



American
Friends of
the Jewish
Museum
Hohenems,
Inc.

Stephan Rollin
President

Mark Brunner
Vice President

Uri Taenzer, Esq.
Secretary-Treasurer

Trustees
Dr. Robert Amler
Ronald Bernell
Doris Billes
Nadia Follman
Harvey Gutman
James Hirschfeld
Francesca Brunner Kennedy
Claude Rollin, Esq.
Hon. Susan Shimer
Monica Wollner

THE AFJMH NEWSLETTER

May 2002
Volume III
Issue 2

Editors: Susan Shimer and Monica Wollner

SPECIAL EDITION

This newsletter is devoted to the work of Eva Grabherr, the first Director of the Jewish Museum Hohenems, who left her position with the Museum to pursue a PhD program at the Department of Hebrew and Jewish Studies of University College London. Her contribution to the Museum is evident to all of us. Her contribution to scholarship will be evident to all who are privileged to read her dissertation. Those who have met or corresponded with Ms Grabherr will not be surprised to learn that University College accepted her dissertation without any request for changes, and the University should be awarding her a PhD shortly.

Ms Grabherr has graciously acknowledged the contribution of the American Friends of the Jewish Museum Hohenems to the translation of her dissertation. We made this contribution because we recognized the importance of her work to an understanding of the life of the Jewish community in Hohenems in the late 18th and first half of the 19th century. We are most appreciative that Ms Grabherr was willing to allow us to publish a chapter from it before anyone else has that opportunity. The chapter follows an introduction prepared especially for us by Ms Grabherr.

LETTERS TO HOHENEMS

A Microhistorical Study of Jewish Acculturation in the Early Decades of Emancipation By Eva Grabherr

Attentive readers of this newsletter may remember my article in the Newsletter of January 2001, in which I tried to give a rough outline of the historical source material which forms the core of my dissertation, submitted to the Department of Hebrew and Jewish Studies of University College London in December 2001. My investigation of the life of southern German rural upper class Jewish families during the decades of emancipation at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries is carried out on the basis of a previously unpublished source: the family archives of the Hohenems Court Jews* Levi-Löwenberg. It consists of documents, primarily letters, from the period between 1760 and 1865, which were found in 1986 in the attic of what was formerly the family's residence. In 1990 the documents were given to the Jewish Museum Hohenems by the present owner of the building. For my research, I first recorded the whole correspondence (270 documents), written in Hebrew characters into a databank, and described and analyzed the correspondence using a variety of criteria. The analysis makes the source material, which is of high historical value, accessible to other scholars for future research. This is what I regard as the very essence of my work with the finding.

* Court Jews were Jews who regularly and officially dealt with the Court, often with respect to financial matters. In Hohenems, like in the southern German realm in general, the Court Jews were important suppliers for the emperor's army.

1303 Marlkrass Rd., Cherry Hill, N.J. 08034
Phone: 856-428-5232 Fax: 856-428-7803
Email: renrollin@aol.com

123 N. Church St., Moorestown, N.J. 08057
Phone: 856-235-1172 Fax: 856-235-1911
Email: taenzeru@juno.com

The main participants in this family correspondence were members of the Court Jew family Levi in Hohenems and Ulmo (later Ullmann) in Augsburg. The ancestors of the Levi brothers Lazarus (or Lezer) (1743-1806) and Hirsch (1735-1792), to whom the earliest letters of the finding were addressed resided in Hohenems as early as 1704. The mother of Lazarus and Hirsch was Maria Moos, a sister of the long-time head of the Hohenems Jewish community, Maier Moos Kauschelis. Maier Moos was head of the community from 1753 until his death in 1777, was described as a very rich, and highly respected man with widespread trade relations. We know very little about Lazarus and Hirsch's father, Josef Wolf Levi. Recognizing the finely tuned marriage policies of the upper-class Jewish families, it can be assumed that he was financially successful or at least was seen as having potential. After all, the Moos family, related to the Court Jew families of southern Germany, as well as the Uffenheimers of Innsbruck and the Mays from the Churpfalz (originally also from Innsbruck), would certainly not marry off their daughter to just anyone.

