lind's income while on tour: Sherry Lee Linkon, "Reading Lind Mania: Print Culture and the Construction of Nineteenth-Century Audiences," *Book History* 1 (1998): 94-106.

and hosted lavish “academies” where he debuted his own humorous and poetic material. Saphir’s “Musical Declamatory Academies,” as they were known, showcased programs that featured musical performance, declamation, and humorous readings. These were massive productions, typically held in one of Vienna’s major commercial theaters, and, in spite of Saphir’s checkered reputation as an editor, they were loved by the city’s elite. Saphir always debuted his own funny poetry and “humorous lectures,” and he was often able to secure the participation of many of Europe’s most celebrated performers, like Jenny Lind and the beloved muse, singer Pauline Viardot-García.¹⁰⁴ The contradiction between the low esteem in which local writers held the *Humorist* and high esteem in which they held the academies was striking. One reviewer, for example, wrote in advance of one of the academies:

Of M. G. Saphir’s [musical] academy, it can certainly be expected that the most exquisite of the budding talents of the season will offer their best and most splendid [performances], in accordance with elite audience taste; that these elite audience members will attend [the academy] in abundance; . . . that [actor Julie] Rettich will thrill [the audience] with her mastery of declamation and, in total glory and complete brilliance, bring flowers and gemstones of the most subtle scent out of the language that is built into Saphir’s poetry, which is full of sumptuous image luxury; . . . that Saphir’s comedic poetry, full of humor and wit, would be another win for the jocular and humorous declamation genre . . . —that the musical-declamation academy, which Saphir staged last Sunday, once again fulfilled all these expectations is self-evident.¹⁰⁵

A journalist for the *Sonntagsblätter* began a favorable review of an 1842 academy with the assertion that “Saphir’s academies have had for a number of years the best reputation.”¹⁰⁶

The enthusiasm with which critics greeted the academies was all the more surprising since the

¹⁰⁴ For example, the program for Saphir’s academy that took place on January 31, 1847 records that Saphir secured the participation of Jenny Lind, as well as the incredibly popular singer Josef Staudigl and the actor Luise Neumann, among others, for the event, which was to take place in the city’s major commercial theater the Theater an der Wien. Three of the six pieces on the program were works by Saphir, one a humorous reading declaimed by Saphir himself. See Saphir, “M. G. Saphirs Akademie,” *Der Humorist*, Jan. 23, 1847.

¹⁰⁵ Anon., “M. G. Saphir’s musikalisch-deklamatorische Akademie,” *Oesterreichisches Morgenblatt*, Dec. 31, 1845.

¹⁰⁶ H., “Josefstadt. M. G. Saphir’s Akademie und humoristische Vorsehung,” *Sonntagsblätter*, April 10, 1842.

events featured a blend of “highbrow” musical performance and “lowbrow” satirical lectures and audiences consisted of not only many of the city’s most important critics, but also many of Saphir’s female fans.

Part of the reason that these academies were so loved was because of the talent that Saphir was able to secure for the performances. Saphir maintained close relationships with many of Europe’s top artistic figures, which encouraged local Viennese critics to take him more seriously. Saphir often stayed at the homes of European artistic elite during his travels. Giacomo Meyerbeer, one of Europe’s most popular opera composers of the period and also a Jew, visited Saphir often during his visits to the Habsburg capital. Meyerbeer recalled in his diary that Saphir hosted lavish soirées and formal dinners at his home in Meyerbeer’s honor.¹⁰⁷

While the popular masculinity Saphir embodied at the *Humorist* found resistance among many of his middle-class professional peers, Saphir’s efforts to counteract this reputation proved at least partly successful. Combining the glamorous academies and his European artistic alliances with his consistent effort to advertise his position that female contribution to artistic and literary production should be limited helped Saphir build a degree of respect among his peers. This was true even as Saphir continued to be treated differently from other journalists. The academies continued to receive glowing reviews. The *Humorist*’s harsh theater criticism was quoted with respect by papers around the city bespeaking the fact that it was read not only by a “lowbrow” audience but also by members of the (male) journalistic elite. In addition, Saphir participated in several of the political activities led by Viennese journalists in the 1840s. Like

¹⁰⁷ Giacomo Meyerbeer, *The Diaries of Giacomo Meyerbeer*, vol. 2, trans. and ed. Robert Ignatius Letellier (London: Associated University Press, 2001), 190, 208. See also the anecdotes about Saphir’s friendships in *Saphiriana. Anekdoten, Witze und Charakterzüge aus dem Leben M. G. Saphir’s* (Brünn: Verlag von Franz Karafiat, 1874).

other Viennese writers, Saphir visited Leipzig, where he met with members of the Writers' Club and tried to gain the favor of the liberal faction, receiving approval for membership in the club only after prolonged debate among the club's members. Along with most of Vienna's major journalists, editors, and writers, Saphir signed Bauernfeld's 1845 petition to the state for censorship reform.

The fact that Saphir was able to maintain and foster a modicum of respect and admiration in Vienna from other journalists demonstrates that the literary masculinity in journalism, epitomized by *Sonntagsblätter* journalists was not entirely inflexible. "Serious" literary journalism could tolerate some opposition, in the form of a popular journalist, who peppered his papers with "light" content to attract a broader range of readers than other papers could claim. In her work on the concept of hegemonic masculinity, sociologist Raewyn Connell has discussed the fact that ideal gender norms in a given context can tolerate some difference in practice. While heterosexual masculinity has long informed the hegemonic image of the ideal politician, individual homosexual male politicians have occasionally achieved great success. According to Connell's logic, ideal masculinity must accommodate some variance because almost no one can successfully live up to the ideal. Thus, if anyone is to profit from the ideal, nonconformities must be at times overlooked.¹⁰⁸ This is an apt means of understanding how Saphir, given his major deviations from "literary masculinity" could still find relative support in Vienna from other journalists. By remaining committed to the principle that only educated, middle-class men ought to *produce* work for the public sphere and by entertaining his fellow journalists with performances that featured Europe's major stars, Saphir's style as a journalist could be tolerated

¹⁰⁸ Raewyn Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), 186.

and accommodated in the city.

Still, Saphir continued to be subjected to occasional exclusion and anti-Jewish mockery. The literary masculinity of the *Sonntagsblätter* was simply a much better path through which Jewish men in Vienna could find access to elite middle-class circles in Vienna. It is no surprise, then, that many more Jews chose to have their writing printed in the *Sonntagsblätter*, rather than approaching Saphir to request publication. Moritz Barach and Sigmund Engländer, both young Jewish journalists, published in both the *Sonntagsblätter* and the *Humorist*. These two writers were perhaps the only two Jewish journalists who were, for a time, able to appear as “literary” and as “popular men,” depending on the context. Nearly all other Jews opted to portray themselves as “literary men” rather than “popular men.” This choice was clearly the best one for Jews of 1840s Vienna who wanted to encounter few social obstacles. As Giacomo Meyerbeer related in his diaries, Saphir once organized a series of artistic performances and a formal dinner for the opera composer.¹⁰⁹ However, as lovely as this event was, it took place on the evening after the literary society Concordia, from which Saphir was excluded, had feted Meyerbeer with an extravagant display. Concordia’s event was led not only by the famed dramatist Grillparzer, but by several Jewish Concordia members. A poetry reading by Frankl, the Jewish journalist who epitomized literary masculinity, was billed as the event’s central attraction, while Saphir, the “popular man,” had to wait until the subsequent night to celebrate Meyerbeer’s stay in the city.

¹⁰⁹ Meyerbeer, *The Diaries of Giacomo Meyerbeer*, vol. 2, 190. Diary entry originally from Dec. 29, 1846.

Part Two: 1848-1859

Chapter Three

The Political Man: The Partisan Journalism of 1848

The *Wiener Allgemeine Damenzeitung* (General Viennese Women's Paper), edited by journalist Hermann Meynert (1808-1895) had been in print for just over two months before uprisings broke out in Vienna on March 13, 1848. Two weeks later Meynert ran the following announcement in the paper:

Isis has transformed herself into a man, and the *Damenzeitung* must also transform herself into a man because the times have become masculine, and the limitations associated with the name of our newspaper no longer apply. In such a time as this, no one will be surprised when the *Damenzeitung* . . . now suddenly appears with a beard and a weapon as

The National Guard.

Quite frankly, we would feel ashamed before the world and before ourselves if, in opposition to the high, holy seriousness [*Ernste*] of the present, we still concerned ourselves with the friendly trivialities with which a sick era, long in captivity, killed a lot of time and which, now, healthy and freed, ought to be put aside.¹

True to his word, just two days after Meynert issued this announcement, he closed the *Damenzeitung* and launched a new paper, entitled the *Oesterreichische Nationalgardist und konstitutionelle Staatsbürger* (the Austrian [Male] National Guard and [Male] Constitutional Citizen). As he had promised, the new paper barely resembled the former. Short stories and fashion articles were replaced with editorial or didactic articles on the political events that dominated the news that day. Reports on Viennese theater life were swapped for a new column entitled "Small World Theater," that contained reflections on international news. Current events and editorials about the new civil militia replaced the "friendly trivialities" of the *Damenzeitung*.

Meynert's description of the transition from a "feminine" to a "masculine" paper came only after Ferdinand I, in response to the uproariously voiced demands of revolutionaries,

¹ Hermann Meynert, "An die verehelichten Interessenten der 'Damenzeitung,'" *Wiener Allgemeine Damenzeitung* (Vienna), March 30, 1848.

officially lifted censorship of the press on March 15 and promised to issue a liberal press law in the coming months. With the emperor's decision, journalism in Vienna was thrown into chaos overnight. None of the Vormärz papers remained the same. Editors revamped newspaper content and layout within days, and over the next months hundreds of new papers were put into circulation. Student papers, workers' papers, democratic papers, liberal papers, conservative papers, Catholic papers, and a Jewish paper became available. Many were already well known by mid-June.

If the image of the literary man had dominated notions of the "ideal" journalist before March 1848, after March, ideas about how the journalist was supposed to behave and what gendered qualities he was supposed to practice were thrown into confusion. While the literary journalist of the Vormärz was ideally supposed to belong to the male middle class, to demonstrate restraint and moderation, and to espouse liberal values, these values came into question during the revolution. Journalists and readers disagreed fundamentally about the characteristics that journalists of the revolution were supposed to embody.

As Meynert's statement upon the closing of the *Damenzeitung* suggests, there were only two qualities upon which journalists typically agreed concerning the image of the journalist of 1848: the journalist of the revolution ought to be "political," and he ought to be a man. These two qualities were not unrelated. As Meynert indicated, the "beard and weapon" of the male journalist was equivalent to the "political" content—news, editorials, and the like—with which Meynert would fill his new "masculine" newspaper. Although entertainment journalism had provided ample opportunities for Vormärz journalists to express their political opinions, as discussed in Chapter One, journalists of 1848 increasingly came to imagine old entertainment journalism with its "feminine trivialities" as "apolitical" and "womanly." In turn journalists of

1848 believed that the new genres introduced to the press after the lifting of censorship were the “true” site of politics and that news reporting or editorializing were the best expression of masculinity in journalism. To be a proper political man of the press, it was necessary to contribute to the new “manly” genres of the year.

Jewish journalists proved adept at transitioning from the Vormärz model of the literary journalist to the model of 1848. As in the previous period, they aimed to adopt the paradigmatic practices associated with middle-class masculinity in order to gain acceptance in male circles in Vienna, but, as important figures in journalism, they end up playing a major role in shaping the behaviors and attitudes associated with the figure of the journalist. Jewish journalists held leadership and editorial positions in all different types of newspapers, except those printed for Catholic and far right-wing audiences. Vormärz Jewish editors like Ludwig Frankl and Moritz Saphir revamped their newspapers to reflect the expectations of the new year, while many young Jewish men printed their own student or radical papers as new factions took shape. Several Jewish men became known as pioneering political cartoonists when censorship law was changed to permit the printing of political cartoons. Throughout the year Jewish journalists also served as elected parliamentarians, on political committees, as National Guards, and as leaders in revolutionary activist organizations. Salo Baron’s argument from an article written for the centenary of the revolution still remain true: the uprisings of 1848 marked one of the first modern political events during which Jews were fully embedded in European political structures and engaged in a European political conflict, rather than a conflict specific to the Jewish community.²

² Salo W. Baron, “The Impact of the Revolution of 1848 on Jewish Emancipation,” *Jewish Social Studies* 11, no. 3 (1949): 195-248. Baron’s argument is echoed in Reinhard Rürup, “Progress and Its Limits: The Revolutions of 1848 and European Jewry,” in *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, eds. Dieter Dowe, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, and Jonathan Sperber, trans. David Higgins (New York: Berghahn Books, 2000), 749-764.

Not only were Jewish journalists important actors in 1848, but the issue of Jewish legal status in the empire was at the heart of political debate that year, which meant that Jewish journalists' public behavior as "proper men" came to be viewed as critically important. The question of whether Jewish men would be accorded the same rights as Christian men and whether discriminatory Jewish taxes would be repealed were central concerns of the imperial parliament. Thanks to the lifting of censorship, these questions dominated the press as well. Articles on the subject of the *Judenfrage* appeared in scores of articles just weeks after the uprisings began. Moreover, for the first time in modern Viennese history, not only the status of Jews but also Jewishness itself could be discussed explicitly in the press. Anti-Jewish and pro-Jewish sentiments did not need to be masked to fit the dictates of censorship law.

Despite the new press freedoms, the liberty with which Jewishness could be debated was less of a boon for Jewish journalists than might have been expected. Jewish journalists remained married to the image of the journalist as a middle-class man, shaping and formulating ideas about the norms associated with journalism from the perspective of middle-class masculinity in general. Few Jews emphasized their own religious or cultural affiliation with the Jewish community, and when they did, they typically wrote pieces in support of Jewish emancipation, exempting any discussion of their personal affiliation.

The decision to remain quiet about the personal religious backgrounds of individual journalists was not pursued by a new faction of conservative journalists who began making themselves known from early summer 1848. This new breed of conservatives—radicals called them "reactionaries"—began turning to anti-Jewish rhetoric to express their anger about the left-wing turn in politics. These journalists complained that *Jewish* radical journalists were

responsible for introducing anarchy in the city and for disrupting a harmonious imperial system. For anti-Jewish conservatives, it was not their masculine middle-class qualities for which Jewish journalists ought to be known. Instead, they believed that Jews ought to be distinguished by their *Jewishness* first and foremost. In their opinion Jewish journalists acted primarily in their capacity as Jews, not as a middle-class men, and, thus, Jewishness was to blame for the city's ills. The question of masculinity was at the core of the debate. Anti-Jewish conservatives accused Jewish journalists of disordering the public sphere by complaining that Jews, especially Jewish radicals, possessed corrupted masculinities.

The “End of the Feminine”

On the first day after the granting of press freedom in Vienna, on March 15, 1848, Moritz Saphir published two political cartoons in the *Humorist*. One of the cartoons was entitled “Volk Scene: Assembly of Bad Writers in Light of the Free Press.”³ Under the title appeared a riotous knot of “bad writers,” along with a woman whose hands were raised in grieved supplication. The bad writers, all wearing fashionable middle-class dress of the day, were standing upon a pile of rubble marked with several labels: “theater criticism,” “[Johann] Strauss the Son,” “Sperl Ball” (a popular event of the Vormärz social calendar). Meanwhile, one of the bad writers stood above the others and cried out, in the caption, “Good sirs! We are *ruined!* The press is free—what can now be written?”

Although the *Humorist* had printed a good deal of theater criticism in the Vormärz, by March 15 its cartoonists relegated such material to the rubbish heap of bad writing. The *Humorist* was not alone. Entertainment papers across the city quickly transitioned their content

³ B. Bachmann Hohmann, “Volks-Scenen. Versammlung der schlechten Schriftsteller in Ansehung der Freien Presse,” cartoon, *Der Humorist* (Vienna), March 15, 1848.

from theater criticism, celebrity gossip, and short stories to news-reporting and editorializing. This transition was not merely cosmetic. It prompted a broad re-imagining of the role and definition of “politics” in journalism, which involved re-gendering genres of journalism that had previously been integral to the city’s “masculine” press. If poetry, short stories, and criticism had been central genres of writing for the literary male journalists of the Vormärz, by 1848 most journalists believed that news-reporting and editorializing better conformed to their ideas about what the proper male journalist should be writing, while entertainment journalism had come to be seen as a “feminine” form of writing. The genres vital to entertainment journalism no longer held their primary role in the industry. According to 1848 journalists, this transition turned the “literary men” of journalism into “political men.”

On March 13, two days before the *Humorist* published its “Volk Scene” cartoon, a motley group of university students, agricultural workers, and craftsmen gathered before the Landhaus in Vienna, where the aristocratic Estates of Lower Austria was set to meet that day. The protesters planned to demand constitutional protection, free press, reduced taxation, and a definitive end to the payment of feudal dues, and they were prepared to interrupt the meeting if necessary. Two young men, Adolf Fischhof, a Jewish physician’s assistant, and Joseph Goldmark, a Jewish medical student, emerged as leaders, intermittently addressing the crowd in what were later described as elegant and provocative terms. After protestors were denied admittance to the meeting, the confrontation quickly turned physical. Protestors stormed the Landhaus. Minutes later they were met with military fire. The protest set off a violent confrontation that lasted two days. Protesters, especially craftsmen and craftswomen and agricultural workers, looted and destroyed property in several parts of the city and suburbs, and at least thirty-five protesters, also mostly craftsmen and craftswomen, died at the hands of the

military.⁴

Despite the bloodshed, the protests successfully secured a set of major liberal concessions from Ferdinand I. After rumors of the concessions spread on late March 14, Ferdinand issued an official charter the next day. Ferdinand promised to draft a constitution, convene an imperial parliament, grant press freedom, and give permission for city residents to found an armed civilian militia. Two days later Ferdinand also appointed, for the first time, a constitutional ministry, with positions for a minister president, along with ministers of war, foreign affairs, interior, finance, and justice.

The city's entertainment journalists had long identified with political liberalism, a position they successfully managed to articulate in spite of censorial restrictions in the years prior to 1848. As liberals, journalists' main goal in the years before 1848 was to advocate for granting political and civil rights to male members of the middle-class, though individuals disagreed on precisely who should be included in this expansion of power. Journalists also advocated for abolishing press censorship and for dismantling what they believed was a robust network of spies and informants employed by Metternich.⁵

In spite of their political goals, most liberal entertainment journalists had not been on site at the Landhaus on March 13. They were, however, fully primed to understand the significance

⁴ The *Humorist* published a list of those who died. See "Verzeichnis der bisher erkannten Gefallenen," *Der Humorist*, March 21, 1848.

⁵ There are many sources for these opinions. On discontentment with the Censorship Authority and the interest in German nationalism and imperial unity, see Chapters One and Two of this dissertation. For a close reading of several liberal sources, see R. John Rath, *The Viennese Revolution of 1848* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1957), 21-29. The *Grenzboten*, the liberal newspaper edited by Ignaz Kuranda in Leipzig is one of the best sources of specific political opinions held by the Viennese male middle class since so many Viennese journalists contributed to it (typically anonymously) in the 1840s.

of Ferdinand's concessions.⁶ To entertainment-press journalists, the March 15 concessions were colossal victories, the realization of a liberal platform almost overnight. According to this logic, the March Days, as March 13 through 15 would come to be called, marked the moment of "political awakening" in Vienna and among its middle class. The slumber of the Vormärz had finally been broken by the revelatory lifting of censorship. The context of a stark transition from slumber to wakefulness underlies the *Humorist's* cartoon that mocked "bad writers" of the old entertainment press who had written only theater criticism and celebrity gossip. "Theater criticism" was symptomatic of the old, censored world and would become rubbish to be overlooked in the new world of the free press. The *Humorist's* joke would be repeated in varied form throughout the entertainment press in the weeks that followed March 15.

The impression that emerges from journalism written in the immediate wake of the uprising is triumphant and celebratory. Newspapers reported the events of the March Days with breathless exhilaration. Journalists envisaged Ferdinand as their benevolent liberator, an image they put in sharp relief against the "Metternichian system."⁷ "Freedom" (*Freiheit*), a word that was rarely allowed to be printed in the Vormärz, became a celebratory byword for the editors of the old entertainment press. For journalists, the most feted victory by far was the repeal of censorship laws. In fact, "freedom" was practically shorthand for "freedom of press." Journalists excitedly awaited the new press law that the regime had promised to issue shortly after the

⁶ The city had been on edge for weeks, especially after news of the Paris uprisings in February had made it to Vienna. Vienna's professional middle class and middle-class students, for example, had been petitioning the state intensively in the weeks leading up to the confrontation appealing for lowered taxes and constitutional protections. In addition, students of the University of Vienna had been intensively recruiting agricultural workers and craftsmen to join their planned demonstration at the meeting of the estates, set for March 13. For a detailed overview of the state of the empire, especially Vienna, in the month preceding the conflict of March 13, see Rath, *The Viennese Revolution of 1848*, 3-56.

⁷ For example, Josef Sigmund Ebergsberg, "Wien," *Der Österreichische Zuschauer* (Vienna), March 17, 1848 and *ibid.*, March 20, 1848.

dismantling of the Censorship Authority, sharing rumors that the law would grant wide latitude to journalists, except in cases of libel.⁸

The political developments catalyzed specific changes in the form, content, and discursive qualities of Vienna's press. "Old" entertainment newspapers of Vienna nearly uniformly and almost immediately switched editorial approaches. The *Sonntagsblätter*, for example, restarted its issue counter from 322 to 1, following editor Ludwig Frankl's statement "I hereby declare [all previous issues] null and void, and I begin today with No. 1."⁹ By April 1 the *Wiener Zeitschrift* was no longer billed as the "magazine for art, literature, theater, and fashion" but rather the "magazine for rights [*Recht*], truth, progress, art, literature, theater, fashion, and social life." The *Humorist* included the parenthetical notation "(Censor-free paper)" under its masthead as of March 16. The *Theaterzeitung* combined the approaches of both the *Zeitschrift* and the *Humorist*, changing its tagline to the weighty claim to be a "censor-free organ for all daily news, of life, of the progress of the time, in art and science, in literature, in the fields of intelligence, industry, trade, etc."

The changes were not only in the papers' appearances. Editors began replacing articles on fashion, lengthy theater and art reviews, and humorous jokes with "political" articles: news reports, minutes or announcements from the meetings of various representative and revolutionary bodies, recollections of the March days by participants, and editorials about the future of the city. The *Wiener Zeitschrift*, to take one example, had printed a notice in December 1847 inviting readers to subscribe for the first quarter of 1848. The notice advertised the paper as "a favored

⁸ For local excitement and opinion about the forthcoming press law, see, for example, Moritz Saphir, "Pressfreiheit und Repressivgesetz," *Der Humorist*, March 16, 1848 and Andreas Schumacher, "Preßgesetz," *Die Gegenwart* (Vienna), March 23, 1848.

⁹ Ludwig August Frankl, "Sonntagsrede," *Sonntagsblätter* (Vienna), March 19, 1848.

entertainment paper and an educated [*gebildeten*] organ for literature, daily news, art, fashion, and theater.” Its contents would consist of “colorful images from Viennese life,” “theater reports from each of Vienna’s theaters,” “musical reports,” a “women’s album,” and a “conversation salon [with reports on] amusing tidbits [*Pikanterie*], the most interesting stuff from the new travel novels, oddities, puffs, and more.”¹⁰ The *Zeitschrift*’s next subscription advertisement, however, ran in late March 1848 and had a completely revamped magazine description:

Freedom of press is the red, pulsing lifeline of freedom. We have achieved it, and we must now make it count. Let’s not stop for a minute but rather advance without ceasing. There is still much to do, and the press is the organ of progress. Everyday we should call attention to what remains to be done; we want to introduce a system of checks over all branches of state administration, and we want to attempt to bring all parts of the national economy and knowledge of government into popular consciousness [*Volksbewußtsein*], by means of popular articles [*populären Aritikeln*]. Likewise, it is our intention to keep a watchful eye on foreign politics and especially to all proceedings in Germany, combined with the progress in Austria. We want to bring a complete chronicle of all events and political proceedings in Vienna, to share the most important manifestos, and to compile everything that concerns the imminent Reichstag into brief summaries. Therefore, the *Wiener Zeitschrift* will maintain, as before, its serious, dignified posture and never get derailed by fruitless ranting but rather advocate for reasonable content and practical proposals. As before, this paper will also offer complete reviews of new literature, art, music, theater, and fashion, report all scientific advancements, and also bring to our readers authentic reports about foreign proceedings by means of our correspondents in all of Europe’s main cities.¹¹

This outline sums up the most common changes that would be implemented in the old press during the weeks and months after the March conflict. Old topics, like art and literary reviews, were shortened to make room for a new set of journalistic material and news reporting, about which newspaper contributors had more to say than they had room to print it. To a certain degree, the respective tones of the two *Zeitschrift* advertisements had changed as well. The new

¹⁰ Josef August Bachmann, “Pränumerations-Einladung auf den 33ten Jahrgang der *Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunst, Literatur, Theater, Mode, geselliges Leben usw. usw.*,” *Wiener Zeitschrift* (Vienna), Dec. 24, 1847. Bachmann was the editor of the *Wiener Zeitschrift* from February 1847.

¹¹ Bachmann, “Pränumerations-Einladung auf das zweite Quartal der Wiener-Zeitschrift, *Wiener Zeitschrift*, March 29, 1848.

advertisement was less defensive and more collective: unlike the December 1847 text, which sought to defend its own importance, the March 1848 text employed a communal image of “press” as an advocate for progress and freedom in the empire.

Although the censored entertainment journalists had always managed to convey political content in their work, the post-March explosion of “political” columns and the increased usage of the word “politics” in general gave the impression that Vienna had rapidly transitioned from a non-political to a political city. Editors began separating the “political” sections of their papers from the “non-political” sections, a demarcating principle that became even more pronounced as the year went on. Along with the *Sonntagsblätter*, Ludwig Frankl began publishing a new paper titled the *Abendzeitung* (Evening Paper), which was dedicated to offering “brief, relevant, quick, new” reports on the goings-on in Vienna and beyond.¹² In late summer Moritz Saphir briefly tried to raise money to convert the *Humorist* into the *Politischer Horizont* (Political Horizon), though his experiment only lasted a few weeks for lack of funds. Although theater criticism, in much reduced form, reappeared later in the summer, a one-paragraph theater column in the *Humorist* expressed what had become the prevailing attitude toward that genre for many of the city’s journalists in 1848: “Who, in our volcanic times,” wrote the journalist, “has patience and leisurely hours enough to critique a work of art, indeed even the necessary attentiveness to see it?”¹³

¹² Ludwig August Frankl, “Vorbemerkung,” *Wiener Abendzeitung* (Vienna), March 27, 1848.

¹³ M—r, “Kunst- und Theater-Halle,” *Der Humorist*, May 20, 1848. The initials indicate that this short statement was likely written by Saphir. See a statement from June in the *Sonntagsblätter*, in which a former critic laments the fact that the paper was unable to provide critical reviews of the number of plays that had been mounted at local theaters since “politics” had, for the time being, made theater “dead”: anon., “Theater,” *Sonntagsblätter*, June 4, 1848. For another similar expression, see anon., “Das Burgtheater,” *Wiener Abendzeitung*, March 27, 1848. Another expression of local disinterest in theater and art later in 1848 can be found in the recently recovered diary of journalist Benjamin Kewall, see Benjamin Kewall, *Erlebte Revolution 1848/49: Das Wiener Tagebuch des jüdischen Journalisten Benjamin Kewall*, eds. Wolfgang Gasser and Gottfried Glassner (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), 193.

The “awakening” of journalists to a “political reality,” rather than one dominated by art and theater criticism, changed not only the way that men expressed themselves as “political” individuals—it also shaped their self-expression as men. Contributing to the art and literary press before 1848 had been an important means for male journalists to express their solidarity with the male liberals, but after the events of 1848, the art and literary press came to be increasingly associated with apoliticality and femininity. Instead, male journalists self-identified as proper men by publishing news reports, writing editorials, and running the minutes from parliamentary and committee meetings—not primarily by writing short stories. These genres of journalism, in turn, came to be viewed both as the “ideal” expression of political journalism and as the most appropriate form of journalism that proper, middle-class men ought to write. For the male journalist, the ability to behave according to the standards of normative masculinity required that he write news reports and opinions pieces.¹⁴ Although Vormärz entertainment journalists, like Moritz Saphir (the *Humorist*), Ludwig Frankl (the *Sonntagsblätter*), and Josef Sigmund Ebersberg (the *Zuschauer*), who were discussed in previous chapters, had long labored to sever “feminine” from “masculine” topics in Vienna’s entertainment press in the decade before 1848, the overnight legalization of writing on the subjects of current events and parliamentary politics was imagined by journalists to constitute the “liberation” of masculine topics from the “feminine” or “childish” confines of entertainment journalism.

¹⁴ Karl Marx, in an 1844 article that critiqued of Hegel’s *Philosophy of Right*, actually articulated precisely this logic when he predicted a future revolution in Germany. He wrote that, after the tenets of revolutionary thought had “penetrated deeply into this virgin soil of the people [the proletariat], the *Germans* will emancipate themselves and become *men*.” Although Marx suggested that revolution would come through the working class and most liberals of Vienna did not believe this would be the case, the expression of revolution as a “political awakening” and transition from immaturity to adult masculinity was the same. Karl Marx, “Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s *Philosophy of Right*: Introduction,” in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker, trans. Thomas Bottomore (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1978), 65. Emphases Marx’s.

Hermann Meynert's statements, cited above, regarding his decision to transform the *Wiener Allgemeine Damenzeitung* into the *Nationalgardist* illustrate the "liberation" of journalism from "femininity." Meynert described the events of March 1848 as proof that "the times have become masculine." Accordingly, he reasoned, "the *Damenzeitung* must also transform herself into a man" that "appears suddenly with beard and a weapon as *The Nationalgardist* [The National Guard]." ¹⁵ Meynert's statement exposes his assumption that the events of March and the arrival of freedom of press transformed the old entertainment press from a state of femininity into a state of masculinity. The topics of the Vormärz, according to Meynert, had become by definition feminine, while the events of 1848 were masculine, tout court.

After March 1848 male journalists mocked "outdated" female musicians and decadent fashion trends. Writers typically interpreted the March Days as the definitive watershed event in the transition from feminine or immature journalism to masculine or mature journalism. For example, Franz Hohegger (1815-1875), a teacher and dramatist, contributed a short editorial on March 18 in the *Oesterreichisches Morgenblatt* that gave a gendered reading of the journalism of the Vormärz: "Both domestic and international Viennese journalism [that is, any journalism written by Viennese writers] were all too often scornfully and bitterly accused of emasculation [*Saft- und Kraftlosigkeit*], pettiness, insignificance, shallowness, and so on. . . . How was it supposed to confront time and history in a *manly way when it was treated like a child?*" ¹⁶ Hohegger depicted Vormärz journalism as sleepy, immature, and feminine. Hohegger believed that emasculation signified impotence, and he argued that Viennese journalism of the Vormärz

¹⁵ Hermann Meynert, "An die verehelichten Interessenten der 'Damenzeitung,'" *Wiener Allgemeine Damenzeitung*, March 30, 1848.

¹⁶ Franz Hohegger, "Zeitfragen. Ein Wort über Preßfreiheit," *Oesterreichisches Morgenblatt* (Vienna), March 18, 1848. Emphasis mine.

was never able to assume the power of “manly” behavior. Hochegger then described the newfound task facing the matured journalist of 1848:

Freedom of press; the National Guard; [parliamentary] representation of the people; independent, public judiciary; taxes that are more equal and less burdensome for the poor segments of the population; the repeal or reduction of the consumption tax and the stamp tax; improvement of the school system; freedom of education and so forth—all of these have been partially granted but are partially in progress. In this lies the beautiful, worthy task of journalism. [Journalism] must take up the questions of the time, shed light on the perceptions of the highly important subjects of general welfare, thoroughly and impartially illuminate the same from all sides, and seek to correct the many erroneous perspectives that prevail among the typically uneducated masses and that so easily generate anxiety and indignation over deceptive expectations.¹⁷

Hochegger’s article is not written to Viennese men in general but addresses Viennese male journalists in particular. It is the journalist who, according to Hochegger, must assume the mantle of manly adulthood appropriate to the new age. Hochegger envisions the journalist as a paternalistic leader uniquely qualified to understand the new political issues of the time, charged with the task of explaining these issues to the “uneducated masses.” A week and a half later the *Morgenblatt* printed an article entitled “Chronicle of the Great March Days in Vienna” that echoed Hochegger’s opinion. The “chronicle” ended with a description of the protestors gathered outside the House of Estates on March 13:

In the 1000 hearts lived one feeling alone, a feeling that had long slumbered in each breast but now, by the enthusiasm of the speaker, awoke to full clarity of consciousness; it was [a feeling of] fraternity and unity. Many people from different nations embraced each other with the words: No, no national hate—we will be brothers.”¹⁸

On one hand this statement expressed national solidarity, which was an important element of liberal rhetoric in early 1848, but this point of view also depicted the March Days as an awakening from political slumber into “consciousness” of masculine fraternity, a position that

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Johann Reiter, “Chronik der großen Märztage in Wien,” *Oesterreichisches Morgenblatt*, March 29, 1848.

is as exclusive as it is inclusive. These articles from the *Morgenblatt* echo the rationale behind Hermann Meynert's decision to shutter the *Damenzeitung* in favor of the *Oesterreichische Nationalgardist*. As Viennese male journalists would have it, the lack of popular interest in theater criticism, the need for paternalistic leadership of the masses, and the awakened political consciousness all foretold Meynert's claim that Viennese journalism had indeed "become masculine."

