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In 1948 and 1949 the Viennese Otto Friedlaender published two books about Vienna in the decades around 1900, *Letzter Glanz der Märchenstadt: Bilder aus dem Leben um die Jahrhundertwende 1890–1914* and *Wolken drohen über Wien: Lebens- und Sittenbilder aus den Jahren vor dem ersten Weltkrieg*. They nostalgically, but also critically, evoke the Habsburg myth of the mutually sustaining powers of Empire and Church and thus of the empire’s spiritual unity through the shifting lens, his “Standpunkt,” as he puts it, of inner exile between 1938 and 1945. To the best of my knowledge, neither book has received any critical attention. I introduce them here by way of asking several questions about this author and his texts: Who was Otto Friedlaender? What connects his variants of the Habsburg myth? What are the roles of image and word in them? In answering these questions, I argue that, rather than one-sidedly aligning nostalgia with image and critique with word, Friedlaender invests image and word together and dialectically with both. The main focus of this essay will be *Letzter Glanz* (1948), occasionally compared to its pendant, *Wolken drohen* (1949). Throughout I will attend to the visuality of the two books, which is emphasized in their subtitles and is central to Friedlaender’s technique of spatial and temporal layering of past and present. To do this I will avail myself of the concept of the “Fernbild” first introduced to art theoretical discourse by the sculptor Adolf von Hildebrandt (1847–1921) in his influential book *Das Problem der Form* (1893) and then adopted in art historical language and also in Walter Benjamin’s cultural criticism.1 In a nutshell, the “Fernbild” oscillates between, on the one hand, temporal and spatial distance, and, on the
other, utmost closeness and presence. In Friedlaender’s texts such oscillation connects nostalgia and ironic critique, even as each is informed by a radically different knowledge and experience. In 1963 Friedlaender published a novel, *Maturajahrgang 1907*, which belatedly shed light onto the near-impossibility of his undertaking twenty years before, especially in regard to the author’s own subject position. In what follows, I will cautiously refer to this book’s autobiographical traits.

### 1. Vienna 1900 in 1948, 1949, 1963: Reflection and Variation

To introduce the three books as well as my thematic focus on the Habsburg myth, I begin with one passage from each.


*Letzter Glanz* is a seemingly loose sequence of short, beautifully crafted chapters, some comprising vignettes of keenly observed social life and ethnic identity, most written in the present tense and easily mistaken for eyewitness accounts.² Epitomized in the second chapter’s airy, multi-sensory description of the annual Corpus Christi procession, the Habsburg myth is only slightly questioned by the occasional elevation of the Christian-Socialist Karl Lueger
to iconicity and by the social stratification of Vienna’s inner and outer districts. The window display of cultural and political icons and the clear hierarchy, in which the cardinal is the emperor’s herald, suggest just how much was at stake in this annual spectacle. If the processions of the outer districts and the provinces were no less holy than the central district’s “Hofball Gottes,” they were certainly less imperial, lacking the emperor’s essential and real presence. The historical frame in Letzter Glanz is wider than Vienna 1900 and almost imperceptibly defined as three-generational, spanning 1888 to 1927.


Wolken drohen is Letzter Glanz’s more obviously critical double or twin. Consisting of sketches of Viennese social life, in particular and now explicitly of intergenerational conflict and crisis, it is inflected by instances of “modern anti-Semitism”—some vicious attacks, some involuntary blunders, and most written in the present tense. The choice of the present tense in both books suggests less the pseudo-presence of the past than the validity of some sentences about the past for the author’s present, be they observations or aphoristic statements; or, to the contrary, the use of the present tense may highlight their invalidity and even voidance by the present, 1938–1945. Arguably, the latter is the case in this passage on the Schottengymnasium as the steward of core values invested in the Habsburg myth, that is, free and tolerant coexistence, under the auspices of the Emperor and Roman Catholicism, of all those sharing the goal of educating the “feine” male youth, the elite not
solely of Vienna but also of the empire in preparation for professional and institutional responsibility in the empire. Attending the Schottengymnasium means admission to an elitist club with all its opportunities and responsibilities, among them the rejection or denial—the “Nicht-kennen”—of modern, that is, racial, anti-Semitism. At the same time it means being taught “eher einen latenten Katholizismus” (Wolken drohen 112).³

On May 20, 1938, the Nuremberg Racial Laws, the “Reichsbürgergesetz” or “Blutschutzgesetz” of September 15 through November 14, 1935, were introduced in Austria. According to these laws, Otto Friedlaender was a racial Jew. “Mischlinge” in the National-Socialist sense of the word were those with two or three Aryan grandparents (see Rabinovici 57–68; Gesetzblatt 420–421). Friedlaender uses the term “Mischling ersten Grades” in his third book, Maturajahrgang 1907, set in Vienna 1937 to 1945 (516). Its protagonist, Christian Freyburg, identifies himself as a Catholic Jew in the above sense and embodies his coded name for the Habsburg myth with curiosity, passive sensitivity, and luck. He is “Frey” owing to the last Habs”burg” emperor and the constitution of 1867, which emancipated the empire’s Jews, and “Christian” on account of his parents’ response to the “interkonfessionelle Gesetz” of 1868. In his preface of 1963 Friedlaender presents this book as “insofern wahr, als es dem wirklich Erlebten nachgebildet ist.” He adds, “Es ist auch keine Figur eine autobiographische.” His tongue-in-cheek proof is that “vergebens wird man in der Blutgasse einen Greißler suchen. Sie ist eine der wenigen Wiener Gassen, in der es keinen gibt.” Blutgasse is a short medieval street located just behind the Stephansdom, and the fictitious Greißler, or grocer, is Fritzi’s small grocery store that serves as a screen for women with triple lives as “Vorstadt” wives, “Innere Stadt” prostitutes, and spies for an underground rescue and protection organization operating, hidden in the bright daylight, from within the Gestapo’s central office in the former Hotel Metropol. A fellow Karburgian “Klub” member there helps, but also uses, the “Nichtheld” Freyburg and others, all the while enriching himself with the treasures the deportation of Vienna’s Jews leaves behind. Thus, in this last book Friedlaender claims his protagonist’s Jewish “Mischling” identity as the fruit of Jewish assimilation to the Habsburg myth and as key to his survival:

Der Generaldirektor Doktor Binder . . . hielt es für sein Recht, den alten Direktor des Gymnasiums . . . für sich in Beschlag zu nehmen und ihn fühlen zu lassen, wie weit er es gebracht habe . . . er sprach zu
ihm herunter und bemühte sich, jenen gleichzeitig hochmütigen und ergebenen Ton zu treffen, in dem die Aristokraten mit den kleineren Geistlichen reden. Katholische Geistliche lächeln demütig und spitzbübisch, wenn jemand zu ihnen arrogant ist. (*Maturajahrgang* 16)

This scene at the 1937 reunion of the 1907 Matura class, of those born, like Friedlaender, in 1889, shows us the overbearing businessman Binder and the school director rehearsing the Habsburg myth. The roles, though, are not clearly distributed. Binder tries out the part of the aristocrat, yet “der alte” director, an epithet that resonates with the familiar “der alte Kaiser,” smiles mischievously, “spitzbübisch,” to signal his patronizing forgiveness of such pretense. As prelate of the fictitious Karburg Stift, a version of Friedlaender’s Schottengymnasium, the school director seems to play—has to play—both parts at once.

2. Otto Friedlaender

Who was Otto Friedlaender? If the first of my questions seems to be the most straightforward, it is nevertheless quite challenging to answer it. Born in Vienna on March 31, 1889, Otto Wilhelm Josef Friedlaender was the son of Josef Friedlaender (1854–1943), a well-known lawyer, who as Hof- und Gerichtsadvokat held the position of Senatspräsident at Austria’s Oberster Gerichtshof, and Ottilie Friedländer, née Goldberger de Buda (1862–1932), who in 1888 availed herself of the “Interkonfessionelles Gesetz” of 1868 permitting everyone of at least fourteen years of age renunciation or “Konfessionslosigkeit” and subsequent conversion to another religion or denomination (Staudacher 9, 171). She converted to Roman Catholicism, as did her husband Josef four years later. Otto was born into it and did not change this later. He attended the Schottengymnasium, one of Vienna’s two top elite gymnasia (the Jesuit Theresianum being the other) and was “Maturajahrgang 1907.” The Schottengymnasium’s website lists him among its prominent pupils, though the online archive’s “Jahresbericht” of 1908 for 1907 does not name him among the graduates. He studied law in Vienna, receiving his doctorate from its university, then embarked on studies of art and literature in Grenoble and Oxford, from where he returned in 1913. In World War I he served as officer and Kaiserjäger in the Dolomite Alps. Subsequently he took a civil service position at the Vienna Chamber of Commerce. As vice
secretary of the Chamber of Commerce he worked closely with its secretary, Ludwig von Mises, cofounder of the Austrian Neo-Liberal School of Economics, who immigrated to Switzerland in 1934 and to the United States in 1940. Friedlaender is also said to have worked for Austria's admission to the League of Nations in 1920 and to have helped revive Bertha von Suttner's Österreichische Friedensgesellschaft of 1899. The few brief biographical entries, such as in the Österreichische National-Biographie, then note his books and the date and place of his death.

