

History Yearbook, which has contradicted the idea of a “dying” empire for decades. Much of Arens’s discussion of the flaws in the approach of Carl E. Schorske to the history of Viennese modernism and modernity is interesting, but not as pioneering as presented. There has been extensive criticism of Schorske’s approach from other historians, for instance as collected in *Rethinking Vienna 1900*, published in 2001. On the evidence provided here, much of the preexisting revisionist historiography appears to have eluded Arens’s notice. This is unfortunate, because Arens’s approach would have been significantly enhanced by incorporating this other, extensive body of historical knowledge.

Belle Necropolis is potentially a most interesting book, taking on some of the misconceptions of Habsburg history, and attempting to employ interesting concepts to explicate the Austrian approach to the past, but in its execution, the book falls short of its potential.

Steven Beller
Washington, DC

Shapira, Elana. *Style and Seduction: Jewish Patrons, Architecture, and Design in Fin de Siècle Vienna*. Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2016. Pp. 336, 30 illus.
doi:10.1017/S006723781800036X

Elana Shapira’s book is an intelligent contribution to the study of Viennese modernism and, more specifically, to the role of Jewish patrons in its creation. Shapira argues that antisemitism forced Jews to pursue multiple strategies in building a “union” with European, gentile society. The book is divided into four chapters. Each chapter examines a set of Jewish patrons and their “coproductive” relationships with specific modernist artists. In chapter one, she discusses historicism through the patrons Eduard von Todesco and Gustav Epstein and their collaboration with Ludwig Förster and Theophil Hansen. In chapter two, she discusses the Secession movement through patrons Ludwig Hevesi, Karl Wittengenstein, and Friedrich Victor Spitzer and their collaborations with Joseph Maria Olbrich, Gustav Klimt, Josef Hoffman, and Koloman Moser. Chapter three examines modernism through the relationships of patrons Isidor Singer, Heinrich Kanner, Fritz Waerndorfer, and Richard Beer-Hofman with Otto Wagner, Koloman Moser, Josef Hoffman, and the *Wiener Werkstätte*. The final chapter on the avant-garde examines the collaboration of Peter Altenberg and Leopold Goldman with Adolf Loos. Shapira pushes the definition of patronage to its limits here, as Altenberg’s iconic cultural position creates the patronage, not direct funding or ownership.

Shapira (relying on theories of dress, dandyism, and cultural seduction from writers such as Georg Simmel and Rhonda Garelick) stresses the erotic nature of Viennese style—thus the subtitle of her book. She shows how the coalescing of identification, authority, and eroticism empowered Jewish patrons not only to design their own self-identification, but also to promote new paths toward a modern, progressive society. For Shapira, this empowerment allows, at least wealthy Jewish patrons, to reject the dominant cultural forms of Jewish presence in Austrian society: assimilation or alienation. Modernist patronage provided a path for “actively fashioning new language to convey their aims of emancipation as well as claims of cultural authority” (2). Beyond the necessity of all the patrons to navigate their position as Other in an antisemitic society, however, her argument is not a generalized one. Every patron used their specific personalities and generational contexts to build individual strategies, which in turned help direct the aesthetic differences in the four movements examined. These strategies ranged from promoting a pan-European identity through Hellenism, to using the idea of the *Gesamtkunstwerk* to foster debate about difference, to embracing the guise of the flirtatious stranger as a means of

shifting vice into virtue, and, finally, to elevating “Jewish aesthetic sensibility not as a subjective preference but as a force to spur reaction in the Viennese public” (168).

On the issue of evidence, Shapira’s argument is dependent on the idea of patronage as “coproduction,” that is, the interaction of patron and artist in defining modernist idioms. From a historian’s perspective, the idea of coproduction promised a level of historical evidence that would include how such partnering worked. Unfortunately, Shapira limits direct evidence (letters, contracts, essays, etc.) on that historical process of interaction and relies more heavily on a combination of her own art historical analysis with sociological theory. Her historical evidence, especially in the first two chapters, is at times tangential to the patrons. Their actual voices are much too limited throughout the book—the one major exception is Adolf Loos in the final chapter. Her use of Ferdinand von Saar’s *Seligmann Hirsch* to explain the aesthetic choices of Todesco in chapter one is just one example: “Though this story was written after Todesco’s time as a cultural producer in Vienna, it can be said that he would have appreciated the character who questioned a certain art of acculturation and might have reveled in the iconoclastic unruliness of the self-made Galician Jew” (40). This pattern is repeated throughout the book and contributes to her frequent use of the subjunctive mood in making conclusions.

Shapira’s talent at reading architectural structures and artistic symbols, however, is impressive and well informed. The book provides a wide-ranging discussion of how key figures, well beyond just her patrons and artists, defined modernism. Her discussion incorporates the contributions of Bahr, Kraus, Weininger, Zionism, British modernism, and others. Shapira, however, spends much more time on the process Jewish self-identification (its theory, its goals, and its particular expression for each patron) than she does on the parameters of what makes a movement historicist versus avant-garde. This means the reader must begin with a good foundation of art historical knowledge. Some may even question the clarity of the boundaries separating these labels and be left wondering how or why gentile artists would promote modernism.

Beyond the historical narrative of Jewish patrons, she also claims to be redressing the purposeful, scholarly rejection of Jewish contributions to modernism. Stressing the 1996 Beller/Gombrich debate, she argues that most scholars have either “dismissed” or left as “missed opportunities” the narratives of Jewish contributions to modernism, including the patrons she examines (2). Her push to claim historiographical significance for her thesis is overstated. It appears dated in that there is now general acceptance for the importance of Beller’s thesis in Anglo-American scholarship.

Nonetheless, in terms of the historical role and contributions of Jewish patrons to the four artistic movements and the theoretical claim that such macrocultural activities are related to individual social strategies of self-identification, Shapira’s book is a valuable contribution. It certainly creates a more complex view of Viennese modernism and its historical development. For anyone who has read Shapira’s published articles and chapters, much of the book will be overly familiar; at least part of all four chapters have been published separately in a series of independent essays.

Donald Wallace
United States Naval Academy

Gluck, Mary. *The Invisible Jewish Budapest: Metropolitan Culture at the Fin de Siècle.* The George L. Mosse Series in Modern European Cultural and Intellectual History. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2016. Pp. 272, 40 illus.

doi:10.1017/S0067237818000371

In *The Invisible Jewish Budapest*, Mary Gluck reconstitutes select concrete and symbolic spaces where urban history and Jewish history met and collided in fin-de-siècle Hungary. Focusing on key members of two generations of cultural innovators, the author explores varied cultural