Although the formal changes that swept the old entertainment press made Vienna's print landscape appear to have been radically altered to reveal a newly progressive, politicized, and masculine world of text and language, this interpretation ignores the reality that in these early weeks practically all of the liberal journalists who celebrated freedom of press were the same men who had been leaders in the highly politicized and masculine environment of the Vormärz entertainment press. The notion that 1848 ushered in a politicized era was not true since journalists had found ways to express their political opinions through the entertainment press in the previous decade. Rather, the primary change that took shape in the press shifted the boundaries of masculinity in journalism from the genres common to the entertainment press to the genres that populated the press of 1848: news-reporting, editorializing, and the like. Viewed as a watershed event by eyewitness journalists, the March Days did not actually *make* the press political—it had already been political. Instead, the March Days reshaped opinions about how journalists were supposed to behave as men.

Unified Middle-Class Men?

In the weeks that followed the March Days, a coalition of Jewish and non-Jewish activists, students, and journalists sought to create a unified middle-class brotherhood built on liberal principles that called for the expanding the power of the male middle class. This

campaign, however, required policing the boundaries of the male middle class as much as it required promoting expansionary efforts. The dual need for expansion and restriction is expressed in a rallying cry Moritz Saphir wrote for the *Humorist* on March 16, just one day after violent protests had been suppressed:

Trust! Unity! Order! These three words are the anchors that should secure our achievements. Peaceful conduct, consistent, manly, and dignified peace, paired with vigilance, these will be the maxims for [this] time of deep turmoil.¹⁹

While Saphir called for trust and unity, he also expressed his opinion about the behaviors he deemed appropriate for the times. “Peaceful conduct,” characterized by its “consistent, manly and dignified” qualities, suggests a range of conditions that might contradict it—violence, femininity, and erraticism among them. To ensure that peaceful conduct would not be outweighed by its opposites, Saphir added that it must be “paired with vigilance.” Saphir’s statement fashions a dichotomy between one revolutionary actor and another. The proper revolutionary actor would be identified because he would behave according to the rubric Saphir laid out. The improper revolutionary, however, would exceed the boundaries of “peaceful conduct,” thus demanding the vigilance of the former. In Saphir’s view the revolution required all men to behave according to the principles he enumerated.

Jewish men, especially journalists, were avid participants in the movement that sought to unify middle-class men. The lifting of censorship meant that Jewishness and Jewish issues could be discussed in public with much more freedom than before. Indeed, soon after Ferdinand had granted the first round of concessions, the question of Jewish emancipation became an important issue for debate in the city, and the majority of professional, middle-class men supported full

¹⁹ Saphir, “Liebe um Liebe, Vertrauen um Vertrauen!” *Der Humorist*, March 16, 1848. Emphasis Saphir’s.

emancipation and the ending of discrimination.²⁰ Despite these new freedoms and the relatively wide support the cause of Jewish emancipation enjoyed, most Jewish journalists and professionals who participated in this movement reaped the benefits of a movement that was built on class, professional, and educational solidarity rather than religious solidarity. As a result, most Jewish men preferred to emphasize their self-identification as middle-class professional men, rather than as Jews, in the same way that Christian middle-class men usually emphasized their professional and class-based qualifications, rather than their religious ones. This decision afforded Jews a greater chance of being permitted equal inclusion in the efforts of new political movements and groups. Jewish men, along with their Christian colleagues, participated enthusiastically in efforts to regulate the boundaries of the liberal middle-class solidarity that emerged out of the March Days.

I. Protecting the Boundaries of Unity

While middle-class professional men celebrated the victories of the March Days, they also expressed growing alarm. Middle-class men took to the newspapers to voice a growing anxiety about the “masses” whose euphoria for revolutionary political change, writers believed, might threaten rule of law. In the immediate wake of the March Days, this concern was shared broadly across the educated middle class by students and older professionals, many of whom wrote for the press.

The most substantial effort to “contain” the “masses” began with the founding of a civilian militia in the late afternoon of March 13. Led by prominent members of the city’s literati, the National Guard’s first task during the March Days was to suppress “unruly” revolutionary

²⁰ William O. McCagg Jr., *A History of Habsburg Jews, 1670-1918* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 83-101 and Reinhard Rürup, “Progress and Its Limits: The Revolutions of 1848 and European Jewry,” 749-764.

elements. Although guardsmen were far from agreement on political and social topics, the militia itself became the archetypical representative of a mode of masculinity that many men of the middle class would champion throughout the spring: an orderly, militarized masculinity of the middle class that took as its foil the “savage,” disorderly masculinity of Vienna’s working classes. In terms of its membership, leadership, and its exclusionary principles, the National Guard was an outgrowth of the Legal-Political Reading Club, one of the preeminent institutions for male literati (and thus the entertainment press) of the Vormärz. From the early hours of March 13, individuals had been looking to club leaders for direction. The club’s quarters became a focal point for disseminating news about ongoing events.²¹ Only a short time after the initial confrontation between protestors and the imperial army commenced, Reading Club leaders hastily called together a civilian militia formed of mostly male, middle-class city residents.

The National Guard’s first task was to crack down on men they believed were behaving according to the wrong standards of masculinity: men who were, in the Guard’s opinion, unruly, violent, or unprofessional, a set of qualities in opposition to Saphir’s list of preferred characteristics, cited above. As early as March 15, Guard members began rounding up and arresting revolutionaries—mostly artisans, agricultural workers, and day laborers—who they believed had gone too far in their revolutionary tactics. As demonstrations continued, the violence escalated. Protests engulfed the city. Neighborhoods were looted and property destroyed, mostly by non-middle-class demonstrators. In response, National Guard arrests mounted. Within a matter of days, the National Guard had arrested so many workers that aristocratic property had to be converted into makeshift jail space.²²

²¹ Anon., “Der juristisch-politische Leseverein,” *Die Constitution* (Vienna), March 20, 1848 and Rath, *The Viennese Revolution of 1848*, 75.

²² Anon., “Prinz Coburg,” *Der Österreichische Zuschauer*, March 22, 1848.

On March 15, as part of his liberal concessions, Ferdinand I gave official sanction to the newly formed National Guard. The emperor's statement indicated the kind of pedigree required for guard membership. In a charter addressed to Viennese protestors, Ferdinand stated simply, "The National Guard, based on property and intelligence, is already performing most useful service."²³ Guard membership, as Ferdinand's reference to "property and intelligence" implied, consisted mostly of the middle-class. This was true in the guard's first iteration in mid-March, and it did not change significantly throughout the year. Membership drew largely from the ranks of bureaucracy, business, and other professional spheres. Teachers, professors, doctors, lawyers, journalists, and writers were well represented.²⁴ Elite, middle-class men, who had dominated the entertainment press and Viennese public life in the fifteen years prior to 1848, became members of the guard, promoting guard activities in their reworked newspapers and writing. Lower-class workers were not represented in the National Guard. In fact, it was precisely the Guard's efforts to arrest "savage," lower-class protestors that comprised the "useful service" to which Ferdinand referred.

The amount of paperwork, pageantry, regulatory measures, and public discourse generated by the National Guard proved to be tremendous, and the performance of militarized, politicized masculinity associated with the National Guard was championed by the liberal press. Within only a few short weeks after the initial round of violence, the National Guard was already detailing its own organization and structure, planning costumes and weapon-distribution, and recording expenses and dues paid by members.²⁵ Guard appearance was a constant topic of

²³ Original text (in translation) in Rath, *The Viennese Revolution of 1848*, 84.

²⁴ See the National Guard membership lists in ZPH 7, Foliobox 6, Wienbibliothek im Rathaus.

²⁵ ZPH 7, Foliobox 1, 2, and 6, Wienbibliothek im Rathaus.

debate and anxiety. The question of the colors of the “national flag” and guard costumes were thought to be of grave importance, and the press ran multiple editorials on the matter.²⁶ Guard positions mimicked the hierarchy of military ranking, and weapon-distribution reflected this hierarchy.²⁷ Liberal journalists were quick to circulate and promote the language of solemnity and pomp associated with the Guard. The *Sonntagsblätter*, which had been so devoted to high-level theater and art criticism in the Vormärz was declared the official paper of the National Guard on April 6, and, when Hermann Meynert converted the former *Damenzeitung* into the *Nationalgardist*, he filled the paper with editorials and news reports following the activities of the new militia.²⁸ News reports frequently expressed the anxiety that the Guard was still in “chaos,” revealing the depth of concern that accompanied the liberal attention to proper masculine decorum.²⁹

From its inception the National Guard embodied the transition, according to the city’s journalists, from a liberal masculinity that was rooted in elite literary and artistic journalism to a new image of masculinity that appeared in military uniform. Journalists and poets of the Vormärz began describing themselves prominently as “National Guardsmen.” Johann Nepomuk Vogl, among the most prolific contributors to the old entertainment press, published a celebratory poem entitled the “Song of the National Guards” in the *Oesterreichische Morgenblatt*, an entertainment paper that he edited in the 1840s. Vogl signed the poem “Dr. Joh Nep. Vogl,

²⁶ For example, anon., “Welche werden unsere Nationalfarben sein?” *Sonntagsblätter*, March 19, 1848.

²⁷ ZPH 7, Foliobox 7, Wienbibliothek im Rathaus.

²⁸ For the announcement about the *Sonntagsblätter*, see anon., “Die Nationalgarde,” *Wiener Abendzeitung*, April 6, 1848.

²⁹ For example, see *ibid.*

National Guard.”³⁰ The poem demonstrates the militaristic imagery that began to take shape in Guard rhetoric and among the liberal journalists of the old entertainment press. The first stanza of the poem read, “Health and blessings to our emperor/Our noble Ferdinand/On his head are laurel branches/He who arms his son’s hands.” This celebration of an armed brotherhood, bound in loyalty to the emperor, was central to the militaristic and middle-class masculinity expressed by Guard members in the press.

From the beginning many of the students demonstrated a greater willingness to participate in violent protest and to take the side of workers than had many of their professional counterparts in the middle class. Yet in spite of these differences, expressions of solidarity between students and guardsmen in the weeks after the March Days abounded. Students had been permitted to found their own branch of the National Guard, an Academic Legion to be headed by Adolf Fischhof, the charismatic young Jewish physician’s assistant who had spoken so eloquently and provocatively before the revolutionaries on March 13. Several student papers and publications began to appear, including *Das junge Oesterreich* (Young Austria), edited by Ludwig Eckhardt (1827-1871) and the *Politischer Studenten-Courier* (Political Student Courier), edited by the Jewish student Adolf Buchheim, along with Oskar Falke and Rudolf Gußmann. Like the professional members of the Vormärz press, Vienna’s students expressed loyalty to the emperor, whom they described as a great benefactor of the people; to press freedom; and to the ideals and decorum upon which the new all-male civilian militia was to be based.³¹

The early student press, like the former entertainment press, rejected the “bellettrism” of

³⁰ Johann Nepomuk Vogel, “Nationalgardistenlied,” *Oesterreichisches Morgenblatt*, March 18, 1848. See also Eduard Mautner’s article, signed in a similar way: Eduard Mautner, “Vor einigen Tagen,” *Wiener Abendzeitung*, April 19, 1848.

³¹ See Ludwig Eckhardt, “Was Wir Wollen,” *Das junge Oesterreich* (Vienna), March 13-15, 1848.

the Vormärz for exclusively “political” topics, and the Academic Legion in its early iteration adopted the same militaristic masculinity of the National Guard. Like guardsmen, legionnaires wore military costumes, engaged in heated debate and decorous pageantry, and participated in new political processes across the city and empire. So evident were the similarities between the groups that some professionals chose not to join the National Guard but rather to become legionnaires, as in the case of editor Ludwig Frankl. A portrait of Frankl from the time shows



Fig. 1. Ludwig Frankl in uniform as an Academic Legionnaire. Portrait by Joseph Matthäus Aigner (1849).³²

him wearing his Legion hat, embroidered with an “M” for “medical division” and an “8,” indicating his company (Fig. 1). Along with the plumed, brimmed hat (guardsmen and legionnaires could be distinguished by their hats), students were identifiable in broadsides, prints, and paintings by their boots fitted with spurs.

³² Portrait reprinted in Ludwig August Frankl, *Erinnerungen*, ed. Stefan Hock (Prague, J. G. Calve’sche k. u. k. Hof- und Universitäts-Buchhandlung: 1910), n. p.

Expressions of solidarity between middle-class guardsmen and students of the Academic Legion were ubiquitous through mid-April. Indeed, even if the efforts of lower-class workers had been integral to ensuring that the emperor issued the liberal concessions of March 15, it was primarily the students who received the praise and honor of the liberal press. Although workers were not entirely ignored, the students were hailed as glorious saviors of their countrymen.

In the weeks immediately following the March Days, the National Guard was portrayed by its members as a unified and unifying force among the middle class, even as disagreements arose. In the first month after its founding the Guard proved to be astoundingly popular. By some accounts over 30,000 middle-class men were armed within the first two weeks after March 13.³³ Lynn Hunt's account of the French Revolution in *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* offers a useful way to understand the goals of the Guard.³⁴ Hunt argues that the 1789 French Revolution witnessed the imagined "patricide" of the collective father figure—the king. The father-king was replaced by the model of a "band of brothers," that is, a "fraternity" based on class and gender solidarity fit for the republican age. Middle-class men assumed power over parliamentary life, business, and other sectors of the "public sphere," forcing women to adopt increasingly domestic roles and privatizing women's labor to new degrees.

Although the majority of middle-class men in Vienna, unlike their counterparts in 1789 France, remained faithful to the crown, they did rely on a "band of brothers" strategy to acquire power over the new political, social, and commercial enterprises on the rise in the city after the March 15 concessions were issued. While real unity was as much imagined as it was substantive

³³ For the number of members see, for example, a report in the *Ungar*: anon., "Wiener Neuigkeiten," *Der Ungar* (Pest), March 23, 1848 and ZPH 7, Foliobox 6, Wienbibliothek im Rathaus.

³⁴ Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

since political disagreement abounded in the weeks after the March 15, middle-class liberals and radicals nevertheless relied on the image of a “band of brothers” as a means to express class, gender, and political solidarity that promoted the expansion of middle-class, male power.

The Guard functioned as a middle-class brotherhood, excluding not only women but also men who practiced the “wrong” version of masculinity—principally and in practice, working-class men. In some ways Guard masculinity appeared united precisely by means of its efforts to exclude women and non-professional men. Todd Kontje has provided a helpful addendum to Lynn Hunt’s “band of brothers” model by looking at German cities during the German Wars of Liberation. Kontje argues that, while the “band of brothers” model of political and public power overshadowed the patriarchal model that governed king and subject in public fora, the patriarchal model actually became stronger in the private forum of the home during the Wars of Liberation. Middle-class men who strove to join the “band of brothers” in order to reject Napoleon’s patriarchal power actually reinforced principles of patriarchy at home, where they demanded that their wives and children follow modern practices of bourgeois domesticity.³⁵ The events of 1848 Vienna echo Kontje’s description of German cities in 1813. Although some women had been active in the demonstrations, women could not join the National Guard. Middle-class women were restricted to the supplemental role of sewing flags for guard pageantry.³⁶ Women were given “feminine” tasks.

Besides outright arrests of peasants, artisans, and other members of the working class, Guard members also launched a discursive effort in the press to distance themselves from “unruly” men. Alongside the robust effort by the male, middle-class press to fashion the National

³⁵ Todd Kontje, “Gender-Bending in the Biedermeier,” *Women in German Yearbook* 12 (1996): 53-69.

³⁶ ZPH 7, Foliobox 8, Wienbibliothek im Rathaus.

Guard as organized, orderly, and gravely important lurked the equally vigorous rhetorical push to portray the “masses” as disorderly, unpredictable, and dangerous.³⁷ If, in the decade prior to 1848, a key foil to the educated male elite of Vienna’s press had been the unrefined, slightly comical, and often feminine “Volk,” in 1848 the “Volk” took on a much more sinister appearance in the form of the “masses”—the uncontrollable male bodies that threatened to destabilize the state and its attendant middle-class social life. As Franz Hohegger wrote in the *Morgenblatt*, liberal journalists often imagined themselves to be responsible for holding back the “anxiety and indignation” that stemmed from the “typically uneducated masses.” The *Zuschauer* reported, for instance, that “the thieving masses—wildness, barbarism, and savagery in the flesh—cast a dark shadow over the state of our popular education [*Volkserziehung*].”³⁸ Journalists for nearly all of the city’s old newspapers began calling for “peace and order,” imploring their fellow city residents to demonstrate “sobriety” and gratefulness to the emperor for the “gift” of freedom.³⁹ These statements were not benign rhetoric but intentionally put space between the paper’s contributors and the “wild” and immature or uneducated masculinity of the masses that seemed to occupy a visible position in the city.

II. Jewish Men and Middle-Class Unity

From March 13 onward, Jewish men were in the spotlight in ways that they had never before been in modern Viennese history. When two young Jewish men were killed at the hands of the military during the initial conflict, Jewish leaders and journalists across the city hailed the

³⁷ See, for example, several short reports in the *Wiener Abendzeitung* that draw a line between middle-class liberals and workers: anon., “Wiedererweckung der Lokalpolizei,” *Wiener Abendzeitung*, April 5, 1848 and anon., “Noah Rimmer Arbeiteraufregung,” *Wiener Abendzeitung*, April 6, 1848.

³⁸ Anon., “Prinz Coburg,” *Der Österreichische Zuschauer*, March 22, 1848.

³⁹ For example, Josef Sigmund Ebergsberg, “Wien,” *Der Österreichische Zuschauer*, March 18, 1848 and Saphir, “Der erste Frühlingsstrahl der Preßfreiheit!” *Der Humorist*, March 15, 1848.

men as the first Jewish martyrs for liberal principles. A short biography later printed in the Jewish revolutionary paper that was founded after the March Days described one of the men, Carl Spitzer, in hagiographical terms as “our hero”—a diligent, respectful student who was never rash (Fig. 2).⁴⁰ Isaac Noah Mannheimer, the Viennese community preacher, was invited to speak at a memorial service held for the victims, a historic occasion in which Mannheimer delivered an address alongside a Catholic priest and a Protestant minister. Mannheimer used the speech to call for Christians to extend fraternal unity to Jews:

Permit me a word to my Christian brothers! You wanted the dead Jews to rest with you in your [grave], in one grave. They fought for you, bleed for you! They lie in your grave! Now allow those who have fought the same battle [as you] and the more difficult one, to live with you on one earth, free and unhindered like you!⁴¹

In a later address to the Jewish community, Mannheimer changed his message. In that address he urged Jewish men to fight on behalf of rights for all men, rather than on behalf of the specific cause of Jewish emancipation:

What is now to be done for us [Jews]? For us? Nothing! Everything for the people [*Volk*] and Fatherland, as you have done in the past few days. . . . Now nothing for us! No word about “Jewish emancipation” We will deal with and attend to our fate with patience and peace, raise not a hand for our rights, move not a foot for our rights. First the right of humans to live, to breathe, to think, and to speak; first the right of the *Bürger*, the right of the noble, free *Bürger* in his power.⁴²

Mannheimer’s message for a general audience and Jewish audience were different. In the address to Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, he appealed directly to Christians, asking for their empathy

⁴⁰ Anon., “Geschichte der glorreichen Tage vom 13. bis 18. März, eingeleitet durch eine Biographie Carl Heinr. Spitzer’s,” *Oesterreichisches Central-Organ für Glaubensfreiheit, Cultur, Geschichte und Literatur der Juden* (Vienna), April 4, 1848. The other young man had the last name Hirschmann, but, according to reports, nothing else was known about him, other than the fact that he was a Jew. See *ibid.*

⁴¹ Mannheimer’s speech quoted in I. N. Mannheimer, “Am Grabe der Gefallenen,” transcribed in the *Sonntagsblätter*, March 19, 1848.

⁴² Speech quoted in I. N. Mannheimer, “Erklärung bezüglich auf die Judenfrage,” *Oesterreichisches Central-Organ*, April 4, 1848.

and political support. On the other hand, when he spoke to the Jewish community, Mannheimer called on Jews to forego forms of political action in which they appealed to the state for their emancipation as Jews. Instead, Mannheimer asked Jews to join liberal movements that demanded that the state grant civil rights to middle-class men, irrespective of religion, a political achievement Mannheimer hoped would dissolve the legal distinction between Jew and non-Jews.

While many Jews and non-Jews did continue to push for the lifting of discriminatory restrictions on the Jewish community throughout the year, as public figures, the majority of Jewish journalists chose to follow Mannheimer's suggestion that they portray themselves first and foremost as liberal members of the middle-class fraternity that demanded rights of citizenship from the state—rather than as a Jews in particular. This was the case despite the fact that Jews, Jewishness, and Jewish political causes could be discussed more freely in the press thanks to the end of censorship. Even when they appealed to the cause of Jewish emancipation, Jewish journalists rarely drew attention to their own religious heritage. Rather, Jewish journalists were integral to building fraternal solidarity in the city and to propagating these images through the pages of their newspapers.



Fig. 2. Carl Spitzer, as depicted in a lithograph published by the new Jewish newspaper.⁴³

Jewish journalists played an important and visible role in promoting the discourse of middle-class unity through the press. Former Jewish entertainment journalists hailed the formation of the National Guard and the heroism of the young students and protesters who had brought about the changes of March 15. Ludwig Frankl's poem "The University," the first publication printed after the granting of press freedom, commemorated University of Vienna students by drawing attention to their heroic militarism.⁴⁴ The first two stanzas depicted the young men as valiant soldiers, marching to the beat of a drum:

What approaches with a bold step?

⁴³ S. Cohn, lithograph of Carl Spitzer, printed as part of the following article: Anon., "Geschichte der glorreichen Tage vom 13. bis 18. März, eingeleitet durch eine Biographie Carl Heinr. Spitzer's," *Oesterreichisches Central-Organ für Glaubensfreiheit, Cultur, Geschichte und Literatur der Juden*, April 4, 1848.

⁴⁴ Ludwig August Frankl, "Die Universität" (Vienna: Josef Stockholmer von Hirschfeld'schen Buchdruckerei, 1848).

The weapon flashes, the flag flutters,
It draws near with the bright sound of the drum
The University.

The hour of light has come;
What we longed for, begged for in vain,
Has been lit inside the hearts of the youth
The University!⁴⁵

Frankl's poem was reprinted in papers and broadsides across the city and became a chant used by the student protesters themselves. Moritz Barach, a Jewish journalist who had published writing at several Vormärz entertainment newspapers, including both the *Sonntagsblätter* and the *Humorist*, wrote and printed a set of poems a few weeks after the March Days. Barach's poem paralleled the themes of soldierly solidarity that appeared in Frankl's poem "The University":

Who was it that, when the hour struck,
Anointed their brothers with their blood?
And even as many among them fell,
Lined up more determinedly to do the noble work?
Who was it that, tired and deeply weary
From the serious battle with which they were unaccustomed,
Still desperately and determinedly clung to the sword
Without straying from the goal that had been set?—
It was the students!⁴⁶

Both Barach and Frankl highlighted masculine qualities of heroism and courage and promoted the image of the middle-class—here, the student—warrior as the harbinger of freedom. These themes were echoed in the journalism of many Jewish writers in the wake of the March Days.⁴⁷

Many Jews also participated in expressions of solidarity with their fellow journalists across the city to announce the "granting of freedom" and to continue to advance the political

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Moritz Barach (pseu. J. Märzroth), "Aurorafalter. Dichtungen zur Erinnerung an den 13., 14. Und 15 März 1848" (Vienna: Josef Stöckholzer v. Hirschfeld, 1848).

⁴⁷ Another good example is Siegfried Kapper's article on the proper regalia and weaponry of the National Guard, printed in the *Humorist*: Siegfried Kapper, "Porte epee oder nicht porte epee," *Der Humorist*, March 29, 1848.

goals of male professionals. For example, on March 15, a group of writers, mostly journalists, from across the city printed and distributed a declaration that aimed to counter suspicion among the public that press freedom has in fact not been granted. Of the signatories, close to a third were Jews, mostly well-known journalists.⁴⁸ Frankl, along with Jewish political leader Adolf Fischhof, were on a small committee tasked with the assignment of writing a set of recommendations to the state to inform the new liberal press law that Ferdinand had promised would be passed after he has ended censorship.⁴⁹ Shortly after the March Days, a Writers' Association was formed to advance the goals of the revolution.⁵⁰ Jewish journalists were up for election for every leadership position except one in the organization. So many members of the group were Jewish writers that one memoirist later described the group disparagingly as “the Viennese Writers' Association, or better yet, [the Association] of Writers who Were in Vienna in March 1848, Particularly Jews and Those Who Had Been Members of the Legal-Political Reading Club.”⁵¹ Meanwhile, when the pan-German parliament was created, several Jewish journalists were elected to represent the Habsburg Empire. Ignaz Kuranda, the Austrian expatriate who had printed a liberal journal from Leipzig in the Vormärz, as well as Moritz Hartmann, an erstwhile Volk-story writer and poet for the *Sonntagsblätter* were among the Jewish delegates.

⁴⁸ “Manifest der Schriftsteller Wiens,” March 15, 1848.

⁴⁹ Anon., “Die Berathungen über Abänderung des Preßgesetzes,” *Wiener Abendzeitung*, April 7, 1848.

⁵⁰ See the invitation to join the association printed in the *Humorist*: Saphir, “Einladung,” *Der Humorist*, April 13, 1848.

⁵¹ Paul Schulz, introduction to “Der Wiener-Schriftstellerverein,” in *Marginalien über die Wiener Revolution vom Jahre 1848 und ihre wichtigen Folgen in der spätesten Zeit* (Leipzig, 1856), 233. Self-published.

Another group of Viennese professionals formed a society named The German Eagle, the Free Men's Club in mid-April. The club's mission was to "protect the interests of the fatherland, to advise on existing problems, education for the lower classes, and the cultivation of parliamentary oration."⁵² The group's membership was comprised, according to the *Wiener Zeitschrift*, mainly of "writers and doctors," a clear sign that its ranks would be filled with many educated Jewish men, for whom writing (as journalists) and medicine were two of the most common career paths.⁵³ Indeed, the elected chair person was Sigmund Engländer, a Jewish journalist already well-known in the Vormärz, and the club's secretary was Simon Deutsch (1822-1877), a former rabbinical student who gained a foothold in journalism with the new political developments of 1848.⁵⁴ The club's meetings—which received wide media coverage—featured lectures by Jewish and Christian members on political topics. In the second meeting, for example, Deutsch gave a talk on "professional writers, the press law, and the National Guard." Engländer lectured on the "political education of the lower classes," and Eduard Mautner, the well-known Jewish Volk story writer of the Vormärz, gave a report on the security branch of the National Guard.⁵⁵

Mautner, like many Vormärz Jewish journalists, spent the months after the revolution reporting on the National Guard and political events or writing explicitly "revolutionary fiction,"

⁵² Anon., "Wiener-Signale," *Wiener Zeitschrift*, April 13, 1848.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ On the club's leadership, see anon., "Der deutsche Adler-Club," *Wiener Zeitschrift*, April 14, 1848 and anon., "Klubb 'der deutsche Adler,'" *Der Humorist*, April 13, 1848. On Simon Deutsch's biography, see Louise Hecht, "Self-Empowerment of Jewish Intellectuals in the Habsburg Monarchy," *Religions* 8, no 6 (2017): 13, doi:10.3390/rel8060113.

⁵⁵ On the club's leadership, see anon., "Der deutsche Adler-Club," *Wiener Zeitschrift*, April 14, 1848 and anon., "Klubb 'der deutsche Adler,'" *Der Humorist*, April 13, 1848.

such as the humorous satire of Vormärz censorship he wrote for the *Humorist* in May.⁵⁶ Besides Mautner and the other individuals listed above, Jews were represented in the city's German-language, revolutionary journalism of 1848 by Jakob Löwenthal, Leopold Kompert, Karl Beck, Adolf Frankel, Adolf Chaizes, Samuel Fischer, Isidor Heller, Gerson Wolf, Ludwig Oppenheimer, and a host of "radical" Jewish journalists discussed below.⁵⁷

In the majority of their activities and self-portrayals, Jewish journalists strove to contribute to middle-class male movements, participating enthusiastically in the National Guard and its student branch, the Academic Legion. For these men, political and journalistic contributions to the image of the united male middle class comprised the majority of their professional activity in the months following the March Days, as they put relatively little emphasis on their religious affiliation and heritage, other than supporting the cause of Jewish emancipation. One exception to this, however, was the Jewish newspaper, entitled the *Oesterreichisches Central-Organ für Glaubensfreiheit, Cultur, Geschichte und Literatur der Juden* (Austria Central Organ for Freedom of Religion, Culture, History and Literature of the Jews), which was founded on March 24. The paper, printed two times weekly, was edited by Isidor Busch and Max Letteris, the same two men who had edited the *Jewish Kalender und Jahrbuch* on an annual basis in Vienna since 1842 (see Chapter One). The *Central-Organ* was perhaps the first example of a case in which Jewish journalists of Vienna felt comfortable behaving or self-identifying qua Jews in the press. However, the Jews who contributed regularly to the *Central-Organ* belonged to a different cadre of Jewish journalists than those who wrote

⁵⁶ Eduard Mautner, "Gestrichen! Censur-Novelle," *Der Humorist*, May 9, 1848.

⁵⁷ The best list of Jewish journalists active in Vienna's journalism of 1848 can be found in Max Grunwald, Appendix N, in *Vienna* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1936), 507-516.

primarily for the German-language, non-Jewish press. Journalists like Simon Szánto, Isidor Busch, and Max Letteris wrote nearly exclusively for the Jewish press, while the journalists listed in the descriptions above only occasionally, if ever, contributed to the *Central-Organ*. Many of the paper's other contributors lived and worked outside Vienna. Indeed, the majority of Jewish journalists in Vienna preferred to work for the general press, rather than the Jewish press, further testament to the common perception among Jewish men that participating in revolutionary political movements built on class and gender rather than religious similarities was a more effective decision for Jewish men in 1848 who sought entry into non-Jewish professional, male circles.

Democratic Radicalism, Jewish Activists, and Multiple Masculinities

After the jubilation following the March Days and the founding of the National Guard, the newly appointed ministry as well as the city's educated middle class turned to the work of planning what was to become, at least in theory, a constitutional monarchy. The text of the new press law was announced on April 1. On April 25 the ministry presented the public with a draft of the constitution, which provided for the founding of a bicameral assembly, with an upper house based on title and landownership and a lower house of elected representatives. By early April plans to convene a German national parliament in Frankfurt with members from other German states were underway, and delegates for a pre-parliament were selected to represent specified groups: the newly formed Middle-Class Committee, writers and journalists, university professors, and students.

As these changes took place, it became increasingly clear that the middle-class, male unity advanced by the press in late March was largely imagined. From as early as March 13, there had been rifts in the "unified brotherhood," and each of the political developments of the

subsequent weeks increased the amount of rancor expressed and experienced by Academic Legionnaires, Guardsmen, and journalists, not to mention workers and women, who were excluded from most expressions of middle-class brotherhood in the first place. The announcement of the new press law on April 1 foreshadowed some of the conflict to come. The press law imposed high deposits to be paid by periodical publishers and stipulated prison terms for writers who defamed the crown, the aristocracy, or the constitution and for the printing of offensive images.⁵⁸ The students immediately rejected the law for seeking to re-impose censorship on material critical of the state, and in short order they gathered at the university to protest.⁵⁹ As protests escalated, the ministry became concerned about safeguarding rule of law in the city, and, in an astonishing concession to the students, Minister of the Interior Baron Franz Pillersdorf rescinded the law. Although most of the liberals supported the students—and widely praised the students’ triumphant march to Stephen’s Square where the German tricolor was raised on the evening of April 1—they did not all support the tumultuous style of protesting, and it became apparent that the students and the National Guard were likely to find themselves in frequent conflict. That same day leaders of several of the middle-class groups formed a “Central Committee of Citizens, Students, and National Guards” that was supposed to mediate future conflicts between these groups.⁶⁰

Two days later a new paper, entitled the *Constitution*, ran a harsh appraisal of the state of Austria’s “young freedom.”⁶¹ The article condemned Austrian men for being too “moderate” in

⁵⁸ Rath, *The Viennese Revolution of 1848*, 131, 132.

⁵⁹ As an example of student opinion, see Ludwig Eckhard, “Beleuchtung und Autodafé des provisorischen österreichischen Preßgesetzes [sic],” *Das junge Oesterreich*, no. 2.

⁶⁰ Rath, *The Viennese Revolution of 1848*, 132.

⁶¹ Leopold Häfner, “Das provisorische Preßgesetz,” *Die Constitution*, April 3, 1848.

neglecting to publicly burn the text of the press law as had happened in Pest. The article, penned by the paper's editor Leopold Häfner (1820-?), likened the pain caused by the weakening of the young freedom to "the pain of a brother whose sister has been raped." Moderate men, in Häfner's account, were to blame for the state of affairs. As the rifts became more noticeable in late April, a new political doctrine, promoted by a sector of the rapidly expanding press industry, came to the fore. Led by a coalition of Jewish and Christian journalists, "democratic radicals" distanced themselves by what they viewed as a diluted constitutional doctrine more committed to maintaining rule of law than to liberational politics.