The sons of Maria Moos and Josef Wolf Levi took on the family names Löwenberg, Löwengard, Hirschfeld, Neumann and Gutmann. Three of the sons were named Imperial Court Factors of the house of the Austrian emperor. Most of the private 19th century letters that were found were addressed to Klara Levi-Löwenberg, nee Ullmann (1786-1854). Born in Pfersee (today Bavaria) and living in Augsburg prior to her marriage, she married Moritz (Moses or Moshe) Levi-Löwenberg in 1807, and moved to Hohenems. Her father, Henle Efraim Ulmo, Court Jew of the Prince Bishop of Augsburg and the Austrian Emperor in Vienna, had already corresponded with the Levi brothers in Hohenems as early as 1774. Henle Efraim Ulmo was one of the three Jewish bankers from the rural Jewish communities surrounding Augsburg. He belonged to the large Ulmo family, which was well-known throughout the Burgau and can be traced back to the Ulmo-Guenzburgs. This family ranked among the most prominent families of the Ashkenazic world. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries they pursued high-level marriage strategies, which connected them to Rabbinical families as well as elite business families throughout Europe.

Henle Efraim Ulmo was granted permission to reside permanently in the Free City of Augsburg in 1803, where the family built up the trade with state bonds. Through Ulmo's wife and Klara's mother, Hauna, the Hohenems' Levi could build up family relations with such famous Court Jew families as the Wertheimers in Munich, a common place for the Löwenbergs to travel in the early nineteenth century.

The chapter that follows in this Newsletter deals with the everyday life of these upper class Jewish families in Hohenems and Augsburg and thus give insight into the decisive social and cultural transformations of Jewish life towards the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century in Western and Middle Europe: the dissolution of the segregated Jewish community in this pre-modern era and the entry of the Jews into the bourgeois society of the newly forming nation states. A central part of this process was the relinquishment of the particular Jewish language, in our case Western Yiddish, and the entry of the Jews into the national linguistic community, in our case, German. The Jewish language situation of the pre-modern era was multilingual. Linguists call it an internal bilingualism, in which Hebrew and Yiddish (or another internal communal Jewish language) structured the inner-Jewish linguistic space and an external bi- or multilingualism, which refers to competence in the respective local languages that was necessary for Jewish existence. Loshn Koydesh (the holy language), consisting of elements from Hebrew and Aramaic, was used for the religious realm (worship, education, and legal administration), and Yiddish functioned as an everyday and communal language. For communication with the Christian society (business-relations and contacts to authorities) some members of the community had command of the co-territorial language, German.

The existence of an inner-Jewish communal language like Yiddish reflected the segregation of the Jewish community in many aspects of daily life. With the disappearance of this segregation in the modern era, Yiddish lost its function and was replaced step by step by German. This language transformation thus reflected the general transformation of Jewish life in the decades of emancipation: the entry of the Jews into the general society. The letters of the finding in the former Löwenberg house reflect the language behaviour of three generations in those decades so decisive to this change from Yiddish via German in Hebrew letters to German written in Latin script. They provide the opportunity to do research on this process in all details. I hope that this highly attractive source material will stimulate other historians as well and thus help to shed new light on the history of Hohenems Jewry.

Chapter 4: "EVERYDAY STORIES"

Everyday Jewish Life in the Early Decades of Emancipation as Reflected in the Löwenberg Correspondence

Let us linger a moment at the dividing line between the Jews and the non-Jews that I discussed at the end of the last chapter based on the example of the Jewish letter-writing culture of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As I have shown, both the letters of the eighteenth century as well as those of the nineteenth century mirrored the hegemonic letter-writing culture of the surrounding, non-Jewish society – although each in a different way. At first glance the eighteenth century letters seem fully anchored in their Jewish reference system: the entire document (with the exception of the address) uses the Hebrew alphabet, the date corresponds to Jewish chronology and also the Hebrew greeting and signature draw a prominent outwardly visible border. It is necessary to translate (both literally and metaphorically) in order also to recognise in these letters the existing parallels to the non-Jewish letter-writing culture before Christian Fürchtegott Gellert: for example, the extent of the salutation with its numerous and elaborately honourable titles for the addressee, which articulates that the style of letter clearly falls into the category of current court rhetoric.¹