Perusal of Adolph Lehmann's Adressbücher for Vienna brings one face to face with sparse and chilling information directly corresponding to the unfathomable numbers scholars largely agree upon, namely that of 200,000 Viennese Jews, 65,000 died in the Holocaust and 5,700 survived (Beller, *Concise History*, 236; Rabinovici 241). Lehmann 1937 lists 99 Friedlaenders or Friedländer, and Lehmann 1938 lists 101. Lehmann 1939 includes “Friedlaender, Otto, Dr., Sekr. Stellvertr. VI., Dreihufeiseng. 9” among 75 namesakes, followed by 45 in 1940, 26 in 1941, and just 14 in 1942. There is no Dreihufeisengasse now in Vienna's sixth district, Mariahilf, but its crossroads listed under “Geschäftsbetriebe und Hausparteien” in Lehmann 1940 allow one to identify the Dreihufeisengasse as today’s Lehargasse extending between the Kunstakademie and Gumpendorfer Strasse. Kürschners Deutscher Literatur-Kalender Nekrolog 1926–1970 confirms Friedlaender’s address as Lehargasse 9 (179–80). Thus from 1939 to 1963, he lived just a block away from the first district, the “innere Stadt” he evokes in his books. In 1940 he was one of thirty-two named residents or businesses in Dreihufeisengasse 9, and he counted among the few with a telephone. He was one of thirteen residents left there in 1942 (the last year Lehmann was published) when he finished writing *Letzter Glanz.* He escaped the deportation of Vienna’s Jews in 1941–1942 and survived the city’s bombardments of 1944–1945. In a letter dated July 2, 1946, written at Dreihufeisengasse 9 and addressed to Ludwig von Mises, who was then teaching at New York University, Friedlaender summarizes the years 1928–1945 as follows:

viele Aufregungen mitzumachen hatten, ist selbstverständlich. Bis zum Jahre 1943 habe ich mich mit eigenen Arbeiten und Studien befasst, von da an war ich dienstverpflichtet und habe mich absichtlich auf den bescheidensten Posten herumgetrieben, da nicht aufzufallen eine der wichtigsten Weisheitsregeln in diesen schweren Zeiten war. Im April 1945 habe ich mich sofort wieder der Kammer zur Verfügung gestellt, in der ich jetzt die Abteilung für Zoll- und Handelspolitik leite und vor kurzem durch die Verleihung des Hofratstitels ausgezeichnet wurde.15

What Friedlaender wrote between 1938 and 1942/1945 and what he witnessed could hardly differ more, and yet was held together by his insistence on a connection between himself and the past. Among the “eigenen Arbeiten” he mentions in his letter to Mises was Letzter Glanz and Wolken drohen. How his and “sogar” his father’s survival was possible, how they avoided Gestapo and kz, and how “Geschick” averted “Verschickung,” remains a matter of speculation.16 Apparently he undertook no attempt to leave Vienna in the late 1930s, and his “Dienstverpflichtung” only in 1943 suggests protection of both Friedlaenders, who had been prominent public lawyers, by someone in power.17 It would seem that according to the NS laws they were “nicht-privилиgiierte Nichtglaubensjuden,” but that they continued to live at Dreihufeisengasse 9, for example, suggests some form of “privileged” status. If “Dienstverpflichtung” between 1943 and 1945 “auf bescheidensten Posten” stands euphemistically for forced labor, then Otto Friedlaender’s situation was more dangerous following his father’s death. Otto was one of 2,781 men identified as racial Jews who survived the Third Reich and possibly fewer, as that number is based on the last available record by the Ältestenrat der Juden in Wien of December 1944 (Leiter 495–504). A sense of exile and loss within Vienna resonates in the word “herumgetrieben” for his work duties. Yet his letter to Mises also conveys a seemingly unproblematic return to his duties at the Chamber of Commerce, thus from the essential goal “nicht aufzufallen” to a significant public position and an expeditious promotion to Hofrat smacking of hasty restitution.18 The brief extant correspondence with Mises (two letters by Friedlaender, one by Mises) makes clear that as an expert for transit trade he at first remained loyal to Mises’s free market liberalism, then opposed it, cognizant of the state’s necessary support of Austria’s economic recovery.
The only other primary documents known to me are two portrait photographs at the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek taken at a currently untraced Atelier Schaner in 1951 (Figures 1 and 2). They show Otto Friedlaender dressed in a three-piece suit and posing informally. Avoiding eye contact with the camera, he looks down, as one spontaneously might in conversation. He appears isolated in the second picture, a three-quarter profile view strongly illuminating his face. By 1951 Friedlaender had published his two books on Vienna with the Ring-Verlag, which specialized in political science and editions of texts by Lenin, Marx, and Engels, unlikely companions for someone intent on writing his version of the Habsburg myth. According to all published biographical entries, Friedlaender died twelve years later, on July 20, 1963, in Waidhofen an der Thaya, having published Maturajahrgang 1907 earlier that year. There is no municipal record in Waidhofen of his death and its circumstances.19 July 20, 1963, was also the day following the (temporarily) final court decision that banned Otto von Habsburg from ever returning to Austria.20 On October 20, 1995, Friedlaender’s remains were reburied at Vienna’s Zentralfriedhof (Grossbereich 5, Gruppe 4, Reihe 3, Nr. 26: “auf Friedhofsdauer”). The evidently moved headstone bears the faded inscription (Figure 3): “HOFRAT/Dr. OTTO FRIEDLAENDER/ SCHRIFTSTELLER/ GEB 1889 1963 GEST.” It is strangely incomplete: “Schriftsteller,” but not lawyer, years, but no exact dates. Today Friedlaender belongs among the Zentralfriedhof’s “Bekanntheiten ohne Ehrengrabstatus.”21

3. Corpus Christi Procession

Friedlaender’s Letzter Glanz has three parts. Part I comprises five longer topical chapters (“Die Märchenstadt,” “Die k.k. Residenz,” “Fronleichnam,” “Die Regierungsmaximen,” “Die Wiener”); Part II treats of “Stände, Klassen, Völker, Gruppen,” in eight brief descriptions of Vienna’s ethnic and social mix, and Part III, “Wiener Leben,” offers thirteen vignettes about the coffeehouse, balls, nightlife, and so forth, ending with Vienna’s funeral customs and life with the dead. The book is not illustrated; its subtitle, “Bilder aus dem Wiener Leben,” refers to its language alone. Letzter Glanz presents itself as a sequence of literary “Bilder,” not as the narration of history. In other words, recourse to “Bilder” means recourse to the model of a narrated, in part ekphrastic, collection.22

According to Daniel L. Unowsky’s political analysis of imperial specta-
Fig. 1 (top left). Portrait of Otto Friedlaender, 1951. Photograph, Atelier Schaner. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien. Inv. no. Pf6023B2. (Photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek)

Fig. 2 (above). Portrait of Otto Friedlaender. 1951. Photograph, Atelier Schaner. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien. Inv. no. Pf6023B1. (Photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek)

Fig. 3 (bottom left). Inscription for Otto Friedlaender on Friedlaender tombstone. Zentralfriedhof, Wien, Gruppe 4, Reihe 3, Grabnummer 26. Inscription reads "HOFRAT / Dr. OTTO FRIEDLAENDER / SCHREIBER / GEB 1889 1963 GEST." (Photo: Lori Felton)
cles, the Corpus Christi procession was supreme among the celebrations of Habsburg Austria, especially in the crisis year of the Jubilee, 1898. In what follows, I wish to compare Friedlaender’s second chapter, “Fronleichnam,” with newspaper accounts of 1898 and 1899, not to measure the one by the other, but to clarify the choices made in these different genres of writing. I will also interpret the visual material that accompanied the news accounts, not as their direct illustrations but as equally public documents. Reports on the 1898 procession in Das Vaterland, Wiener Abendpost, Neues Wiener Journal, Wiener Salonblatt, Neue Freie Presse, and the exceptional illustrated Wiener Bilder, show both its utmost importance and utter routine. On Thursday, June 9, the Neue Freie Presse, Morgenblatt announces: “Des Fronleichnamfestes wegen erscheint die nächste Nummer der Neuen Freien Presse Freitag früh.” That next issue reports:

in die Burg war der Monarch von stürmischem Hochrufen, durch Tücher- und Hüteschwenken begrüßt worden. Auf dem Balkon des Eckpavillons der Hofreitschule hatten Platz genommen, um die Procession anzusehen: Kronprinzessinwitwe Stephanie und ihre Tochter Elisabeth . . . und die Herzoge Ludwig Wilhelm und Franz Joseph in Bayern. 25

Other papers vary this account, some inflecting it with more affect, awe, and detail, though not more attention to the audience. The Neues Wiener Abendjournal wrote about the following year’s holiday:

Mit dem üblichen kirchlichen und militärischen Festgepränge hat gestern der ‘Hofumgang’ stattgefunden.


And so forth. The Emperor always wore this uniform, always carried a candle, and always stopped at the four altars to pray in each altar’s “Hofzelt,” thus confirming the city’s imperial and sacred topography. “Wie im Vorjahr, so konnte auch gestern wieder . . .,” attests Das Vaterland on June 10, 1898. This especially lengthy account ends with the imperial family on the Hofreitschule’s balcony and the emperor’s military review in the Hofburg’s courtyard. 27 Similarly, the Wiener Abendpost confirmed that on June 9, “fand die Frohleichenachts-Procession mit dem herkömmlichen Gepräge statt,” and continues, with seeming urgency and obvious primacy, “Se. k. und k. Apostolische Majestät, so wie. . . .” 28 Yet, on June 2, 1899, the Wiener Abendpost reprinted the exact same article, replacing only Cardinal Gruscha’s name with Bishop Schneider’s. 29 The “Apostolic Majesty’s” aura combined with ceremonial repetition is lit-
eralized as banal reproduction apparently not worth the effort to craft a few new sentences. Yet the Benjaminian concern in which aura and reproducibility are incompatible might be misplaced here. The combination of the unique with the serial in the “üblichen kirchlichen und militärischen Festgepränge,” “herkömmliche Gepränge,” “gewöhnlichen prunkvollen Weise,” was expected and did not detract from its significance. If anything, the Wiener Abendpost’s nonchalance betrays the illusion, for better or worse, that in the empire nothing would ever change.

Journalists take care to mention the choreographed gap between Church and Court, between the monstrance-bearing cardinal or bishop under his golden canopy and the bareheaded candle-bearing emperor. Mobile and siteless, this gap constitutes the event’s power in that it generates the force field of the city, with the clergy up front and the court and military stretching behind. Here and elsewhere in this essay I make use of Wolfgang Kemp’s adaptation of Roman Jakobson’s mode of structural analysis to the practice of reception
aesthetics to account for the implied yet unseen in art, both in serial representation (for instance, print cycle) and the single work of art (painting). Of the Corpus Christi procession’s center one may arguably speak as a moving tableau in a spatial-temporal series.