The radicals' political critique of "constitutional monarchists," as they labeled them, was also a disagreement about what form of masculinity was appropriate to the new age. Were middle-class men supposed to prioritize rule of law, security, and fealty to the crown, while contributing to journalism that embodied calmness and decorum? Or, were middle-class men supposed to be united in demanding universal male suffrage and the primacy of the parliament over the crown at all costs, even if personal self-restraint and moderation had to be sacrificed? Accordingly, radicals accused constitutional monarchists of acting without honor, and constitutional monarchists accused radicals of being unruly anarchists and undisciplined, immature schoolboys. As conflicting norms of masculinity took hold in different newspapers, conflicts between journalists and newspapers came to be ubiquitous in the press.⁶²

From the beginning Jewish men were prominent journalists for the democratic radical movement, working closely alongside their Christian friends. Christian journalist Leopold Häfner's radical paper the *Constitution* first went to press on March 20, but it was followed just

⁶² See Raewyn Connell on the concept of multiple, competing masculinities: Raewyn Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), 183-186.

ten days later by Jewish journalist Moriz Mahler's paper the *Freimüthige* (the Candid One). Mahler (1820-?) was born to Jewish parents in Vienna, and he was relatively unknown before 1848, having contributed only a handful of short articles to the *Humorist* before March 1848.⁶³ Together Häfner and Mahler's papers came to be known as the early rabblers in the city. In June Häfner and Mahler journalists were joined by another Jewish writer, Heinrich Blumberg, who published the radical *Ohnehose* (Sans-Culottes), later renamed the *Proletariater* (the Proletariat). Most prominently, the aptly titled *Radikale* was the most serious and well-read of the radical papers. It released its first issue on June 16, and its leadership consisted of a number of prominent Jewish contributors, including Hermann Jellinek, Karl Tausenau, Simon Deutsch, and Sigmund Kolisch. The *Radikale* was edited by Ludwig Frankl's former music critic at the *Sonntagsblätter*, the Christian journalist Alfred Julius Becher. It would become the primary radical paper with which radical democrats—and Jewish radicals in particular—would come to be associated. Jewish journalists also dominated the radical satirical press. Pioneering the model was Jewish student provocateur August Silberstein, whose short-lived paper *Satan* only made it through four issues in April and May. However, when lithographer Willi Beck and journalist Sigmund Engländer founded the *Wiener Katzenmusik* (Viennese Cat Music) in June, the paper would come to serve as endless torment to moderates and conservatives in the city, with its hilarious but harsh commentary and abundance of cartoons.⁶⁴ Finally, Jewish journalists were active in the radical student press. In June Jewish student Adolf Buchheim, along with two Christian friends, founded the *Politischer Studenten-Courier*, which was the most successful and

⁶³ Constantin Wurzbach, "Mahler, Moriz," *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, vol. 16 (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1867), 277, 278.

⁶⁴ *Katzenmusik* or charivaris were a unique form of political protest that became popular in 1848. To perform a *Katzenmusik* a group of protesters would gather before their opponents' house and sing loudly, bang pots and pans, and raise a ruckus into order to publicly shame their opponents.

prominent of the student papers.

As the makeup of the leftwing press became more complex, it began to face fierce opposition among a growing cadre of right-wing political opponents. As early as April pamphlets and broadsides had begun appearing in Vienna's streets decrying the "anarchy" that had overtaken the city's press and the students' dangerous tendency to flout rule of law. By May a conservative periodical press, sharper than the press of the constitutional monarchists," came to occupy an important position in the local journalism industry. Josef Sigmund Ebersberg, the editor of the erstwhile entertainment paper the *Zuschauer*, converted his paper into a mouthpiece for many of the city's conservatives, while newly notorious conservative journalists like Quirin Endlich and Matthias Koch published articles and pamphlets wherever they could.

Unlike moderate journalists, "reactionary journalists," as radicals called them took advantage of the newly won press freedom and began to blame the loss of proper masculine propriety and the city's failed rule of law not only on "unruly and immature" journalists but on unruly and immature *Jewish* journalists. For the first time, Jewish journalists of Vienna faced a sustained and direct attack on their Jewishness, an attack that blamed their corrupted masculinities on their Jewishness. Reactionaries condemned Jewish journalists, even moderate ones, for failing to practice "normal" or "proper" masculinities. For reactionaries, Jewish journalists in particular embodied perverse, juvenile, and ill-mannered masculinities inappropriate for the new age.

By May any semblance of the middle-class, male unity to which journalists had aspired had been thrown into disarray. The new constitution proposed by the emperor on April 25, though initially supported, was ultimately rejected by many of the students and left-wing

guardsmen on the grounds that the bicameral system it set up would favor the aristocracy, not to mention the fact that the emperor reserved the right to abolish the assembly at any time.⁶⁵ A democratic left quickly took shape in the city, around Häfner's *Constitution* and Mahler's *Freimüthige*. A coalition of Jews and non-Jews, including Jewish journalists Mahler, Karl Tausenau, Sigmund Kolisch, and Hermann Jellinek at the helm, founded the Democratic Club, which became the key political men's organization for radical democrats.

Democrats sought greater representation for workers, abolishment of all aristocratic privilege, a close federative relationship with other German states, a looser relationship with non-German Habsburg provinces.⁶⁶ The radical Central Committee broke with the National Guard in early May, and on May 5 the Student Committee, originally a student advisory group created in March to council the new ministry on political matters, petitioned the ministry to restructure the suffrage provision in the constitution, which disenfranchised workers and provided only for indirect elections. Ten days later events came to a head. The ministry had apparently been planning to force the closure of the radical Central Committee, and, when the rumor came to be known by the various democratic groups in the city, students and other left-wing protestors took up arms and marched to the imperial court. That same night—to the surprise of much of the city—the ministry acceded to the demands of the protestors, promising to reconsider the election laws and keep the Central Committee open.

When Ferdinand clandestinely left the city two days later, newspapers portrayed Vienna

⁶⁵ See the satirical article about the bicameral proposal written by August Silberstein, member of the Student Committee (discussed below) and editor of the short-lived student paper *Satan*: August Silberstein, "Zwei Kammern. Beschreibung der Redaktionswohnung," *Satan* (Vienna), May 1848.

⁶⁶ On the various debates on this point during the year, see Jiří Kořalka, "Revolutions in the Habsburg Monarchy," in *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, eds. Dieter Dowe, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, and Jonathan Sperber, trans. David Higgins (New York: Berghahn Books: 2000), 153-155 and Pieter Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016), 205-211.

as a city teetering on the brink of chaos. Though the state's ministers could never be assured of their popularity among different constituencies, many people, including democrats remained loyal to the emperor, still referring to him as their benevolent, liberal leader even as they called for widely expanded rights to representation. When Leopold Häfner and his co-editor at the *Constitution* Joseph Tuvora decided to proclaim a "republic," in the wake of Ferdinand's departure from the city, they were swiftly arrested. However, their activities led to further disintegration of all political factions. Several of the former entertainment paper editors, including Moritz Saphir of the *Humorist* and Adolf Bäuerle of the *Theaterzeitung*, called explicitly for a moderate constitutional monarchy based on "peace and order," for which they were soon written off by democrats as out-of-touch conservatives.⁶⁷ By that time most of the older papers were in any case becoming less relevant than the newer, edgier papers opened after the March Days. The National Guard issued a petition and series of letters to the students, in a last-ditch effort to retain unity, calling their "brothers [and] comrades" to demonstrate solidarity with the emperor through "peace, order, and security."⁶⁸ On May 24 the ministry announced that it planned to shut down the Academic Legion and close the university for the summer, and the Academic Legion prepared a statement—and a bevy of barricades—in order to counter the decree. On May 26 the Central Committee was dissolved and replaced by a Security Committee. The Security Committee would face off with the state ministry for the rest of the summer, often outweighing the power of the state officials. Later that day the Security Committee temporarily

⁶⁷ Both Saphir and Bäuerle had been members of a hastily formed Writers' Association (*Schriftstellerverein*) in mid-April, which had been created by local journalists so that journalists could draft a set of recommendations for the ministry regarding the new press law. Bäuerle and Saphir, who had been elected president, both left the association shortly after it was formed, unconvincingly citing a busy schedule and health concerns, respectively. In both cases, suspicions of their moderate politics certainly played a role in their departure. Anon, "Der Schriftstellerverein," *Wiener Abendzeitung*, April 19, 1848 and anon., "Der Schriftstellerverein," *Wiener Abendzeitung*, April 20, 1848.

⁶⁸ "Loyalität Adresse," in ZPH 7, Foliobox 7, Wienbibliothek im Rathaus.

arrested all of the state ministers after the ministers had ordered the imperial army to advance on the radical protesters, but by May 27 the ministry rescinded its order to close the university and commanded the army to return to their barracks. Although the immediate threat of violence had subsided, by early June all pretense of unity among the male middle class had vanished.

In reality Jews were no more active in democratic-radical politics than the Christian colleagues. But in May and certainly by June, Jews occupied a prominent and visible position as radical journalists, in part because their numerical involvement in radical journalism far outweighed the percentage of Jewish residents in Vienna when compared to the non-Jewish population. As journalists, they received more attention and scrutiny, given the public nature of their profession. By late June nearly all of the major radical papers had Jewish editors. As a result radical Jewish journalists were important players in rethinking standards of behavior associated with the “journalist” as a public figure, but they also become vulnerable to attacks as Jews.

For journalists of all stripes, the “collapse of the middle-class brotherhood” stemmed not only from a debate about the best political future for the city and the empire, but it also animated a tension among journalists regarding how a man needed to behave in order to be considered a “proper” journalist. While the political battle between radicals, moderates, and reactionaries played out in the press, their behaviors as journalists diverged. Moderate and conservative journalists described radical journalists as provocateurs, for whom peace and order had no value. Radical journalists, on the other hand, described moderates and conservatives as selfish, dishonorable men, concerned only with their own well-being. Both sides accused the other of ascribing to the wrong standards of middle-class masculinity in journalism. Jewish journalists found themselves as the heart of this debate, leading the fray in introducing new models of

behavior in journalism, while also finding it necessary to deal with attacks on their status as Jewish men as the reactionary press took hold.

Moderate journalists called for subdued emotion and restraint to prevent the “anarchy” of radicalism from dominating the city. Moderates like Moritz Saphir called for “peace, order, and security” (*Ruhe, Ordnung, und Sicherheit*) and accused radical journalists of being “anarchists.” For example, in one article Saphir described two paths to the future:

In a moment like the present the future stands before us as two doorways. At the first doorway cluster the heroes of permanent revolution, the men who bring anarchy under the cloak of democracy and terrorism under the mask of energy across the threshold in order to nail the future to a republic with [their] fiery words. And at the other doorway stand the shy, despondent men of true democracy, with shamefaced cheeks and faint words, the shy, despondent men of true progress, the men of true freedom, the men of true democratic faith. They knock with polite fingers on the door and wait patiently and in an old German manner [*altdeutsch*] for a lisping “Come in!”

Whereas the revolution-faction storms through the entrance, scattering the doors with an ax, and when this does not work, they bring a *Katzenmusik* to the future, invading the future through the window in order to demolish it, the small flock of true Volk- and freedom-friends stand at the door, like women in small German towns, and bow and make compliments before they even take a step [inside] . . .⁶⁹

In this formulation Saphir critiques radicals, with a specific nod to Engländer and Beck’s *Wiener Katzenmusik*, by describing them as men who act without patience, restraint, and self-control. They bring terrorism and anarchy to the empire under the guise of a good future by means of their uncontrolled rhetoric: a proper masculinity gone awry. Curiously, Saphir feminizes the “men of true democracy,” describing them as patient and respectful, like women in small German towns. On the other hand, Saphir accuses the unrestrained “revolution-faction” of being responsible for feminization of the “men of true freedom,” who are forced to adopt “shy, despondent” attitudes and must wait upon the future with “shamefaced cheeks.” The unruly

⁶⁹ Moritz Saphir, “Durchschnittspunkt des ‘politischen Horizontes,’” *Der Humorist*, Sept. 24, 1848.

masculinity of the revolution-faction has caused widespread emasculation of the “men of true freedom.” Underlying this argument is the hope that the “men of true freedom” will be restored to “manly” dignity.

In the same article Saphir continued:

The era begets the men that it needs, but the era also discards the men that it no longer needs, just as nature discards human material when it accomplishes its mission.

The revolution has completed its mission. It buried political and social bodies around it, plowed furrows, had three days of sowing [March 13-15], watered the seeds with blood and goodwill. It must now make way for the call of harvest, the time of gathering, the call to dinner and bread milling.

After the furrows [were made], the seedlings arrived; after the digging and tilling came the young plants. After the threshing came the gentle breeze of winnowing, which separates and sifts chaff from grain.

One can observe our journals that have sprung up since the March Days—naturally, with a few exceptions—from all sides, and one will involuntarily turn away from them. From the perspective of utility, they are useful only for themselves and for the general degradation of the publicity. From the political perspective, they believe that they will be viewed as inspired visionaries. Meanwhile, they are nothing more than epileptic organs of complete political immaturity to the point of total absurdity. And from the perspective of talent, they have no other talent than using the lawlessness of the current time as a balancing rod, by means of which they strut along for a while on the swaying rope between the gallows and the affection of the masses.

A man who does not respect himself cannot drive an industry.⁷⁰

In this passage Saphir argues that the demands of history drive changes in journalism. Journalism and its protagonists are cultivated by historical need in a given era and, in turn, journals and journalists are “discarded” when they are no longer demanded by the era. Saphir likens this process to a planting and harvest cycle: the “chaff” of journalism is eventually sifted out and trashed, while only the “grain” of the journalism remains. In Saphir’s opinion most of the journals that were founded after the March Days were nothing more than vulgar rags, content to

⁷⁰ Ibid.

appeal to the “affection of the masses.” As in the earlier passage, this account is laden with gendered assumptions about the nature of 1848 journalists. If the previous passage demonstrates the unrestraint of the “revolution-faction”, here Saphir depicts the revolution-faction as immature, uncultivated, and sick—a group of journalists who failed to reach full manliness or masculine maturity. They are men, who, like chaff that surrounds wholesome grain, must be “discarded” in order to prevent the “degradation of the publicity.” They are men, moreover, who lack not only respect for others, but also respect for themselves, a fact that prevents them from being capable of leading the journalism industry. Indeed, Saphir concluded the passage: “A man who does not respect himself cannot drive an industry.”

Radical journalists, in opposition to Saphir, often did not consider passion, intense emotion, or frivolity to be outside the norms of good behavior for the journalist. Instead, many radical journalists believed that the “peace, order, and security” (*Ruhe, Ordnung, und Sicherheit*) position that Saphir promoted bespoke cowardice, apathy, and ineffectiveness. A loud group of Jewish and Christian radical journalists were at the forefront of this debate. For example, on May 16 Jewish journalist Moriz Mahler’s *Freimüthige* published an editorial that actually contended that “anarchy of passions” would lead to peace—the exact opposite of the claims made by journalists who worried about the provocative writings of far-left journalists.⁷¹ Jewish journalists Willi Beck and Sigmund Engländer of the *Wiener Katzenmusik* were perhaps the most provocative of the radicals since their satirical newspaper regularly published political cartoons that contained direct ad hominem attacks. One of their most frequent targets was the coalition of journalists who believed that “peace, order, and security” constituted the proper values for 1848 politics. In an article that mocked the Central Committee of Citizens, Students, and National

⁷¹ Anon., “Letztes Wort an die verantwortlichen Minister,” *Der Freimüthige* (Vienna), May 16, 1848.

Guards that was temporarily founded to attempt to mediate conflicts between the groups, Engländer opened with the following critique:

What has the Committee of Bürgers, National Guards, and Students not done for order and security [*Ordnung und Sicherheit*] and the preservation of the rights of the people?

Until now, Vienna has had three political committees, a Central Committee, a Security Committee, and now the above-mentioned Committee [of Bürgers, National Guards, and Students], which we hope will endure for as long as its name is long. The motto of this committee is: topsy-turvy or confusion on confusion. The committee will presumably appear in a dream to the sleeping magistrate of the Middle-Class committee and show him what the committee is supposed to do since all of the committee's directives are supposed to come from him. He first called it the Committee "for Order and Security" [*Ordnung und Sicherheit*] but later it occurred to him to attach the predicate "for the preservation of the rights of the people" to the name! Indeed, here [in Vienna] every institution of freedom turns into a police force! The National Guard, which was determined to protect the rights of the people, had hardly been launched before it turned into a police force, before it tore up the protestors' placards The Central Committee had hardly established itself on March 15 before it became a Security Committee, to which Julius Zerboni di Sposetti [a leading conservative figure] gave the advice that [it] should tie up and gag all of Vienna's residents because peace [*Ruhe*] could best be preserved that way.⁷²

Although moderates were convinced that the committee was set up to advance the goals of the revolution through pacific means, Engländer argued that the committee, built on the values of "order and security" actually suppressed revolutionary efforts, by becoming a police force used to "tie up and gag all of Vienna's residents" for the sake of peace. In Engländer's view, trumpeting the slogan "peace, order, and security" was tantamount to rejecting the goals of the revolution.

Engländer and Beck also self-satirized, which reframed the norms with which journalists were associated. For instance, the *Katzenmusik* printed cartoons that were in some cases so vicious that Engländer was eventually brought to trial for defamation by Baron Schloissnigg,

⁷² Sigmund Engländer, "Was hat der Ausschuß der Bürger, Nationalgarde und Studenten für Ordnung und Sicherheit und Wahrung der Rechte des Volkes nicht gethan?", *Wiener Katzenmusik* (Vienna), June 16, 1848.

who for a time served as the minister of trade and whom the journalists had ridiculed at length. Rather than attempting to protect his reputation by retracting his statements, Engländer turned the defamation into an opportunity to herald his status as a provocateur. He printed his own satirical and bombastic description of the events, along with a silly cartoon of himself in prison jumpsuit, drawn by Willi Beck. Under the cartoon appeared the caption “Sigm. Engländer, Editor of the Charivari [the *Katzenmusik*’s alternate name], residence: in the press-law jail” (Fig. 3).⁷³ The paper even invited its “friends and enemies”—especially “beautiful women”—to the court to witness the proceedings.⁷⁴ When the case was resolved in his favor, Engländer pronounced himself heroic and innocent on the front page of the *Katzenmusik*, ending with the absurd and hilarious statement, that he had asked the court judge after the proceedings had ended “whether [he] still had the right never again to bore [his] readers with attacks on Baron Schoissnigg.”⁷⁵ Other radical newspapers described Engländer in equally heroic terms. Most prominently, the *Radikale*, which had been following the lawsuit, hailed Engländer as a valiant political champion, rather than a disturber of the peace, as he was described in moderate and conservative circles.⁷⁶

⁷³ Weltsch, “Unser erster Preßprozeß,” *Wiener Katzenmusik*, July 15, 1848.

⁷⁴ Engländer, “Einladung an Freunde und Feinde des Charivari,” *Wiener Katzenmusik*, Sept. 3, 1848.

⁷⁵ Engländer, “Die verfolgte aber doch siegreiche Unschuld oder unser erster Preßprozeß,” *Wiener Katzenmusik*, Sept. 5, 1848.

⁷⁶ Anon., “Der Pressprozess der Schriftstellers Sigmund Engländer,” *Der Radikale* (Vienna), Sept. 5, 1848.



Fig. 3. Cartoon in the *Wiener Katzenmusik* depicting editor Sigmund Engländer dressed as a prisoner of the “press-law jail.”⁷⁷

Radicals also began appealing to peasants and other lower-class men in the Habsburg Empire, aiming to form a masculine solidarity that was anathema to the middle-class vision of moderate liberals and conservatives. Most of these appeals were expressed by means of the radical press, and they were most often spearheaded by Jews. Moriz Mahler, for example, began printing a supplement to the *Freimüthige* entitled the *Bauernzeitung* (Peasants’ Newspaper). Mahler, who was the main writer for and editor of the *Bauernzeitung* printed articles in every issue calling for fraternal unity from “his dear brother peasants.”⁷⁸ He even included a note at the end of each issue that listed his address and urged any male peasant with a political question to

⁷⁷ Willi Beck., cartoon, *Wiener Katzenmusik*, July 15, 1848.

⁷⁸ For example, Moriz Mahler, “Meine lieben Brüder Bauern,” *Der Freimüthige*, July 26, 1848.

drop by his house for an explanation. The Democratic Club began printing broadsides aimed at workers, appealing for the same fraternal solidarity Mahler hoped to encourage between peasants and male radicals and addressing workers as “brothers and friends.”⁷⁹ The *Political Student Courier* followed a similar program, calling for fraternity between students and workers as brothers united in a common fight.⁸⁰ The image of solidarity between workers, peasants, and middle-class radicals advanced by Jewish journalists was fleeting—it would not withstand the final weeks of the revolution. However, even if the vision was brief, it offered a dramatically different version of fraternal unity than the version promoted by moderate and conservative journalists, for whom exclusive principles informed their idea of a middle-class brotherhood.

The image of masculinity advanced by radical journalists diverged from the image developed by moderates. Moderates and conservatives called for masculinity built on restraint, order, middle-class exclusivity, and elite education. Radicals, on the other hand, appealed to working men and men of the peasantry, mocked the cause of “peace and order,” believed that passionate and uninhibited behavior was necessary for revolutionary progress, and self-satirized in order to lampoon the “serious” political man envisioned by their opponents.

Despite the differing views on what constituted the most appropriate masculine practices for a journalist, Jewish radical journalists, like Engländer and Mahler or Jellinek and Tausenau at the *Radikale*, who were among the most prominent public figures, conformed to the behavior of their moderate Jewish counterparts by rarely appealing to the specific cause of Jewish rights. They almost never publicized or discussed their own identities as Jews in the press, even though

⁷⁹ For example, “Arbeiter!,” broadside printed by the Democratic Club (Vienna), Aug. 22, 1848.

⁸⁰ For example, anon., “Demokratische Adresse an die Wiener Studenten,” *Politischer Studenten-Courier* (Vienna), July 3, 1848 and anon., “Volksgespräche. Bürger, Student und Bauer,” *Politischer Studenten-Courier*, July 29, 1848.

the reading public was aware of their heritage. Across the sphere of journalism, including both moderate and radical crowds, Jews chose to emphasize the fraternal solidarity of political party or class, even though they supported freedom of religion. In both moderate and radical circles, Jews who followed this principle enjoyed a high degree of integration in their respective political movements. Jewish radicals rarely experienced discrimination from their likedminded Christian political colleagues, just as Jewish moderates rarely experienced discrimination from Christian moderates.

The Reaction and Anti-Jewishness

The decision among Jewish journalists, radical and otherwise, to steer away from publicly discussing their Jewish heritage stemmed from another development in the journalism industry. After a slew of new left-wing newspapers appeared in Vienna in June and the makeup of the leftwing press became more complex, radicals began to face fierce opposition from a growing cadre of right-wing political opponents. As early as April pamphlets and broadsides began appearing in Vienna's streets decrying the "anarchy" that had overtaken the city's press and the students' dangerous tendency to flout rule of law. By May a conservative periodical press—radicals called it the mouthpiece of the "Reaction"—came to occupy an important position in the local journalism industry.

Though most conservatives accepted the basic tenets of constitutionalism, they increasingly called for the re-imposition of state control by means of police surveillance if necessary, the curtailment of radical protesting, and loyalty to the emperor. Conservative writers also rejected the radical aim to create a federal alliance between Austria and other German states. Instead, conservatives wanted to preserve the integrity of the Habsburg Empire by suppressing national rebellions in Hungary, Bohemia, and elsewhere when necessary. Above all,

conservative critics hated the *Schandpresse* (“scandalous press”), as they nicknamed radical journalism. They blamed the students, initially, for these “outrages,” but quickly they adopted a more specific target: the radical Jew.

Although conservatives were correct in pointing out that there were indeed many Jews among Vienna’s radical journalists, they nevertheless espoused a view that inextricably linked Jewishness and radicalism, as if one could not exist without the other. The argument, moreover, crystallized an emerging tension between competing modes of masculinity that became widespread in late May and early June with the rupture of any appearance of middle-class, male unity. Conservatives challenged “radical Jews” by calling into question their ability to behave as proper, sober, and “calm” men, the image that had been circulated as the apotheosis of “good” masculinity among the National Guard and liberals since March. By mid-summer conservative “reactionaries” had adopted the “Jewish radical” as the face of their critique of the unruly, anarchic, and self-serving radical man in general.

The conservative argument tended to blame two groups of Jewish men who had supposedly had a corrupting influence on Vienna’s public sphere. First, conservatives suggested, radical Jews or “young street Jews” had infiltrated the city’s journalistic circles, fomenting unrest and spurring a breakdown in city order. Second, “speculative” Jews had taken over the publishing industry, giving voice to the radicals, and turning a profit for themselves in the meantime. According to this argument, “speculative” Jews and “young street Jews” had colluded together in their opportunistic, disorderly plan, suffusing the city’s press with dangerous radicalism on the one hand and unmoored greed on the other.

In April a short book entitled *The Influence of Jews on Our Civilization with Special Attention to Industrial Institutions* was released in Vienna. Written by one Johann Quirin

Endlich—a pamphleteer who would become an infamous conservative in Vienna—the book was one of the many anti-Jewish tracts to hit the streets of Vienna in late March and early April.⁸¹

The Influence of Jews presented a direct attack on the masculinity and manly ethics of the Jewish men of Vienna, whose deviation from “normal” masculinity, according to Endlich, was the result of a bleak history. In the introduction, Endlich argued that Jews had deviated from their ancient, honorable ancestors. Modern Jews, suggested Endlich, lacked “manly independence” because of their historical position of subservience, in which Jews had been forced to “grovel like dogs.” Endlich accused Jews of harboring insidious hate for Christians and for nurturing an obscene obsession with money, an obsession they sought to use in order to exact revenge on their Christian oppressors.

For Jewish journalists Endlich had especially harsh words. “Jewish writers,” wrote Endlich, “are unable to grasp the serious nature of life, and they have more regard for trinkets than for the strong forms of a master’s hand.” Moreover, he continued, “The great retinue of Jews who muddle around in literature can be found primarily in the market of belletrism.”⁸² Endlich then offered a scathing assessment of Moritz Saphir. In Endlich’s opinion Saphir—“an exhibitionist, highwayman, and a bully”—“lays his antennae on public opinion, determines the majority, and then insults or offers praise according to said majority.”⁸³ Saphir, continued Endlich, was an archetypal example of nearly all Jewish journalists in Vienna. Indeed, “whatever Jews offer in this field is bad through and through because it is entirely unprincipled. . . .”⁸⁴

⁸¹ Johann Quirin Endlich, *Der Einfluß der Juden auf unsere Civilisation mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Industrial-Anstalten in Oesterreich* (Vienna: Ulrich Klopff sen. und Alexander Eurich, 1848). Little biographical information about Endlich exists. His work did not appear in print, unless it was published under a different name, before 1848.

⁸² Endlich, *Der Einfluß der Juden*, 51.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 52.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 53.

Endlich feminized Jewish journalists by associating them with belles lettres, which had come to be considered a “feminine” form of writing, as opposed to “manly” political journalism. But Endlich also accused them of possessing a corrupted form of masculinity, a version of masculinity ill-suited for a journalist. “Exhibitionist, highwayman, and bully” were not insults that emasculated or feminized Jewish journalists. In Vienna of the nineteenth century, these terms would rarely if ever have been used to describe women. Like the contemporary insults “faggot” or “pansy,” which are typically used to degrade gay men whom others believe possess failed or improper masculinities, “exhibitionist, highwayman, and bully” were reserved in nineteenth-century Vienna to indict a man for being the wrong kind of man. These insults were similar to those of which moderates and reactionaries accused radicals. Rather than acting with restraint in the service of fraternal unity, Endlich accused Saphir of bullying his fellow journalists and robbing or deceiving the public in unvirtuous ways—of acting in ways that were masculine (only men tended to be described as bullies) but yet an inappropriate form of masculinity, unbecoming of a proper journalist. According to this formulation, Jewish journalists possessed masculinities gone wrong.

Although the most basic goal of *The Influence of Jews* was to prevent Viennese residents from supporting Jewish emancipation, it also excoriated the city’s press through the medium of Jewish journalists.⁸⁵ By May and certainly by mid-summer, a wave of conservative journalists followed Endlich’s lead in deriding the city’s journalism by assimilating Jewishness with bad and irresponsible writing. Although Endlich’s text, a product of the late March Days, took

⁸⁵ *The Influence of Jews* also used the anti-Jewish trope of “Jewish avarice” and obsession with wealth in order to advance a critique of economic liberalism, though this topic is outside the scope of this chapter.

The Influence of Jews was not the only anti-emancipation text to hit Vienna’s bookstores that spring. For example, an anonymous pamphlet entitled “Calm Words Against the Emancipation of Jews” was also available. For a favorable review of this text, see anon., “Erster Brief,” *Der constitutionelle Hans-Jörgel* (Vienna), April 15, 1848.

belletrism to task for failing to address “serious content,” by May Viennese conservatives had mostly stopped talking about belletrism. Instead, conservatives railed against what they believed to be the increasing anarchy of radical journalism—and they blamed such journalism on Jews too young or too ignorant to express themselves in a mature way in public venues. Following Endlich’s lead, conservatives challenged the content of Jewish masculinity, calling into question the maturity, sobriety, and ethical commitment of “Jewish scribblers.” As Endlich had argued about Saphir, Jewish radicals were believed by conservatives to possess deviant or botched masculinities that had failed to reach manly adulthood. Conservatives did not, therefore, primarily *feminize* Jewish radical journalists. Instead, they accused them of possessing the wrong kind of masculinity.

The *Zuschauer*, a former entertainment paper that had initially espoused liberal views after March 15, was one of the first papers to take up Endlich’s argument. Johann Sigmund Ebersberg, the paper’s long-time editor, first wrote a favorable review of *The Influence of Jews* in late April.⁸⁶ The majority of the review focused on Endlich’s “total accuracy” on the subject of Jewish journalists. Ebersberg agreed with Endlich that “among certain radical clubs, born out of our current conditions, the ones who shriek the most, the most unsatisfied, and the most brash are Jews,” whose writing is saturated with “veniality, insolence, and buccaneering.” Ebersberg’s focus was on radical, not belletristic journalism. The review cost Ebersberg the respect of the majority of the city’s press. He was immediately vilified by both radicals and moderates for his anti-Jewish statements, and thereafter he began endorsing more conservative opinions. Ebersberg continually spoke out against “immature rabblers” in the radical press, arguing that radicalism and Jewishness went hand in hand. In June he wrote that “there is hardly any

⁸⁶ Johann Sigmund Ebersberg, “Juden-Emancipation,” *Der Österreichische Zuschauer*, April 21, 1848.

publication of the bad kind without the signature of a couple of Jewish names.”⁸⁷ These “rabblers,” he wrote, ought to be warned by their co-religionists to curtail their unruly behavior so that “the bad doesn’t spoil the good” in an otherwise “reputable” population. Later that same month Ebersberg took the argument further and blamed “speculative Jews” for colluding with “reckless and inexperienced teens” along with “any nefarious subject without title or estate” in order to foment unrest in the city via the press with the “hope to make some money.” “This alone,” he wrote, “is the cause of our uproar.”⁸⁸

Newly founded conservative papers followed Ebersberg’s lead. In late July the inaugural article in the newly founded paper *The Whip (Die Geißel)* made it clear that the paper’s target was not radicalism as such but specifically the “scandal literature” of the radical press:

Have you still not noticed how your scandalous writings have decreasing appeal by the day. . . ? And [have you not noticed] that the way you write about the most important [topics] . . . , what you say about the most important questions of the day, [and] what your opinions are on the market conditions might lead one to believe you had sat in the laundry houses of Vienna’s washerwomen and learned politics in the taverns of haggling Jews? Proving this to you will be the task of *The Whip*. To punish you when you snatch away the honor of your fellow man with your naughty boy’s finger Even if you rail against the rod that whips you—the rod will remain impervious and will strike you again and again, even if you burst in masses. You are dealing with men who don’t fear you—but if you don’t give up your banditry, you will be afraid because the whole world is indignant.⁸⁹

The brutal argument targeted the manliness of radical journalists using several strategies. Not only did the writer infantilize radical journalists as “naughty boys,” but the language of the article was unambiguously sexual, drawing an implied comparison between radical journalists and submissive or dominated—and thus feminine—sexuality. The writer also questioned the

⁸⁷ Ebersberg, “Wien,” *Der Österreichische Zuschauer*, June 3, 1848.

⁸⁸ Ebersberg, “Wien,” *Der Österreichische Zuschauer*, June 14, 1848.

⁸⁹ J. F. Böhringer., untitled lead article, *Die Geißel* (Vienna), July 24, 1848.

journalistic integrity of radical writers, whose work amounted to nothing more than the feminine gossip one might pick up in a washerwoman's laundry room. Finally, the writer accused the naughty boys of learning "bad politics" from "haggling Jews," a swipe that took aim not only at journalists but at the politics of Jewish business owners. But it was the follow-up article in the paper's third issue that crystallized the connection between Jews and radical journalism:

"Respectable Jews are indignant about the brazen, insolent, unprincipled [Jewish] boys who dominate a part of the penny [*Kreutzer*] press They crusade forcefully against this horde of shameless Jewish scribblers and desire as quick as possible the curtailment of their vile press."⁹⁰

In unapologetic language through the entirety of its publication, *The Whip* made it clear that Jewish men who possessed "improper" masculinities were responsible for bad journalism.

Conservative newspapers in Vienna argued that the Viennese Jewish population was split into two camps: a group of respectable Jews who were in the majority and a group of Jewish ne'er-do-wells: the "naughty boys" and "street Jews" of the "scandalous penny press" and their co-conspirators—the Jewish speculators (that is, newspaper publishers) looking to make a profit of the city's turmoil.⁹¹ In the frenzied writing of August, and September, the twin caveats that not all radical journalists were Jews and that not all Jews were radical journalists began to be forgotten by the conservative press. Indeed, Jews in general came to be associated with radicalism: a middle-class masculinity gone awry. The argument became so extreme that

⁹⁰ J. F. Böhringer, "Was geht denn in Wien vor?" *Die Geißel*, July 26, 1848.

⁹¹ For examples of the *Zuschauer*'s continued journalism along these lines, see a series of articles written by Ebersberg in mid-July: Ebersberg, "Eine kleine Geschichte als Illustration zu Schandartikel," *Das Österreichische Zuschauer*, July 17, 1848 and Ebersberg, "Christ und Jude—zu Gericht!" *Der Österreichische Zuschauer*, July 19, 1848. In these articles Ebersberg responded to critical pieces written about the *Zuschauer* in the *Wiener Katzenmusik*. He argues that the *Katzenmusik*'s unfavorable critiques, penned by Sigmund Engländer, were "new evidence of the perfidy and treacherousness of that high and diabolical level of which only Jewish writers are capable." He also claimed that Vienna's "press lies nearly entirely in the power and hands of speculative Jews."

conservatives even started “accusing” non-Jewish radical journalists of being Jews in an effort to discredit their “scandalous” lack of moral restraint and immature, inflammatory politics (Fig. 4). The Jewish man, for conservatives, came to be a metonymic stand-in for “unruly politics,” just as the “radical man” came to be a metonym for “Jew.”