The Löwenberg correspondence from the nineteenth century, on the contrary, immediately reveals that it has been permeated by the non-Jewish letter-writing culture in the outer appearance of the letters: starting at the margins, "non-Jewish" elements seep visibly into the letter-writing culture of the Jewish writers. The Latin writing system and the "general" chronology (also called "bürgerlich") is already in use for the dates. Often the signature is written using the Latin alphabet and in some, even the salutation is in non-Jewish writing. This process of visible integration of elements of non-Jewish culture into the Jewish, which my present work will deal with in one specific (although certainly quite representative) aspect; the gradual dissolution of the dividing line between the Jewish and non-Jewish realm, is central for understanding the dynamics of the transition from the Jewish premodern to the Modern Era. This process, however, should not be misunderstood as one of successful Christian assimilation of the Jews in Europe. Jumping to such a conclusion would be a fallacy as it would remain trapped in the structures of the premodern era and would also ignore one of the central developments of the Modern Era: secularisation, concretely "de-Christianisation" in Europe which, starting in the Early Modern Era, encompassed ever more social fields. Not only politics and the state, but also science and culture increasingly liberated themselves from theology.² Bourgeois culture and society was conceived as supra-confessional "per-se". That also explains the great fascination during these decades with "pre-Christian" antiquity: a cultural inheritance that could be referred to by all without having to grant priority to any certain religion. The Jews did not enter Christian society in the late eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth centuries, instead, they entered the supra-confessional conceived bourgeois society; they did not leap into "Christian history" but, rather, into "general history". This general context is important for understanding the high level of acceptance of this integration process among the Jews in Central and Western Europe. Far from being a defeat of the "old", politically powerful opponent Christianity, integration provided an entry into something "new", which in terms of religion was at least neutrally conceived.

Until this point, my interpretation of the Löwenberg correspondence in terms of the transformation of the relationship between the Jews and non-Jews during the transition to the Modern Era has been based on the reading of these letters as an implicit testimony to this change. The content of the correspondence, the explicit statements and narratives of the writers, has not been used much in the analysis; my conclusions have come more from the implicit message of the testimonies: from the way that they wrote their letters, the writing system they used, how they dated them, etc. But what do we explicitly learn from these letters, for example, about the social environment of the Levi-Löwenberg family in Hohenems and the Ullmanns in Augsburg? How are the

¹ On the significance of Christian Fürchtegott Gellert for the German letter-writing culture, see Reinhard M. G. Nickisch, *Die Stilprinzipien in den deutschen Briefstellern des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts. Mit einer Bibliographie zur Briefschreiblehre (1474-1800)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 172-75.

² See also Giacomo Marramao, *Die Säkularisierung der westlichen Welt* (Frankfurt/Main: Insel Verlag, 1999; 1st ed. Gius. Laterza & Figli, 1994).

concrete encounters of Jews and non-Jews reflected in this correspondence? Where did encounters take place and to which social realm do they belong? Do these letters witness friendships between Jews and non-Jews or is the regular contact more or less limited to business interactions?