The newspaper reports of 1898 and 1899 can be matched with photographs showing the carriages’ arrival at the Stephansdom and their departure from it hours later, and the bareheaded emperor holding his candle as he follows the cardinal’s canopy (figures 4 and 5). They show the choreographed presence of all sorts of uniformed men, the dense wall of the populace behind the military cordon, the grandstands filled to capacity, and, beyond, the shuttered first floors of businesses large and small across from the cathedral, on the Graben, and so forth, with their upper floor windows filled with spectators. These photographs, however, do not just illustrate the “fröhliche und feierliche Pomp,” as Joseph Roth writes in the Radetzkymarsch (242); they also scale this mass spectacle against billboards and shop sign with lettering
as tall as the emperor himself. Prominent among them is the sign of the men’s clothing store Rothberger, whose upper floors could be rented like a private grandstand for superior viewing. “Die feinen Leute aber,” writes Friedlaender, “haben Plätze in den Fenstern der Häuser gemietet, die an dem Wege der Prozession liegen, und die ganz feinen Leute sind auf Fensterplätze eingeladen” in an embassy or Palais (Letzter Glanz 36). The “feinen” women and men seated behind large shop windows, in turn, look as though exhibited in them, which in a way they were. The “Herren-Kleider-Magazin” Rothberger owned Stephansplatz 1, 9, and 11; its history is well documented. The event was prohibited in 1939, when Friedlaender likely wrote about the Corpus Christi procession during Karl Lueger’s term of office (1897–1910), and the Warenhaus Rothberger was already “aryanized,” as in Austria “aryanization” happened rapidly between November 23, 1938, and February 21, 1939. These photographs, then, are suggestive of far more than the dyadic Habsburg myth, namely its relative, reluctant, and temporary inclusion of Vienna’s Jews. One peculiarity of Vienna’s Corpus Christi procession should be emphasized. If generally it was and is customary for the Catholic population to walk and participate in the procession, in Vienna the population, whether Catholic or not, watched this imperial-religious procession from the street; from grandstands, apartments, and balconies; and from seats in shop windows. Yet insistence on the myth’s dyadic rather than more complex constellation persisted everywhere and remains difficult to overcome. It is central, for example, to Joseph Roth’s evocation of the Corpus Christi procession in the Radetzkymarsch, in which Lieutenant von Trotta for the last time feels uplifted, free, and almost in reach of “Tugenden, die er nicht besaß.” Roth ends his vivid account with the arrival of the imperial carriages at the Stephansdom:

Der Kaiser lächelte nach allen Seiten. Auf seinem Antlitz lag das Lächeln wie eine kleine Sonne, die er selbst geschaffen hatte. Vom Stephansdom dröhnten die Glocken, die Grüße der römischen Kirche, entboten dem römischen Kaiser Deutscher Nation. Der alte Kaiser stieg vom Wagen mit jenem elastischen Schritt, den alle Zeitungen rühmten, und ging in die Kirche wie ein einfacher Mann; zu Fuß ging er in die Kirche; . . . (244).

By contrast, Friedlaender continues with the procession following mass at the Stephansdom. He begins with Vienna’s imperial orphans leading it and, moved by their sight, the “feine Damen” on balconies. Describing it mainly
as seen and commented upon by its upper bourgeois audience, Friedlaender lightens the event’s gravity, secularizes its significance, and also makes it clear that the whole city had to turn out to watch the carriage and foot processions so as to give the event its power. They had to wait outside while emperor and cardinal celebrated mass knowing the people were waiting outside, and they watched each other watching. Friedlaender does not just describe this criss-crossing of mutual confirmation, attention, and imaging as part of the event; rather, this crisscrossing itself conveys the event to the reader and also humorously diffuses and confuses it in conversation:

Den Buben zieht man fleckenlose weiße Matrosenanzüge an, und dazu machen sie unwillige Gesichter, denn sie mögen das gar nicht. ‘Schäm dich, so ein großer Bub . . .’, sagt man ihnen, aber er schämt sich doch gerade, weil er ein großer Bub ist und immer noch den weißen Matrosenanzug tragen muß, also ob er fünf Jahre alt wäre. (Letzter Glanz 34)

Wenn die Auffahrt glücklich beendet ist, dann muß man lange warten . . . Das ist ein endloses, qualvolles Warten besonders für die Kinder, die man mitnimmt, damit sie es noch einmal gesehen haben, denn was weiß man, ob es das alles noch oft geben wird . . . man muß das gesehen haben, solange der alte Kaiser lebt. Was danach kommt, weiß doch kein Mensch.

Man gibt den Kindern zu essen . . . Man sagt den Kindern: die armen Soldaten müssen auch da stehen und wenn du groß wirst, wirst du auch ein Soldat sein . . . So vertreiben sich also die Erwachsenen die Zeit, indem sie die Kinder erziehen und dabei vergeht ihnen die Zeit angenehmer als den Kindern. (Letzter Glanz 39–40)

The thoughtlessness of the grown-ups is at once hilarious, oppressive, and prescient. Friedlaender is fond of pointing up this mixture of unwitting accuracy, careless prejudice, and superficial convention. This, for example, is the arrival of Erzherzog Eugen, head of the Teutonic Order:

Alle Operngucker sind auf ihn gerichtet, wenn er bei der Procession in seinem malerischen, weiten, weißen Ordensmantel mit dem schwarzen Kreuz auftritt, und die Leute erzählen einander mit Sensationsschauer von seinen letzten Liebesabenteuern—sie müssen nicht wahr sein—und die Damen mit herablassend-authoritären
Stimmen haben da viel richtigzustellen, aber unleugbar ist es, daß er Klavier spielt (vierhändig mit einem Juden, einem Advokaten—es ist nicht zu glauben, daß er sich niemand anderen zum Klavierspielen findet . . .) aber es schadet ihm nicht, es macht ihn noch interessanter . . . Schad', daß er nicht der Thronfolger ist, denken die Leute. (Letzter Glanz 38)

As Friedlaender imagines women’s perspectives easily shifting between court gossip and piety, tells us what men think but do not say, and describes the tired children’s inculcation into witnessing this possibly last procession with the emperor, he also confirms what makes it so effective, namely, the constitutive moment of its central scene:

Der Erzbischof verschwindet hinter seiner leuchtenden Monstranz, die er vor dem Gesicht hält und zwischen den Geistlichen, die seine Arme stützen. Man sieht nur das Sanctissimum, das aus der weißen Seide hervorleuchtet . . .

Und dann kommt ganz allein in der Mitte der Straße barbhaft, von Alter und Demut gebeugt, der Kaiser mit einer Kerze in der rechten Hand, die linke am Säbelknauf, den Generalshut haltend. Alles schaut ergriffen den alten Mann an, der so einsam und gebeugt seiner Pflicht nachgeht mit seinen weißen Haaren, in seinem weißen Generalsrock, und die Sonne brennt erbarmungslos auf seine glänzenden Orden und seinen kahlen Greisenkopf.

Friedlaender immediately deflects this moving image:

“Mein Gott, der arme, alte Mann! . . . Zwei Stunden lassen sie ihn in dieser Hitze ohne Hut dahergehen—daß er das aushält . . .,” sagen die Damen mit milden Stimmen, erschauern innerlich vor ihrer eigenen Kühnheit, daß sie den Kaiser einen armen alten Mann nennen . . .

Aber im Gefühle männlich-heldischer Solidarität erwidern die Gatten: “Er ist eben der Kaiser und das ist seine Pflicht.” (Letzter Glanz 41–42)

With this the reader is reminded of the boy who, like long ago his father and not unlike the emperor in his white (and red) uniform, must accept his duty to wear a white sailor’s suit on Corpus Christi, wait a long time, and then witness what might not endure into his future, what did not endure, as Friedlaender
clearly implies. The dazzling brightness of white and gold, presented in crisp facets and reflections, suggests the tension between the permanent, sun and heat, and the fleeting appearance and experience. Reflection suggests sunlight and flickering gold as much as a flash of insight in Friedlaender’s account crafted around the chronology of the age-old ritual described in newsprint. Andreas Huyssen, strongly relying on Jonathan Crary’s work, has argued that the narrative opticality in modern Viennese literature generally contains an internal darkness and self-disturbance. In Friedlaender’s prose, however, reflective visuality is also indicative of insight, deployed by virtue of the author’s both retrospective and back-dated proleptic imagination, even as he cuts insight short in the spectators’ carelessness as much as in the notion of duty invoked by them, the emperor’s duty to safe-keep what is, think not too hard about it, and defer the changes to come.