Fig. 4. When the *Zuschauer* accused non-Jew Josef Rank, beloved short-story writer of the Vormärz and radical editor of 1848 paper *Volksfreund*, of being both a Jew and a “cowardly, pathetic, and vile mudslinger,” not only did Rank deny both accusations himself, but *Wiener Katzenmusik*, edited by two Jewish radicals, ran a cartoon about the exchange. The cartoon featured Ebersberg as a “Jew eater”—a slang way of referring to an anti-Jewish person—swallowing Josef Rank “on the assumption that he is a Jew.”⁹²

There was intense public pushback, both by Jews and non-Jews, in the radical press

⁹² Ebersberg, “Aufforderung,” *Der Österreichische Zuschauer*, June 28, 1848; Josef Rankl, “Ehe der Hahn kräht—zweimal verrathen,” *Der Volksfreund* (Vienna), July 1, 1848; and Willi Beck., “Ebersberg als Judenfresser,” cartoon, *Wiener Katzenmusik*, July 7, 1848.

against the vilification of radical journalists in general and Jewish radical journalists in particular. In a rare example in which a Jewish journalist publicly (though anonymously) discussed his personal status as a Jew, an anonymous Jewish contributor to the *Studenten-Courier* wrote an article in which he acknowledged and attempted to correct the erroneous view that all Jews were republicans or that all Jews “ought be republicans.” Indeed, wrote the journalist, “how wrong and unfair is this accusation!”⁹³ The fact that the radical paper’s editors were so concerned to decouple radicalism and Jewishness in public perception demonstrated the degree to which this stereotype must have penetrated local opinion. The *Wiener Katzenmusik* responded to the anti-Jewish slurs by turning the conservative critique of masculinity back on the conservatives themselves. Sigmund Engländer and Willi Beck printed a long-running series of cartoons that lambasted Ebersberg for his anti-Jewish and “yellow-black” politics, referring to the imperial colors that radicals associated with the aristocracy. The paper took aim at Ebersberg’s masculinity by criticizing his body. He was caricatured as miniature, fat, ugly, feminine, and cowardly. “Ebersberg, the young boy” began one of the satirical quips.⁹⁴ Readers loved the cartoons so much that Engländer and Beck ran them from late June all the way through October and added images of J. F. Böhringer, editor of *The Whip*, as an old, ugly woman as well. Nevertheless, even if radicals fought back against the reactionary effort to link Jewish masculinity with unruly or unethical radicalism, in local Viennese discourse, the image of the Jewish radical as unprincipled masculinity stuck.

The October Revolution

On the early morning of October 6, 1848, the Richter battalion of the Habsburg imperial

⁹³ Anon., “Die republikanischen Juden,” *Politischer Studenten-Courier*, July 21, 1848.

⁹⁴ Anon., “Was ist das dringendste Bedürfnis unserer Zeit?” *Wiener Katzenmusik*, July 8, 1848.

army, stationed in Vienna, was set to march toward Hungary in an effort to suppress the nationalist revolution underway in the province. The order had already been roundly protested by the Democratic Club. Club members had gone about buying drinks for Richter battalion soldiers since the previous evening so that many of the soldiers found themselves completely drunk at the time the marching order was to be carried out. By 4:00 in the morning, when the battalion was set to leave, a good number of the crew, inspired by the radical left, defected to the civilian side, leaving the battalion significantly weakened. Two hours later the battalion finally began its march, but at the outskirts of the city it encountered a riotous group of Academic Legionnaires and left-wing National Guardsmen seeking to prevent the army's eastward march. Between the legionnaires, guardsmen, and the defected soldiers, the battalion's leader, General Hugo von Bredy, was killed, and the soldiers temporarily stopped their advance.

Shortly thereafter, events became more tumultuous. Victorious guardsmen and students had returned to the city center, but as they approached Stephan's Square, they came across a large group of National Guardsmen who opposed their effort to prevent imperial troops from marching to Hungary, and fighting broke out between the conservatives and the radicals, pitting "National Guardsman and National Guardsman" against each other, as one legionnaire described it.⁹⁵ Indeed, described the same legionnaire, "The bloodbath was horrific. All around everything was covered with blood."⁹⁶ As the conflict continued, other guard battalions arrived on scene to defend the radical side, and violence only became worse when the army joined the fray on the side of the conservatives. The brutal confrontation continued across the square, and some rioters

⁹⁵ Friedrich Kaiser, *1848: Ein Wiener Volksdichter Erlebt die Revolution. Die Memoiren Friedrich Kaisers*, ed. Franz Hadamowsky (Vienna: Bellaria Verlag, 1948), 126.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

broke into the St. Stephan's Cathedral to try to wait out the worst part of the violence.

Meanwhile, members of the Democratic Club and other radicals of the middle and working classes assembled to protest before the office of Theodor Latour, Minister of War. When the protesters arrived outside the Ministry of War, they began calling for Latour to appear. Latour allowed the protestors to enter the building's courtyard, but he escaped to an attic room on the top floor. The protest became louder after the gates had been opened, and a short time later Latour penned his resignation, which he sent down with Franz Smolka, vice-president of the Austrian Assembly. When the protesters learned that the resignation would only occur if the emperor gave his permission, the tumult became violent, and protesters demanded access to Latour. Smolka had no choice but to lead them to the minister. Flanked by Adolf Fischhof, the leader of the Academic Legion, on one side, and a National Guardsman on the other, Smolka led the protestors to Latour, but, in spite of the agreement that peace would be maintained, in short order protesters managed to break past their co-legionnaires and co-guardsmen who were trying to protect the minister. Within minutes Latour had been beaten and knifed to death and stripped nearly naked. The protesters then tried to hang his body out the upper window but ended up dropping it into the crowd below, where it was additionally mutilated and eventually hanged on a nearby lamppost.⁹⁷

The events of October 6 happened twenty days before the imperial army definitively reasserted control over Vienna, but they represent the vicious conflict that had superseded the "fraternal unity" that had supposedly characterized the male middle class in the days

⁹⁷ There are many accounts of these events, some of the most gruesome and memorable of 1848. See, for example, Kaiser, *1848: Ein Wiener Volksdichter Erlebt die Revolution*, 118-132 and Benjamin Kewall, *Erlebte Revolution 1848/49: Das Wiener Tagebuch des jüdischen Journalisten Benjamin Kewall*, eds. Wolfgang Gasser and Gottfried Glassner (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), 199-201. See also Rath, *The Viennese Revolution of 1848*, 325-329.

immediately following the initial outbreak of uprisings on March 13. Much of this conflict had taken place in the pages of the press, and, as outlined above, the relative consensus about the norms that were associated with the ideal journalist's masculinity also disintegrated. What it meant to be a journalist was unclear. Although writers and the reading public knew that an ideal masculine journalist was supposed to be "political," it was unclear what behaviors, attitudes, and positions were defined as properly political.

Twenty days after Latour's murder, the state had finally gained enough power to retake the city. On October 26 the combined troops of Count Josip Jelačić, commander of the imperial army in Croatia, and Prince Alfred Windischgrätz, commander of the imperial army in Bohemia, managed to surround Vienna and overpower the armed revolutionaries. The city was restored to imperial control, and the revolutionary effort was ended. Over the next week, nearly the entirety of the city's press was suspended. Most papers were suppressed and closed for good. Nine radicals were sentenced to death, among them Alfred Julius Becher, editor of the *Radikale*, and Hermann Jellinek, one of its most frequent contributors. Most other radicals fled to Saxony and then to Paris or London. The constitutional period was not over in Austria—that would not happen definitively until 1851, but until then, the crown always had the upper hand.

A week later, a handful of newspapers were permitted to return to print. The first among these were Ebersberg's *Zuschauer*, Böhringer's *Whip*, and a new paper, entitled *Schild und Schwert, Politisch conservatives Journal* (Shield and Sword, A Political Conservative Journal), edited by the inflammatory anti-Jewish pamphleteer of the summer Johann Quirin Endlich. The first issue of *Schild und Schwert* Endlich's paper began with an argument and ended with a request:

The argument:

A week has passed since we have spoken publicly to the people of Vienna. Events interrupted our work, events that we predicted, and about which we often warned, and the prevention of which we tried, with every means possible but without success, to achieve. . . . Vienna did not listen to us, or rather we were drowned out by people who wanted to betray and barter off everything for silver coins. . . . They triumphed, until the hollow walls and ruins smoldering from fire, until the howling and cries of woe of the entire population, until the ruin of many families, until the shrieking pain of widows and orphans, until the wheezing of the dying and the broken eyes of those who fell in battle, until their villainous character changed or their putrid heart was moved or else until all these terrors and the approach of their enemy forced them to flee or to protect themselves. . . .

The party of idiocy, which is usually called the democratic [party], comprehends, or always wants to comprehend freedom in such a way that it has the most leeway for its own machinations, and all classes in the state have been slandered by this pathetic rot so much that it seems almost necessary to the purposes [of the democrats].⁹⁸

The request:

It is not possible for us give free reign to our indignant feelings and our inner persuasion; and although we consider the Jews, and the majority of the Jews, as the misfortune of our fatherland as well as the misfortune of us all, it is impossible under our condition of besiegement to use the writer's free word to call for truth and our heart's desire.

Therefore be patient! Whoever knows anything about the machinations of the Jews, send us a letter with the details, and we will not fail to bring it to the knowledge of the public.⁹⁹

If the radical party of Vienna had temporarily been shuttered and its supporters hanged and fled, the image of the Jewish radical and his companion, the Jewish speculator, nevertheless, survived October in good health. While journalists remained in conflict about the image of the "ideal" journalist and the ideal gendered behaviors with which this image was to be linked, the association between "Jew," "radical," and "speculator" had taken hold and would remain embedded within Vienna's press.

⁹⁸ Johann Quirin Endlich, "Die blutige Sühne Wiens," *Schild und Schwert* (Vienna), Nov. 10, 1848.

⁹⁹ Endlich, "Zur Nachricht," *Schild und Schwert*, Nov. 10, 1848.

Chapter Four

The Business-Man: The Shift to “Commercial Journalism” and the Rise of the Manager

In 1854 Moritz Gottlieb Saphir, who at the age of fifty-nine was still editing the *Humorist*, wrote a sharply worded attack on Leopold Landsteiner. A Viennese Jew twenty-two years Saphir’s junior, Landsteiner had only recently returned to his hometown after years in Paris, but by 1854 Landsteiner had already made a name for himself in the Habsburg capital. Landsteiner owned the city’s largest paper, the *Morgen-Post*, and, at the time of Saphir’s attack, he had just purchased the *Wiener Telegraph*. Saphir’s comments came just a few weeks after Landsteiner authorized a series of antagonistic parodies of Saphir that appeared in the newly purchased paper.¹ In his response to the parodies in the *Telegraph*, Saphir targeted Landsteiner:

If, however, the readers think that the constant slanders against me that Mr. Landsteiner fires off in the *Telegraph* [sic] are [motivated by] animosity, malice, or scorn, the reader is wrong. The flabbiness and watered-down brain activity of Mr. Landsteiner would never gain [enough] strength for such an energetic activity as malice or scorn. It is nothing more than “speculation,” “haggling” [*Schacher*]—*Spekulatzi*. Mr. Landsteiner thinks he will sell a couple more Kreutzer papers doing this. It is nothing more than haggling [*Schacher*] in its most rough, rotten form.

...

Has the public even read any lines by you? . . . Have you done anything for humanity, for art, for criticism? In short, how can you dare to position yourself opposite me as a “writer” [*Schriftsteller*], journalist” [*Journalist*] or “poet” [*Dichter*]?

...

In the intellectual sphere you are a fat zero, a *nothing*. You are no writer. You are no poet. You are no journalist.²

In Saphir’s catalogue of Landsteiner’s sins, two were the worst. First, Landsteiner had made no adequate contributions to the field of art or criticism. Second, Landsteiner chose to print

¹ For example, anon., “Wiener Punch. Juxkalender für das Jahr 1855. Aus tiefstem Mitleid Herrn M. G. Saphir gewidmet,” *Wiener Telegraph* (Vienna), Oct. 26, 1854.

² Moritz Saphir, “Inventarium unseres Journal-Elends. 1. Herr Leopold Landsteiner, Doktor des journalistischen Fetzensacks, Professor der Politik ohne Noth und Magister der literarischen Obstruction,” *Der Humorist* (Vienna), Nov. 1, 1854.

intellectually dubious papers, buoyed with scandalmongering articles. Lacing his attack with anti-Jewish language, Saphir accused Landsteiner of using these methods because he prioritized profitmaking over sound journalism. For these crimes Saphir argued that Landsteiner was unworthy of being named a journalist. Instead, he was merely a huckster and a speculator of the basest sort, a profit-seeking publisher with no interest in contributing to quality journalism in a serious fashion.

Saphir's invective against Leopold Landsteiner animates a tension between journalists of pre-1848 and journalists of post-1848 Vienna that came to the fore in the 1850s. As Saphir's critique of Landsteiner illustrates, the outstanding archetypal image of the "journalist" of pre-1848 Vienna was a literary man (see Chapter One), an elite masculine figure whose most important work was his contribution to the fields of literature and criticism. For a brief period in 1848, the archetype of the journalist was the partisan man, a fraternal member of a political faction for whom broadcasting his political affiliation was key. However, after the months of revolutionary uprisings in 1848, the Habsburg Empire and the field of journalism underwent a series of broad economic changes. By the early 1850s state and private entrepreneurs built up financial and commercial infrastructure across the Habsburg Empire. The middle class became more independent with the rise of private credit, accelerated mobility and communication, and improved school systems. The press industry expanded, relying on telegraphy for news transmission, introducing advertising to newspapers, and cheapening paper price per issue to increase circulation. By the mid-1850s the predominant image of the Viennese journalist, in the eyes of contemporaries, morphed from the literary man of the 1840s or the partisan journalist of 1848 to an image of the enterprising business-man whose fortune was tied to his ability to successfully acquire more readers and advertisers for his papers. Newspapers were no longer run

by hands-on editors but had editors-in-chief whose primary tasks were to handle the papers' financial matters and hire subeditors. During the 1850s many of these editors bought second papers, and some even purchased publishing houses. In the decade after the uprising of 1848, a new generation of journalists in Vienna had transformed the archetypal image of the journalist from the literary man to the business-man, the forerunner of today's media mogul.

As in previous eras, the most prevalent image of the journalist of this period was masculine and middle-class. This was, in part, simply because contemporaries never envisioned a journalist as a woman or as a member of a different economic class. As a result, the "business-man" in journalism of the 1850s and the qualities with which this ideal came to be associated were, by definition, masculine and middle-class. While women did occasionally contribute belles lettres to pre-1848 papers, the number of female contributors in the 1850s was miniscule, and much of the "female content" that was common to Vormärz entertainment papers disappeared in the papers of the 1850s. Likewise, the number of educated, middle-class contributors to Viennese newspapers during this period swelled, and aristocratic or working-class men had only a minor role in writing for the press. This reality meant that the language used to describe and the characteristics used to imagine the figure of the journalist were viewed as male and middle-class.

The image of the "business-man" was fraught, and those journalists who adopted the priorities of business-men did not always publicly admit that they did. In most cases the business-men of journalism claimed to embody ideals associated with "proper" middle-class, liberal men of the 1850s. They claimed to be honorable men, to have respect for truth, and to run politically and financially independent press outfits, all qualities that were considered obligatory components of the ideal middle-class man of the period (even if many men did not live up to the paradigm). In practice, however, most journalists and editors did not behave as if these were their

most important priorities. These priorities were often secondary at best. Instead, journalists demonstrated in practice that their main goals were business-oriented. Expanding sales and newspaper revenue was the central priority, and they often accused their rivals of failing to be virtuous, truth-respecting men in order to drum up readership for their papers—not because they were primarily concerned with enforcing “honorable” behavior. The business-man of journalism thus publicly advocated for impartiality and honor, while privately recognizing that being a successful editor of a commercial paper required that profit be the central priority. The dissonance between rhetoric and practice meant that many of the journalists who critiqued the business-man of commercial journalism, for whom profit came before other concerns, themselves embodied the very image they critiqued.

While the image of the “business-man” reshaped what it meant to be or behave like a journalist, one demographic fact remained continuous between the 1840s and 1850s: many of the most well-known journalists of the 1850s were Jews. As in previous periods, Jewish men were central to facilitating and spearheading the transition from earlier models of the journalist to the model of the business-man in journalism. For much of the 1850s, Jewish men were the most important newspaper editors in Vienna, and they led the industry’s transition to the commercial press. However, the liberal economic change and new migratory trends meant that from 1848 onward, a new generation of Jewish journalists appeared on the stage in Vienna. To a degree even greater than in the Vormärz, many of the leaders in journalism during this period were Jews, including both Landsteiner—who was active in the Jewish community of Vienna—and Saphir—who had converted to Protestantism some years earlier but continued to socialize in Jewish circles (see Chapter Two). The old stalwart Saphir and the newcomer Landsteiner were joined by Gustav Heine, Ignaz Kuranda, Moritz Szeps, Karl Beck, and Eduard Breier, Jakob

Löwenthal, Isaac Jeitteles (pseudonym Julius Seidlitz), Otto Bernhard Friedmann, and Eduard Warrens as prominent Viennese journalists, while Leopold Kompert, Heinrich Landesmann, Isidor Heller, and others who had been active in Viennese journalism in the previous decade remained important players. Unlike the Jewish journalists of the previous decade, who achieved leadership positions in Viennese journalism as a result of their literary popularity and their continuous efforts to befriend members of the city's literati and cultural elite, the new generation of Jewish journalists rose to prominence by means of major governmental and international connections they had developed. For example, Warrens had served as American consul in Trieste where he developed a close relationship with Habsburg Minister Franz Stadion, who first invited him to take up a position as a journalist in Vienna. Landsteiner spent years in Paris, where he got to know many important Viennese expatriates and business leaders, and he later cultivated friendships with several of the new Habsburg ministers after the suppression of the revolution, as did Isidor Heller. Kuranda leveraged his participation as a moderate liberal in the 1848 Frankfurt Parliament and his relationships with major political players in the Habsburg Empire and German states in order to gain respect and prominence as an editor.

As the new generation of Jewish journalists became important figures in the city, some of their non-Jewish competitors found anti-Jewish language to be a convenient tool with which they could condemn what they labeled the "unethical" or "dishonest" motives of their Jewish rivals. Nevertheless, at their own papers, those same men who criticized Jewish journalists typically adopted the same commercial practices of which they accused Jews. In addition, Jewish journalists proved just as willing to disparage their business rivals (and often their fellow Jews) just as harshly. The business-man in journalism thus criticized his fellow editors and business rivals for adopting commercial practices, while using those same practices to expand his own

newspaper. Jews were subject to and vulnerable to anti-Jewish abuse that stemmed from criticism of the model of the business-man, but they were just as likely to levy the same critique on their competitors. Meanwhile, the majority of the condemnation of the new model of the business-man actually came from within the journalism industry itself. However, despite the criticism of the business-man in journalism, by the end of the 1850s, it had become impossible to succeed in the growing industry without adopting a business model that put profit ahead of other concerns, a model that set the stage for the rapid development of the mass press that would shape politics and social life in Europe for the rest of the century.

The Commercial Press: 1848-1851

Although the most exciting press polemics of 1848 concerned the sharp-tongued battles between the papers of the radical left and those of the conservative right, another change was underway. From mid-summer a new style of newspaper began appearing on Vienna's streets and in its coffee shops: the commercial press. While journalism had always been a commercial and competitive industry, the commercial press of that year represented a broad shift away from the liberal belletristic papers of the Vormärz and the partisan papers of mid-1848. The commercial newspapers revolutionized newspaper pricing and distribution structures, expanded readership, used new communication technology for news reporting, and, above all, introduced widespread press advertising to Vienna's public. By the late 1850s the commercial press would dominate Viennese journalism. This change was not restricted to Vienna. Indeed, the designation "commercial press" has been used to identify a style of newspaper that appeared in cities across Europe and the United States at roughly the same time. Aptly titled, *The Commercialization of News in the Nineteenth Century*, Gerold Baldasty's book on journalism in the United States ascribed the mid-century escalation of commercialization in American newspapers to many of

the same factors at work in the Habsburg Empire: developments in advertising, population growth, expanded literacy, and improved communication technology.³ For the first time in many cities across the globe, journalism finally came to be experienced, by those who were successful, as a profitable field, rather than a source of merely supplementary income.

Soon after the outbreak of revolution in March, August Zang and Leopold Landsteiner, two Viennese colleagues who had met in Paris in the “censored” years before 1848, made their way back to their hometown to join the fray. Landsteiner (1817-1875), a Jewish man born in Vienna, had been working as correspondent for French- and German-language newspapers, serving for a time as a Paris correspondent for the well-known *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*. Zang (1807-1888), also born in Vienna, had served the Habsburg army before moving to Paris where he founded a large baking company with the help of another Vienna-born nobleman named Ernst Schwarzer (1808-1860). The Zang company introduced Viennese machine-manufactured *kipfel* (croissant-style rolls) across France. The *kipfel* had proved widely popular around the country, and through his work Zang came into contact with journalists and Viennese expatriates, building a network of French and Habsburg leaders, including Landsteiner.⁴

When revolution broke out in Vienna, both Landsteiner and Zang—who eventually sold the *kipfel* company—quit Paris to return to their hometown. What they found in Vienna was a palpable enthusiasm for liberal principles and an enticing commercial opportunity in the press, thanks to the repeal of censorship on late March 14. Landsteiner soon found work as a

³ Gerald J. Baldasty, *The Commercialization of the News in the Nineteenth Century* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992). See also Kirsten Belgum, *Popularizing the Nation: Audience, Representation, and the Production of Identity in Die Gartenlaube, 1853-1900* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998). Belgum’s work deals with the German-speaking sphere.

⁴ Joseph Alexander Helfert, *Die Wiener Journalistik im Jahre 1848* (Vienna: Verlag der Manz’schen, 1877), 98 and Constantin Wurzbach, “Zang, August,” *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, vol. 59 (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1874), 162.

contributor at the recently founded *Allgemeine Österreichische Zeitung*, an undertaking of Zang's erstwhile baking partner Ernst Schwarzer, who had left Zang some years prior and, like Landsteiner and Zang, moved to Vienna upon the outbreak of uprisings.

In mid-summer Zang approached Landsteiner with a proposal to found a paper, and Landsteiner accepted.⁵ On July 3, 1848 the first issue of the *Presse*, edited by the pair, hit Vienna's streets. The *Presse* was unlike any previous publication that had been printed in the Habsburg capital. First of all, it was dense: four pages, each three columns wide with tiny typeface. Second, unlike most of its competitors, the *Presse* claimed to be non-partisan. In fact the opening article stated that the paper's goal would be to "reveal and say the truth in an impartial, strong manner."⁶ The biggest change, however, was in pricing structure. Instead of charging the usual rate of ten to twenty-five Gulden for an annual subscription, the *Presse* cost one Kreuzer (1/60 of a Gulden) per issue, and a year-long subscription cost only six Gulden. In addition the *Presse* was sold on the streets, encouraging buyers to purchase it by the issue rather than by subscription.

The only other paper in Vienna that had tried this method was *Gerad' Aus! Gerad' Aus!*—edited by Otto Bernhard Friedmann (1824-1880), a Jewish editor who would eventually play an important role in later commercial newspapers. *Gerad' Aus! Gerad' Aus!* did not survive long, nor did its content and layout resemble that of the *Presse*. Its pricing system, however, was an important precursor. During its months of printing between May and October, the paper met with brief but sound commercial success. It cost one Kreuzer per issue and was sold from

⁵ Helfert, *Die Wiener Journalistik im Jahre 1848*, 101 and H. M. Richter, "Die Wiener Presse," in *Wien. 1848-1888. Denkschrift zum 2. December 1888*, vol. 2 (Vienna: Commissions-Verlag von Carl Konegen, 1888), 420.

⁶ Anon., "Wien den 2. Juli," *Die Presse* (Vienna), July 3, 1848.

wagons on the streets, what the paper's editor called its "roaming offices."⁷ Some accounts reported its circulation to be as high as 12,000 sales per issue, a remarkable feat since the largest Vormärz papers rarely exceeded 3,000 sales per issue.⁸

Though *Gerad' Aus! Gerad' Aus!* preceded the *Presse* in the one-Kreutzer system in Vienna, it was not the primary model adopted by Zang and Landsteiner. Rather, the *Presse* bore a close resemblance to the similarly titled paper Parisian *La Presse*, edited by Émile de Girardin (1802-1881). Founded by Girardin in 1836, *La Presse* became the most popular and widely distributed newspaper in Paris in short order. During his time in Paris, Zang had made the acquaintance of Girardin, and the influence that *La Presse* had upon Zang was evident in the Viennese *Presse*. *La Presse*, like Zang's paper would be, was four pages in length, three columns wide, and privileged news reporting. *La Presse* also included a lengthy feuilleton, printed "under the line" as editors described the separation between the news stories and the feuilleton, demarcated by a thick black stripe halfway down the page. In *La Presse* the feuilleton was reserved for social-political commentary, literary critique, and sometimes stories. Newspapers in Vienna had been printing feuilletons for years, but, because of censorship restrictions, the Vormärz content that tended to appear in the feuilleton was in topic and genre indistinguishable from the content that appeared "above the line." Zang's *Presse* was the first paper to mimic *La Presse*, reserving the feuilleton for political and social commentary and sometimes short stories with content written in a more informal voice than that of the news columns (Figs. 5 and 6).

⁷ See the upper right of *Gerad' Aus!* issues for the references to "roaming offices." For a brief description of the paper's innovative structure, see Ernst Viktor Zenker, *Geschichte der Wiener Journalistik*, vol. 2 (Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1893), 76. Joseph Helfert remembered that when *Gerad' Aus!* first appeared it was sold by young men wearing caps embroidered with "G. a." who called out "One kreutzer for the paper!" from wagons that were driven around the city. See Helfert, *Die Wiener Journalistik im Jahre 1848*, 61.

⁸ Helfert, *Die Wiener Journalistik im Jahre 1848*, 61.

Zang and Landsteiner even hired a dedicated feuilleton writer, Heinrich Landesmann (1821-1902), a Jewish journalist and storyteller better known by his pseudonym Hieronymus Lorm.

The most important commercial strategy adopted by the press during this period would come only after the suppression of the revolution in October. Two weeks after the *Presse* was allowed to return to print, it began running advertisements. Throughout the entire nineteenth century, until 1848, the only newspaper in Vienna that had been permitted to run advertisements was the official *Wiener Zeitung*, but since late summer the *Presse* had been printing one or two discreet ads. When the military violently ended the revolution on October 26 and put the city under martial law, the city's effective leader Field Marshal Windischgrätz ordered all newspapers except the official *Wiener Zeitung* suspended.⁹ Radical left-wing papers were permanently closed, but only a week after October 26, the *Presse*, as well as a handful of conservative, anti-Jewish papers, returned to print. Two weeks after its reappearance, in mid-November, the *Presse* started devoting an entire two-thirds of a page in the four-page paper to advertisements. A month later Zang and Landsteiner gave a full page to ads, and by the end of the year ads accounted for more than a page and incorporated large typeface, lithography, and techniques akin to twenty-first-century native advertising. Advertising, combined with the one-Kreutzer pricing system, transformed the journalism industry, making newspapers more commercially viable endeavors than ever before. Advertising also changed the visual composition of papers. Readers came to expect at least a page of advertisements for mostly Vienna-based commercial goods, services, and even lotteries (Fig. 7).

Already by the end of 1848 the *Presse* had competitors, and by January 1849 all of the major competitive commercial newspapers were edited by Jewish men. The *Presse*'s main

⁹ During this period, even the *Wiener Zeitung* was allowed to print only official statements issued by the state.

competitor, the *Journal des Oesterreichischen Lloyd*, had previously been a trade journal in Trieste, but in September 1848, under the suspected influence of the former governor of Trieste, Franz Stadion, who had been appointed an imperial minister, the paper's editors decided to transfer the *Lloyd* to Vienna where it was converted to a "political" newspaper. The transition was overseen by Jewish convert to Protestantism Eduard Warrens (1820-1872), who became the chief editor, though his name did not appear on the pages of the paper. The editor responsible for the paper's content was journalist Jakob Löwenthal (1807-1882), a Jewish man originally from Poznań, who had already been contributing to the *Lloyd* in Trieste.¹⁰ Like the *Presse*, the *Lloyd* ran advertising, could be bought for cheap, and featured a feuilleton section written by Jewish

¹⁰ *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon, 1815-1950*, vol. 5 (Graz and Cologne: H. Böhlau, 1971), 292.

Die Presse.

Statt: Gleiches Recht für Alle.

Abonnement.
 Ganzjährig 3 fl. 6 kr.
 Halbjährig 2 fl. 6 kr.
 Einzelne Blätter kosten 2 kr. 6 kr.
Tägliche Postverendung.
 Ganzjährig 3 fl. 6 kr.
 Halbjährig 2 fl. 6 kr.
 Einzelne Blätter 2 kr. 6 kr.

Redaktion.
 Tuchlauben, Nr. 483, 2. Stock.
Expedition und Abonnement:
 Wallner, Nr. 7.
Interesse.
 Die späteste Portzeit ist 4 Uhr. 30.
 Unvollständige Briefe ohne Rücksendung werden unbedingte zurückgewiesen.

Das Kabinet vom 21. November

Das Kabinet, das so eben die Geschäfte Oesterreichs in die Hand genommen, hat seine Politik bekannt, deren doppelseitige Seite wir betrachten müssen. Es ist eine Politik des Widerstandes und eine Politik des Fortschrittes. Die Beschränkung der Associationen und die Beschränkung der Presse sind die Hauptgegenstände der Politik. Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen. Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen. Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen.

Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen. Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen. Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen. Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen.

Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen. Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen. Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen.

Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen. Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen. Die Beschränkung der Associationen ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen, die Beschränkung der Presse ist die Beschränkung der Freiheit der Meinungen.

Doktor Servans.
 Von Alexander Dumas Sohn.
 Da die durch eine Ungeschicklichkeit des Pächters der Wohnung gerichtet wurden, so haben die Dienst, um ihr Leben zu retten. Servans hat so viele Feinde, und brachte den Bescheid des Tages seinen Eltern, bei denen er in besseren Zeiten immer Abendessen einnahm, bis die Verzweiflung in ihm den letzten Schritt that. Servans, der nach dem Bescheid des Tages für sich das Verhör, durch welches er sich selbst verurteilt hatte. Es ist wohl sehr begreiflich, daß Doktor Servans, der in Servans einen gewissen Bedienten aufgenommen meinte, als er bemerkte, daß dieser, wenn seine Arbeit vollendet war, die in die Bibliothek ging, dort das größte Buch nahm, das er nur haben konnte und damit im Sommer, der Winter, im Winter in sein Zimmer sah, daß Doktor Servans sagen wird, darüber

in Zorn gerieth, und dem Desinquenten drohte, ihn im Wiederbetretungsfalle wegzujagen. Da sich aber Servans ihm mit Bräunen zu Füßen warf, und ihm sagte, daß er lieber das Band verlassen, als nicht mehr leben wolle, überlegte der Doktor, daß es endlich das Beste sei, wenn ein Bedienter lese, als wenn er ein Verbrecher wäre, und überließ ihm in Gottes Namen eine Abtheilung seiner Bibliothek, in welcher Werke fanden, die er nicht mehr benutzte, und die jetzt die Grundlage zu seines Bedienten wissenschaftlicher Ergründung bilden sollten.

II.
 Am Jahre 1800, da der Doktor seinen Vorwitz kennen lernte, war er schon fünf und zwanzig Jahre alt. Sein Leben ging an ruhiger zu werden, und die Anstrengungen, die wenigen Verbindungen, die er in dieser Beziehung geschloffen hatte, hörten allmählich auf, seine Gedanken zu beschäftigen.

Die Arbeit, das Studium war es, dem er sich mit seiner vollen Thätigkeit hingab.

Sein Leben ging immer friedlich und ruhig dahin, und nur seine Wohlthaten und die großen Dankgedanken in dem Gebiete der Wissenschaften begleiteten die Spur der entsetzlichen Jahre. Die Wissenschaften waren ihm nach und nach lieb geworden und der einzige wahrnehmende Strauß, der in dieser Hinsicht stehen war die Fremdschaft von Servans. Dieser war ganz

und gar ein anderer Mensch geworden. Seit zwanzig Jahren lag er sich täglich Morgens und Abends ein, und verbrachte tiefe Stunden. Das Resultat war eine so tiefe Kenntnis aller dessen, was in das menschliche Reich gelang, daß Servans, der ehemalige Bedienter, allmählich der Schüler, der Gesellschafter und endlich der Freund seines Herrn ward.

Servans war aber trotz dieser Veränderung seiner Stellung darauf beharren, den Doktor noch wie vor zu behandeln, so wie er es am ersten Tage seines Eintrittes in das Haus gethan hatte, als er noch arm und unwohlthun war.

Wenn ich, sagte er zu seinem Herrn, in Ihrem Hause ein halber Gelehrter geworden bin, so sind das die Geschenke meines Dienstes die ich fast erprobten Götter zurückgelasse. Ihnen, mein Herr und Meister, verbleibe ich das Alles, und wenn es auch mein höchstes Glück ist, Ihr Freund zu sein, so nehme ich doch nur unter der Bedingung an, daß ich die Pflichten erfülle, die Sie mir aufgegeben haben, und daß Sie mich immer zurechtweisen, wenn ich dieser Pflichten nicht so pünktlich wie früher nachkomme.

Und Servans hand wirtlich am frühen Morgen auf, um die Bücher seines Herrn, herbeizuholen, um sie zu lesen, das sie immer zu nehmen einnahmen, wenn er sich genöthigt mit einander aufzugeben um Kranke zu besuchen zu machen, da die Kranken endlich zu dem Do-

ner fast eben so viel Buxen hatten, als zu dem Herrn.