A qualifying remark (that was also mentioned previously) must first be reiterated before these questions can be answered: these letters do not represent “the” everyday Jewish life in the decades of emancipation. For one, they are testimonies from the Jewish upper class and therefore do not represent the social heterogeneity of the Jewish community. For another, the messages in the letters themselves are limited both by the relationship of the respective correspondence partners as well as the function of the correspondence; the letters of the eighteenth century, for example, are inner-Jewish business correspondence. Family matters, everyday affairs, etc., are only touched upon peripherally if at all. Non-Jews and the non-Jewish world are merely mentioned in terms of a business context. This corresponds with what we already know of the Christian-Jewish relations of the Early Modern Era, and is not surprising in light of the function of this correspondence. The letters of the nineteenth century, on the other hand, are family letters. Not only male heads of households and fathers, but also women and children are involved in this exchange and are able to express their perceptions and experiences. Here the family’s daily life takes up the most space and business matters appear only occasionally as an aside. But also in these letters, everyday life does not really come up conclusively; only that which is deemed important and worthy of relating between the correspondence partners. In terms of the previously formulated questions about the family’s social environment, we have been extremely fortunate with the preserved correspondence in the Löwenberg collection. The social network in which the correspondents live, the members of the immediate and the extended families, the acquaintances, and also the participation in social life are thematised often and comprehensively in the letters. If asked for a spontaneous estimate of the contents of the correspondence of the nineteenth century, I would describe the families’ social network and their participation in social life in its various forms as the central content of these letters. The dominance of this theme is an immediate reminder of the great significance that sociability held in the bourgeois culture and way of life.³ Furthermore, this element of content (as well as other elements already mentioned) identifies the letters as typical testimonies of the culture of bourgeois family letter-writing in the nineteenth century oriented on the oral conversation and its rules.

Bourgeois “Sociability”

From the reading of this correspondence, one gets the picture that there must have been a permanent coming and going in the houses of the Levi-Löwenbergs in Hohenems and the Ullmanns in Augsburg. Moritz Löwenberg travelled regularly to Augsburg, mostly for business reasons, as did Klara and the children. Also the Ullmann siblings in Augsburg, mainly Josef Henle, often report in their letters that they have had a safe return from Hohenems. Beyond that, there is scarcely a letter that does not mediate news about or greetings from people who had just arrived or departed. Not only the correspondence partner and perhaps their immediate family is greeted, but additional greetings are also offered in the letters: e.g. to the cook, the nanny, the private tutor, scribe, or commis in these Jewish houses where also persons well beyond the circle of the small family must have lived.⁴ Often a separate note for these people was included in a letter. Likewise, the news related by visitors was immediately passed on. Often the narration began with the phrase: now the news “Khodoshim”, heard from this or that person. For those persons who formed the social environs of the family, interesting topics were: marriages (an important subject is the wealth and age of the “Khazen”),⁵ pregnancies,

3 Rebekka Habermas also speaks of the “restless sociability” of the actors of the letters and other ego documents that she uses to follow the embourgeoisement of the Merkel and Roth families in Nürnberg. Rebekka Habermas, *Frauen und Männer des Bürgertums: Eine Familiengeschichte (1750-1850)*, Bürgertum. Beiträge zur europäischen Gesellschaftsgeschichte, no. 14, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000, 139.

4 JMH LB, B 8/9.9.1816 (Josef Henle, Peppi, Nina and Fanni Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems). The writers also greet, among others, the cook, Nenele. JMH LB, B 51/20.1.1813 und 10/10.6.1813 (Josef Henle Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Levi-Löwenberg/Hohenems). Josef Henle greets Leopold Weil, scribe from Innsbruck, into the House of Moritz Löwenberg, and “Herr Campe” (Sigmund Campe from Fürth), scribe at Josef Löwenbergs.

5 See, for example, JMH LB, B 153/5.5.1808 (Henla Ettinger/Augsburg to Klara Levi/Hohenems). Henla Ettinger provides information about a Madmoisel Samson, who would be well served by the scribe from Kaula, Reb Chaim Gunzenhausen.

births, “Bris Mile”- (Bar Mitsvah-) celebrations, as well as deaths, but also the unexpected return of a husband to his wife, who had nearly come to terms with her situation as an “Agune” (abandoned but not divorced woman) and now had a “Bris Mile” (circumcision) to celebrate.⁶