4. “In der Mitte der Straße”

Retrospective and proleptic imagination literally meet in the “Mitte der Straße,” in plain sight. Popular and widely published images of the procession’s all-meaningful core of cardinal and emperor abound, presenting close-ups of the moving nodal gap between the monstrance bearer, his arm bearers, the canopy bearers, and, at a certain distance, the candle bearer Franz Joseph (figure 6). In Vienna the Corpus Christi procession, established by Pope Urban IV in 1264, derived its particular power from the central founding legend of the Habsburg dynasty, the legend of Count Rudolf II of Habsburg and the priest, established a few decades after his death in 1291 as “a potent claim to divine favour” (Wheatcroft 29). Two early nineteenth-century examples, one literary and one painterly, stand out. In Franz Grillparzer’s König Ottokars Glück und Ende (1823), the story is told in brief to Emperor Rudolf to remind him of his former, presumably true, self to which he should remain faithful and feel accountable:

Gabt Ihr nicht einst im Walde, nah bei Basel,
Dem Priester, der das Allerheil’ge trug
Zu eines Kranken Trost und, aufgehalten
Vom wüt’gen Strom der Aar, am Ufer irrte,
Das eigne Pferd, die Flut drauf zu durchsetzen?
(747–51)
Told in the form of a rhetorical question, this literary invocation of a legend as undeniable historical truth confirms the emperor’s authority along with his Christian humility as “einfacher Mann,” as Joseph Roth would put it a century later in his Radetzky Marsch. Historically closer to Grillparzer is the Nazarene painter Franz Pforr’s (1788–1812) anti-academic painting, Count Rudolph of Hapsburg and the Priest (1809, Städelsches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt) (figure 7). Instead of presenting a historical event, which might have involved period-style trappings such as a high gothic monstrance plausibly belonging to Count Rudolf’s lifetime, the painting re-presents the legend with legitimizing “primal directness,” taking this approach to an unprecedented level of extreme archaism: “No revivalist painter had risked such artlessness before” (Vaughan, 172). Following the Nazarene painters’ German artistic models, here Dürer’s engraving St. Eustace (1500–1501)—a conversion scene—Pforr’s chosen dynamic of parity between count and priest is subtle and advocates unity. That Pforr’s painting dates from the same year as his departure from Vienna’s art
academy to cofound the revivalist Lukasbund suggests a programmatic role for the painting. In this frieze-like composition to be read from left to right, the bareheaded Rudolf offers his horse to the barefoot priest about to ford the stream. Called, the priest turns around. As the two men’s eyes meet, the Church’s safe journey is exchanged for the sanctification of Habsburg rule, with Rudolf’s page and the priest’s acolyte as witnesses. The physical gap between the two men is crucial; they must not touch each other except through their haptic mutual gaze. Thanks to Pforr’s literary model, Schiller’s Der Graf von Habsburg (1803), Rudolf’s page leads a second horse by its reins, while the priest’s primary, spiritual recourse is the “Sanctissimum” he carries; yet each will continue his journey changed and indebted to the other. Witnessed externally by the painting’s viewers, the depicted event evidences Habsburg power and legitimacy at the height of Napoleon’s power following his dis-

Fig. 7. Franz Pforr, Count Rudolph of Hapsburg and the Priest, 1809, oil on canvas, Städelisches Kunstinstitute, Frankfurt am Main. (Photo Credit: Foto Marburg/Art Resource, New York)
solution of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806. Pforr’s “primitivist” archaism offers continuity of Habsburg dynastic rule into the newly configured Austro-Hungarian monarchy and dispels all notions of historical distance or rupture, let alone loss. In turn, his focus on continuity connects Pforr’s painting, Grillparzer’s later drama, and the turn-of-the-century spectacle of the Corpus Christi procession.

In his “Fronleichnam” chapter Friedlaender interweaves the balance of Church and Empire with the consideration of duty, a concept that deserves further examination. Much early literature written by contemporaries close to the imperial court and also recent scholarship on Franz Joseph attend to his acceptance and also cultivation of duty (Margutti 44–45). One early editor of his letters, Otto Ernst, emphasizes the emperor’s dutiful “technique” of formal, controlled family life and his mastery of the “technique of prestige” (17–18). Both were acquired early and then practiced until the end. Charts of the emperor’s curriculum from first grade to Matura detail his school week. From early on he learned as many languages spoken by “his peoples” as possible; religious instruction and attending mass were constants; the humanities were later supplemented by social sciences, including economics, and the reading of newspapers. What impulses connected the Habsburg myth, the emphasis on duty, and elite education? Friedlaender’s account in Wölken drohen emphasizes the entitlement to social elite status and “club membership” that came with attending the Schottengymnasium. If indeed the school had long provided the “kaiserlichen Lehrer” while educating the social elite, then its curriculum should convey how it inculcated a sense of duty to the empire. The published Jahresberichte detail not only the general curriculum but also each course, including the topics for essay exams. Friedlaender’s education was considerably less modern than the emperor’s half a century earlier, as it excluded social sciences, modern languages, and the guided reading of newsprint. Extensive reading in the German and Austrian classics—Lessing, Schiller, Goethe, and Grillparzer, including Ottokar’s Glück und Ende—suggests an emphasis on moral consciousness and obligation in its focus on tragic historical conflicts.

But what connects the notions of “Pflicht” and entitlement to the Habsburg myth? In Friedlaender’s Letzter Glanz the husbands’ answer to this question is “noblesse oblige,” namely, the mutual stewardship of Church and Empire: Walking in the hot street both is and demonstrates the “poor old man’s” duty. In their role as bourgeois fathers, the husbands invert this logic of
duty and entitlement: The schoolboy in his sailor’s suit must endure discomfort and so earn his entitlement. Friedlaender ironically implies that he may have been such a boy in June 1898 or 1899. Scholarship on Vienna’s Jewish bourgeoisie emphasizes a collective sense of duty to master the best possible education (Rozenblit 99–126, Beller, Vienna 43–69, 88–105). In Stefan Zweig’s account in Die Welt von Gestern (1942, published 1944), at the predominantly Jewish Wasagasse Gymnasium he attended but does not name, formal education meant duty, ambition, and joylessness (37–69). Friedlaender’s fictitious husbands and fathers have integrated the positions of duty and entitlement up to a point. While not allowed to walk behind the emperor, they are satisfied observers of the emperor out there on the street “im Gefühl männlich-heldischer Solidarität.” He dutifully follows the cardinal’s canopy whose splendor and shade he does not share and then publicly prays under the canopies of his four “Hofzelte.” These were a traditional part of Habsburg ceremony whenever the emperor appears in open public space. In the climactic moment of Grillparzer’s Ottokars Glück und Ende the Hofzelt is meant to shield the indignity of Ottokar’s surrender to Rudolf but then is ripped open so that Ottokar’s humiliation is witnessed by all. As Vienna’s cardinal with his monstrance and canopy partakes of a divine vertical axis, the emperor accepts complete exposure to the horizontal expanse of secular space, the space of his duty but also his domain. In turn, as the emperor carries the flame of his own mortality and his dynasty’s endurance, his imperial gaze is on the cardinal’s back from a carefully maintained measured distance of several yards. The spectacular pomp of Church and Empire is a much-anticipated given, a “herkömmliches Gepränge” in which the powerful “poor old man’s” presence always surprises anew.

To understand how “Pflicht” could acquire the elevated status of both religious and imperial aura, one needs to examine how this experience was extended into the rest of the year and into everyday life. Mass-produced images of the emperor’s life proliferated at the time. Hans Pauer’s “Bild-Dokumentation” catalogs thousands of images: photographs and works in all reproductive print techniques, such as copper engraving, lithograph, helio-gravure, and wood engraving. Some were based on the deluxe jubilee albums of 1898 (Unowsky, 105–111). Unowsky considers this industry under the rubrics of consumption and kitsch (113–44), but one also should ask how this industry could be so compelling and effective. For these images to have power, their iconography had to be identifiable and even repetitive: church
holidays, arrivals and departures, birthdays and weddings, balls and state visits, openings and inaugurations, parades and military exercises. Their style had to be accessible and recognizable. Creating that style mainly fell to three artists and illustrators, Artur Lajos Halmi (1866–1939), Theo Zasche (1862–1922), and Wilhelm Gause (1854–1916). Whereas Halmi and Zasche each made dozens of images in 1875–1897 and 1892–1907, respectively, Gause made hundreds between 1897 and 1910. His preferred technique was painting—energetic brush drawing, gouache, and watercolor, which, mechanically reproduced, retained the appearance of immediacy. Two subjects held particular power: the Corpus Christi procession and the emperor working at his desk—at the Burg, Schonbrunn, Bad Ischl, and wherever he traveled. So dominant was the image of the emperor as civil servant, dressed in a simple uniform, working at his desk from the earliest morning hours, there taking care of his empire and following his daily to-do list of public and private correspondence, telegraphs, memoranda, and “Akten,” that his death more or less at his Schonbrunn desk became part of his early hagiography. The desk, like the procession, is the site of “Pflicht” but also of dedication. Some images show the emperor at work surrounded by his courtiers, others show him entirely alone. The example chosen here isolates him and brings the implied single viewer close up to the desk, where the emperor is so immersed in his work that he does not seem to notice this presence (figure 8). He is also emphatically bareheaded, which is easily read as humble. Gause must have sensed the potential for a connection when he invented a counterpart to this photograph, or similar ones, in his watercolor of the emperor kneeling in his “Hofzelt” at the Loblkovitzplatz altar during the Corpus Christi procession of 1897 (figure 9). The pose is remarkably similar to that of the emperor at his desk. Again he knows nothing of our presence, even as he is participating in the most public of events. The moment shown, in which he leaves his “Generalshut” on the throne behind him, is of humility and dedication. This image places us near the unseen altar, which creates the perfect illusion of the emperor’s paternal piety toward his people(s). Side by side the two portraits realize the convergence of duty and piety and the elevation of duty to the level of the Habsburg myth rooted in the story of Count Rudolf and the priest. In effect Gause created a “Heiligenbild,” a devotional print of the kind placed in hymnals, brought back from pilgrimages, religious holidays, and funerals. The proximity of photographs showing the emperor at his desk to Gause’s image of the praying emperor eventually led to their fusion into a close-cropped
color version of the kneeling emperor disseminated during World War I titled “Kaiser Franz Josef im Gebet für die verbündeten Armeen” and captioned with a prayer (figure 10). Among the general population such images seem to have been trusted with both protective and apotropaic power. Gause could provide them because of his training at the Düsseldorf Academy, long (1826–1859) under the directorship of Wilhelm von Schadow, himself once a Nazarene brother in Rome.39 Since 1871 Gause studied with the Estonian Eduard von Gebhardt, a history painter of Christian iconography who significantly contributed to the “Spät-Nazarene” Düsseldorf style (Bieber and Mai 165–85). The particular combination of subjects of past or contemporary history with formal borrowings from Christian iconography spoke to a wide range of ideological causes. Thus Karl Marx admired Carl Wilhelm Hübner’s Die schlesischen Weber (1844) for its sacrificial tone (Rose 104–11).40 The Düsseldorf Art Academy provided Gause with the necessary preparation and versatility for becoming a prolific illustrator in Vienna, where he moved in 1879. His topical range includes the spectacles of court and city, the “Hofball” and the Ringstraße flâneurs, the Corpus Christi procession and the Ashanti “Völkerschau” at the Prater. Perhaps he found inspiration for the hagiographic picture of the kneeling emperor in a successful offshoot, with a strong market in Austria, of late-Nazarene religious art in Düsseldorf, namely popular color prints of devotional subjects (Rudolph 186–96, Metken 365–88). This combination of art industry and popular piety is reflected in Friedlaender’s opening passage on the Corpus Christi procession: “Die Leute stellen Heiligenbilder in die Fenster und Kerzen dazu, manche auch das Bild des Kaisers oder des Doktor Lueger” (Letzter Glanz 34).