Nach den Wünschen freilich die Freunde mit einander und machten man Abends ein Spielchen oder eine Partie Schach.

Man sieht, daß diese einfache dem Studium geweihte Leben in keiner Weise zu der Annahme berechtigt, daß der Doktor und Servans sich mit unheimlichen übernatürlichen Kräften beschäftigten. Den Grund aber, bei diesem Verhältnisse lag das, soll der Leser im nächsten Kapitel erfahren.

III.
 Einmal Abends spät kam eine schwarzgekleidete Frau, und fragte nach dem Doktor Servans.
 Die arme Alte weinte unaufrichtig und faun fand sie in dem Kabinet vor dem Doktor, fast die Zusammen, und aus den eingelegten Augen trüben Tränen konnte man mitten in dem Schloffen nur entnehmen, daß ihre letzte Tochter dem Tode nahe war.

Der Doktor, der eben eine Partie Schach mit Servans spielte, stand augenblicklich auf, nahm seinen Hut und folgte der alten Frau, die ihm unerschrocken die Hände küßte und weinte.

Servans nahm, ohne die Beschäftigten in Unterbrechung zu bringen, ein Buch und wartete.

Feuilleton.

Fig. 6. A typical first page of an issue of Zang's Presse, December 2, 1848, No. 128, 503. Source: ANNO/Austrian National Library.

An sämtliche löbliche Zeitungs-Redaktionen.

Der hiesige hiesige Redakteur der **Landes-Zeitung** hat als ungeduldig erwiehen und klagt zu Mitherausgeber, Zeitungs- und unzeitigen Redaktionen geführt. Um dies zu vermeiden, werden wir künftig für die Zeitung, welche wir in anderen Blättern zu machen wünschen, den von die Zeitungs-Redaktionen, welche bei uns erschienen sind, zu machen, von nun an ein Zeichen zu thun.

Von der Redaction der „Presse.“

Seidenstoffe

Der hiesige hiesige Redakteur hat als ungeduldig erwiehen und klagt zu Mitherausgeber, Zeitungs- und unzeitigen Redaktionen geführt. Um dies zu vermeiden, werden wir künftig für die Zeitung, welche wir in anderen Blättern zu machen wünschen, den von die Zeitungs-Redaktionen, welche bei uns erschienen sind, zu machen, von nun an ein Zeichen zu thun.

Anzeige.

Der hiesige hiesige Redakteur hat als ungeduldig erwiehen und klagt zu Mitherausgeber, Zeitungs- und unzeitigen Redaktionen geführt. Um dies zu vermeiden, werden wir künftig für die Zeitung, welche wir in anderen Blättern zu machen wünschen, den von die Zeitungs-Redaktionen, welche bei uns erschienen sind, zu machen, von nun an ein Zeichen zu thun.

Militär-Zarod

mit Portraits: Franz Josef I. und mehrerer ersten Feldherren, dann Kriegs-Szenen etc.

Patent-Spielfarten.



Von der neu erfundenen Posamentierwaaren- und Ordensbänder-Fabrik für die k. k. österreichische Armee, Bürgerwehr und Staatsbeamte

Hauptniederlage in Wien am Graben zum Nothwand Nr. 1122.

Bestellt sind aus bester Arbeit alle Europäischen Ordens- und Medaillenbänder

Clavier

zu verkaufen und umzutauschen in Schimpf's k. k. Hof-Clavier-Machers, **Wald, Hof, Hofmann, R. 212.**

Kunsthandlung L. T. Neumann in Wien,

Das nach der Natur von **Hof, Kriehuber** lithographirte Portrait der **k. k. Hofchauspielactin**

Fräulein Mathilde Wildauer

als Mund im „Vespere hinterm Heerd.“

Verlag von Tendler & Comp. in Wien,

Reichsgesetz für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich.

Der Selbststark in Geschlechtskrankheiten.

Das durch die einfaches Mittel und in der 100 Jahren Zeit von allen Formen des Selbststark zur Wiederherstellung des verlorenen Zeugungsvermögens, so wie zur Beseitigung der Krankheit.

Bei Wallsthauser, Buchhändler

Vergrößerung. Tafelbuch für das Jahr 1850.

Ein Delgemälde zu verkaufen.

Bei Wallsthauser, Buchhändler, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Bei Wallsthauser, Buchhändler

Unsere Zustände

Franz Jang,

in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Trauer-Waaren-Niederlage

A. Hänsel & Fray

3 Abne

Im Trattnerhof

Gleich zu beziehen!

Einladung.

Haas und Handlung.

In vertriehen.

Einladung.

Einladung.

Einladung.

Einladung.

Einladung.

Einladung.

Einladung.

Einladung.

Wandtafeln

Hand-, Lehr- und Hilfsbuch der Naturgeschichte mit durchaus nach der Natur gezeichneten und lithographirten Abbildungen, herausgegeben von **Karl Müller**.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Karl Müller, k. k. Hof-Geograph, in Wien, am Graben, Nr. 1122.

Fig. 7. A sample advertisement page in the *Presse*, November 29, 1849, No. 284, n. p. Source: ANNO/Austrian National Library.

journalists Karl Beck (1817-1879) and Leopold Kompert (1822-1886), both poets well loved by Vienna's public. In early October Ignaz Kuranda (1811-1884), the Jewish Viennese liberal journalist who had published a liberal paper from Leipzig during the Vormärz and returned to his hometown with the outbreak of revolution, founded the *Ost-Deutsche Post*. The paper made it through less than a week of publication before it was temporarily suppressed by the regime, but, when it returned to press in January 1849, it would become an important mouthpiece for moderate liberals. Meanwhile, famed Jewish poet Heinrich Heine's brother Gustav (1812-1886) took over the editorship of the *Fremden-Blatt* and transformed it into a major commercial outlet from December 1848 onward.

In contrast to the radical journalists of 1848, commercial journalists, among them many Jewish men, tended to voice moderate liberal opinions. Journalists for this new kind of paper supported male suffrage that restricted voting power for lower-class men. They also called for renewed rule of law, which they hoped a moderate National Guard would protect. Like the conservative journalists of 1848, they associated radicalism with anarchy and hoped "immature" provocateurs of the far-left would be contained. In its first issues printed in Vienna, for example, the *Lloyd* printed a series of articles entitled "The Reaction." The articles were anonymous but probably written by Jakob Löwenthal or perhaps, less likely, Eduard Warrens. Unlike the radical position that held the conservative "Reaction" responsible for all ills that had befallen the city, the *Lloyd's* position was that the Reaction was a natural if unfortunate response to the unruly behavior of left-wing "mob." According to the anonymous journalist, "The most fatal curse that can strike a country is the despotism of radicals and revolutionaries."¹¹ Among the middle class

¹¹ Anon., "Alt- und Neu-England," *Journal des Oesterreichischen Lloyd* (Vienna), Sept. 27, 1848. See also anon., "Die Reaction," *Journal des Oesterreichischen Lloyd*, Sept. 27, 1848. These articles, part of a series, were most likely written by Jakob Löwenthal or Eduard Warrens.

of 1848, loyalties between political parties were strongest, rather than loyalties between religious groups, and the moderate position of Jewish commercial journalists, who directly criticized their radical co-religionists, testifies to this fact.

Legal Uncertainty

From the suppression of revolution in late October 1848 through 1851, press across the Habsburg Empire faced a precarious legal future. When marshal rule was imposed in October 1848, no new press law was issued for some time. The radical press was permanently closed. Far-right conservative papers that were committed to the supremacy of monarchical rule, that called for stiff suppression of radicalism, and that tended to voice anti-Jewish opinions, like the *Geissel* and the *Zuschauer*, were permitted to return to print. Likewise, moderate liberal papers that had railed against the “anarchy” of radicalism but upheld liberal principles like limited suffrage—the *Presse*, the *Lloyd*, the *Humorist*, the *Ost-Deutsche Post*, and the *Fremden-Blatt*, all edited by Jewish men—were given permission to reopen over subsequent weeks as well.

Though newspapers were published regularly from late 1848, until March 1849 editors had little legal direction regarding press regulation. While the military remained in power, journalists published news content only and no editorials. Meanwhile, a group of noblemen headed by Felix Schwarzenberg as minister-president and Franz Stadion as interior minister took over the state ministry. In March 1849, a few months after having convinced Ferdinand I to abdicate the throne in deference to Franz Josef, they successfully shut down the fledgling parliament, repealed its constitution, and tried imposing a constitution authored by Stadion. In practice the constitution was never implemented, and the city continued to be governed by intermittent royal patents, the military, and a growing police force.¹² A press patent issued on

¹² On this period in Viennese history, see Alan Sked, *The Decline and Fall of the Habsburg Empire*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited, 2001), 140-152.

March 13 re-imposed censorship over the press, permanently eliminating the possibility of a jury trial for journalists accused of violating the law, which had been viewed a major victory for journalists the previous year, and placed the press under the jurisdiction of the ministry of the interior. The patent restricted the publication of articles deemed threatening to the state and “public morality” and compelled publishers to sell their papers from brick-and-mortar offices, never on the streets. It also required all newspaper editors to submit a copy of each issue to the military authority at the time of publication, instituting post-publication control rather than the pre-publication censorship of the Vormärz. Most importantly, the law mandated that editors of political papers printed in Vienna purchase a newspaper concession for 10,000 Gulden, a huge sum, and prohibited individuals under the age of twenty-four, as well as non-Habsburg citizens from obtaining a concession.¹³

The 1849 system remained in place until July 1851, when Franz Josef issued a new order that purported to clarify the topics that were to be censored. It prohibited material deemed offensive to “the throne, the unity and integrity of the kingdom, religion, morality, or principles of society.”¹⁴ These categories proved to be vague, however, and could encompass a broad range of material. The new law also set up a warning system whereby authorities would issue a maximum of two warnings to a newspaper for problematic content before revoking the paper’s

¹³ “Kaiserliches Patent vom 13. März 1849 giltig für Österreich ob und unter der Eins, Salzburg, Steiermark, Kärnten und Karin, Görz und Gradiska, Istrien, Triest, Tirol und Vorarlberg, Böhmen, Mähren, Schlesien, Galizien und Lodomerien, Krakau und Bukowina enthaltend das Gesetz gegen den Mißbrauch der Presse” (Vienna, 1849), <http://www.univie.ac.at/medienrechtsgeschichte/Pressgesetz1849.pdf>. The patent was signed by Franz Josef and eight state ministers: Schwarzenberg, Stadion, Kraus, Bach, Cordon, Bruck, Thinnfeld, and Kulmer.

¹⁴ “Kaiserliche Verordnung vom 6. Juli 1851, wirksam für den ganzen Umfang des Reiches, womit provisorisch mehrere Bestimmungen bezüglich der inländischen periodischen, und der ausländischen Druckschriften angeordnet werden,” in *Landesgesetz- und Regierungsblatt für das Krönland Mähren* (Brünn: Franz Gastl, 1851), 297-299.

concession.¹⁵ Only in late 1851 did the press gain a level of legal stability that would last for over a decade. In December 1851 Franz Josef finally repealed the state-issued constitution and retook absolute control. In May of the following year he published a new press patent that reaffirmed the expensive concession system, the warning system, the post-publication submission requirement and upheld the moratorium on offensive content and hawking newspapers on the streets. This law remained in place until 1862.¹⁶

For contemporary journalists and nineteenth-century historians, the period between October 1848 and December 1851 represented not only a major setback for freedom of press, but also a period of legal indirection that gagged and confounded journalists. Joseph Alexander Helfert (1820-1910), who served as a state secretary beginning in 1848 and later became a historian at the University of Vienna, called the press printed in the legally precarious years between 1848 and 1852 the “besieged press” (*Belagerungs-Presse*), echoing the military’s name for their period of rule over the city, the “state of siege” (*Belagerungszustand*).¹⁷ Helfert drew from an article penned by editor Ignaz Kuranda in the *Ost-Deutsche Post* the day after it was allowed to return to press in mid-December 1848. In the article Kuranda described the trajectory of his editorial endeavors: first, the years during which he printed the liberal *Grenzboten* in the Vormärz period, from exile in Brussels and then Leipzig, to his return to Vienna in 1848 when he founded the *Ost-Deutsche Post* on October 1, 1848 before it was temporarily suppressed until December:

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ “Kaiserliches Patent vom 27. Mai 1852, wodurch für sämtliche Kronländer des Reiches, mit Ausnahme des Militär-Gränzgebietes, eine neue Preß-Ordnung erlassen, und vom 1. September 1852 angefangen in Wirksamkeit gesetzt, und das Gesetz gegen den Mißbrauch der Presse vom 13. März 1849) Nr. 161 des Reichsgesetzblattes außer Geltung gesetzt wird” (Vienna, 1852), <http://www.univie.ac.at/medienrechtsgeschichte/Pressordnung1852.pdf>.

¹⁷ Helfert, *Die Wiener Journalistik im Jahre 1848*, 249.

We have practiced the journalistic profession under different conditions. We fled from rule of Sedlnitsky's intellectual restraint [*Geisteszwang*] to the aegis of Belgian press freedom. For seven years we edited a newspaper under the shifting atmosphere of German censors. For five days we even enjoyed the long-desired happiness of printing a newspaper under complete freedom of press in Austria (from October 1 to 6); twenty days later we persisted at our job under the threat of revolutionary events. We have thereby had opportunity enough to acquire many experiences and techniques. But we lack the knowledge for one branch of journalistic praxis: the art of speaking under conditions in which there is neither censorship nor press freedom, the art of running a newspaper that, in a state of siege [*Belagerungszustande*], will not consider sacrificing its self-determination and the freedom to still maintain its viewpoint.¹⁸

According to Kuranda and later Helfert, the siege of the press in the period following the suppression of the revolution had thrown journalism into a state in which neither press freedom nor the familiar conditions of Vormärz censorship existed. If journalists knew how to express their views under the clamp of censorship before March 1848 and while enjoying press freedom between March and October of that year, journalists of the “besieged press” faced unknown conditions.

The “Business-Man” of Journalism in the State of Siege

Although Ignaz Kuranda expressed concern that the state of siege would leave journalists uncertain about how to manage their businesses and master their trade, the months from October 1848 through Franz Josef's reassertion of absolute control in December 1851 do not, in fact, reflect an unproductive and unprofitable period of time for commercial journalists. On the contrary, the period of legal certainty proved to be a period of remarkable press expansion. It was also a period during which journalists developed a set of behaviors and attitudes that would come to define the new “business-man” in journalism for the next decade. Two important practices came to be associated with the journalist during this period. First, press scandals—conflicts

¹⁸ Cited in Helfert, *Die Wiener Journalistik im Jahre 1848*, 253. The original was printed in the *Ost-Deutsche Post* (Vienna), Dec. 19, 1848.

between individual editors or writers—proliferated, and journalists frequently accused their rivals of lacking manly honor and a commitment to telling the truth. Journalists alleged that their competitors were scandalmongers or liars, while maintaining that they themselves epitomized respectable and honorable men. Second, journalists aimed to prove that their rivals were not politically impartial. Most frequently, they complained that rival newspapers voiced “ministerial politics,” allegedly providing evidence that the newspapers were bankrolled by a state minister who wanted to use the paper as a mouthpiece for his political views. Such an insult was meant to undermine the journalists’ claims to be freethinking and neutral, qualities that were *de rigueur* for liberal men of the middle class.

While accusations of political partiality and dishonorable conduct proliferated in the early 1850s, the question of why these behaviors characterized the “business-man” in journalism remains unanswered. A close look at several of the conflicts reveals that the primary goals and concerns that motivated much of the public vitriol stemmed not from a real interest in matters of honor but rather from an interest in using scandal to attract public attention, rivet newspaper audiences, and, therefore, expand readership and circulation. Scandal turned out to be a good way to attract readers, and big audiences were key for industry growth.

Five editors, Leopold Landsteiner, Eduard Warrens, August Zang, Gustav Heine, and Ignaz Kuranda—all Jews except Zang (Warrens had converted from Judaism)—were especially adept at testing out new tactics, a fact that is not surprising given the extra pressure on Jewish journalists to succeed in the field of journalism since other professional options were foreclosed to them. The conflicts that marred their professional relationships indicate that not only were Jewish men important players in transforming the journalist to an 1850s business-man, but that these Jewish men had no qualms engaging in public disputes, even if the disputes sometimes

pitted them against each other. Protecting one's reputation had little to do with one's religious background or one's ability to avoid public feud. Instead, those journalists who could most easily preserve their public reputations were those who adopted and championed the opinions most favored by the liberal, middle-class men in the city, be they Jews or non-Jews. Despite legal and market vicissitudes during the "state of siege" and the public conflicts in which editors and journalists engaged, these five editors laid a foundation that would allow them to dominate Viennese journalism for the rest of the decade and to set themselves up as paradigmatic models of the business-man in journalism.

I. Scandalous Men

On October 26, 1850, two years to the day after the Habsburg military had reasserted control over Vienna, the state-managed *Wiener Zeitung* ran an official announcement from the central military authority.¹⁹ The announcement accused local journalists of compensating for the restrictions of censorship by writing articles that criticized members of royal families in Europe and sought to incite the population against the state. The military issued official warnings to three newspapers, including the *Österreichische Reichszeitung*, a newspaper founded and edited by Leopold Landsteiner after he had left the *Presse* in late 1849. Finally, the announcement ended with a general condemnation of these inflammatory "personal attacks," threatening punishment to the editors of any papers that flouted this rule.

Though the attacks on royals that sometimes appeared in newspapers marked an obvious effort to counter censorship, they also had the effect of drawing attention to the newspapers and to the journalists who printed this material. Yet while the military regime worried about the political consequences of criticism of royals, the real public attention was raised not when these

¹⁹ K.k. Central-Militär-Untersuchungs-Commission, "Kundmachung," *Wiener Zeitung* (Vienna), Oct. 26, 1850.

same journalists attacked members of European royalty, but rather when they attacked other journalists. During this period, public conflicts between editors and journalists were so frequent that the *Preßburger Zeitung*, which closely tracked journalism in Vienna, joked that one of the city's conservative journals should recommend to the state that, in order to prevent the conflicts, censorship be brought back in full because "press freedom does not defend editors from their own incivility."²⁰ Of the five journalists who led the Viennese press in the state of siege, Landsteiner and Warrens were the kings of scandal- and conflict-driven journalism.

In late 1849 Landsteiner had quit his role as editor at the *Presse*—August Zang was known to be a stingy employer. A few months later he founded the *Österreichische Reichszeitung*, and within a short period of its founding, Landsteiner managed to get himself embroiled in a conflict with his former boss. The *Presse* accused Landsteiner of publishing a paper that was "ministerial," an adjective that implied both that it was conservative and that it was being secretly bankrolled by a state minister.²¹ Landsteiner countered by invoking article seventeen of the press patent of July 1849 to accuse August Zang of the *Presse* of libel, but Zang managed to recuse himself of the accusation by claiming that he had only used the word "ministerial" in the first sense, to indicate that the *Reichszeitung* was conservative.²² Papers across the empire were reporting eagerly on the conflict, hoping for a showdown between the two major editors.²³

The scandal in fact did not cool down but was rather superseded by another dispute.

²⁰ Anon., "Wien, 28 Januar," *Preßburger Zeitung* (Pressburg, now Bratislava), Jan. 30, 1850.

²¹ Anon., *Die Presse*, Nov. 18, 1849.

²² Private letter from Landsteiner to the *Presse* was printed in an article in the *Presse*: anon., untitled article, *Die Presse*, Nov. 21, 1849. See also anon., untitled article, *Die Presse*, Nov. 23, 1849.

²³ For example, see anon., *Salzburg Constitutionelle Zeitung* (Salzburg), Dec. 3, 1849.

While Zang and Landsteiner had gone head-to-head for a few weeks, the state bank was going bankrupt, an issue that was discussed nearly daily in Vienna's major papers. Most of the papers argued that the bank should cut the hefty dividends paid to shareholders. This position was advocated best by Eduard Warrens, "administrator"—he was not listed as head editor—of the *Wiener Lloyd*. Warrens claimed that this was the only logical response to the crisis.²⁴ This position earned him favor in educated, middle-class circles around the city. Landsteiner, on the other hand, became the only prominent voice in journalism to speak out against Warrens' solution, in favor, instead, of raising taxes. This position firmly convinced Viennese readers that Zang had been right in describing the *Reichszeitung* as ministerial. By January 1850 the conflict had overrun its original topic. The *Reichszeitung* accused Warrens of creating a scandal just to increase the *Lloyd's* number of subscribers and of practicing "dishonorable behavior." "Mr. Warrens," concluded one article, "is a huckster. He calculates." And later another article reported: "What are truth and honor to him [Warrens]?" The *Lloyd*, on the other hand, called Landsteiner a "denouncer" who might as well give up his career in journalism and go work for the reactionary state.²⁵

After exchanging critical articles for over a month, Landsteiner challenged Warrens to a duel. What happened after that is not clear. Landsteiner refused to talk about it. Several newspapers reported that Landsteiner and Warrens, along with their seconds and witnesses, had met at a specified time in Wiener Neustadt to resolve the debate, but instead of solving the

²⁴ For a description of the *Lloyd's* position see a two-part series from late December 1849. The articles were printed anonymously, but the conflict between Warrens and Landsteiner makes it clear that Warrens authored them. Warrens, "Für die Bank und gegen die Bank-Actionäre," part 1 and part 2, *Der Lloyd*, Dec. 28, 1849 and Dec. 30, 1849.

²⁵ Both the *Ost-Deutsche Post* and the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* actually published catalogs of all of the major insults that the two papers hurled at the other. See anon., "Oesterreich.—Wien, 25 Jan.," *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* (Augsburg), Jan. 29. 1850.

problem with a duel, they came to an oral agreement. Other papers claimed that this was impossible. Many papers pointed out that a duel would have been highly risky due to “personal differences”—namely, Landsteiner’s short stature.²⁶ Entertaining rumors flew around the city, until the *Presse* published the “true” account.²⁷ According to their anonymous correspondent, Landsteiner and Warrens had met, but, on account of extreme nerves, both Landsteiner and his second had become violently ill, requiring the service of a doctor. Warrens had then benevolently accepted an offer by Landsteiner’s second to resolve the dispute by means of a written explanation. The correspondent ended with the derisive quip that, even though Landsteiner had formally “won” the duel and seen his honor restored by Warrens, the defendant, it was up to the reader to determine who really was the more honorable of the two belligerents.

Whether there was any truth in the *Presse*’s account is not known, and it seems more probable that Zang, whom Landsteiner had accused of libel only two months prior, would have been only too happy to provide a story about Landsteiner that would tarnish his reputation as a man of honor. However, there was another issue at stake. Even though no one knew the truth of what had happened, the German-speaking public was riveted by the scandal for months. Newspapers across the empire and beyond published both serious and satirical reports on the conflict. By late January papers were even publishing a catalog of all the insults.²⁸ In other words by leveraging their reputation as honorable men, Warrens and Landsteiner gained public recognition. Both journalists claimed that they were superior in strength and honor; attacked their opponent for lacking these qualities; and, meanwhile, captured the attention of the public. In this

²⁶ This was the initial position of the *Presse*: anon., “Korrespondenzen. Wien, 1 Februar,” *Die Presse*, Feb. 2, 1850.

²⁷ Anon., “Korrespondenzen. Wien, den 9. Febr.,” *Die Presse*, Feb. 10, 1850.

²⁸ For example, anon., “Oesterreich—Wien, 25 Jan.,” *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, Jan. 29, 1850.

case Warrens was the clear beneficiary of the scandal. The *Lloyd* was said to have gained approximately 1,000 new subscribers, while the *Österreichische Reichszeitung* continued to come under fire.²⁹

Even if Landsteiner had initiated the conflict with Warrens in the early debates about the bank's insolvency, Warrens was no passive party. Born Wolf Arens to a Jewish family in Stockholm, Warrens had deep history as a public figure before he arrived in Vienna in 1848. As a young man he had immigrated to Saint Louis, Missouri and taken up a position as a venerable editor of German-language newspapers. He eventually converted to Protestantism. In Saint Louis Warrens played an important role campaigning for US presidential candidate James Polk, and, when Polk won the election, he appointed Warrens the American consul in Trieste. Warrens moved to Trieste and developed a close relationship with the Habsburg governor based in that city, Franz Stadion, who would become the Habsburg interior minister in November 1848. Warrens also got to know the editorial staff at the *Lloyd*, which was a trade journal based in Trieste at the time. In 1848 Stadion encouraged Warrens to facilitate the transfer of the *Lloyd* to Vienna, where it became one of the major "political" journals, giving up its narrower focus on trade.

After Warrens had "won" the popular opinion in the conflict with Landsteiner, he went on to pick more fights, some in even more dramatic fashion. A few months after the dispute with Landsteiner, he feuded with Ignaz Kuranda at the *Ost-Deutsche Post* over the subject of municipal elections, but the most entertaining scandal concerned a series of suspicious advertisements that had been running in Viennese papers since 1848. Sold by one J. T. Goldberger, "electro-magnetic rheumatism necklaces" were purported to be scientifically tested

²⁹ Reported in anon., "Oesterreich—Wien, 30 Jan.," *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, Feb. 3, 1850.

devices that would cure the pain of rheumatism by delivering an electric current to the joints. Advertisements for the devices had been appearing in the ad sections of Viennese papers for years. Finally in 1851, the *Fremden-Blatt*, headed by editor Gustav Heine, launched an effort to undermine the scientific credibility of the necklaces. Heine ran a series of articles that called into question the professional qualifications of the scientists who had approved the necklaces. He dismissed Goldberger as a quack and discouraged the local Viennese from purchasing his wares.

The *Fremden-Blatt*'s first critique of the necklaces appeared on April 17, 1851.³⁰ It was soon followed by others. Not to be outmaneuvered, Goldberger shot back. On May 18 he wrote a vicious response that appeared in the *Lloyd*. After a string of other insults, mostly directed at Heine, Goldberger wrote,

Using examples, I revealed some of the numerous, obvious lies that Heine forces on his readers in nearly every issue of the paper. However, is it not a disgusting sign of the times that people devoid of any moral worth can act with such impunity? That, under the appearance of telling the truth, they can authorize the grossest distortions, such malicious rumors, the most terrible accusations, and then reject factual corrections? Which injustice is greater: the lie, the slander—or the denial of one's ability to correct them?³¹

In response Heine went on the offensive. "In the future," argued the *Fremden-Blatt*'s follow-up, "only a fool would buy the necklaces."³² The article then took Eduard Warrens to task for allowing Goldberger's article to be published. The article concluded somewhat mysteriously. Warrens, continued Heine, had proved himself to be "more cowardly" in a previous "highly unpleasant" experience, and Heine felt that he had no choice but to bypass other means of settling the disagreement and to take Warrens directly to court for libel.³³ What these "other

³⁰ J. Schneider, "Die galvano-electrischen Ketten von Goldberger," *Fremden-Blatt* (Vienna), April 17, 1851.

³¹ J. T. Goldberger, "Aufklärung und Berichtigung," *Der Lloyd*, May 18, 1851.

³² The editors, "Erklärung," *Fremden-Blatt*, May 21, 1851.

³³ *Ibid.*

means” that Warrens had been too “cowardly” to pursue in a previous conflict were revealed some hours later, when Warrens fired the next round in an article in the evening edition of the *Lloyd*. The lengthy article recalled an affair that occurred three years prior, in 1848.³⁴ At that time Karl Beck, Jewish poet and journalist, had been employed as the chief editor of the *Lloyd*’s feuilleton. Beck’s brother Willi was the infamous co-editor of the *Wiener Katzenmusik*, a satirical paper of the radical revolutionary left, until he was arrested and put on trial following the military occupation of Vienna in October (see Chapter Three). After Willi had been arrested, Heine’s paper, the *Fremden-Blatt*, published a report that appeared to verify the allegations against Willi. Karl, fearing for his arrested brother’s life, published a rejoinder in the *Lloyd* to the *Fremden-Blatt*’s article. In the rejoinder he not only called the *Fremden-Blatt* a “speculating mediocrity,” but he also accused Heine of being a denouncer whose denunciations were based on speculation rather than fact.³⁵ Heine, in Karl Beck’s words, was a dishonorable man.

According to Warrens’ recollection, Heine had been incensed by Karl’s article, and he showed up in Warrens’ office, whereupon he challenged Warrens to a duel. Warrens, however, told Heine that he ought to take up his issue with Beck, but Heine responded that Beck, who was merely a feuilleton editor, was below his status and thus not worthy of being a dueling partner. When a representative for Heine appeared in Warrens’ office the next day, Warrens repeated his argument that Beck was the individual at fault but said that, if Heine was determined to hold Warrens responsible, he was prepared to duel. The representative left, and in the end nothing came of the encounter. Heine never reappeared in Warrens’ office, and the duel never took place. Instead, a tiny six-line apology—printed in small type at the end of an issue—appeared in the

³⁴ “Wien, 21. Mai,” evening edition of *Der Lloyd*, May 21, 1851.

³⁵ Karl Beck, “Notizen. Das Fremdenblatt,” evening edition of *Der Lloyd*, Dec. 28, 1848.

Lloyd two weeks later.³⁶ Warrens concluded his account of these events to the court with a harsh reiteration of Beck's original accusations that Heine was a lying denouncer who lacked honor. In addition, Warrens added, Heine had no respect for the truth.

This account, authored by Warrens and printed in the *Lloyd* on May 21, 1851, was followed by a response by Heine and several more complaints by Warrens. In each article the belligerent editor called the honor and public standing of his opponent in question. Over subsequent days Warrens urged Heine "to leave all honorable human company because of his lack of character."³⁷ Heine, for his part, wrote that "no man of honor could give or accept satisfaction" from Warrens in the event of a disagreement.³⁸ Meanwhile, the *Fremden-Blatt* reported that the *Lloyd's* numbers were tanking precipitously, a statement that may or may not have had any relationship to reality.³⁹

The case was finally taken before the high court in mid-July.⁴⁰ Heine's primary allegation was that he had been wrongfully maligned on May 21 when Warrens accused him of being a lying denouncer, a dishonorable man, and one who had no respect for truth. The details were rehashed, and Karl Beck, Willi Beck, and several other employees of the *Lloyd* and the *Fremden-Blatt* testified. Warrens' testimony was the longest speech, outlasting both of the lawyer's statements. Despite being the accused, Warrens was on the offensive through the entire trial. He

³⁶ The editors, "Herr Heine," evening edition of *Der Lloyd*, Jan. 13, 1849.

³⁷ Warrens, untitled article, evening edition of *Der Lloyd*, May 22, 1851.

³⁸ Heine, untitled article, *Fremden-Blatt*, May 22, 1851.

³⁹ Anon., "Wien," *Fremden-Blatt*, May 29, 1851.

⁴⁰ Cases details can be found in a series of three reports in the *Allgemeine Österreichische Gerichtszeitung*: "Vierte öffentliche Verhandlung der siebenten Schwurgerichts-Sitzung in Wien am 11. Juli 1851," *Allgemeine Österreichische Gerichtszeitung* (Vienna), July 12, 13, and 15, 1851.

claimed, first and foremost, that he was only the “head editor,” not the “responsible editor,” of the *Lloyd*, drawing upon a professional distinction common to the leadership structure at contemporary papers.⁴¹ He also argued that when Goldberger’s article insulting Heine had appeared in the *Lloyd* in May 18, 1851, Warrens himself had been out of the city recuperating from a serious illness. When he returned, he had expressed anger to his subeditors that the article had been printed since it contained potentially inflammatory material.

Warrens also explained his statements regarding the accusation that Heine was a lying denouncer, an allegation first leveled against Heine by Beck in 1848. “Denouncing” had a specific legal definition in Habsburg law, but it was not a clear one. To denounce, one had to do so voluntarily and for ignoble reasons. Warrens maintained that Heine had earned a reputation as a denouncer in order to enjoy special privileges from the regime. Warrens also claimed that Heine had been a public supporter of the far left during the revolutionary days and had only turned to the side of the military regime after the suppression of the revolution in October—further testament to his dishonorable and untrustworthy character. But Warrens never directly accused Heine of being a denouncer. Instead, he maintained that Heine had merely gained that reputation. When the judge reminded Warrens that printing rumors as fact could be considered libel, Warrens responded that he had only printed the rumor as such, arguing “I will here only remark that I never said about Mr. Heine, as it has been misunderstood, that he was a denouncer. Rather, I said that he has a reputation for a being [a denouncer]. . . . I added in my article, ‘Whether this [reputation] is true or false I don’t know.’”⁴² Warrens’ argument persuaded the

⁴¹ “Vierte öffentliche Verhandlung der siebenten Schwurgerichts-Sitzung in Wien am 11. Juli 1851,” *Allgemeine Österreichische Gerichtszeitung*, July 12, 1851.

⁴² *Ibid.*

jury. They voted in his favor, leaving him free to return to his post at the *Lloyd*, while Heine was required to pay Warrens' legal fees. As in the case of the dispute with Landsteiner, Warrens proved the most talented at swaying public opinion to his side.

Despite the rhetoric expressed in these disputes of the early 1850s, defending one's masculine qualities—honor, truthfulness, and courage—was not always the most important goal for editors. Rather, editors recognized that scandal and conflict sold well. Subscription rates during these debates surged as the public followed the saber-rattling. Warrens was accused repeatedly for stoking conflict exclusively for this purpose. As a result, it is not surprising that the editors who engaged in these conflicts emerged as some of the most important and well-known editors of 1850s Vienna. The *Fremden-Blatt*, the *Lloyd*, and the *Presse* were the major press organs during this period, and Landsteiner, despite the wounds to his honor, went on to found and edit the most successful paper of the decade, opened just weeks after he closed the *Reichszeitung*. Scandal- and conflict-driven journalism made good commercial sense. During the state of siege, when editors were prevented from publishing direct attacks on the government, public officials, and national or religious groups—attacks that might have drawn an audience—ad hominem, public disputes between individuals, with middle-class, “masculine” characteristics like honor or respect for truth on the line, became one common commercial strategy for journalists.