The festivals described above are often mentioned as social events in the letters: marriages and Brit Mila- or Bar Mitsvah-celebrations. Not every Ullmann felt comfortable in his or her element. On 16 November 1809, for example, Josef Henle, barely eighteen years old, wrote to his older sister in Hohenems that although he was invited to the inn for the marriage of “Bile, daughter of Binswanger”, he did not participate: due to the costs, but also because he expected few young people to be there, and, finally, he did not know how to dance. Apparently his younger sister Henriette was spared at least this latter fate: on 14 November 1813, Zirle Weil invited Miriam (Wilhelmine, Mina), the daughter of Klara and Moritz, to come to Augsburg to learn how to dance with Henriette.⁷ Much more pleasurable for Josef Henle was the *zehr shene nitlikhe* [very nice concert] at the Binswangers which he told Klara about in June of 1812. Zirbele sang and Leo played the piano. Many people were present and they both received a lot of *kovid* (admiration).⁸

One of the domestic forms of sociability, which is often mentioned, mainly in the women’s letters, are the visits or “fisitn” as they are commonly called in the correspondence. Zirle Weil, but also Pepi Wertheimer, Josef Henle’s wife, and Nina Ullmann often report of the numerous “fisitn” to their houses. In 1807, Zirle Weil reported of numerous visits that had been announced (among others from Herrn Kaula), which she, however, did not want to receive due to the mourning period at the house, as these visits would also bring happiness and pleasure along with them. In 1816, Pepi reported in great detail about the house-warming visits that she received upon her move into the new house. Only the “alte Obermayer” did not show up due to her illness. In 1820, Nina from Augsburg reported to her sister that she had just returned from her journey, yet due to the steady stream of visitors had had no time to write. She urged Klara to try and understand her situation. Klara must certainly know herself what to expect upon returning from a journey: there is always something to do. First you receive “fisiten”, and then you have “gegenbesukhe” (returning the visits) and so on. Receiving visitors and returning the visit were ritualised activities. These visits were also pleasurable, but – as Nina Ullmann’s letter makes clear – they were nonetheless a social duty and were therefore experienced as “work”. The circle that formed on a particular occasion was clearly determined as Pepi’s remark that the alte Obermayer “had not yet called by” indicates. In order to “belong” one had to integrate into the game of receiving and being received. Rebekka Habermas emphasises the significance of these visits for the social life of the female bourgeoisie. In the Löwenberg collection as well, it is mostly women’s letters that refer to the visitations as duty and work.

Sociability outside the home is also a theme that is gladly touched upon in this Jewish correspondence. Frivolities and festivities are written about extensively. In 1816, Josef Henle told about the “redouten” (masquerades) in which he had participated, one of which had been attended by 1,200 people. Nina reported of her visits to the casino in Augsburg and her frequent attendance at masquerades and harmony balls, in both Munich and Augsburg. She does not spend a single evening at home, she wrote to her sister in Hohenems in 1824, adding that she was happy to hear that Klara is also doing everything possible to amuse herself.⁹ Zirle reported from Augsburg to Klara about the great applause that her daughter Mina (Wilhelmine, Miriam) was receiving at the “local balls”. In the “big city” of her maternal relatives (see above) she had not only been exposed to dancing but also the culture of the balls and social life. We also hear in the correspondence of another “rural Jewish” girl from Hohenems who enjoyed the social life of Munich and Augsburg. According to Nina in a letter to Klara from 1824, the niece of Moritz Löwenberg, Babette, born in 1801, had come to

6 JMH LB, B 21/7.11.1811 (Josef Henle Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Levi/Hohenems).

7 JMH LB, B 119/16.11.1809 (Josef Henle Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Levi/Hohenems). JMH LB, B 110/14.11.1813 (Zirle Weil/Augsburg to Klara Levi/Hohenems). JMH LB, B 86/24.5.1820 (Nina Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems).

8 JMH LB, B 112/21.6.1812 (Josef Henle Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Levi/Hohenems).

9 JMH LB, B 108/28.2.1816 (Josef Henle Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg). JMH LB, B 130/12.12.1824 (Nina Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg). The Ullmanns and the Löwenbergs could often be found in Munich. That was probably also due to their relationship to the Wertheimer family from Munich.