The emperor’s dual role in the “herkömmliche Gepränge,” his embodiment of civil service and his demonstration of “Apostolische Majestät,” perpetuates the medieval concept of the “king’s two bodies,” one secular and one sacred (see Kantorowicz). In playing these roles annually, the emperor wagered the deferral of the Habsburg Empire’s end and of the street’s occupation by Lueger and the Christian Socialists. In Friedlaender’s wishful thought, Lueger remains uncertain how much attention he is allowed to draw in the Corpus Christi procession, keenly aware of his mayorship’s repeated rejection by the emperor (Letzter Glanz 36). When Friedlaender wrote Letzter Glanz and evoked street images of Vienna 1900–1914, the “Mitte der Straße” was a potentially life-threatening place for him. This raises the question of where and how he positioned himself at the literal site of his writing, Dreihufeisengasse 9.
5. Authorial Positions

The notion of “inneres Exil” has proven both helpful and problematic, yet it appears appropriate when applied to Friedlaender writing “meine eigenen Arbeiten.” He is palpably present in his texts via the shifting visuality of their “Bilder” and decidedly not from any identified and fixed point. However, one might say that he invites his readers to think of the dedications and prefaces to his books as the sites where he imagined or remembered Vienna 1900–1914. He also suggests that the book manuscripts were not revised after 1945.

*Letzter Glanz* is “meinem lieben Freunde Herbert Waniek gewidmet” as the one “der mich angeregt und stets ermutigt hat, dieses Buch zu schreiben.” Waniek (1897–1949) was a stage producer and actor. In 1921 he began his career at the Deutsches Theater Brünn/Brno and between 1924 and 1927 acted at the Theater in der Josefstadt under Max Reinhardt. After a few years at the Schauspielhaus Zurich and the Essen Opera, he returned to Vienna, producing sixty-six plays at the Burgtheater from 1933 to 1949.41 Waniek’s encouragement of Friedlaender bore fruition when everything changed “über Nacht” in March 1938: “Da entstand in mir der Wunsch, meine Erinnerungen an das

Fig. 8. Portrait of Emperor Franz Joseph I at His Desk. Photograph. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien. Inv. no. Pf19000E161. (Photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek)
Fig. 9 (above). *Corpus Christi Procession, Kaiser Franz Josef im Gebet am Altar auf dem Lobkovitzplatz.* Zeichnung. Wilhelm Gause, 1898. © Schloß Schönbrunn Kultur- und Betriebsges.m.b.H./Fotograf: Sascha Rieger.

Fig. 10 (left). *Kaiser Franz Josef in Gebet für die Verbündeten Armeen, Zur Erinnerung an den Weltkrieg 1914/1915.* Color reproduction. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien. Inv.no. PORT_00049442_01. (Photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek)
Wien meiner Jugend, solang sie mir noch klar und deutlich, nicht durch allzu große Entfernung entstellt, gegenwärtig waren, aufzuzeichnen, und diesen Wunsch habe ich mir mit diesem Buch erfüllt” (*Letzter Glanz*, no pagination). Friedlaender claims that he wrote this book for himself as a wish fulfillment. What prompted this wish—“da” and “über Nacht”—is also what threatened the task with distance and alienation, “allzu große Entfernung,” and even with the disfigurement of his memories (“entstellt”). He did not intend objectivity; instead he defined witnessing as subjective: “Ich sage darum auch nicht: so war es, sondern: so habe ich es von meinem Standpunkt mit meinen Augen gesehen.” Nor did he aim for “Schriftsprache,” “feste Form,” “ein kw” but instead for “ein ehrliches, naturgetreues Abbild der Wirklichkeit” that no longer existed: “Dieses Buch wurde im Dezember 1938 begonnen und im August 1942 beendet.” His insistence on the subjective viewpoint as that which leads to a faithful representation brings to mind the geometrically constructed viewpoint beneath a baroque ceiling fresco from where everything painted there looks right, or plausibly present, whereas standing a few paces away distorts this illusion. Such a viewpoint is corporeal, yet also theoretical, as it “mathematisiert den Sehraum” (Panofsky 126). It is subjective, yet claims “Naturtreue.” The camera image will always primarily show the fresco’s underlying geometry and thereby erase the phenomenal experience. Plausible visuality and emphatic subjectivity coincide in such a construct whose presence can only be experienced visually and then retold in words. If the fresco makes visual sense only from one mathematical “Standpunkt,” other individuals looking from different viewpoints would of necessity see anamorphic images. But Friedlaender’s insistence on both utmost subjectivity and “ehrliches naturtreues Abbild” is still accurate. Anyone not in his situation would inhabit that mental, physical, and optical spot, Hufeisengasse 9, quite differently. But how did Friedlaender make plausibly present what was threatened with removal and distortion? He calls it “Erinnerungen” and “Bilder,” a personal, immaterial archive with which he lived in the exile of his apartment in central Vienna.

Friedlaender dedicated *Wolken drohen* to the memory, “dem Andenken,” of his mother, Ottilie Friedlaender, “deren Geist und Wesen aus mir spricht.” His goal again was not “feste Form,” but, on the contrary, “die unheimliche Unrast der Geister und der Kräfte darzustellen.” Again he insists on “nur subjektive Wahrhaftigkeit,” on perception with “meinen eigenen Augen von meinem Standpunkt” (*Wolken drohen*, no pagination). This time he describes
his position in terms of class and education, as that “eines akademisch gebil-detjen jungen Wieners aus bürgerlicher Familie.” This self-description makes clear that in writing this book he was engaged in a dialogue with his younger self. He explicitly aimed “mir darüber Rechenschaft zu geben, wieso denn so viel Unheil für Europa und für die ganze Welt aus unserem Boden seinen Ursprung nehmen mußte. . .” (Wolken drohen, no pagination). This task and his word choice of “mußte,” not “konnte,” implies that he did not see Austria as Germany’s first victim, even as he adds that he wrote the book when “Österreich nicht Österreich heißen durfte,” that is, between March 1938 and April 1945. He dates his preface March 1949, around his own sixtieth birthday.

We cannot know how Wolken drohen was written alongside Letzter Glanz. According to the prefaces, Friedlaender began writing Wolken drohen six months earlier than Letzter Glanz and continued work on it for three more years after finishing that book. In fact, then, Wolken drohen literally frames Letzter Glanz on all sides, both spatially and temporally, thereby even prompting the reader of both books to think of Letzter Glanz as somehow having primacy over Wolken drohen and also as being mediated and protected by the latter. Early into Wolken drohen, Friedlaender offers the attentive reader some guidance to reading it as such a companion to Letzter Glanz. His pages ascribing Viennese anti-Semitism in large part to envy and jealousy regarding the “jüdischen Glanz” point to great and “echte” successes in science and art, music and literature, and also to “Glanz und Ruhm und Geld.” Repeatedly using the word Glanz, he concludes that “der Wiener an dem Glanz seiner Stadt sich nicht freut, weil Juden an ihm teilhaben” (Wolken drohen 35). While not rewriting any section of Letzter Glanz, he nevertheless imbues its nostalgic title with a fateful gravity it does not seem to have until Wolken drohen casts its analytical shadow over it. Is the Corpus Christi procession, with all its brightness, also such a “Glanz” in which Jews “teilhaben”? Friedlaender leaves this question open. Neither book uses the word “Jude” in a chapter or section title; however, Wolken drohen’s last chapter title is: “Der Glanz erlischt.”

Treating the Habsburg monarchy’s end, it matches the deaths of individuals with the disappearance of “letzter Glanz” in a range of areas; it aligns Gustav Mahler with Viennese opera, Josef Kainz with the Burgtheater, and Karl Lueger with Austrian politics (“nicht das letzte Licht, aber der letzte Glanz,” Wolken drohen 307). In a fictional train compartment discussion dated August 1, 1914, an old Jewish physician predicts: “Wir gehen einer furchtbaren Zeit entgegen und das eine sag’ ich Ihnen schon heute: Was immer geschehen
wird—man wird sagen: die Juden sind Schuld daran” (Wolken drohen 316). The “ferne” “Lebens- und Sittenbild” momentarily collapses with the present, but Friedlaender quickly pushes it back into the past, letting the two old excellencies and the rational young man returning from England continue their debate while the Jewish doctor keeps his premonitions to himself, just as everyone expects of him, the narrator notes.