The fact that public conflict was a familiar commercial strategy during this period explains why Jewish journalists typically expressed little anxiety about engaging in these disputes, even when it brought them into conflict with other Jews and temporarily harmed their public reputation. Newspapers continued to do well after the conflicts had concluded, and, during this period, editors were able to repair their public reputations with relative ease. This is

especially apparent since all of these editors continued to find success throughout the decade. For this reason Jewish men often became involved in personal conflicts and were, in fact, leaders in escalating disputes of this sort.

It appears that the journalists who “won” a given conflict were simply those who adopted the opinions that prevailed among middle-class men. For example, in the dispute with Landsteiner, Warrens supported the position held by the majority of middle-class Viennese men that bank insolvency should be fixed by reducing dividends to the bank’s big shareholders, maintaining throughout that small shareholders should attend shareholder meetings and voice their opinions. Landsteiner’s opinion that dividends should not be reduced was simply a less popular position among middle-class men. The opposite situation, however, occurred in the 1850 conflict between Kuranda and Warrens over local city council elections, in which Kuranda was perceived to be the clear winner among middle-class men since he adopted the opinion held by the majority of the male middle class.⁴³ Indeed, during this early period, Jewishness played a more minor role in shaping journalists’ local reputations, and Jewish men often deployed the common commercial strategy that used scandal and public conflict to drum up newspaper readership.

The image of the business-man of journalism during the state of siege was double-edged. On the one hand, the new editors expanded readership, attracted advertisers, boosted circulation, and made profits far beyond Vormärz rates. These commercial priorities were central to their decision-making and informed their willingness to engage repeatedly in public disputes since evidence shows that newspaper sales typically increased during these scandals. On the other

⁴³ On the relative popularity of the two editors during this debate, see anon., “Wien. 25 September,” *Die Presse*, Sept. 27, 1850.

hand, editors and journalists sought to prove that they possessed and modeled the virtues of ideal middle-class men, who were supposed to act unfailingly with honor, courage, and truthfulness. Ostensibly, honor, independence, respect for truth, and courage were used as yardsticks to compare and rank the men of the press, but, in practice, editors could be commercially successful whether or not their reputation emerged from these disputes unscathed.

II. Ministerial Politics?

Most Jewish journalists who succeeded in the commercial press were moderate liberals, as they had demonstrated already in 1848, and most liberal men of Vienna believed that political and financial independence were imperative for the ideal liberal man. One of the primary ways that journalists challenged their competitors' claims to be paradigmatic liberal men, therefore, was by questioning their financial and political independence. The moderate liberalism advocated by journalists was not a uniform political doctrine, and writers disagreed on a range of topics. However, there was one point of general consensus: middle-class, professional men consistently gave a high appraisal to independent expression. The best version of the middle-class man, they believed, ought to be able to express himself independently and boldly in public forums. This put journalists in a double bind, similar to the one they had experienced in the Vormärz. On the one hand, their reputation as important public voices, as they believed they were, depended on protecting and projecting their independence. On the other, they were subject to restrictions of censorship law and, increasingly, to the demands of advertisers. The Jewish journalists who led the early commercial press were both among the most vulnerable to this insult and among those most ready to recourse to this method in order to criticize competitors.

For editors and newspaper publishers, the accusation that their papers were not financially or politically independent was especially uncomfortable because the task of writing

the editorial for each issue often fell to them. At the least, they were legally liable for the content of editorials printed in their papers. From 1848 onward, editorials came to be viewed as de rigueur for the commercial press, and it was during this period that opinion pieces began to be more clearly delineated from news reporting. Indeed, the word “*Leitartikel*” (“editorial” or “leading article”) which helped distinguished between “news” and “opinion” did not start appearing in most German-language newspapers in Vienna and elsewhere until 1849. That editors and publishers often wrote or were legally liable for the *Leitartikel* put additional pressure on their need to appear independent, articulate, and supportive of a strong middle class.

The circumstances faced in journalism from late 1848 to 1851 meant that one of the easiest ways to question the financial and political independence of a journalist was to accuse one’s rival of being “ministerial,” that is, allied with a state minister. Already by late 1848, the state ministry—an invention of that year—was viewed by liberals and radicals alike as a body of cronies willing to sacrifice liberal freedoms for stringent rule of law. This opinion was even more common after Minister-President Felix Schwarzenberg and Interior Minister Franz Stadion dissolved the parliament in March 1849 and tried to impose their own constitution. To be called “ministerial” was a serious attack. The accusation contained three implications. First, it always implied that a newspaper was conservative and opposed to middle-class, male independence that was part and parcel of liberal doctrine. Second, it also implied that a paper’s chief editor was weak in the face of state or individual ministerial pressure. Finally, it also insinuated that the publication was bankrolled by a minister, which meant that its editors were bad businessmen who relied on subsidies to keep their enterprise afloat.

Though editors worked hard to keep it a secret, the accusation that one’s paper was “ministerial” was not always baseless. State leaders in the Habsburg Empire had started to

recognize that managing public opinion, rather than trying to suppress the press, was a useful anti-revolutionary strategy, and state ministers did privately endorse and perhaps finance some of the local papers during this period. Christopher Clark has argued that this change was initiated by regimes across Europe. He writes that during the 1850s, many state leaders moved from a “system based on censorship to one based on news and information management.”⁴⁴ Censorship policies designed to prevent the circulation of information were replaced with state-led strategies that tried to curate the kind of information its citizens received rather than to limit it altogether. This meant, in practice, that bureaucrats and politicians sometimes tried to gain control of newspapers. Journalists often accused each other of “falling prey” to ministerial incentives, and, when the accusation proved correct, the discovery provided even more fuel for the accusers.

A long Jewish history of creating alliances with local power in order to protect Jewish welfare—a centuries’ old survival tactic for Jewish communities—sometimes meant that individual Jewish journalists were more vulnerable to the allegation that their papers were ministerial and that they could not resist lucrative financial or political support by state leaders. However, it was also the case that non-Jewish editors were frequently accused of being ministerial, while Jewish editors sometimes accused their co-religionists of being ministerial as well. During the early 1850s, the proliferation of the ministerial insult was a symptom of the sharp competition that characterized the newspaper industry and the relationships between major journalists. Accusing a competitor of being ministerial was a way to attract readers to one’s paper by drawing them away from another.

⁴⁴ Christopher Clark, “After 1848: The European Revolution in Government,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 22 (2012): 193. See also Gabriele Melischek and Josef Seethaler, “Von der Lokalzeitung zur Massenpresse: Zur Entwicklung der Tagespresse im Österreichischen Teil der Habsburgermonarchie nach 1848,” *Jahrbuch für Kommunikationsgeschichte* 7 (2005): 52-92.

Radical journalists of 1848 began accusing the *Presse*, likely with no basis for the accusation, of being tied to Minister Franz Stadion. Willi Beck, the Jewish radical cartoonist for the *Wiener Katzenmusik*, for example, created several cartoons that linked his co-religionist and political opponent Leopold Landsteiner, then the main editor of the *Presse*, to Stadion. In one cartoon, Beck depicted Landsteiner diligently writing down the words of Stadion, who was sitting in his inkwell, dictating (Fig. 8). The caption at the bottom of the cartoon imagined Stadion saying to Landsteiner, “You are my entire hope! I will sit in the ink, and you will write me out.” In the cartoon Landsteiner then commented, apparently to himself, “This is terrible! There is so much tannin in this ink that, despite all the black tones, the yellow tones come through immensely!” The reader would have immediately identified Beck’s accusation. Yellow and black, the imperial colors, were used by radicals to identify those they believed were loyal to the old aristocratic system and the new conservative Reaction, and Beck was suggesting that Landsteiner was a mouthpiece for both.

Wie Herr Dr. Landsteiner die „Presse“ schreibt, und wer ihm im Tintensafß sitzt.



Stadion: Sie sind meine ganze Hoffnung, ich sitze in der Tinte, Sie werden mich aber heraus schreiben.
 Landsteiner: Es ist schrecklich! in dieser Tinte sind gar so viele Galläpfel, daß trotz aller Schwärze das Gelbe ungeheuer durchschlägt.

Fig. 8. “How Mr. Dr. Landsteiner of the *Presse* writes and who sits in his inkwell,” cartoon in the *Wiener Katzenmusik*, depicting Franz Stadion in the inkwell and Leopold Landsteiner writing at the desk, August 22, 1848.⁴⁵

That 1848 radicals like Willi Beck would accuse moderates like Leopold Landsteiner of being ministerial, however, is not surprising, though their shared religious heritage makes the case more outstanding. After the suppression of the revolution, however, these accusations were not restricted to party conflicts between these two groups. The conflict between August Zang and Leopold Landsteiner after Landsteiner left the *Presse* in 1849 began when the *Presse*'s reporters accused Landsteiner's new paper the *Reichszeitung* of being ministerial. The *Presse* had run advertisements for the new paper several times before its first printing, but, after the *Reichszeitung* put out its third issue, the *Presse* published an article that stated that, with only three issues to its name, the *Reichszeitung* was already aiming to be the “police of other Viennese journals”—implicitly allying Landsteiner's new paper with the de facto police regime that had formed in Vienna.⁴⁶ A follow-up article two days later made the connection more explicit: “The *Reichszeitung* seems to have set as its mission nothing other than to be the paper surrogate of the not-yet-extant police regime.”⁴⁷ The *Presse* was not wrong to point out that the *Österreichische Reichszeitung* advanced conservative positions favorable to the restrictive state.⁴⁸ However, Landsteiner quickly responded by accusing Zang of libel. At the same time, other newspapers began circulating rumors that the *Presse* was ministerial, which revived the complaint levied by

⁴⁵ Willi Beck., “How Mr. Dr. Landsteiner of the *Presse* writes and who sits in his inkwell,” cartoon, *Wiener Katzenmusik*, Aug. 22, 1848.

⁴⁶ Anon., untitled article, *Die Presse*, Nov. 18, 1849.

⁴⁷ Anon., untitled article, *Die Presse*, Nov. 21, 1849.

⁴⁸ For example, the *Reichszeitung* tended to support increased taxation, an unpopular measure to solve the mounting state deficit. See anon., “Die Finanzlage Oesterreichs. III,” *Österreichische Reichszeitung* (Vienna), Nov. 18, 1849.

Willi Beck in the summer of 1848.⁴⁹ In 1849 the *Presse*'s journalists sought to defend their own work by printing a list of articles they had published that criticized the state.⁵⁰ On November 23, 1849 the *Presse* published yet another article critical of the *Reichszeitung* that concluded emphatically, "Never before has a newspaper sported the ministerial colors so quickly and with such self-confidence."⁵¹

Just over two weeks after the last article was published on the matter, the *Presse* was banned from Vienna by the state in response to its critical articles dealing with state deficit, and newspaper administration and publishing activities temporarily moved to Brünn, where Zang continued to print the paper until it was allowed to return to Vienna in 1851. The state-ordered ban boosted the *Presse*'s reputation for independence and did nothing to support Landsteiner's claims of independence of the *Reichszeitung*. The *Presse* clarified that its accusation against the *Reichszeitung* merely suggested that the paper was politically aligned with the ministry, not that the paper was financed by a minister, and, thanks to this addendum, Landsteiner could not bring Zang to court for libel.

Immediately after the *Presse* and Landsteiner exchanged barbs, Jakob Löwenthal and Eduard Warrens went to war with Leopold Landsteiner over state finances. During that conflict other Viennese newspapers accused both the *Lloyd* and the *Reichszeitung* of ministerial opinions, supporting the popular belief that the *Wiener Lloyd*'s 1848 transfer from Trieste to Vienna had been encouraged and possibly financed by Minister Franz Stadion. The *Preßburger Zeitung* labeled both Landsteiner and Warrens "matadors of the conservative press," while the

⁴⁹ For the 1848 accusations, see the *Presse*'s response: anon., "Wien den 4. Juli," *Die Presse*, July 5, 1848.

⁵⁰ Anon., untitled article, *Die Presse*, Nov. 21, 1849 and anon., untitled article, *Die Presse*, Nov. 23, 1849.

⁵¹ Anon., untitled article, *Die Presse*, Nov. 23, 1849.

Augsburger Allgemeine wrote that both had a “ministerial reputation.”⁵² The short-lived satirical journal *Punch*, based in Vienna, went even further:

The scandal is for us liberals even more delightful because of its entirely conservative nature. The bone of contention is not, say, one element more or less of press freedom, not freedom of assembly, not [about] a paragraph of the constitution; it has nothing to do with constitutional freedom, oh no! What two conservative loafers argue about is—money!—Bank dividends have them up in arms; money and more money!⁵³

Neither the *Lloyd* nor the *Reichszeitung* were outfits of the far-right, and, indeed, both editors considered themselves liberals. Warrens was not always opposed to being described as a conservative liberal, but Landsteiner would have balked at the *Punch*'s insult, having been an outspoken defender of the urban middle-class since his days at the *Presse*. Nevertheless, the reason that the accusation of being ministerial stung was not merely a question of political allegiance. To be ministerial meant that an editorial staff was not independent and self-determining. Ministerial papers could not be trusted to print sound editorials, and their contributors could not be trusted to report accurate news. In this sense being “ministerial” was as bold an attack on the claim that editors and journalists were independent men. Some attacks called out individual editors, rather than entire newspapers. For example, when an anonymous pamphlet tried to prove that the *Reichszeitung* occasionally printed left-wing, if incoherent, articles, and thus could not be ministerial, the *Zuschauer*, which had been skewered in 1848 across the city as the mouthpiece of the Reaction, printed an article defending Landsteiner and arguing that these leftist article printed in the *Reichszeitung* could not have been written by

⁵² Anon., “Wien, 28. Januar,” *Preßburger Zeitung*, Jan. 30, 1850 and anon., “Wien, 24. Jan.,” *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, Jan. 28, 1850.

⁵³ Anon., “Wie der Lloyd und die Reichszeitung ihre schmutzige Wäsche waschen, und wie der Punch ferner seine Lauge darauf schüttet,” *Punch* (Vienna), Jan. 29, 1850.

him.⁵⁴ That the conservative *Zuschauer* backed Landsteiner only deepened local suspicion that Landsteiner, though not the *Reichszeitung* as a whole, enjoyed ministerial support.

Both the *Reichszeitung* and the *Lloyd* enjoyed ministerial endorsement, if not financial support. The *Reichszeitung* supported Felix Schwarzenberg, the minister-president, and the *Lloyd*, which had been transferred from Trieste to Vienna in 1848 with the encouragement of Minister Franz Stadion, was the only Viennese paper that published a positive obituary of Stadion when he died in 1853.⁵⁵ However, the public allegations that certain papers were “ministerial” was more than a genuine expression of concern about the state of independent journalism. As with the strategy to engage in high-level public feuds, accusing one’s rival of being ministerial was a commercial tactic designed to detract readers from a competitor’s paper and attract them to one’s own. Accusing a rival of being ministerial raised public suspicion regarding his claim to middle-class, masculine political and financial independence, thus calling into question his capacity to serve as a voice of reason in the press. To engage in these quarrels was part of the typical behavior of the business-man of journalism during this period.

Jewish editors did not shy away from mutually accusing each other of being ministerial, nor did they hesitate to defend their own independence and partiality. Underlying some of the accusations against Jewish journalists may have been antipathy toward Jews and a belief that Jews were more willing to ally themselves with state power. However, Jewish men during this period also accused other Jewish journalists as well as non-Jews of being ministerial, while publicly and forcefully protecting their own reputations. They rarely presented themselves qua

⁵⁴ Anon., *Die gouvernementale Reichszeitung und die Revolution. Offenes Sendschreiben an Herrn. Dr. Leopold Landsteiner* (Vienna: J. P. Sollinger’s Witwe, 1850) and anon., “Tagesfragen. Mehr und mehr lüftet die Umsturzpartei ihren Schleier,” *Der Österreichische Zuschauer* (Vienna), Sept. 7, 1850.

⁵⁵ See Kurt Paupié, *Handbuch der Österreichischen Pressegeschichte 1848-1959*, vol. 1 (Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1960), 125, 126.

Jews in the press. Rather, they sought to portray themselves as the best journalists. During the state of siege, these tactics allowed Jewish journalists and especially editors to gain prominence in the burgeoning industry.

Commercial Journalism and the New Business-Man: The Mid-1850s

On December 31, 1851, Franz Josef re-assumed total control over the empire, rejecting altogether the possibility that Franz Stadion's imposed constitution would be implemented and retaking imperial power in all provinces. For journalists this step was viewed as the final death knell for any version of the press freedom gained in 1848. In March of 1852 Franz Josef issued a renewed press patent that reaffirmed, in a more permanent fashion, the concession system that required paper owners to pay huge sums in order to obtain a newspaper concession, as well as the restrictions on content that "threatened" state and public morality.

With the reassertion of absolute imperial control, commercial journalists began to reassess their practices. Most editors were able to successfully rehabilitate their public reputations, if they had been tarnished when public feuds and ministerial accusations were the in-vogue way to attract readership during the "state of siege." From 1852 on the commercial press would adopt practices that saw more substantial growth in circulation rates, and most of the same Jewish journalists who did well in the early 1850s were able to deploy the new strategies effectively. Landsteiner was unable to shed the reputation the *Reichszeitung* had for being ministerial and dispute-driven. The paper folded in 1852. The *Wiener Lloyd* managed to survive until 1854, but by then it too was superseded by more popular papers. Nevertheless, both editors began successful new journalistic enterprises shortly after the earlier papers closed. "Ministerial" newspapers were less commercially successful, and most editors changed their political angle after 1852. Disputes between individual editors started to fall out of fashion, as publishers and

editors found new and better ways to attract subscribers. Scandal mongering became so associated with the period between 1848 and 1851, that when Landsteiner wrote a provocative article for his new paper the *Morgen-Post* in 1853, the *Presse* chastised him for “using the old scandal mongering tactic to increase subscribers.”⁵⁶

As a result of the new commercial practices, the image of the business-man of journalism took on new dimensions as well. Editors and journalists of the rising commercial press only infrequently engaged in public conflicts in which they questioned their rivals’ masculine claims to honor, truthfulness, and political independence in order to attract readers. Instead, these business-men began adopting new managerial practices, developing complex workplace hierarchies, and expanding advertising, such that the business-man in journalism came to be understood not as individually responsible for newspaper content but as a powerful and rationalized participant in a modernized economic industry, which was from the beginning gendered male.

As they had in other eras, Jewish journalists flourished, but from the mid-1850s through the 1860s Jewish journalists and editors in Vienna experienced more success, in terms of readership and social respect, than they had in any other period. Leopold Landsteiner, Moritz Szep, Jakob Löwenthal, later Meir Letteris, and others were considered among the most important press innovators in the period, and their papers dominated the landscape, as did their models of the behaviors associated with the “proper journalist.” This was the case in spite of new incidents of anti-Jewishness, which were on a slow rise from the 1848 period onward in the Habsburg Empire. In these years Jewish journalists managed to remain central players in Viennese journalism without spending considerable time responding to anti-Jewish attacks. This

⁵⁶ Anon., “Tagesneuigkeiten,” *Die Presse*, Dec. 13, 1853.

relative acceptance, along with the fact that “Jewishness” was increasingly associated with “journalism” among Vienna’s local population, gave them space and opportunity to shape the press industry—and the image of the journalist—as a whole.

Contemporaries and nineteenth-century historians interpreted Franz Josef’s decision to reaffirm the newspaper concession system, post-publication censorship, and the warning system after he retook absolute power as the coup de grace for press freedom. H. M. Richter (1840-1900), a nineteenth-century Viennese historian, described the 1850s as a “period of suffering” for the press. He argued that through that decade journalism’s “existence was constantly threatened,” while journalists were oppressed by “the preventative censor and the repressive system, the sword over [their] head.” His contemporary, statistician Johann Winkler, concluded in a chapter entitled “Under the Repressive Systems (1852-1862)” that “the stagnation that dominated the press industry until 1859” proved the “effects of the repressive system” in “an unequivocal way.”⁵⁷

Contemporary historians have also viewed the 1850s as a reprise of the repressive years of the Vormärz. For example, Norbert Bachleitner concluded that while the new laws offered a certain protection from the arbitrary decisions of censors, “the police’s motives for interfering [in the press] remained more or less the same” as they were in the Vormärz. Indeed, he writes, the new laws “once again punished the misuse of the press.”⁵⁸ Likewise, historians of the nineteenth century, as well as contemporary scholars, have pointed out that the overall number of “political”

⁵⁷ Johann Winkler, *Die Periodische Presse Oesterreichs* (Vienna: K.K. Statistischen Central-Commission, 1875), 91 and H. M. Richter, “Die Wiener Presse,” in *Wien. 1848-1888. Denkschrift zum 2. December 1888*, vol. 2, 423, 424.

⁵⁸ Norbert Bachleitner, “The Politics of the Book Trade in Nineteenth Century,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 28 (1997): 105. For a similar view, see also Lothar Höbelt, “The Austrian Empire,” in *The War for the Public Mind*, ed. Robert Justin Goldstein (Westport: Praeger, 2000), 224.

papers (a legal category that included the majority of papers under discussion here) dropped after 1848 and rose only slowly after the initial plunge, a fact that is taken as evidence of the temporary victory of the repressive regime over free speech.⁵⁹

Viewed from a different angle, however, the period after Franz Josef's reassertion of power in late 1851 was a period of remarkable growth for the press industry. Despite—and, in some cases, thanks to—the new restrictions, the newspaper industry expanded to an unprecedented degree. News reporting technology, volume of sales, and newspaper revenue rose around the empire.⁶⁰ Though journalists may have suffered from censorship in the 1850s, many also prospered. For the first time in Habsburg history, journalism became a sustainable profession for more than only exceptional figures. If Vormärz journalists earned supplementary income from their press writings, Nachmärz journalism became the primary source of income for more individuals than ever before. The concession system that required newspaper owners to pay large sums to purchase a publication permit narrowed the market and reduced competition for journalists who could afford the expense, which likely had a positive rather than a negative effect for major editors and paper owners. Even though selling papers on the streets was banned from 1849 onward, newspaper sales boomed because of their cheap price. The largest papers had a circulation of over 10,000 per issue, and several others boasted over 5,000. Even this lower number far surpassed the circulation rates of Vormärz papers, where the most successful papers rarely had more than 2,500 to 3,000 subscribers. Already by 1849 advertisements made enough revenue for the *Presse* for August Zang to raise the price per issue to two Kreuzer, instead of

⁵⁹ Lothar Höbelt, "The Austrian Empire," in *The War for the Public Mind*, 224.

⁶⁰ See Kirsten Belgum's discussion of the post-1848 conservative period and the concept of the popular magazine in Belgium, *Popularizing the Nation*, 14-27.

one, and other papers followed suite in subsequent years. Gabriele Melischek and Josef Seethaler also point to the rise of the “local paper” model, where editors published popular pieces about mostly local news and relied on bulk advertisement sections for revenue, as a major innovation of the 1850s.⁶¹ They point to Leopold Landsteiner’s paper the *Morgen-Post*, founded in 1852, as a paradigmatic example.

The technology for acquiring and transmitting news also changed rapidly during this period in ways that expanded newspaper commercial reach and appeal. By the early 1840s newspapers were printing “flying dispatches” received via the pigeon post, and within a decade telegraphic news reporting was common. In 1846 the first telegraph line in the empire connected Vienna to the nearby town Floridsdorf. By 1850 many of the major cities in the empire had been connected by telegraph cable. By 1851 535 geographic miles of cable had been laid, and the empire had forty-five telegraph offices. Nearly 45,000 telegrams had been sent by December.⁶² Six years later the number of cable miles was nearly doubled, and the number of dispatches had more than quadrupled.⁶³ By the early 1850s readers already expected Viennese papers to feature “telegraphic dispatches” on the front page (Fig. 9). These changes were occurring across Europe, and, thanks to telegraphy, Habsburg reporters communicated with international reporters faster than ever. It was during this period that both the Associated Press and Reuters were founded, in 1846 and 1851, respectively.

⁶¹ Melischek and Seethaler, “Von der Lokalzeitung zur Massenpresse: Zur Entwicklung der Tagespresse im Österreichischen Teil der Habsburgermonarchie nach 1848,” 52-92.

⁶² For these statistics, see *Tafeln zur Statistik der Österreichischen Monarchie. Das Jahr 1851 mit Übersichtlicher Einbeziehung der Jahre 1849 und 1850*, vol. 2, no. 8 (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1856), Table 10.

⁶³ Hugo Franz Brachelli, *Statistik der Österreichischen Monarchie* (Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1857), 153.



Fig. 9. Advertisement in the *Lloyd* for a public telegraphy demonstration in 1849. November 29, 1849.⁶⁴

The changes experienced in journalism and celebrated by journalists also occurred because Habsburg state ministers adopted a new approach toward state governance and public opinion. As discussed above, Christopher Clark argues that instead of viewing the 1850s as a reprise of post-Napoleonic restoration across Europe, the state strategies implemented in the 1850s sought to control and direct public opinion—a form of “news and information management—rather than to stifle it.⁶⁵ Melischek and Seethaler discuss this argument as it applied specifically to Habsburg attitudes toward the Viennese press.⁶⁶ Both Clark and Robert Evans suggest that the 1850s should not be viewed as a period of reaction, as previous historians

⁶⁴ “Elektromagnetischer Telegraph,” advertisement, *Der Lloyd*, Nov. 29, 1849, No. 564, n. p. Source: ANNO/Austrian National Library.

⁶⁵ Clark, “After 1848: The European Revolution in Government,” 193.

⁶⁶ Melischek and Seethaler, “Von der Lokalzeitung zur Massenpresse: Zur Entwicklung der Tagespresse im Österreichischen Teil der Habsburgermonarchie nach 1848,” 52-92.

named it, but rather as a decade during which regimes across Europe, including the Habsburg government, aimed to preserve political quietude for the purpose of encouraging economic expansion.⁶⁷ For the Habsburg state, public and private economic growth was a goal, not an outcome to be avoided. In Vienna this benefited the press.

In 1852, just after the *Reichszeitung* folded, Leopold Landsteiner founded the *Morgen-Post*, a four-page paper in the style of the *Presse*. The *Morgen-Post* allowed Landsteiner to revamp his image. Although he was still occasionally subjected to some of the old insults that described him as conservative, the *Morgen-Post* mostly allowed him to shed his reputation for being dependent on state ministers and scandalmongering. Two years after he founded the *Morgen-Post*, he also purchased the *Wiener Telegraph*, which was edited by Adolf Bäuerle, who, at the age of sixty-eight was still involved in Viennese journalism. Eduard Warrens converted the *Lloyd* into the *Österreichische Zeitung*, under the patronage of Karl Ludwig Bruck, the minister of finance.⁶⁸ As he had been for the *Lloyd*, Warrens was the paper's administrator, and Isidor Heller, a Jewish journalist who had contributed to the *Sonntagsblätter* in the Vormärz and had worked for Bruck after the revolution, was brought on as the editor responsible for daily content. Heller stayed on until 1860, when he was replaced by Jakob Löwenthal, also Jewish, the original editor of the *Lloyd*. Meanwhile, Ignaz Kuranda, August Zang, and Gustav Heine kept their papers open, acquired even broader readership, and continued to adapt their personal reputations as journalists as well as the technologies and techniques used at their papers.

By the mid-1850s Viennese papers could be organized into three tiers: a first tier for

⁶⁷ Clark, "After 1848: The European Revolution in Government," 171-197 and R. J. W. Evans, "From Confederation to Compromise: The Austrian Experiment, 1849-1867," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 87 (1995): 135-167.

⁶⁸ Constantin Wurzbach, "Warrens, Eduard," *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, vol. 53 (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1874), 94.

papers with the highest circulation number per issue, a second tier comprised of papers that had respectable mid-range circulation, and a third tier for papers that trailed behind. Statistics show that in 1855 the first tier included the *Morgen-Post* with a circulation of 18,000-19,000; the *Presse* with 17,000; and the *Fremden-Blatt* at a circulation of 12,500. In the second tier were the *Ost-Deutsche Post*, which hovered around 4,000; the state-run *Wiener Zeitung*, which had about 5,500; *Österreichische Zeitung*, with around 5,000; the *Wanderer*, also around 5,000; the short-lived *Wiener Stadt- und Vorstadt Zeitung*, with 6,000 to 8,000 and 10,000 subscribers for their Sunday edition; and the *Wiener Telegraf*, which had between 5,000 and 5,500 subscribers.⁶⁹ Of these papers all except the *Wanderer*, the *Wiener Zeitung*, and the *Presse* were either owned or edited by Jewish men, including the *Wiener Stadt- und Vorstadt Zeitung*, edited by Julius Seidlitz, pseudonym for Isaac Jeitteles (1814-1857).⁷⁰

The New Business-Man of Journalism

In the mid-1850s the image of the business-man of journalism, for whom newspaper profit and expanded readership were the top priorities, took on different qualities and practices from those first exhibited by Landsteiner, Warrens, and Heine in the early 1850s. As the image of the business-man of journalism changed so too did the middle-class masculinity associated with the journalist. Driving this change was the fact that journalists and editors developed increasingly elaborate managerial systems for their businesses from the 1850s onward. Newspaper executives and employees were fit within these new hierarchies. They viewed themselves as critical components within the rising industry, which itself constituted part of a

⁶⁹ Constantin Wurzbach Tannenber, *Bibliographisch-Statistische Übersicht der Literatur des Österreichischen Kaiserstaates vom 1. Jänner bis 31. December 1855*, vol. 1 (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1857), 38.

⁷⁰ Jeitteles died unexpectedly in 1857, and his paper was closed.

new modern economy built on middle-class professionalism and male labor. By the end of the decade, the fact that nearly all of the city's press had adopted the commercial changes as well as the fact that most journalists and editors functioned in some capacity as "business-men" demonstrate the degree to which it had become impossible to succeed in journalism without adapting to the new standards.

For Jewish men, the new norms that governed the image of the business-man were even more critical. Faced with the need to avoid anti-Jewish abuse and with the opportunity to integrate into middle-class circles, Jewish men proved remarkably flexible, both accommodating and spearheading changes in journalism and in the image of the journalist. The Jewish journalist of the mid-1850s would set the stage for subsequent decades when Viennese Jews would continue to play an increasingly visible role in the press.

I. Managers and Managerial Systems

The major change to the image of the male journalist in the 1850s came about with innovations in newspaper managerial systems and workplace hierarchies. If the disputes of the early 1850s had amplified the public visibility of the city's major journalists, conditions in the expanding industry of the mid-1850s encouraged the papers' head journalists to become less visible on the pages of their papers. Former head editors began to list themselves as "owners" or "publishers," instead of editors.⁷¹ They adopted complex managerial systems, with publishers and owners at the top, followed by "responsible editors," and then chief editors and a variety of other subeditors. They hired employees who dealt with the advertisement page alone. The new

⁷¹ In the 1850s some editors chose to refer to themselves as the *Herausgeber*, rather than the *Redakteur*. Although *Herausgeber* and *Redakteur* can both be translated as "editor," in this context *Herausgeber* is better translated as "publisher" since it usually indicated an administrative, rather than editorial position. The *Herausgeber* sometimes contributed editorials to the paper, but this was rare. Usually it was the *Redakteur* and other subeditors who wrote newspaper content.

management structure was necessary not only because the papers were growing in circulation and size and thus required more employees, but also because, in most cases, “responsible editors” were legally liable for potentially inflammatory material. “Publishers” or “owners” were not. Adopting this managerial structure provided better legal protection for the heads of the newspapers.

These changes revamped expressions of middle-class masculinity associated with the journalist because social expectation held that newspaper “owners” or “publishers” should derive from the male middle class. It remained anathema among the Viennese population—indeed, among the European population as a whole—that a woman could hold a position of this sort. Likewise, journalism had always been associated with the educated middle class. Class, gender, and profession were therefore intertwined as the practices associated with the dominant image of journalist of the mid-1850s shifted. The top priority of the business-man of journalism was supposed to be expanding newspaper revenue, as it had been during the stage of siege in the early part of the 1850s, but the practices implemented to achieve this priority changed, which meant that the image of the journalist, as a man and as a member of the educated middle class, transformed as well.

Jewish journalists and editors of the period were leading exemplars of this change. As early as 1850 Eduard Warrens was already claiming to be responsible not for majority of the daily content but for the financial concerns of the *Lloyd* and its political and editorial direction. Describing his position, Warrens stated, “I am not the responsible editor. I am the head editor; I lead the administration; I represent the owners of the paper; and all the employees of my paper are employed by me. I hold the leading influence over the political direction of the paper, and I

write the editorials myself.”⁷² Warrens also made the decision to consolidate the business operations of the *Lloyd* under one self-owned publishing house, named the Lloyd Publishers. Non-Jew August Zang was also an early example. Already by late 1849 he had purchased Carl Gerold und Sohn, the publishing house where the *Presse* was printed—a wise financial move that made him the financial beneficiary of several press endeavors over the next decade. By May 1856 the *Presse* no longer listed Zang as the “chief and responsible editor” but as the paper’s “owner.” Zang’s financial success was legendary in the city. One memoirist writes that, thanks to his success as a publisher, Zang was able to purchase a villa in the hills outside Vienna.⁷³

Jewish journalist Leopold Landsteiner’s trajectory as a journalist is perhaps even more paradigmatic of the mid-1850s. The *Morgen-Post*, which he founded in 1852, resembled the press in many respects. It incorporated a feuilleton, a page or more of ads, and it was sold at the requisite price of one Kreuzer per issue. Shortly after its debut, it became one of the most circulated papers, outperforming the *Presse* by several thousand sales per issue, and outlasting Landsteiner, who died in 1875, by eleven years.⁷⁴ Landsteiner remained listed as the “publisher and responsible editor” of the paper through the 1850s, but in the 1860s he dropped the latter title, leaving merely “owner.” He also hired Moritz Szepe (1834-1902), a Galician Jew who had contributed a few articles to local papers, as the “chief editor” in 1858. Szepe’s name never actually appeared in *Morgen-Post*, but he acquired a reputation for being responsible for penning many of the political articles that appeared in the paper until he left *Morgen-Post* in 1867.