Augsburg from Munich and found that there was not enough going on in this city.¹⁰ The cultural and educational diligence of the Ullmans and Löwenbergs is evident in their frequent theatre and museum visits. Pepi Ullmann-Wertheimer expresses in a letter from 30 September 1816 to her sister-in-law, that Josef Henle and she would not have the pleasure of any more theatre visits that year. Nina wrote in 1824 that she had learned from Efraim that Klara had gone to the theatre in Lindau. She reported of her own museum visits with her sister Fani in Munich. Moritz Löwenberg was also a true theatregoer during his journeys. In 1812, Zirle reported to Klara that Moritz had not travelled through Augsburg on his last trip home, and therefore he had been unable to visit the new theatre. In 1817, Moritz wrote to Klara from Vienna and told her that he had visited the Burgtheater. Moritz not only visited the famous theatre in the monarchy's capital but also the "rotite" (Redoute/masquerade) and he travelled in the best Jewish circles: visiting the Wertheimers, Wertheimsteins, Königswarters and Biedermanns. He also tells Klara in 1817 from Vienna that the previous evening he had even met the Herr Baron von Eskeles at Moritz Königswarter's.¹¹ The fact that Jews were diligent theatregoers, as well as concert and museum visitors can be considered a signet of embourgeoisement.¹² This made them part of a "general audience" (no longer fragmented by religious or class borders), which had formed in the eighteenth century in public dialogues about art. This "general audience" presented an important nucleus of the bourgeois public realm. The "new" public realm disputed the primacy of state and church as the former central organs of the public realm. In this sense, the early bourgeois public realm was also political, even if it did not argue about politics in the narrow sense, e.g., about state authoritarian control, but, rather, about literature, theatre performances, painting and music.

Rural Jews and the City

Yet another facet of bourgeois culture is reflected in Moritz Löwenberg as a theatre-goer in Augsburg, Munich and Vienna and Klara in the theatre in Lindau and at the Emperor's ball in Bregenz¹³ or Nina and Fani as museum visitors in Munich. This facet is their relation to the city. Ever since the eighteenth century, the city increasingly became the central site for the public realm that had previously been granted to the court; and it was those new institutions of the bourgeois sociability and self-improvement culture such as the theatre, the museum and the concert hall that secured the city's predominance in the Modern Era. The Jewish families whom we know from the letters of the Löwenberg collection enjoyed the cultural and social offer of the city and enthusiastically made use of it. This included those who (still) lived in the countryside and, through their inter-regional familial network had privileged access to the city – a privilege not only of the men employed in business, but also the women and children. The latter were also sent to the city for their education, as shown by the example of Wilhelmine/Mina/Miriam Löwenberg. She received the finishing touches of her education in Munich in 1819/20 at Theres Rothschild's and also learned to play piano there, which she had probably already learned in Hohenems.¹⁴ Taking all of these facts into consideration gives the impression that, although the Jews may have lived in the countryside, in their "minds" they had already long arrived in the city. The tracks of the Jewish urbanisation in Central and Western Europe, which took place rapidly in the second half of the nineteenth century, had already begun to be laid in the early decades of the century. Although it was first the legal equality of residency rights that would enable the complete enactment of the move from the countryside into the city, this step had already been introduced several decades earlier.

How these Jewish elite-families with their urban ways of life and culture were perceived in the non-Jewish countryside remains an interesting question. There has been no investigation of these issues for Hohenems,

10 JMH LB, B 163/April 1824 (Zirle Weil, Moshe Levi, Ber Ulmo, Nina Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg). JMH LB, B 130/12.12.1824 (Nina Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems).

11 JMH LB, B 26/7.1.1812 (Zirle Weil/Augsburg to Klara Levi/Hohenems). JMH LB, B 125/19.11.1817 (Moritz Löwenberg/Vienna to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems). JMH LB, B 28/22.11.1817 (Moritz Löwenberg/Vienna to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems).