*Maturajahrgang 1907* is dedicated to an unknown “Lola in Dankbarkeit und Verehrung,”42 and its preface, largely a disclaimer of directly autobiographical content, ends with the question of how ordinary, weak, “dem Heldentum und der großen romantischen Geste abgeneigte Menschen” could live through and accept the times narrated—not pictured—in this book, the years 1937 to 1945. Exploring this question also meant exploring the conditions under which Friedlaender wrote *Letzter Glanz* and *Wolken drohen*. Furthermore, here he enters, at the level of narrative fiction, into a broader discussion among those who died in exile before 1945 (Joseph Roth and Stefan Zweig) and between others who either chose permanent exile (Hermann Broch) or returned (Volkmar von Zühlsdorff) about Austria and Germany and their own relations to these cultural and political spaces.43 Friedlaender’s own situation of inner exile in central Vienna was different. As self-identified educated bourgeois he was not neutral, and in *Letzter Glanz* he writes with dark irony that “der Wiener” “überlässt den Berlinern und den Juden die Gefahr, sich zu blamieren. Ja, wenn es keine Berliner und keine Juden gäbe!” (Letzter Glanz 51) He describes the “Wiener” as a Catholic:


When Friedlaender wrote this, the emperor, quintessential paradigm of such joyless, sacrificial duty, was long dead and most of Vienna, as Doron
Rabinovici has shown, engaged in the systematic persecution of its Jewish population (57–60). Knowing this, Friedlaender left it to his readers to interpret the meaning and application of the “grosse passive Mut.” Did he then think of himself as a “Wiener” and Jew and Catholic? Nowhere does he directly acknowledge his recent classification as a Catholic racial Jew. The American Jewish Committee’s report in 1944 on The Jewish Communities of Nazi-Occupied Europe conveys that the Austrian census of 1933–1934 counted 176,035 Jews in Vienna and 191,458 in all of Austria. The report clarifies that this count was based on religion. By contrast, “[t]he number of Jews living in Austria in 1938, according to the interpretation of the Nuremberg laws, was about 250,000.”44 In other words, the racial count, uncertain and without a basis in the census, included converts and “Konfessionslose” and their descendants. As one such descendant under extreme pressure mitigated, according to his letter to Mises, by one of the “wichtigsten Weisheitsregeln,” inconspicuousness, that is, near-inaudibility and near-invisibility, Friedlaender surely had a complex and reflected understanding of both word and image in his book manuscripts.

6. “Fernbild”

Attending to the status of the image as bearer of meaning and authority in turn-of-the-century Vienna might seem an anachronistic undertaking nearly four hundred years after the Protestant Reformation’s image debates on the spiritual and political dangers of idolatry. It is nevertheless instructive to ask what it meant to use images, to trust them and let them speak to the degree Friedlaender does. According to Beller, Viennese Jewish schools taught ethical self-reliance inflected by a profound distrust of visual symbols and images; by contrast, he found, Catholic school education used images and instilled trust in their evidential and symbolic, truth-bearing capacities. On the basis of Beller’s thorough, contrasting account of Catholic and Jewish education in Vienna and of the authority of image and word in each (Vienna 88–121), one can begin to fathom the complicated educational experience of first- or second-generation converts. On his own account, Friedlaender trusts and preserves his images without challenging them to disclose more and also without unmasking them as mere appearance. To him images are not deceptive, or at least not more deceptive than words. Above all he trusts the “Fernbild,” without himself using the term. The “Fernbild” is primarily a
The spatial but also temporal concept first introduced into art historical scholarship around 1910–15 by scholars interested in early phenomenology as well as in the then still new physio-psychological study of perception. The term was coined by the sculptor and art theorist Adolf von Hildebrandt (1847–1921) in his influential book, *Das Problem der Form* (1893, nine editions by 1914). As an early review of the English translation in 1907 succinctly put it, Hildebrandt demanded that “the artist must make his composition look . . . as it would look if projected at a distance and hence flattened into a plane,” not so as to make it pseudo-photographic, but because according to Hildebrandt “the value of a picture does not depend on the success of a deception, but on the intensity of the unitary spatial suggestiveness concentrated in it” (Gordon 136–37). This suggestiveness is not solely spatial but also temporal, in that it presupposes a visual literacy of form developed over one’s lifetime. In reading forms, Hildebrandt writes, “we provide as a background, as it were, for the subject of the appearance a past or a future or an enduring efficacy” (101). In this way, visual literacy relies on the “background” of visual memory (“Erinnerungsbilder”) (31). Accordingly, in art the “Fernbild” is a conceptually (not optically) distant image whose concentrated efficacy allows one to see both one’s memory images and one’s daily habitual ways of seeing at a unified remove in which the familiar appears distant and the distant intensely close. Even as the “Fernbild” is a “pure, unified, planar image,” the “distant image is never entirely static, but contains characteristics that invite representations of motion” (36–46). In Friedlaender’s usage, I propose, the “Fernbild” is saturated with memory and thereby partially related to nostalgia. It is nostalgic to the extent that it projects into the past a promise and so is dually inflected by longing for this past potential and also by regret of its betrayal. Yet Friedlaender’s use of a narrative present tense inflects the past also with foreboding and with unwanted promises kept. In this way his “Fernbild” in *Letzter Glanz* is more than the subjective “plausible illusion” mentioned earlier. The literary “Fernbild” translates a visual memory into text. To a certain extent the “Fernbild” is comparable to the Benjaminian emblematic “Denkbild” in need of a caption. Of its author Benjamin writes, “He drags the essence of what is depicted out before the image, in writing, as a caption, such as in the emblem-books, forms an intimate part of what is depicted” (*Drama* 185). To be sure, there is neither violent dragging of text before the image nor internal captioning in the “Fernbild,” but there is the magic and threat of stillness, and the need for words, framing, or more images. In Hildebrandt’s description of the
“Fernbild,” fascinated awareness of such spellbinding power is what activates it, so that it is “never entirely static, but contains characteristics that invite representations of motion.” In _Letzter Glanz_, Friedlaender offers his own definition of the “Bild,” its stillness and inherent invitation to imagine the temporal and spatial motion integrating perception and memory, in a crisp yet distant and moving memory image:


One of those spectators gratefully absorbing this procession of images back then, “solang der alte Kaiser lebt,” was and still is the author himself (_Letzter Glanz_ 27, 33, 40; _Wolken drohen_ 307). We might even think of this procession of everyday life and its street as layered on, in Hildebrandt’s sense, to the past of the Corpus Christi procession, itself profoundly informed by the Habsburgs’ founding legend of Count Rudolf and the priest.

7. “Allzu große Entfernung”

Between 1938 and 1942, Friedlaender’s “Bilder der Strasse” are his archive of still “Fernbilder” brought to vibrant multisensory life. If in 1948 he acknowledges this as a personal wish fulfillment, the emotionally charged and ironically broken visuality of _Letzter Glanz_ defines the relation(s) between visuality and nostalgia as an unresolved dynamic, rather than a procession-al sequence of appearance, threatened disappearance, and cherished reappearance. In this dynamic the golden frame of stillness beckoning from the past and annually reappearing—without the Habsburgs, yet saturated with the memory of the imperial “herkömmlichen Gepränge”—is continuously threatened by the disappearance, by stillness in the sense of death, of both object and subject, image and observer, Vienna 1900 and Friedlaender 1938–1942. Seasonal disappearance and reappearance once intensified analeptic and proleptic imagination and in turn provided the “Fernbild” with its concentrated efficacy. In writing, Friedlaender fulfilled his own wish to keep such integral disappearance from turning into permanent removal. Writing
provided the dynamic energy that integrated the distant and the near in the “Fernbild” and rendered iconic nostalgia ironic critique and vice versa. As a literary task, his endeavor was extremely ambitious and psychologically challenging, which may have contributed to his writing two books, *Letzter Glanz* and *Wolken drohen*, somehow side by side. Speaking in biographical terms, writing was also a practical task. Forced retirement from Vienna’s Chamber of Commerce in December 1938 entailed that he was a lawyer in exile who became a “Schriftsteller” solely in exile, an identity he later maintained and further strengthened through membership, among other organizations, in the Österreichischer Schriftstellerverband (1950) and P.E.N. (1951). Between 1938 and 1945 Friedlaender wrote himself back near Vienna 1900 so as to preserve it. Perhaps he also wrote so as to preserve himself during the time of writing, December 1938 to April 1945, and this double motion provided the connection between those two worlds, in part through fear.

In the preface to *Letzter Glanz* he names the fear of “allzu große Entfernung,” an “all too great distance” that would require a bridging beyond his imagination’s capacity. Yet “allzu große Entfernung” also means death. In both books, he writes solely of the fear of the emperor’s death back then, before 1914, and of all that might follow: “Alles hat Angst vor einer Zukunft, die sich auch kühne Geister nicht vorstellen können und wollen. Jeder sieht und spürt die Gefahren, auf die man zutreibt. Jeder stützt sich auf den alten Mann, alles hängt an ihm, denn alle bösen Mächte sind gebannt, ‘solang der alte Kaiser lebt’” (*Letzter Glanz* 27). Friedlaender’s fictive ignorance, yet premonition of “alle bösen Mächte” to come hinges on the “alten Mann” as a Catholic Wiener incapable of acting: The emperor avoids solving the “Konflikt der Nationen” and “fördert alles, was jenseits und über dem Konflikt der Nationen steht: Die Kirche, das Militär . . . die Juden, die Volkswirtschaft, die Kunst, die Wissenschaft, und seine letzte Hoffnung ist die internationale Arbeiterbewegung,” the latter as a remedy “gegen das nationalistische Bürgertum” (*Letzter Glanz* 46).

Clearly, gratitude for “Bilder” is not enough; attention and vigilance, “Aufmerksamkeit,” is necessary. It is this “Aufmerksamkeit” for the political meanings and social tensions in even the most carefree situations and the most thoughtless, hence trusting, everyday conversations that characterizes both *Letzter Glanz* and *Wolken drohen*, and in this the two books strongly differ from Zweig’s *Die Welt von gestern*. In its chapter titled so similarly, “Glanz und Schatten über Europa” (180–198), Zweig insists on the complete cos-
metropolitan freedom he experienced as an in hindsight inattentive member of the cultural elite in the years 1900–1910, an experience that was primarily European, not specifically Austrian, and in which he was “sorglos.” A generational “wir” loved its own “Optimismus” and “ahnten” nothing (184, 198).