⁷² “Vierte öffentliche Verhandlung der siebenten Schwurgerichts-Sitzung in Wien am 11. Juli 1851,” *Allgemeine Österreichische Gerichtszeitung*, July 12, 1851.

⁷³ Carl Sitter, “Aus den Memoiren eines einjährigen Unfreiwilligen,” in *Funken und Splitter*, vol. 6 (Vienna: Selbstverlag des Vereines “Eintracht,” 1877), 72.

⁷⁴ After the *Morgen-Post* closed in 1886, Moritz Szepe bought the paper and converted it into the *Wiener Tagblatt*.

Landsteiner himself became less involved in day-to-day content. More to the point, when Landsteiner bought the *Wiener Telegraph* in 1854, his name did not even appear on the paper until the 1860s, when he was listed as the “owner and publisher.”

In 1858 Landsteiner once again found himself at the center of a controversy that provides evidence of the increasing distance between responsible editors or paper owners and their employees. For some months a rumor circulated that Landsteiner had been overheard trying to convince Gustav Heine at the *Fremden-Blatt* to join him in creating an “editors’ cartel” to hold newspaper employee’s wages artificially low and thus increase the profit for upper management.⁷⁵ Whether there was any truth in this rumor is unknown. Landsteiner publicly denied in the pages of the *Morgen-Post* that the conversation had happened.⁷⁶ He called on Heine to deny it as well. Heine wrote a curt retort in the *Fremden-Blatt* that the rumor was not true but that he felt no responsibility to serve as Landsteiner’s public “defender.”⁷⁷ Two individuals who were said to have been present for the original conversation wrote a short response in Landsteiner’s paper, claiming that the conversation had merely been about the honoraria paid to contributors, not about a cartel.⁷⁸ Regardless of the truth of the matter, the fact that this rumor circulated attests not only to the distance that had accrued between upper management and newspaper employees, but also to the way that this distance was eventually taken for granted as a fact of journalism. This was markedly different from the previous two decades, when head editors wrote the majority of newspaper content.

⁷⁵ Details of the rumor appeared in many papers. See, for example, Saphir, “Journal-Hauptwache,” *Der Humorist*, June 3, 1858.

⁷⁶ Anon., “Zur Abwehr,” *Morgen-Post*, May 30, 1858.

⁷⁷ Anon., “Der Redakteur der ‘Morgenpost’ . . .,” *Fremden-Blatt*, June 1, 1858.

⁷⁸ L. J. Semlitsch and Rudolf Valdek, untitled article, *Morgen-Post*, June 2, 1858.

During his time at the *Morgen-Post*, Moritz Szeps would become one of the most important editors of the late 1850s and 1860s. By 1866, under his leadership, the *Morgen-Post* had acquired approximately 30,000 subscribers. Szeps, moreover, was an important political voice in the city, calling for liberal changes and in support of the liberal party, successfully negotiating numerous conflicts with local authorities. By 1867 Szeps purchased the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, which had only been in publication for a few months at that point. Most of the employees of the *Morgen-Post* followed Szeps to the new paper. Biographer Constantin Wurzbach estimates that the paper sold 30,000 to 40,000 issues daily and had 200,000 to 300,000 readers. It was, moreover, read by “democrats” and “aristocrats” alike. For this reason, writes Wurzbach, Szeps ought to be viewed as the “embodiment of modern journalism.”⁷⁹

Along with the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, other major press outfits led by Jewish journalists in the 1860s are better known to today’s historians. Isidor Heller, who had worked under the management of Eduard Warrens at the *Lloyd’s* successor the *Österreichische Zeitung* started his own paper in 1859 entitled the *Fortschritt* (The Progress) and billed as a newspaper for “politics, industry, trade, and social life.” The *Fortschritt* found little success, but in 1864 Heller collaborated with then-editor of the *Fremden-Blatt* Wilhelm Wiener to found the *Neues Fremden-Blatt*, a rival to Heine’s original paper. The *Neues Fremden-Blatt* survived over a decade in the city, with Heller at the helm. That same year, in perhaps the most famous event in mid-century Viennese press history, convert from Judaism Max Friedländer and his colleague Michael Etienne, along with convert from Judaism Adolf Werthner, an investor and newspaper administrator, quit their positions at the *Presse* and founded the *Neue Freie Presse*. The *Neue*

⁷⁹ Constantin Wurzbach, “Szeps, Moriz [sic],” *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, vol. 47 (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1880), 117-122.

Freie Presse would dominate the Viennese press landscape for years and serve as a mouthpiece for major Jewish liberal thinkers.

The editors and paper owners of this period, except for the editors of the *Neue Freie Presse*, are little remembered by historians, despite their central position in public life and Habsburg economic developments. Part of the reason that this is the case is because the mid-1850s marked a shift away both from the Vormärz model in which one editor would be responsible for nearly all of his paper's content and from the boisterous, scandalmongering tactics journalists used in the early part of the 1850s. Instead, newspaper owners began to impose distance between their own professional responsibilities and the work of day-to-day content writers. Owners were charge of the financial and managerial side of the enterprises, while a variety of subeditors and journalists contributed regular content. Rather than following the scandalmongering model Warrens and Landsteiner pursued in the early 1850s, paper owners hired more employees and built up dense managerial structures. Moreover, responsible editors and subeditors divided the content between themselves, and many articles were published without names. News reporting no longer listed "contributors" but appeared instead as a series of impersonal dispatches. News was becoming less personal, and journalists of the 1850s were, consequently, less interested in developing strong public personas.

II. Excluding Women from New Management Systems

The management structure developed by the editors and journalists of the major 1850s papers relied on excluding the involvement of women and, for the most part, lower class men. It was inherently a middle-class, male system designed to broadcast the politics and social beliefs of those who belonged to the male middle class. Both before and during the uprisings of 1848, women as journalists and editors played little role in Viennese papers. However, prior to the final

months of 1848, editors did occasionally print a short story or letter written by women, and during the Vormärz, women's columns were a standard feature of many mainstream papers. After 1848 women's presence in newspapers in this way largely disappeared. More to the point, even if articles by women were occasionally featured, women were entirely excluded from the managerial systems set up at the city's major newspapers. A few papers did cater to women, but these were much smaller enterprises than the largest press outlets, which determined the behaviors and practices that were commonly associated with the dominant image of journalist. Regardless, even those few papers that catered to women were owned, published, and largely written by men since newspaper management was always comprised entirely of men.

Susanne Kinnebrock has argued that decades later, by the end of the century, many women were working as freelance journalists. These women, however, have been left out of historical studies on the fin-de-siècle press.⁸⁰ This historiographical exclusion, she suggests, has happened for two reasons. First, by the end of the nineteenth century, the image of the journalist as male was fully entrenched in common perceptions. To “be” a journalist, according to societal notions, one had to be a man. Even if women were involved in journalism, they were rarely perceived as being “real” journalists. Historians have adopted this faulty perception. Second, newspaper managerial staff, particularly at major newspapers, were all men, excluding women altogether. For these reasons, journalism came to be seen as a male pursuit, largely thanks to commercial and managerial changes that gendered stereotypes about the “proper” journalist.

Following Kinnebrock, I have argued in previous chapters that the perception of the

⁸⁰ Susanne Kinnebrock, “Revisiting Journalism as a Profession in the 19th Century: Empirical Findings on Women Journalists in Central Europe,” *The European Journal of Communication Research* 32, no. 2 (2009), <https://doi.org/10.1515/COM.2009.009>.

journalist as male began from the early rise of journalism in Vienna. Here I suggest that the development of managerial systems in Viennese journalism dated largely from the 1850s and that part and parcel of this development was the exclusion of women from managerial positions as owners, publishers, responsible editors, other subeditors, and key journalists. Indeed, their occasional contributions are mostly invisible, which furthered the notion that the “proper” journalist must not only be male but must also be plugged into the new management structures as a primary employee.

In general, newspapers of the 1850s adopted a more formal and distant tone, rarely addressing their readers using the second person and presenting news reports in an impersonal fashion. This quality might lead readers to imagine that newspaper content was not gendered. But the creators, disseminators, and assumed readers behind this kind of content were male. Not only were editors, publishers, and owners all men, but the “neutral” tone with which telegraph-wired news reports and front-page editorials were written was always received by the male members of telegraph associations and penned by male editors. In the Vormärz content written by or for women was explicitly marked, while male content was not. The lack of such gendered coding in the Nachmärz must be read as male implicitly or by default.

Still, content that was coded for women did not disappear altogether. Rather, in Vienna’s major newspapers, women’s content moved to the advertisement section. Advertisements that appeared in the Viennese press targeted both men and women, but from the beginning many of the ads were gendered. The first time the *Presse* ran a half-page ad section, it printed short advertisements for a number of small enterprises: a public lending library, a fencing school, a dentist, and a music teacher and private tutor, an announcement about a partisan newspaper for moderate liberals (the paper would not survive), a women’s clothing and fabric store, and a

solicitation—in French—for a young woman who “speaks perfect French, Italian, and German” to become an instructor for young girls.⁸¹ Of these, the fencing school and the partisan newspaper were intended for men. The lending library, the dentist, and the music teacher/private tutor could be for both men and women. The clothing store and the classified ad for a young female teacher were intended for women.

Over time advertisements became more sophisticated, and as they did, so did the gender-target marketing. By 1851 the *Presse* was running advertisements on both the first and last pages, and by 1852 the paper had expanded its paper to eight pages, at least four of which ran ads. The first page was often entirely populated by advertisements, in large font with images, and advertisements ran throughout each issue, sometimes inserted between regular news columns. Advertisements had increased in scope and variety. Some were not explicitly gendered. Huge ads for private lotteries ran almost daily, as they did in most of the city’s other papers. Ads for various household and health remedies, such as insect repellent and powder for indigestion were common. An advertisement for a company that exchanged old playing cards for new ones ran for years in many of the local papers, and doctors and book publishers took out ads on a daily basis. But there were also clear distinctions between ads for men and ads for women. Some men’s clothing stores published advertisements, and ads for real estate and other investments were clearly intended for men. Some of the largest ads were for women’s clothing stores, domestic products like dishware, and new novels for a female reading audience. Besides that, classified ads were typically meant either for men or boys and women or girls. “Marriage offers” for young women appeared frequently from the mid-1850s. For example, two adjacent “marriage offers” appeared in the *Presse* in the summer of 1856. The first advertised that “an educated [*gebildeter*]

⁸¹ Advertisement section, *Die Presse*, Nov. 17, 1848.

young man, who has a secure income, along with an estate of some thousands of Florin, would like to marry a girl, of the Jewish religion, with a good education and a reasonable estate.”⁸² The second ad was similar: “A young licensed pharmacist, with a private estate of 8,000 Florin, would like, by means of this now not uncommon public announcement, to marry a morally educated girl or childless widow, who has at her disposal at least 12,000 Florin.”⁸³ To the left of these classified announcements was a solicitation for a governess. Several classified ads for young men—as a winemaker, a private tutor, railroad employees—appeared on the same page.

Advertisements were not only geared toward women, but, as women’s columns and the few contributions by female writers that had been present in the Vormärz dropped out of the papers, the ad section was usually the only place where content marked as feminine or for women could be found. Correspondingly, journalism and the increasingly complex managerial structures that governed papers became more masculine since male readers were considered normative. Women simply did not fit the “professional” image that journalists developed with the rise of the commercial paper in the 1850s. Instead, the relegation of women to the advertising section and the dominance of men in the making of journalism revived the model Moritz Saphir deployed at the *Humorist* in the Vormärz (see Chapter Two): men were the producers and women the consumers.⁸⁴

⁸² Anon., “Heirats-Antrag,” *Die Presse*, July 31, 1856. One Florin was equivalent to one Gulden.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Irene Bandhauer-Schöffmann has discussed how the perception that men were business-builders and women were economic consumers was ingrained in commonplace knowledge by the end of the nineteenth century in Austria. She writes, “For a business history which attempts to bring culture back into business history, it is interesting to analyse how the concepts of masculinity and femininity along with the dichotomy of the sexes were deeply ingrained into economic thinking on entrepreneurial behavior. At the beginning of the 20th century the process of defining the term entrepreneur as the male alpha type man and the marking of production as male in opposition of consumption as female was firmly established in the field of economics. The linking of masculinity and entrepreneurship, which has existed in different forms since theories about the entrepreneurial characteristics were formulated, structured experiences for women and limited their economic citizenship. Irene Bandhauer-Schöffmann, “Widows and

Jewish Leaders, Anti-Jewishness, and Integration

As this chapter has demonstrated, Jewish men were central players not only in building the industry of journalism in 1850s Vienna, but in shaping the attitudes, practices, and behaviors associated with the business-man of journalism. But why were there so many Jewish men involved? Part of the answer to this question is the same answer discussed in previous chapters. In the Habsburg Empire Jewish middle-class men were locked out of professions, such as university professorships and civil service, that were typical occupations for educated middle-class men. Jews, then, turned toward journalism as another option. Moreover, journalism provided Jewish men an opportunity to publicly demonstrate their “aptitude” for social integration and their coherence to the norms of middle-class professional men, at a time when many individuals did not believe they possessed such aptitude. As journalists, they had the opportunity to demonstrate these qualities before an audience. As they became leaders in journalism, they soon came to play a constructive and constitutive role in developing (rather than merely imitating) modes of masculine behaviors associated with the image of the journalist.

As in previous eras, most Jewish editors and newspaper owners of Vienna’s press in the 1850s preferred to highlight their qualities as “proper” middle-class male journalists rather than Jews, in part because of the reasons described above. However, they did have to contend with a steadily mounting anti-Jewish activity, which had been slowly growing since the appearance of the conservative, anti-Jewish movement of 1848. While the extreme anti-Jewish political faction was mostly stifled in the 1850s, anti-Jewish sentiment was increasingly directed at Jewish journalists, who were convenient public targets. Many critics of the new “business-man” of

Daughters: Austrian Business Women and Their Status in Family Firms in the 19th and 20th Centuries,” conference paper, XIV International Economic History Congress (Helsinki, August 2006): 19.

journalism found anti-Jewishness a useful means by which to critique this new model. They argued that the “negative” commercial changes should be attributed to the high percentage of Jews in the industry. Among urban men of the 1850s, many individuals who touted anti-Jewishness often did so as a way to articulate their distaste for a range of commercial changes that swept the press during the 1850s. Some people, for example, resorted to anti-Jewish rhetoric to condemn what they believed were “unethical” or “dishonest” motives of which they accused many of the commercial journalists. For some critics, Jewish journalists and the commercialization of the press were synonymous. Although in Vienna anti-Jewishness was still a minority opinion and many Jewish journalists experienced professional success, the public presence of anti-Jewishness could not be ignored.

Whether the rumor circulated in 1858 that Leopold Landsteiner wanted to create an “editors’ cartel” was driven by anti-Jewishness is difficult to prove with certainty, but since the rumor alleged that Landsteiner had brought up this idea to Gustav Heine, his co-religionist, it is likely that it was motivated by anti-Jewishness. Conspiracy theories that held conniving Jewish cabals responsible for controlling economic markets and implementing capitalist changes in Europe had become more common, and the idea that Landsteiner wanted to create a cartel among Viennese editors mirrors these anti-Jewish theories.⁸⁵ As Derek Penslar has discussed, European theories that held Jews responsible for economic change or economic ills abounded in the mid-century, playing on bizarre ideas that argued that Jews were both masterminds of new capitalism and thieves or criminals of the impoverished underground.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ On anti-Jewish cabal theories, see Derek J. Penslar, *Shylock’s Children: Economics and Jewish Identity in Modern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 42-49.

⁸⁶ Penslar, *Shylock’s Children: Economics and Jewish Identity in Modern Europe*, 1-9.

In his response to the accusation, Landsteiner did not mention the possible anti-Jewish connotations of the insult. Instead, he directly refuted the truth of the rumor and criticized Heine for failing to immediately step forward to defend him. Heine, though he did acknowledge that the rumor was untrue, expressed contempt for Landsteiner and demonstrated no urgency in bringing up the question of anti-Jewishness. When Landsteiner's first response did not stop the rumor from spreading, he relied on two non-Jewish acquaintances to clear his name and restore his honor in public, through a follow-up article in the *Morgen-Post*.⁸⁷ Landsteiner did not refute the anti-Jewish attacks by defending his status as a Jew but rather by defending his status as a man of integrity in private conversation.

A more obvious case of anti-Jewishness that Landsteiner faced occurred in 1854, during the conflict with Moritz Saphir that was referenced at the beginning of this chapter. Shortly after Landsteiner purchased the *Wiener Telegraph*, he had authorized a series of insulting cartoons and articles to be printed in the paper. Saphir responded in kind:

If, however, the readers think that the constant slanders against me that Mr. Landsteiner fires off in the *Telegraph* [sic] are [motivated by] animosity, malice, or scorn, the reader is wrong. The flabbiness and watered-down brain activity of Mr. Landsteiner would never gain [enough] strength for such an energetic activity as malice or scorn. It is nothing more than “speculation,” “haggling” [*Schacher*]—*Spekulatzi*. Mr. Landsteiner thinks he will sell a couple more Kreutzer papers doing this. It is nothing more than a haggling [*Schacher*] in its most rough, rotten form.

...

In order to further dishonor where possible, in order to push the taste and tendency of the lowest stratum even lower in baseness and brainlessness, Mr. Landsteiner bought the *Wiener Telegraph*! Along with the *Morgen-Post*, the *synagogue* for the elite among the tinkers, Mr. Landsteiner submitted the *Telegraph* as a *sukkah* for literary piglets and skunks who live in the crevices of the *Wiener Punch* or the *Gassenzeitung* and others, and who will now increasingly appear in the *Telegraph* and become the foul yeomen of intellectual impotency.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ Semlitsch and Valdek, untitled article, *Morgen-Post*, June 2, 1858.

⁸⁸ Saphir, “Inventarium unseres Journal-Elends. 1. Herr Leopold Landsteiner, Doktor des journalistischen Fetzensacks, Professor der Politik ohne Noth und Magister der literarischen Obstruction,” Nov. 1, 1854.

Six days later Landsteiner issued a short response to Saphir's attack, and then six days after that, Saphir followed Landsteiner's response with another vicious article. Saphir reminded his readers that his intention was to expose the "haggling activity" (*Schachertätigkeit*) and the "eagerness for profit" of the press, to reveal "those individuals who lack all intellect, talent, and professional calling and who are nothing other than hucksters."⁸⁹ After Saphir wrote his first article, Landsteiner suddenly "imagines that he is now a *literary something*, and . . . after *six days* of continual intellectual constipation, on the seventh day he worked up for himself a little essay, crying from Abraham's bosom."⁹⁰

The anti-Jewish nature of Saphir's statements is impossible to miss. In the first article he claimed that Landsteiner's papers were the "synagogue" and "sukkah" (a Jewish ritual hut built for the holiday of Sukkot) for the pious among Vienna's literary philistines, who only read the most lowbrow of local papers. He accused Landsteiner of haggling, speculating, and hawking cheap Kreutzer papers merely to turn a profit, rather than for literary cultivation. For a nineteenth-century audience, haggling, speculating, and hawking would have immediately conjured up an identifiable menu of anti-Jewish allegations. Jews were accused of distorting economies for personal gain both by haggling cheap wares and by speculating on risky economic enterprises. Saphir moreover invoked a derogatory mixed metaphor that linked Landsteiner's "poor" literary output with constipated bowel movements and "Abraham's bosom," another direct connection to Landsteiner's religious heritage. The degrading quality of the insult—Landsteiner's "little essay," likened to a "crying" child—upbraided Landsteiner for having "childish" and immature literary skill, instead of the sophisticated literary skill that Saphir

⁸⁹ Saphir, "Anzeige und Abfertigung," *Der Humorist*, Nov. 12, 1854.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* Emphasis Saphir's.

believed was necessary for a proper journalist.

For Saphir, accusing Landsteiner of being at once a conniving speculator and a vulgar haggler was a means to criticize the commercial turn in journalism. The high percentage of Jews in journalism was an exploitable reality for critics of the journalist as business-man, and, as Jewish journalists gained recognition, critics began to harness anti-Jewishness to denounce what they believed were the unethical priorities of these new journalists. The insult was also gendered and classed. If “journalist” indicated a male member of Vienna’s professional middle class, then one tactic with which to criticize someone’s status as a proper journalist was by disparaging his masculinity. Saphir’s decision to belittle Landsteiner as childish and lacking integrity, invoking both anti-Jewish and gendered insults, called into question the notion that Landsteiner merited being viewed as a journalist at all. Saphir did not waver on this point: “In the intellectual sphere,” he wrote of Landsteiner in the same article, “you are a fat zero, a *nothing*. You are no writer (*Schriftsteller*). You are no poet (*Dichter*). You are no journalist (*Journalist*).”⁹¹ In a similar fashion, Carl Sitter, a non-Jewish journalist and contemporary of Saphir and Landsteiner, recalled in his memoir that during this period newspaper editors interested in profit over quality hired “Veitels and Itzige,”—in other words, inferior Jewish journalists—to work for their papers.⁹²

Saphir’s decision to use anti-Jewishness to convey his criticism of Landsteiner is surprising. Saphir himself came from Jewish heritage. Though he converted in the early 1830s, Saphir maintained close friendships with many Jewish residents of Vienna and defended Jewish

⁹¹ Saphir, “Inventarium unseres Journal-Elends. 1. Herr Leopold Landsteiner, Doktor des journalistischen Fetzensacks, Professor der Politik ohne Noth und Magister der literarischen Obstruction,” Nov. 1, 1854.

⁹² Sitter, “Aus den Memoiren eines einjährigen Unfreiwilligen,” 73.

causes in his paper. Like Landsteiner, he had been on the receiving end of anti-Jewish jokes for decades.⁹³ If he insulted Landsteiner using anti-Jewish means, he knew well that such statements could—and had been—just as easily be turned against himself.

Despite the occasional episodes of anti-Jewishness, Jewish journalists of the 1850s experienced relative acceptance when it came to their religious heritage. Most of the criticism they received, in fact, was directed at specific articles they published or was instigated by rival journalists for the purpose of attracting new readers who were interested in the dispute. Meanwhile, Jewish journalists of this period continued to tout their characteristics as “proper” middle-class men in journalism, rather than publicly discussing their religious practices—a decision that makes sense given the fact that Jews had not yet even been granted full emancipation in Vienna. The fact that anti-Jewish activity was fairly subdued during this period provides another reason that Jewish men were able to achieve success in journalism. A high degree of tolerance, though it would not last, combined with the economic and social opportunities that journalism provided for Jewish men, meant that Jews became disproportionately involved in the burgeoning press industry. It also meant that Jewish men had the possibility of becoming leaders in shaping perceptions about journalism and perceptions about the journalist himself.

Curiously, while anti-Jewishness was used as a way to critique the business-man in journalism, Jewish journalists and editors also found ways to levy the same criticism. Even as Jewish and non-Jewish journalists adopted business-first practices, many of them sought to deny that they prioritized commercial aims over other goals. Landsteiner’s response in the *Morgen-*

⁹³ For evidence of his close friendships with Viennese Jews, see *Saphiriana. Anekdoten, Witze und Charakterzüge aus dem Leben M. G. Saphir's* (Brünn: Verlag von Franz Karafiat, 1874).

Post to Saphir's invective is a case in point. Landsteiner stated that any good observer of Vienna's daily press ought to know enough not to associate the *Morgen-Post* "with the word 'Kreuzerblatt.'" ⁹⁴ He added that the only similarity between a Kreutzer paper and the *Morgen-Post* was the one-Kreutzer price per issue. He concluded by stating that the *Morgen-Post* ought to be acknowledged for its two forms of success: quality journalism on political and social topics and a circulation of 26,000 per issue. Defending the paper by referencing its commercial success probably only added fuel to Saphir's original complaint that Landsteiner put profit above content. Landsteiner, however, also made a promise: "We will have many opportunities later to denounce the corruption in theater matters, the ignorance of literature, the tastelessness in matters of style, the stupidity when it comes to politics that they [the *Humorist's* contributors] display nearly every day." Landsteiner therefore accused Saphir of possessing the exact same tendency toward literary philistinism of which Saphir accused him. Both editors, as it were, accused each other of valuing profitmaking over literary journalism. In fact, Landsteiner's other paper, the *Wiener Telegraph*, had already made a similar claim about Saphir in an anonymous parody published six days before Saphir wrote his first article about Landsteiner. If the "regent of the year" was money, wrote the *Telegraf's* anonymous satire contributor, then M. G. Saphir was his "most subservient servant." ⁹⁵ In other words, Landsteiner believed that Saphir was as commercially oriented as Saphir later accused Landsteiner of being.

While it would seem that Vienna's journalistic circles split between those who adopted the new image of journalist as business-man and those who did not, a close reading reveals a

⁹⁴ Anon., "Montags-Courier, Die vergangene Woche, *Morgen-Post*, Nov. 6, 1854. Emphasis Landsteiner's. The article was published anonymously, but it was almost certainly penned by Landsteiner in direct response to Saphir.

⁹⁵ Anon., "Wiener Punch. Juxkalender für das Jahr 1855. Aus tiefstem Mitleid Herrn M. G. Saphir gewidmet," *Wiener Telegraph*, Oct. 26, 1854.

more complicated situation. Although Saphir castigated what he believed to be Landsteiner's commercial rather than literary motives as a journalist, Landsteiner made the same accusation about Saphir. The tendency among journalists to accuse their rivals of the identical crime, that of prioritizing profit over honor, truth, or literary work, occurred repeatedly through the 1850s. The disputes were not exclusively between Jews and non-Jews, although the language of anti-Jewishness began to be harnessed for the purpose of making these accusations. What these mutual accusations indicate, however, is that the same critics who claimed to reject the decision to prioritize profit over other concerns were the very critics who effected and accelerated this change. By the end of the 1850s, the journalism industry had changed to such a degree that it had become impossible for journalists to fully reject the practices of the business-man.

Conclusion

Feminization and Vilification in the Fin-de-Siècle

In the decades after the events in this dissertation took place, the Jewish population in Vienna underwent a series of transformative demographic changes, while local and imperial Habsburg politics reshaped the factors that affected Jewish life in the capital city. Under pressure from three main groups—the growing Liberal faction, Hungarian revolutionaries who wanted autonomy for their province, and aristocrats who wanted to see some of their old powers restored in the provincial diets that had been weakened after 1848—the Habsburg regime attempted to reorganize in the early 1860s. Conservative Minister of the Interior Alexander Bach, who had dominated the Habsburg government since 1849 was eventually replaced with a liberal centrist minister, Anton Schmerling. Schmerling’s government passed the February Patent in 1861, which established a new imperial diet based on centrist liberal principles. The Reichsrat had both an upper and a lower house, the latter of which was to be made up of officials chosen by means of a rigged election system that used a voting tax to guarantee the dominance of aristocratic and middle-class voters.¹ Despite the fact that Schmerling’s liberal administration attempted to placate liberal party members, Hungarians, and aristocrats alike, it encountered increasing opposition from nationalist groups across the empire. In response to pressure from Hungarians, Croats, Czechs, Italians, and others, in the mid-1860s Franz Josef moved to turn the government away from the liberal direction it had pursued since the passage of the February Patent. In 1865, Schmerling was replaced with conservative minister Richard Belcredi, and the February Patent was suspended. Two years later tension between Hungarian leadership that sought national

¹ Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016), 253 and Barbara Jelavich, *Modern Austria: Empire and Republic, 1815-1986* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 59-61.

autonomy and Austrian leadership came to a head, and Franz Josef was forced to negotiate what today is referred to as the “Dual Compromise” with Hungary in 1867. According to the compromise, both Hungary and Austria were set up as constitutional monarchies, each governed by separate constitutions. Hungary was given full autonomy of interior affairs, and the empire effectively split into two parts. Meanwhile, although the compromise was reluctantly supported by centrist liberals in Austria, Austria’s conservative faction grew increasingly popular, as resentment of nationalist movements grew, and some liberals began to switch camps.

Just as it did for Hungarians, 1867 proved to be a turning point for Habsburg Jews as well. Austria’s new constitution finally guaranteed complete emancipation of Jews across the empire. Although Viennese Jews had long experienced relatively secure social and financial standing in the Habsburg capital, until 1867, their residence in the city was legally restricted, and Jews across the empire had been forced to endure highly discriminatory laws that limited their movement, economic wellbeing, and occupational freedom of choice. Emancipation in Austria had several outcomes. The most noticeable one was its prompting of a major demographic shift.² The Jewish population of Vienna in 1848 numbered approximately 4,000, and likely did not even double over the subsequent decade. However, between 1867 and 1869, the Jewish population of the capital city grew to 40,230 individuals, according to the government census taken in 1869. This was equivalent to more than a 4 percent increase of Jews in the city’s overall population. By 1880 the Jewish population numbered 73,222, and by 1900 the population was nearly 150,000,

² Robert S. Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph* (Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1989), 43.

putting Jews at 8.8 percent of the population of Vienna as a whole.³ By 1910 Vienna was home to the third-largest Jewish community in Europe, after Warsaw and Budapest.⁴

Although the Viennese Jewish population of the 1830s through the 1850s was comprised of many individuals who had migrated from Moravia, Galicia, Hungary, and other provinces, the population boom that began in the late 1860s meant that Jewish migrants from these provinces poured into the Habsburg capital at an unprecedented rate.⁵ Moreover, it became more common for whole families, rather than individual men, to move to the city. Over the next three decades, Jewish life in Vienna was transformed. The relatively few options for Jewish community participation until the 1860s expanded by the fin-de-siècle to encompass a vast network of Jewish organizations, institutions, religious communities, and political groups.⁶

As discussed in Chapter Three, the first Jewish newspaper in Vienna, the *Oesterreichisches Central-Organ für Glaubensfreiheit, Cultur, Geschichte und Literatur der Juden*, was founded in 1848 during the revolutionary months. After it, along with most other papers, was suppressed in October 1848, few newspapers intended for a Jewish audience were founded in Vienna until the 1860s. In the final three decades of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth, however, the Jewish press expanded rapidly. Viennese Jews could not only find Jewish newspapers published in German, but they could also read newspapers in Yiddish, Ladino, and Hebrew, as well as other provincial languages. Jews could pick between newspapers that represented a range of political movements, including liberalism, Zionism, and

³ Marsha L. Rozenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983), 17.

⁴ Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz*, 41.

⁵ Rozenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914*, 22 and Wistrich, *the Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph*, 42-47.

⁶ On this topic, see Rozenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914*, 147-174.

socialism and newspapers that supported many forms of Jewish religious practice, from Sephardic or Ashkenazic papers to Orthodox or Reform.⁷

In addition to the expansion of the Jewish press, Jewish journalists remained engaged in Viennese press targeted for a general audience as well. In fact, Jewish involvement in the general press surged. Historian Robert Wistrich described the relationship of Jewish journalists to the Viennese press in the final decades of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth in the following terms:

Above all, Jews were prominent among the great press tycoons. They owned, edited, and very extensively contributed to most of the leading newspapers of Vienna. Though somewhat exaggerated, it was significant that Henry Wickham Steed, *The Times* correspondent in the Austrian capital, could write that “economically, politically and in point of general influence they—the Jews—are, however, the most significant element in the Monarchy.” Wickham Steed particularly singled out the liberal *Neue Freie Presse*.⁸

The *Neue Freie Presse* (1864-1939), founded in 1864 when convert from Judaism Max Friedländer (1829-1872) and his colleague Michael Etienne (1827-1879) split from Zang’s *Presse*, remained until the end of the century the best-known liberal outlet in Vienna. In its heyday, it was edited by Eduard Bacher (1846-1908) and later Moritz Benedikt (1849-1920), both Bohemian Jews who had moved to the capital city. As historian Richard Grunberger reports, it was rumored that Benedikt, who worked at the paper from 1872 and died as chief editor in 1920, was so important that “the making or breaking of [Austrian] ministries was in his hands.”⁹ While, Grunberger remarks that this was certainly an exaggeration, the rumor nevertheless attests to Benedikt’s social and political cachet at the time. The most remembered

⁷ See Jacob Toury, *Die Jüdische Presse im Österreichischen Kaiserreich, 1802-1918* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983), 69-110.

⁸ Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz*, 170.

⁹ Richard Grunberger, “Jews in Austrian Journalism,” in *The Jews of Austria*, ed. Josef Fraenkel (London: Vallentine, Mitchell, and Co., 1967), 89.

journalist of the *Neue Freie Presse* today is undoubtedly Theodor Herzl (1860-1904), whose reporting on the Dreyfus Affair while he was the paper's Parisian correspondent, launched him into the public spotlight in Vienna. Meanwhile, Moritz Szeps (1835-1902), whose early career was described in Chapter Four, purchased the liberal *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* (1867-1945) in 1867 only months after it had been founded and transformed it into the most important commercial rival of the *Neue Freie Presse*. The *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* came to occupy a less centrist and more democratic political orientation than the *Neue Freie Presse*.

The second best-remembered Jewish journalist of the time, after Herzl, is his rival editor Karl Kraus (1874-1936). Kraus's satirical paper *Die Fackel* (1899-1936) criticized a range of institutions, individuals, and business enterprises in Vienna. Kraus was especially critical of his fellow journalists, and two of his main targets were Moritz Benedikt of the *Neue Freie Presse*, whom Kraus accused of corruption, and later Theodor Herzl, who Kraus mocked for his efforts as a pioneer of the Zionist movement. Kraus, who had converted from Judaism, often used antisemitic language in his journalism, though Paul Reitter has recently argued that Kraus only mimicked antisemitic language, rather than adopting antisemitic viewpoints, in order to make his case against corruption in big business.¹⁰ In part thanks to Kraus's rabble-rousing tone, *Die Fackel* became one of the most popular papers in the city. The founder of the Austrian Social Democratic Party, Victor Adler (1852-1918), was also Jewish. In 1889 Adler founded the *Arbeiter Zeitung* (1889-1991), the mouthpiece of the party, which eventually boasted a circulation of 10,000 with Adler at the helm.¹¹ Besides the examples listed above, Jewish editors and publishers founded and led numerous other papers across the city from the final third of the

¹⁰ Paul Reitter, *The Anti-Journalist* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008).