If Vienna’s Corpus Christi procession was “der Hofball Gottes,” then what did God do to sustain or void the Habsburg myth? Friedlaender answers this question by way of darker after-images to that of God’s most worldly moment in the liturgical year. This happens literally in the vignette “Nachtleben” in which a Herr Kaiserlicher Rat and his wife visit “nach dem Ball das Nachtlokal”:


Friedländer’s bourgeois vainly believes himself omniscient. This motif returns in one of the last vignettes, “Geistiges Leben,” which begins, “Wien ist zwischen 1900 und 1910 einer der geistigen Mittelpunkte der Welt und Wien hat keine Ahnung davon” (Letzter Glanz 319). But what follows, instead of a list of points of pride familiar from Vienna 1900 surveys, is this: On the Heldenplatz a policeman gives a penalty ticket to a young, pale man “wegen unbefugten Hausierhandel mit Ansichtskarten.” “Ob die von Ihnen selbst gemalt sind, ist ganz gleich—verboten ist verboten. . . . Ja, wann Sie nicht zahlen können, wenn ’S halt sitzen—machen ’S kein Aufsehen. Wie heißen Sie?” Long before naming Hitler, Friedlaender assumes his reader’s understanding of the young man’s identity (Letzter Glanz 322–23). The emperor’s carriage drives by and literally sidelines this scene: “Wenn er nach der Seite geschaut hat, hat der Kaiser den blassen jungen Mann gesehen…” (323). But quite likely he did not see him. Put in terms of the “Fernbild,” yet countering it, the “subject of appearance” now has the future as its background, not the past, and its concentrated efficacy is that of political satire. In other words, Friedlaender saturates Viennese cluelessness (the bourgeois, the policeman, the emperor) with the future he knows as the condition of his own writing. Then he ponders divine
omniscience again: At the Café Central, Trotsky “bestellt einen Braunen” and waits for Lenin. Next God, the ultimate cynic, appears:

Der Herrgott, der die Menschen darum gerne beobachtet, weil sie gerade genug freien Willen haben, um das Spiel, das sie mit einander treiben, für ihn interessant zu machen, sieht alles, reibt sich allwissend die Hände und lacht in seinen Bart hinein.

[...]


[...]

“So,” sagt der Herrgott, “soll ich Ihnen sagen, wer die zwei Herren sind—ich kenne sie gut—es sind meine Engel des Gerichtes und der Rache, und wenn die Zeit reif sein wird, [...].”

Der Cerny lacht freundlich... mein Gott, was redet oft der Herr von Altenberg zusammen oder der Dr. Friedell! Da grüßt der alte Herr ernst und gemessen die zwei Russen. Die stehen vom Sessel auf, danken ehrfurchtsvoll und feierlich, und wie sich der Cerny umdreht, ist der alte Herr schon weg.

[...]

Aber am Abend stimmt dem Cerny die Kassa. Auf ein so kleines Wunder kommt es dem Herrgott nie an, nur große tut er nicht gern. Die Menschen sollen ihr Spiel nur nach ihrer Fasson spielen.” (Letzter Glanz 324–25)

Friedlaender’s satirical theodicy is Catholic according to his own definition quoted earlier; it alleges that all are equally reduced to powerless acting at God’s arbitrary bidding and places free will under the “Wiener’s” “grossen passiven Mut.” Meanwhile, God echoes Frederick the Great’s famous dictum that “jeder soll nach seiner eigenen Façon selig weren.” But Friedlaender does not end Letzter Glanz here; he continues with “Krankheiten” and ends the book with “Der Tod,” a vivid evocation of Vienna’s traditional funeral cult and of the Zentralfriedhof on November 2, All Souls’ Day. Then he observes in biting economic terms, “Heute ist das alles kaum mehr ein Schatten von damals. Seitdem Leben und Tod in Massen produziert werden, sind sie im Werte gefallen. Die Menschen werden heute schon fast wie der Abfall und Unrat verbrannt oder verscharrt” (Letzter Glanz 345). If Friedlaender wrote his Corpus Christi chapter in December 1938 or January 1939 and this ending
in August 1942, then he acknowledges in it the Holocaust and the “allzu große Entfernung” of his memories. “Heute” as the “subject of appearance” completely ruptures the dynamic of the “Fernbild” which in Letzter Glanz gradually shifted from an ironic-nostalgic image of the past to a satirical image of the anticipated future come true, from “Glanz” to “kaum mehr ein Schatten.”

8. “Denkbild”

Since 1995 Friedlaender’s tombstone stands on a corner grave, seemingly too close to its neighbor to display its inscription on the front and to align it with the greenery before it (figure 11). This is a quintessential Benjaminian “Denkbild,” an allegorical emblem composed of disparate objects somehow sharing each other’s company. Here it is the literally petrified disunity of the “Denkbild,” rather than the dynamic and moving unity of the “Fernbild,” that stirs the labor of remembrance. Placed atop the tombstone backed by a second, larger slab engraved at its top with a cross, palm leaves, and cartouche bearing a faded inscription is a sad angel seated on an oddly shaped rock. An iconographic blend of loin-clothed preadolescent putto, Roman “spinario” (“Dornauszieher”), and tense-toed Job, its most striking feature is its intense, forlorn gaze until one notices its left hand seeming to pick up or set down an invisible object, perhaps a rock, a gesture to which the resting right hand almost points. Perhaps this angel once was part of a larger ensemble in which these gestures mediated specific meaning, perhaps not. Now he intensifies the entire tomb monument’s Benjaminian “Denkbild” in its disunity and historical layering. The monument is composed of parts coming from different physical and historical contexts: the base, a second base belonging to the vertical slab, the slab itself, the tombstone, and the angel.

The tall slab’s back bears the marks of thick ivy vines and roots, which evidently once overgrew it. Positioned here so as to back the tomb’s other parts, it was a second-hand Catholic headstone, which may bear the names of those it once commemorated, covered by the Friedlaenders’ tombstone. Both, slab and tombstone, at some point received bevelled vertical edges to make them match each other better and to determine the latter’s “front” side.

In contrast to the rough-surfaced gray rock of the tomb’s other parts, the angel is finely carved in marble. It is signed on its own base (to its left) by Edmund Klotz (1855–1929), a successful Viennese sculptor from Inzing, Tyrol, who worked in a neoclassical transition style between Ringstrasse
Fig. 11. Grave of Friedlaender family, 1995. Inscriptions for Josef and Otto
Friedlaender, 1943 and 1963. Zentralfriedhof Wien, Großbereich 5, Gruppe 4, Reihe
3, Grabnummer 26. (Photo: Lori Felton)
Klotz made a sepulchral monument for one “Dr. Friedländer in Wien” in or before 1927. Lehmann 1927 lists eleven men named Dr. Friedländer, including Josef, Senatspräsident, then seventy-three years old. Klotz’s angel may or may not have been his. As early as 1943 or as late as 1995 it was made to fit the Friedlaenders’ original tombstone, which at some point seems to have been turned by 90 degrees. As mentioned earlier, its left side bears the inscription for Otto Friedlaender. Its right side bears an inscription for his father Josef Friedlaender: “Dr. JOSEF FRIEDLAENDER/ SENATSPRÄSIDENT/ AM OBERSTEN GERICHTSHOFE/ 13.2.1854–11.4.1943.” This second inscription may imply that the tombstone dates from 1943 and in 1963 came to serve the graves of both Josef and Otto Friedlaender. Perhaps Josef, perhaps both together planned it in this way around the time that Otto finished writing Letzter Glanz in August 1942 with the horror “heute” of the dead being “wie der Abfall oder Unrat verbrannt oder verscharrt.” In April 1943 this potentially double tombstone could have implied Otto’s hopeful anticipation of an eventual cemetery burial rather than death in the Holocaust. In October 1941, Dr. Rössler, director of Vienna’s municipal cemetery’s administration, had decreed that no “Judenchristen” were allowed to be buried on Christian cemeteries. On December 25, 1941, the decree was reiterated explicitly for Catholics. The Catholic convert Josef Friedlaender was buried in the Zentralfriedhof’s “Neuer Israelitischer Friedhof” section, which had been bought and designated as such in 1911 and was metonymically known as “Tor IV” for its gate. Josef Friedlaender was one of 800 converts and “Konfessionslose” buried there between fall 1941 and spring 1945 (Leiter 613). The genealogical record of April 15, 1943, is under the rubric “Jewish burials” and adds the middle name “Israel,” in keeping with the decree of August 17, 1938, requiring Jews bearing “non-Jewish” names, such as the Friedlaenders’ Habsburg names Otto and Josef, to be thus identified. On November 6, 1939, Josef and Ottillie’s marriage record of 1882 had been stamped “Annahme des Zusatznamens Israel—Sara angezeigt!” All this strongly suggests that in
1963 Otto was buried near his father and implicitly as a “racial Jew” in the language of the Nuremberg Laws. Only the exhumation and reburial of the Friedlaenders’ remains in one Catholic grave in 1995 erased this identification. The two Friedlaenders’ neutral tombstone guarded and mourned by Edmund Klotz’s neoclassical angel was now literally backed, but also burdened, by the cross-bearing slab. In its profoundly melancholic refusal to offer solace, this tomb “entfernt” us from Friedlaender’s nostalgic “Fernbilder.”

Notes

This essay could not have been written without the support of several individuals and institutions. Above all I am grateful to Professor Anna Lea Staudacher of the Institut für Geschichte at the Universität Wien for her generous interest in all phases of this project and for her expert advice. My sincere thanks also to Professor Jeffrey M. Herbener of Grove City College, Pennsylvania, for providing access to the Friedlaender–Von Mises correspondence in its archive and to Andreas Kals, director of the Zentralfriedhof Wien; Katrin Kokat at the Deutsches Exilarchiv 1933–1945, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek in Frankfurt; and Manfred Bauer, Stadtgemeinde Waidhofen for their help in my effort to gather Otto Friedlaender’s biographical data. I owe special thanks to Lori Felton, MA, doctoral candidate at Bryn Mawr College, for examining and photographing the Friedlaenders’ grave at the Zentralfriedhof.

1. Kemp, “Fernbilder,” compares the spatial-temporal concept of aesthetic distance in Benjamin’s “aura,” the “Unnahbarkeit” of the physically near work of art, with spatial-temporal concepts in Alois Riegl’s and Aby Warburg’s writings on art historical methodology. Kemp implicitly demonstrates how all three critically engage with Hildebrandt’s particular understanding of the “Fernbild” as a work of art that integrates both temporal-spatial distance and closeness such that the beholder’s mnemonic visual literacy is challenged and confirmed. Both Benjamin’s and Warburg’s explanations of the implied critical position of the “Fernbild” anchored it in an eighteenth-century aesthetic of the sublime.

2. Two examples may suffice: Morton lists Friedlaender’s two books under the rubric “primary sources,” and Cyrus uses his work as contemporary reportage.

3. On Jewish attendance of “the two most prestigious schools in Vienna: the Gymnasium zu den Schotten and the Theresianische Akademie,” see Rozenblit. In 1875 the Schotten had a “core of Jewish students,” but did not later on “because of its increasingly German nationalist orientation” and its “antisemitic overtones” (103). In Vienna and the Jews, Beller expands on Rozenblit (52–67) but does not reconcile the school statistics by religion with his own definition of Viennese Jews by descendance (11–13).

4. Trauungsbuch, entry for the marriage of Josef Friedlaender and Otttilie Goldberger de Buda on October 15, 1882, residents of the 1st district. See Austria, Vienna, Jewish . . . and Deaths, 1784–1911, document scan, image 94 of 257 images. The Oberste Gerichtshof, in existence since 1749 was constitutionally defined in 1867. Its Zentralbibliothek holds twenty titles connected with Josef Friedlaender’s name. When he was Senatspräsident, there likely were far fewer Senate (review committees) than today (eighteen).
5. Anna Lea Staudacher, email to the author, April 19, 2013.
7. See both Schottenstift and Schottengymnasium, www.schottenstift.at and www.schottengymnasium.at.
9. “Otto Friedlaender,” Austria-Forum. I have been unable to confirm Friedlaender’s pacifist engagement in other sources.
13. Lehargasse 9–11 (Dreihufeisengasse 9), called Wohn- und Geschäftshaus Reithoffer, was designed and built in 1912–1913 by the prolific Slovenian architect Max Fabiani (1865–1962), a student of Otto Wagner. Apparently it survived the war intact. See Architektenlexikon.
14. Josef Friedlaender died on April 11, 1943, at the age of 89, not 90. All four Friedlaenders—Josef, Ottlie (69), Otto (74), Erich (72)—were buried at the Zentralfriedhof on October 20, 1995. The Zentralfriedhof’s online database lists them solely under Otto Friedlaender’s entry. In 1963 Otto was buried elsewhere in the Zentralfriedhof. Andreas Kals, faxed letter to the author, July 26, 2013.
15. Ludwig von Mises archive, General Correspondence: Box 11, S149, F1, correspondence file “Otto Friedlaender,” Grove City College Archive, Grove City, Pennsylvania.
16. There is no trace of any attempt by Friedlaender to leave Austria in the following archives, online collections, and print sources: Dokumentationsarchiv des österreichischen Widerstandes; Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv; Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Sammlungen; Österreich im Exil; or Amann and Zühlsdorff.
17. Anna Lea Staudacher attributes Friedlaender’s survival to his descendancy from Catholic converts; emails to the author, April 19, 2013, and January 14, 2014. See also Thieberger 180–82; Rozenblit 127–46.
18. In this regard Friedlaender’s biography brings to mind Ursula Krechel’s historical novel Landgericht.
20. For a detailed chronology, see “Der Habsburgerstreit (1958–1966).”
21. Andreas Kals clarified that in 2006 the grave was rededicated to receive honor status. Faxed letter to the author July 26, 2013.
22. On these alternative discursive models, see Kenny.
24. Neue Freie Presse, no. 12138, June 9, 1898, 1. All quoted newsprint is accessible at the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek at ANNO, AustriaN Newspapers Online, http://anno.onb.ac.at.
25. Neue Freie Presse, no. 12139, June 10, 1898, 1.

30. Several of Wolfgang Kemp’s studies in the 1980s tackle the methodological problem of absence, loss, allusion, and the implied unseen. In addition to his “Fernbilder,” see “Death at Work,” “Ellipsen, Analepsen, Gleichzeitigkeiten,” and his edited volume, *Der Anteil des Betrachters*.

31. Kurzel-Runtscheiner 81–97. Arguably the sailor’s suit functions as a civilian uniform for children, connecting them to the multitude of uniforms both in and framing the procession.

32. Jacob Rothberger, founder of the business in 1861, became k.k. Hoflieferant in 1867, built his store in 1886, and expanded in 1893. He died in 1899, at the peak of his business success which his four sons inherited. See Hann; Botz, esp. 191–93.


35. The Nazarene Ferdinand Olivier also painted this subject. In his version of 1816 the interaction is less reserved. See Ziemke, “Die Anfänge in Wien und in Rom,” passim; on Pforr’s painting, see cat. no. b11, 61, 74; on Olivier’s, cat. no. b4, 59, 69 in *Die Nazarener in Rom*. On the “Habsburgthema,” see Krapf, “Entstehung des Lukasbundes in Wien” (27–33).

36. Compare Palmer 2–27; Wheatcroft 258–59; and the detailed curriculum charts in Ernst.

37. The *Jahresbericht des Schottengymnasiums 1908* reports that essay exam topics included “Charakter Rudolfs II. bei Grillparzer,” *Jahresbericht 1908*, 72. The languages and literatures taught were Latin, Greek, and German, whereas the student body was international (“Ungarn, Bosnien, Deutsches Reich, Belgien, Holland, Frankreich, Italien, Türkei”). Religion: “kath, rom (312), griech, evang, israelitsch (17).”

38. According to the *Neue Freie Presse’s* description of June 10, 1889, deputies of all Viennese parishes and “Ordenseinheitlichkeit,” walked behind the mayor and far ahead of the cardinal in the Corpus Christi procession. This contrasts with Friedlaender’s claim that socially the Schottenpräl was second only to the cardinal.

39. See *Düsseldorfer Malerschule* catalog. On Schadow, see *Nazarener* catalog, 220–26; on Gause, *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1930*, 413; Eigenberger.
40. See Ricke-Immel; and *Düsseldorfer Malerschule*, cat. no. 110.
41. “Waniek, Herbert,” *Austria-Forum*; Danielczyk and Blubacher.
42. The Ring-Verlag credits a Lola Ferdl with providing the “Buchschmuck” for *Letzter Glanz*.

43. See Broch; Roth, *Briefe 1911–1939*. The latter includes extensive correspondence between Roth and Zweig, with by far most of the letters written by Roth.
In their introduction to *Empathy, Form and Space*, Mallgrave and Ikonomou situate Hildebrandt’s treatise within the framework of physio-psychological empathy theory and research on optical perception.

*The Problem of Form*, translation adjusted. Compare Hildebrandt, *Das Problem der Form*, 16–28, 75. The translation of 1907 is abridged. Mallgrave and Ikonomou include a new translation of the entire text.

Benjamin writes similarly about the image in Proust as “the highest physiognomic expression which the irresistibly growing discrepancy between literature and life was able to assume.” Benjamin, “The Image of Proust” 202.

Apart from Kemp, “Fernbilder,” there is little scholarship on the question of how Benjamin’s work related to his generation's debates on art historical methodology. The concept of allegory dominates discussions of Benjamin’s methodological relevance, including Camille; Hanssen; and Iversen and Melville 38–59.

Friedlaender also held membership in the Verband der geistig Schaffenden Österreichs (1950) and the Journalisten- und Schriftstellerverein “Concordia” in Vienna.

Kürschners Deutscher Literatur- Kalender auf das Jahr 1963 summarizes Friedlaender’s literary biography until 1962 (175).

The inscription reads EDMK (M and K are fused) KLOTZ, combining monogram with surname. Literature on Klotz is scarce; see *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950* (Bd. 3, Lfg. 15, 1965), 421; “Inzing: Heimat großer Söhne”; Oberthanner; and “Die Innsbrucker Friedhöfe: Orte des Besinnens, Spiegelbilder des Lebens.” On sculpture generally, see Frodl et al.

Klotz’s monuments are indebted to Canova’s cenotaph for Archduchess Marie Christine (1805) in the Augustinerkirche, Vienna's Hofkirche. On the latter, see Honour; on changing cemetery laws, see Bauer.

Quoted anonymously in Oberthanner 1.


*Lehmann 1927*, vol. 1: 337–38. His address was Dreihufeisengasse 9.

The location was ZF Tor 4, Group 020a, Row 001b, Tomb No. 26. See Josef Friedlaender, no. 44786, in *GenTeam: Die genealogische Datenbank*. The site warns of errors, which may account for the wrong record of Josef’s year of birth, 1889, which was Otto's, and, presumably, the wrong address, Seegasse 16. "Gruppe 020a/Reihe 1b" was started in November 1942, and 020a is not among Leiter's maps of grave groups. Leiter 612, 648–51. The Friedhofsdatenbank der Israelischen Kultusgemeinde Wien (IKG) does not list either Josef or Otto, as they were converts. See *Findbuch für Opfer des Nationalsozialismus*. One mandate of the “Ältestenrat der Juden in Wien” (1941–1945) was to keep records on all racial Jews by NS definition. Leiter 494, 500–501.

The stamp is on Josef’s page of the *Trauungsbuch*, with “Sara” crossed out.

Leiter notes that in October 1996, when she began her research, only three graves in Tor IV’s sections for “Nichtgläubensjuden” were tended; everything else was overgrown and neglected (616). She documents a large number of exhumations; see 648–51.

To compare Friedlaender’s melancholy angel to Benjamin’s angel of history, see Scholem.
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