¹¹ Grunberger, "Jews in Austrian Journalism," 93.

nineteenth century through the first decades of the twentieth. These included, among others, the *Montags Revue* (1870-1915), the *Neue Wiener Journal* (1893-1939), the *Zeit* (1902-1919), the *Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt* (1872-1928), the *Abend* (1915-1934), and the *Tag* (1922-1938).¹²

As the Habsburg regime was increasingly forced to address the precarity of its imperial structure and as new nationalist movements called for recognition and autonomy, the liberal political vision that had once dominated in Vienna's middle class came to be seen by accelerating numbers of city residents as outdated in its insistence on an empire united under a common government and a common—German—culture. New groups and individuals saw themselves excluded from the liberal promise, while many liberals became disillusioned with their own platform as they feared that it would not do enough to tamp down the “radicalism” of nationalists or proletariat workers. By the 1870s strong new conservative movements had taken root in Vienna and around the Austrian Empire.¹³ Many liberals changed ranks, joining old aristocrats and anti-nationalists. The new movements were aided as well by technological innovation in the mass press, from which conservatives were able to trumpet their views and appeal to wide sectors of the population, including workers, peasants, and lower-middle-class artisans.

With the rise in conservative politics, a new form of virulent antisemitism began to take shape in Austria. As discussed in Chapters Three and Four, the uprisings of 1848 witnessed a surge in anti-Jewish behavior and anti-Jewish pamphleteering, motivated, in part, by the fact that

¹² Ibid., 92-95.

¹³ On the rise of political conservatism, see John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995). See also Jonathan Kwan, *Liberalism and the Habsburg Monarchy, 1861-1895* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Peter Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), 31-70, 121-184; and Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1961), 116-180.

many people associated Jewish journalists and other Jewish public figures with radical, “unruly” masculine behavior that eroded rule of law in the empire. The stereotyping did not diminish over the subsequent decades. Instead, by the 1870s powerful antisemitic opinions had taken hold among sectors of Austria’s the lower middle class, peasantry, and wealthy classes. Historians have offered many explanations for this development.¹⁴ In Vienna, the influx of Jewish migrants coincided with the rise in discontent with the Liberal Party’s platform—a platform championed by the *Neue Freie Presse* and the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, both edited by Jewish men. Jews not only came to be associated with “out of touch” liberal views but also, paradoxically, with the rise of socialism as well as the rise of capitalism, both of which were viewed by many individuals as corrosive to the fabric of society.¹⁵ A rash of journalists began championing antisemitic views, including several Catholic writers. The apex of this development in the political sphere was the 1891 founding of the Christian Social Party, led by conservative and antisemitic politician Karl Lueger (1844-1910), who was elected mayor of Vienna in 1897. The party’s platform took antisemitism as a central tenet. As in France and Germany, Habsburg politics in the latter decades of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth came to be dominated by the issue of antisemitism.

¹⁴ See Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1948); Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews, 1867-1938: A Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); William O. McCagg Jr., *A History of Habsburg Jews, 1670-1918* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 161-222; Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*; and Schorske, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*, 116-180.

¹⁵ See Derek J. Penslar, *Shylock’s Children: Economics and Jewish Identity in Modern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001) and Sander Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).

What does the late-nineteenth-century rise in antisemitism and conservative politics and the acceleration of Jewish involvement in the general press have to do with the question of the Jewish role in establishing modes of masculinity in the press during that period? Moreover, how are the modes of masculinity that came to be associated with fin-de-siècle Jews and fin-de-siècle journalists related to those of the earlier period, discussed in this dissertation? In the 1830s, 1840s, and 1850s, when middle-class Jewish men were still subject to discriminatory laws that prevented them from working as civil servants and professors, Viennese journalism, with its few barriers to entry and the promise of occasional money to be made, attracted many Jewish men to its ranks. Young, German-speaking Jewish men, who benefited from integration into literary and professional circles in Vienna, stood to gain by using the press as a way to make their names in Vienna's literary circles. They did so by adopting forms of masculinity considered "proper" for middle-class, educated men. However, as Jewish men became leaders in journalism, they began to define new forms of masculinity that came to be widely associated with the image of the journalist from the late 1830s through the 1850s.

With a handful of exceptions, this dissertation has offered a narrative of "success." In many cases between 1837 and 1859, Jewish journalists who played major roles in developing dominant masculine norms that defined the image of the journalist found themselves broadly respected and admired during this period. They inspired younger male journalists, and they achieved high levels of integration into professional, literary, and political circles in Vienna. This was especially the case before 1848. Ludwig Frankl, editor of the *Sonntagsblätter*; Leopold Kompert, the famed "Volk stories" writer; and poet Siegfried Kapper, for example, were beloved by Vienna's public and played important roles in local literary society. Even Moritz Saphir, who practiced a form of masculinity that did not always garner unanimous respect, still found

inclusion in local male circles thanks to his decision to publicize his opinion that women should not contribute to the public sphere but should be mere spectators. Attacks on the masculinity of Jewish journalists before 1848 were relatively infrequent, and many Jewish journalists were respected precisely for their “masculine” behaviors. After 1848, when anti-Jewish sentiment among non-Jewish journalists in Vienna became more pronounced, Jewish journalists Leopold Landsteiner, Moritz Szeps, and Ignaz Kuranda still met with local esteem, especially when they chose to espouse the liberal opinions in vogue among middle-class men of the Habsburg capital.

Despite the relative acceptance of Jewish journalists qua men in the 1850s, the uptick in anti-Jewish activity that had begun in 1848 and severely worsened by the fin-de-siècle changed the nature of Jewish participation in Viennese journalism by the end of the century. By then, Jewish men and Jewish masculinity as a construct were routinely vilified and feminized. Jewish journalists, moreover, were a special target of these attacks. Though Jews were still important leaders in the Viennese press, as Robert Wistrich described, and still informed notions about norms of masculinity that dominated the press, Jewish journalists found it more difficult to garner widespread respect. This was in large part because the concept of “Jewish masculinity” was a major object of attack by antisemites and conservatives in Vienna and across the empire as a whole. As Benjamin Maria Baader, Sharon Gillerman, and Paul Lerner have recently argued:

The notion that Jewish men suffered from a distorted masculinity or carried certain female traits did not figure prominently in the intense debates about Jewish emancipation and Jewish civil rights of the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth. The issue of Jewish masculinity arose only occasionally when contemporaries—generally opponents of Jewish emancipation—argued that Jewish men were unfit for military service. . . . On the other hand, some non-Jews considered Jewish populations well prepared for civil society, and significant numbers of Germans and other Western Europeans came to believe that Jews possessed an exemplary family life, in which faithful spouses, devoted fathers and mothers, and obedient sons and daughters formed tightly knit units.

The tone changed toward the end of the nineteenth century, when racialized anti-Semitism spread through Central and Western Europe. Soon, non-Jewish commentators

began to express serious concern about inappropriate gender expressions among Jewish men and women, and the trope of the effeminate Jewish man became the target of pervasive and vicious anti-Semitic critique.¹⁶

For the most part, the observation that Jewish men were infrequently the objects of gendered criticism in the early- to mid-nineteenth century held true in the field of journalism, and this fact permitted Jewish journalists to take on leadership roles in determining modes of masculinity that dominated the press and were widely respected by their non-Jewish peers. However, as Baader, Gillerman, and Lerner point out, the rise of antisemitism changed the tenor of non-Jewish rhetoric about Jewish masculinity. Jewish journalists, as a result, were increasingly perceived to possess corrupt, criminal, conniving, or feminine masculinities.

Wilhelm Marr (1819-1904), the anti-Jewish German pamphleteer and politician who coined the term “antisemitism,” wrote in an 1879 pamphlet, entitled “The Victory of the Jews over the Germans,” that Jewish journalists, through their cunning, had taken control over the German-language press. Germans, by which he meant non-Jews, had failed to anticipate the corrupt, scheming tendencies of Jewish journalists and had allowed their own press industry to be dominated by Jewish men.¹⁷ Sander Gilman credits Marr for playing a key role in transforming anti-Jewishness rhetoric to a “scientific” discourse whereby Jewish “shortcomings” were ascribed to race and biological characteristics that could not be overcome. Marr’s argument also turned on gender. Because his criticism of the state of journalism in Germany lamented an industry that was understood a male in its entirety, his critique of Jewish journalists as conniving individuals set on dominating the press industry was also a complaint about Jewish *men*

¹⁶ Benjamin Maria Baader, Sharon Gillerman, and Paul Lerner, introduction to *Jewish Masculinities: German Jews, Gender, and History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012), 1, 2.

¹⁷ Wilhelm Marr, *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthums vom nicht confessionellen Standpunkt aus betrachtet* (Bern: Rudolph Constenoble, 1879).

specifically. Jewish men, in other words, possessed conniving or corrupted masculinities that led them to take “control” of the press. Moreover, in Marr’s view, the qualities that motivated Jewish men to “control” the press stemmed from their biological—and thus inherent and unmalleable—traits, their irreparably impaired masculinities.¹⁸

The apex of the feminization of Jewish men and Jewish journalists in particular was articulated by philosopher Otto Weininger, himself a Viennese Christian convert from Judaism. Weininger published a book entitled *Sex and Character* in Vienna in 1903. According to Weininger’s bifurcated account of gender, masculinity and femininity represented opposite characteristics: the former logic, activity, and morality, the latter passivity, sexuality, irrationality, and lack of moral direction. In Weininger’s view, Jewishness was equivalent to femininity: to be “Jewish” meant that one exhibited “feminine” traits that Weininger believed were negative.¹⁹ The book thus not only comprises an important example of misogyny in Austrian philosophy, but it also took aim at Jewish men in particular. If Jewishness was commensurate with femininity, which itself was distinguished by “bad” characteristics, then Jewish men were collectively corrosive to society and psychologically impaired. Moreover, Weininger located weak, imitative, and unoriginal qualities—qualities that Weininger associated with women—in the masculinity of Jewish journalists specifically. More precisely, he assumed that Jewish intellectual “proclivity” for journalism was born of the feminine nature of Jewish men.²⁰

¹⁸ Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred*, 211, 212.

¹⁹ Otto Weininger, *Geschlecht und Charakter: Eine Prinzipielle Untersuchung* (Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1903).

²⁰ See Paul Reitter on this point: Reitter, *The Anti-Journalist*, 35, 36.

Sex and Character met with immediate success in Central Europe after its publication. This was, as John Hoberman has pointed out, because it was rooted in stereotypes common during the fin-de-siècle. Many Central Europeans assumed not only that femininity and masculinity were fundamentally different and hierarchically related but also that Jewish men were, on the whole, feminine.²¹ More to the point, the many antisemites in Central Europe at that time believed that Jews were naturally inclined to be journalists, rather than other kinds of writers, because Jews lacked capacity for original thought, a lack they further associated with femininity.²²

The trend regarding perceptions of the masculinity of Jewish journalists at the fin-de-siècle represents a departure from trend in the years under investigation in this dissertation. Jewish journalists of the 1830s, 1840s, and 1850s were able to set standards of masculine behavior in journalism in Vienna, and they were often respected precisely for their masculine behaviors. Only in 1848 did Jewish journalists as a whole come under frequent attack for possessing “conniving” or “unruly” masculine temperaments that eroded public discourse, and, even then, the attack was lodged from the far-right fringe. In 1848 and the 1850s, most middle-class men were still adamantly in favor of Jewish participation in the press and other public institutions. By the end of the century, however, though Jewish journalists still occupied leadership positions in Vienna’s press, they were forced to defend themselves and their co-religionists from frequent and widespread attacks on their qualities as men—as Jewish men, in particular. It could no longer be assumed that most university-educated, professional men in

²¹ John Hoberman, “Otto Weininger and the Critique of Jewish Masculinity,” in *Jews and Gender: Responses to Otto Weininger*, eds. Nancy Harrowitz and Barbara Hyams (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995), 141, 142.

²² Reitter, *The Anti-Journalist*, 35-39.

Vienna supported the participation of Jews at high levels in the press, as had been the case in the mid-nineteenth-century. Jewish responses to gendered attacks are well known to historians today. Movements like some forms of Zionism, which called for Jewish men to “renew” their “weakened” bodies, and appeals that Jewish men become so-called “muscle Jews” were aimed at responding to antisemitic claims that Jewish men were emasculated or possessed inferior masculinities.

If “good” masculine behavior was a key component in allowing Jewish men to integrate into city life in Vienna in the 1830s through 1850s, by the end of the century “good” masculine behavior ceased being a central factor in aiding Jewish acculturation into middle-class, male society. Even professional, university-educated, German-speaking Jewish men were often no longer expected by their non-Jewish peers to possess positive masculine traits. This inferiority, moreover, was attributed to unmutable biological deficiency. Being viewed as leaders in shaping “good” forms of masculinity was out of the question.

Bibliography

Newspapers

Allgemeine Österreichische Gerichtszeitung, Vienna

Allgemeine Theaterzeitung und Originalblatt, Vienna

Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, Augsburg

Das junge Oesterreich Vienna

Der constitutionelle Hans-Jörgel, Vienna

Der Freimüthige, Vienna

Der Humorist, Vienna

Der Österreichische Zuschauer, Vienna

Der Radikale, Vienna

Der Salon, Vienna

Der Sammler, Vienna

Der Ungar, Pest

Der Volksfreund, Vienna

Der Wanderer, Vienna

Die Constitution, Vienna

Die Gegenwart, Vienna

Die Geißel, Vienna

Die Grenzboten, Leipzig

Die Presse, Vienna

Fremden-Blatt, Vienna

Gerad' Aus! Vienna
Journal des Oesterreichischen Lloyd, Vienna
Morgen-Post, Vienna
*Oesterreichisches Central-Organ für Glaubensfreiheit, Cultur, Geschichte und Literatur
der Juden*, Vienna
Oesterreichisches Morgenblatt, Vienna
Ost-Deutsche Post, Vienna
Österreichische Reichszeitung, Vienna
Politischer Studenten-Courier, Vienna
Preßburger Zeitung, Pressburg, now Bratislava
Punch, Vienna
Revue et Gazette musicale, Paris
Salzburg Constitutionelle Zeitung, Salzburg
Satan, Vienna
Sonntagsblätter, Vienna
The Magazine of Domestic Economy, London
Wiener Abendzeitung, Vienna
Wiener Allgemeine Damenzeitung, Vienna
Wiener Katzenmusik, Vienna
Wiener Telegraf, Vienna
Wiener Theaterzeitung, Vienna
Wiener Zeitschrift/Wiener Moden-Zeitung, Vienna
Wiener Zeitung, Vienna

Zeitung für das elegante Welt, Leipzig

Principle Archives

Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Vienna, Austria

Reuters, London, United Kingdom

Wienbibliothek am Rathaus, Vienna, Austria

Published Works

Anonymous. "Saphir und die Wiener Zeitung." In *Bilder-Conversations-Lexikon für das deutsche Volk*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1837, n. p.

Anonymous. *Die gouvernementale Reichszeitung und die Revolution. Offenes Sendschreiben an Herrn. Dr. Leopold Landsteiner*. Vienna: J. P. Sollinger's Witwe, 1850.

"Arbeiter!" Broadside printed by the Democratic Club. Vienna. August 22, 1848.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1948.

Arens, Katherine. *Vienna's Dreams of Europe: Culture and Identity Beyond the Nation-State*. New York: Bloomsburg, 2015.

Baader, Benjamin Maria, Sharon Gillerman, and Paul Lerner, editors. *Jewish Masculinities: German Jews, Gender, and History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012.

Baader, Benjamin Maria. "Jewish Difference and the Feminine Spirit of Judaism in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Germany." In *Jewish Masculinities*, edited by Benjamin Maria Baader, Sharon Gillerman, and Paul Lerner, 50-71. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012.

Bachleitner, Norbert. "The Politics of the Book Trade in Nineteenth Century." *Austrian History Yearbook* 28 (1997): 95-111.

Baldasty, Gerald J. *The Commercialization of the News in the Nineteenth Century*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

Bandhauer-Schöffmann, Irene. "Widows and Daughters: Austrian Business Women and Their Status in Family Firms in the 19th and 20th Centuries." Conference paper, XIV International Economic History Congress. (Helsinki, August 2006).

- Barach, Moritz (pseudonym J. Märzroth). "Aurorafalter. Dichtungen zur Erinnerung an den 13., 14. Und 15 März 1848." Vienna: Josef Stöckholzer v. Hirschfeld, 1848.
- Baron, Salo W. "The Impact of the Revolution of 1848 on Jewish Emancipation." *Jewish Social Studies* 11, no. 3 (1949): 195-248.
- Bauernfeld, Eduard. *Aus Alt- und Neu-Wien*. In *Gesammelte Schriften von Bauernfeld*, by Eduard Bauernfeld. Vol. 12. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1873.
- Belgum, Kirsten. *Popularizing the Nation: Audience, Representation, and the Production of Identity in Die Gartenlaube, 1853-1900*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Beller, Steven. *Vienna and the Jews, 1867-1938: A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Bernstein, Susan. *Virtuosity of the Nineteenth Century: Performing Music and Language in Heine, Liszt, and Baudelaire*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Boisits, Barbara. "Die Bedeutung der *Sonntagsblätter* Ludwig August Frankls für die Wiener Musikkritik." In *Ludwig August Frankl (1810-1894)*, edited by Louise Hecht, 157-181. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2016.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Boyer, John W. *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Brachelli, Hugo Franz. *Statistik der Österreichischen Monarchie*. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1857.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Chase, Jefferson. *Inciting Laughter: The Development of "Jewish Humor" in 19th Century German Culture*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000.
- Clark, Christopher. "After 1848: The European Revolution in Government." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 22 (2012): 171-197.
- Cohen, Richard I. *Jewish Icons: Art and Society in Modern Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Connell, Raewyn and James W. Messerschmidt. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender and Society* 19, no. 6 (2005): 829-859.

- Connell, Raewyn. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- . *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Cvejić, Žarko. *The Virtuoso as Subject: The Reception of Instrumental Virtuosity, c. 1815-1850*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016.
- De Alwis, Lisa. "Censorship and Magical Opera in Early Nineteenth-Century Vienna." Dissertation, University of Southern California, 2012.
- Deak, John. *Forging a Multinational State: State Making in Imperial Austria from the Enlightenment to the First World War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015.
- Deirdre, Kelly. *Ballerina: Sex, Scandal, and Suffering Behind the Symbol of Perfection*. Vancouver: Greystone Books, 2012.
- "Denkschrift über die gegenwärtigen Zustände der Zensur in Oesterreich." Reprinted in *Denkwürdigkeiten der Österreichischen Zensur vom Zeitalter der Reformazion bis auf die Gegenwart*, by Adolph Wiesner, 409-422. Stuttgart: Verlag von Adolph Krabbe, 1847.
- Emerson, Donald E. *Metternich and the Political Police*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.
- Endlich, Johann Quirin. *Der Einfluß der Juden auf unsere Civilisation mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Industrial-Anstalten in Oesterreich*. Vienna: Ulrich Klopff sen. und Alexander Eurich, 1848.
- Evans, R. J. W. "From Confederation to Compromise: The Austrian Experiment, 1849-1867." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 87 (1995): 135-167.
- Federici, Silvia. *Caliban and the Witch*. New York: Autonomedia, 2004.
- Frankl, Ludwig August. *Erinnerungen*. Edited by Stefan Hock. Prague, J. G. Calve'sche k. u. k. Hof- und Universitäts-Buchhandlung: 1910.
- . *Zur Biographie Franz Grillparzer's*. Vienna: A. Hartleben's Verlag, 1884.
- Gamper, Michael. "Der Virtuose und das Publikum: Kulturkritik im Kunstdiskurs des 19. Jahrhunderts." In *Virtuosität: Kult und Krise der Artistik in Literatur und Kunst der Moderne*, edited by Hans-Georg von Arburg, 60-82. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2006.
- Gilman, Sander. *Jewish Self-Hatred*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.
- . *The Jew's Body*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

- Glossy, Karl, ed. *Literarische Geheimberichte aus dem Vormärz*. Vienna: Verlagsbuchhandlung Carl Koenigshausen, 1913.
- Goldstein, Robert Justin, ed. *The Frightful Stage*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2009.
- Gooley, Dana. "The Battle against Instrumental Virtuosity in the Early Nineteenth Century." In *Franz Liszt and His World*, edited by Christopher J. Gibbs and Dana Gooley, 73-111. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Gooley, Dana. *The Virtuoso Liszt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Grunberger, Richard. "Jews in Austrian Journalism." In *The Jews of Austria*, edited by Josef Fraenkel, 83-95. London: Vallentine, Mitchell, and Co., 1967.
- Grunwald, Max. *Vienna*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1936.
- Hanslick, Eduard. *Aus Meinem Leben*. Vol. 1. 3rd edition. Berlin: Allgemeiner Verein für deutsche Literatur, 1894.
- Heady, Kate. *Literature and Censorship in Restoration Germany*. Rochester: Camden House, 2009.
- Hecht, Louise. "Self-Empowerment of Jewish Intellectuals in the Habsburg Monarchy." *Religions* 8, no. 6 (2017), doi:10.3390/rel8060113.
- Helfert, Joseph Alexander. *Die Wiener Journalistik im Jahre 1848*. Vienna: Verlag der Manz'schen, 1877.
- Hertz, Deborah. "Männlichkeit und Melancholie im Berlin der Biedermeierzeit." In *Deutsch-Jüdische Geschichte als Geschlechtergeschichte*, edited by Kirsten Heinsohn und Stefanie Schüler-Springorum, 276-292. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2006.
- Hess, Jonathan M. "Beyond Subversion: German Jewry and the Poetics of Middlebrow Culture." *The German Quarterly* 82, no. 3 (2009): 316-335.
- . "Leopold Kompert and the Work of Nostalgia: The Cultural Capital of German Jewish Ghetto Fiction." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 97, no. 7 (2007): 576-615.
- Höbelt, Lothar. "The Austrian Empire." In *The War for the Public Mind*, edited by Robert Justin Goldstein, 211-238. Westport: Praeger, 2000.
- Hoberman, John. "Otto Weininger and the Critique of Jewish Masculinity." In *Jews and Gender: Responses to Otto Weininger*, edited by Nancy Harrowitz and Barbara Hyams, 141-153. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995.

- Hof- und Staats-Schematismus des österreichischen Kaiserthums*. Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1816-1828.
- Hunt, Lynn. *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Jelavich, Barbara. *Modern Austria: Empire and Republic, 1815-1986*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Judson, Pieter M. *Exclusive Revolutionaries: Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848-1914*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- . *The Habsburg Empire: A New History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016.
- Kahan, Alan S. *Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Europe: The Political Culture of Limited Suffrage*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Kahn, Lothar. "Mortiz Gottlieb Saphir." *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 20, no. 1 (1975): 247-257.
- Kaiser, Friedrich. "Friedrich Kaisers erste Begegnung mit Grillparzer und Gründung der 'Concordia.'" In *Grillparzers Gespräche und die Charakteristiken seiner Persönlichkeit durch die Zeitgenossen*, vol. 3, edited by August Sauer, 208, 209. Vienna: Verlag des Literarischen Vereins in Wien, 1906.
- . *1848: Ein Wiener Volksdichter Erlebt die Revolution. Die Memoiren Friedrich Kaisers*. Edited by Franz Hadamowsky. Vienna: Bellaria Verlag, 1948.
- "Kaiserliche Verordnung vom 6. Juli 1851, wirksam für den ganzen Umfang des Reiches, womit provisorisch mehrere Bestimmungen bezüglich der inländischen periodischen, und der ausländischen Druckschriften angeordnet worden." In *Landesgesetz- und Regierungsblatt für das Krönland Mähren*, 297-299. Brünn: Franz Gastl, 1851.
- "Kaiserliches Patent vom 13. März 1849 giltig für Österreich ob und unter der Eins, Salzburg, Steiermark, Kärnten und Karin, Görz und Gradiska, Istrien, Triest, Tirol und Vorarlberg, Böhmen, Mähren, Schlesien, Galizien und Lodomerien, Krakau und Bukowina enthaltend das Gesetz gegen den Mißbrauch der Presse." Vienna, 1849.
<http://www.univie.ac.at/medienrechtsgeschichte/Pressgesetz1849.pdf>.
- Kapper, Siegfried (pseudonym Dr. Rakonitzky). "Ludwig August Frankl." In *Libussa. Jahrbuch für das Jahr 1850*, edited by Paul Alois Klar, 351-425. Prague: C. W. Medan, 1850.
- Kewall, Benjamin. *Erlebte Revolution 1848/49: Das Wiener Tagebuch des jüdischen Journalisten Benjamin Kewall*. Edited by Wolfgang Gasser and Gottfried Glassner. Vienna: Böhlau, 2010.

- Kieval, Hillel. *Languages of Community: The Jewish Experience in the Czech Lands*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Kinnebrock, Susanne. "Revisiting Journalism as a Profession in the 19th Century: Empirical Findings on Women Journalists in Central Europe." *The European Journal of Communication Research* 32, no. 2 (2009), <https://doi.org/10.1515/COM.2009.009>.
- Kober, Adolf. "Jews in the Revolution of 1848 in Germany." *Jewish Social Studies* 10, no. 2 (1948): 135-164.
- Kontje, Todd. "Gender-Bending in the Biedermeier." *Women in German Yearbook* 12 (1996): 53-69.
- Kořalka, Jiří. "Revolutions in the Habsburg Monarchy." In *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, edited by Dieter Dowe, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, and Jonathan Sperber, translated by David Higgins, 153-155. New York: Berghahn Books: 2000.
- Kord, Susanne. "The Curtain Never Rises: Femininity and Theater Censorship in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Germany." *The German Quarterly* 70, no. 4 (1997): 358-375.
- Krobb, Florian. "Reclaiming the Location: Leopold Kompert's Ghetto Fiction in Post-Colonial Perspective," in *Ghetto Writing: Traditional and Eastern Jewry in German-Jewish Literature from Heine to Hilsenrath*, edited by Anne Fuchs and Florian Krobb, 41-53. Columbia: Camden House, 1999.
- Kwan, Jonathan. *Liberalism and the Habsburg Monarchy, 1861-1895*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Langmuir, Gavin I. *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Laube, Heinrich. *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*. Vol. 3. Stuttgart: Hallberger'sche Verlagshandlung, 1840.
- . *Heinrich Laubes gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 4, Reisenovellen 1. Leipzig: Max Hesses Verlag, 1908.
- Linkon, Sherry Lee. "Reading Lind Mania: Print Culture and the Construction of Nineteenth-Century Audiences." *Book History* 1 (1998): 94-106.
- Marr, Wilhelm. *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthums vom nicht confessionellen Standpunkt aus betrachtet*. Bern: Rudolph Constenoble, 1879.
- Martin, Patricia Yancey. "Why Can't a Man Be More Like a Woman? Reflections on Connell's *Masculinities*." *Gender and Society* 12, no. 4 (1998): 472-747.

- Marx, Julius. *Die Österreichische Zensur im Vormärz*. Munich: Verlag R. Oldenbourg, 1959.
- Marx, Karl. "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*: Introduction." In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, translated by Thomas Bottomore, 53-65. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1978.
- McCagg Jr., William O. *A History of Habsburg Jews, 1670-1918*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Melischek, Gabriele and Josef Seethaler. "Von der Lokalzeitung zur Massenpresse: Zur Entwicklung der Tagespresse im Österreichischen Teil der Habsburgermonarchie nach 1848." *Jahrbuch für Kommunikationsgeschichte* 7 (2005): 52-92.
- Metternich-Winneburg, Clemens Lothar Wenzel. *Mémoires, documents et écrits divers laissés par le prince de Metternich*. Vol. 6. Paris: E. Elon, 1883.
- Metzner, Paul. *Crescendo of the Virtuoso: Spectacle, Skill, and Self-Promotion in Paris during the Age of Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Meyerbeer, Giacomo. *The Diaries of Giacomo Meyerbeer*. Vol. 2. Translated and edited by Robert Ignatius Letellier. London: Associated University Press, 2001.
- Moretti, Franco. "Style, Inc. Reflections on Seven Thousand Titles (British Novels, 1740-1850)." *Critical Inquiry* 36, no. 1 (2009): 134-158.
- Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon, 1815-1950*. Vol. 5. Graz and Cologne: H. Böhlau, 1971.
- Paupié, Kurt. *Handbuch der Österreichischen Pressegeschichte 1848-1959*. Vol. 1 Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1960.
- Penslar, Derek J. *Shylock's Children: Economics and Jewish Identity in Modern Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Pulzer, Peter. *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Rath, R. John. *The Viennese Revolution of 1848*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1957.
- Raz-Krakotzkin, Amnon. *The Censor, the Editor, and the Text*, translated by Jackie Feldman. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.
- Reitter, Paul. *The Anti-Journalist*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008.

- Reynaud, Cécile. "Berlioz, Liszt, and the Question of Virtuosity." In *Berlioz: Past, Present, Future: Bicentenary Essays*, edited by Peter Bloom, 105-122. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2003.
- Richter, H. M. "Die Wiener Presse." In *Wien. 1848-1888. Denkschrift zum 2. December 1888*. Vol. 2. Vienna: Commissions-Verlag von Carl Konegen, 1888.
- Rose, Sven-Erik. *Jewish Philosophical Politics in Germany, 1789-1848*. Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2014.
- Rozenblit, Marsha L. *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914: Assimilation and Identity*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983.
- Rürup, Reinhard. "Progress and Its Limits: The Revolutions of 1848 and European Jewry." In *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, edited by Dieter Dowe, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, and Jonathan Sperber, translated by David Higgins, 749-764. New York: Berghahn Books, 2000.
- Saphir, Moritz Gottlieb. *Meine Memoiren und anderes*. Leipzig: Verlag von Philipp Reclam jun., 1887.
- Saphiriana. Anekdoten, Witze und Charakterzüge aus dem Leben M. G. Saphir's*. Brünn: Verlag von Franz Karafiat, 1874.
- Schippers, Mimi. "Recovering the Feminine Other: Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Hegemony." *Theory and Society* 3, no. 1 (2007): 85-102.
- Schmitt, Curt. "Ignaz Kuranda's *Die Grenzboten* (1841-1848): A Case Study of Vormärz Journalism and Identity." Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2003.
- Schorske, Carl E. *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.
- Schulz, Paul. Introduction to "Der Wiener-Schriftstellerverein." In *Marginalien über die Wiener Revolution vom Jahre 1848 und ihre wichtigen Folgen in der spätesten Zeit*, 233. Leipzig, 1856. Self-published.
- Scott, Joan W. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986): 1053-1075.
- Sealsfield, Charles. *Austria As It Is: or, Sketches of Continental Courts*. London: Hurst, Chance, and Co., 1828.
- Sitter, Carl. "Aus den Memoiren eines einjährigen Unfreiwilligen." In *Funken und Splitter*. Vol. 6. Vienna: Selbstverlag des Vereines "Eintracht," 1877.
- Sked, Alan. *Metternich and Austria: An Evaluation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

- . *The Decline and Fall of the Habsburg Empire, 1815-1918*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2001.
- Springer, Johann. *Statistik des österreichischen Kaiserstaates*. Vol. 2. Vienna: J. P. Sollinger, 1840.
- Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Steel, Emily. “At Vice, Cutting-Edge Media and Allegations of Old-School Sexual Harassment.” *The New York Times*. New York City, December 23, 2017.
- Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie für das Jahr 1841*. Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1844.
- Tafeln zur Statistik der Österreichischen Monarchie. Das Jahr 1851 mit Übersichtlicher Einbeziehung der Jahre 1849 und 1850*. Vol. 2, no. 8. Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1856.
- Thrift, Nigel. *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Toury, Jacob. *Die Jüdische Presse im Österreichischen Kaiserreich, 1802-1918*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983.
- Townsend, Mary Lee. *Forbidden Laughter*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1992.
- Tuvora, Joseph. *Briefe aus Wien*. Vol. 2. Hamburg: Hoffman und Campe, 1844.
- Volkov, Shulamit. “Antisemitism as a Cultural Code: Reflections on the History and Historiography of Antisemitism in Imperial Germany.” *The Leo Baeck Year Book*, 23, no. 1 (1978): 25-46.
- Von Arburg, Hans-Georg, editor. *Virtuosität: Kult und Krise der Artistik in Literatur und Kunst der Moderne*. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2006.
- Wagner, Richard. “Der Virtuos und der Künstler.” In *Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen*, by Richard Wagner. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Verlag von E. W. Fritsch, 1871.
- Weininger, Otto. *Geschlecht und Charakter: Eine Prinzipielle Untersuchung*. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1903.
- Wetherell, Margaret and Nigel Edley. “Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary Positions and Psycho-discursive Practices.” *Feminism and Psychology* 9, no. 3 (1999): 335-356.

- Winkler, Johann. *Die Periodische Presse Oesterreichs*. Vienna: K.K. Statistischen Central-Commission, 1875.
- Wistrich, Robert S. *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph*. Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1989.
- Wolf, Gerson. *Geschichte der Juden in Wien (1156-1876)*. Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1876.
- Wurzbach Tannenber, Constantin. *Bibliographisch-Statistische Übersicht der Literatur des Österreichischen Kaiserstaates vom 1. Jänner bis 31. December 1855*. Vol. 1. Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1857.
- . *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, 60 vols. Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staats-Druckerei, 1856-1891.
- Yates, W. E. "Sex in the Suburbs: Nestroy's Comedy of Forbidden Fruit." *The Modern Language Review* 92, no. 2 (1997): 379-391.
- Zenker, Ernst Viktor. *Geschichte der Wiener Journalistik*. Vol. 2. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1893.
- "Zensurvorschrift vom 14. September 1810." Reprinted in *Die österreichische Zensur im Vormärz*, by Julius Marx, 73-76. Munich: Verlag R. Oldenbourg, 1959.
- "Zensurvorschrift vom 22. Februar 1795." Reprinted *Die österreichische Zensur im Vormärz*, by Julius Marx, 68-73. Munich: Verlag R. Oldenbourg, 1959.