12 Michael A. Meyer, 'The Problematic Acquisition of German Culture', In Meyer and Brenner, (eds.) 1997, 203.

13 JMH LB, B 131 (Zirle Weil/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems).

14 JMH A 11: six letters (1819/20) from Theres Rothschild in Munich to Klara and Moritz Löwenberg in Hohenems. JMH 9: receipt for received 2 fl 24 kr. From L. Dülke, Munich, for a rented Piano-Forte for Rothschild, April 1819. JMH Löwenberg-Vitrine: "Clavier-Musik für Demoisell M. Löwenberg [---] 1817".

the little market village in the Vorarlberg Rhine valley that had long lost all of its court and inter-local administrative functions at the beginning of the nineteenth century. I am also not aware of studies on the reactions of the non-Jewish bourgeois elites who must have met with these Jewish families at the Emperor's ball in Bregenz, the theatre in Lindau, or at the diverse social events in Augsburg. In this context I can merely quote a voice from 1839. The Bavarian public servant, travel writer, and ethnologist Ludwig Steub (1812-1888) also reports in his *Streifzüge durch Vorarlberg (Expeditions through Vorarlberg)* about the spa in Reuthe in the far reaches of the Bregenz forest. He distinguishes between the *society* that meets there as: the *educated classes*, thus the *city people*, and the *country people*. Among the *ladies* of the *educated classes*, in addition to the *beautiful young ladies of the lakeside cities and from Feldkirch* and the *free Swiss women*, he also includes the *beautiful Jewish ladies from Hohenems*. These had a good reputation for *their stately presence*, but are also well known for spending all of their time on *their grooming and accessories* at home.¹⁵

Interestingly, the "Jews from Hohenems" were clearly considered "city people", although the village was decidedly not a city in the nineteenth century. Also noteworthy is the allusion to these women's urban appearance and a tendency towards excessive grooming and accessories. While an old male prejudice of women's addiction to grooming may shine through from behind Josef Bergmann and Ludwig Steub's statement, the letters of the Löwenberg collection also confirm that clothing and outer appearance presented an important matter, at least for Klara Levi-Löwenberg. As we know from the correspondence, a good portion of Klara's wardrobe came from Augsburg and other cities that her husband visited on his business trips. *The beautiful Jewish ladies from Hohenems* certainly also owed their urban appearance to the urban origins of their clothing, wigs and accessories. The correspondence between Klara and her friend, the housekeeper at the Ullman's in Augsburg, Zirle Weil, is particularly embossed by this relationship of exchange. Zirle had Klara's items prepared in the *ganz neuen Fassung [the latest trend or style]* in Augsburg, including coats, a net dress, veil with lace, and beautiful but costly bonnets and hats (a black velvet which was the latest fashion). She also bought her shoes and textiles (yellow merino, batiste, velvet to "attach", and muslin). Furthermore, she brought Klara's bonnets, veils and lace to the cleaners.¹⁶ Moritz also often bought clothing, material, etc. for Klara and the children on his business trips. In a letter written prior to 1813, Klara describes for Moshe in great detail what he should buy for her and from whom. She would like a *beautiful large scarf of the latest fashion*, but this time not in green. Mrs. Obermayer knows where the latest ones are available. And she also asks for a *fine, pretty straw hat with a Bavarian band*. If he doesn't get to Zurzach (a well known fair town in Switzerland), then he should buy it at Rambacher in Memmingen. She doesn't want an Augsburg hat because the hat should be pretty and made from good straw, not bast. It also should not be too expensive, if it is, then she would rather buy it *plain* somewhere else and then purchase the band separately.¹⁷

Zirle emphasized constantly that she would always buy Klara the most up-to-date items. In 1821, she reported from Hohenems that she had obtained the merino from Rambacher and after the midday break she would bring it right to the tailor *Krä*. He often takes long for the work but it is made that much more beautifully. *Krä* also does not require any instruction on the latest *fasson*, since he subscribes to a weekly *journal* and thus is always up to date with what is new. *Krä* is extremely popular in Augsburg. Zirle will have Klara's dress made with a band in a completely new fashion, one that none of the *local Jewish ladies* have. Klara should not say anything about it to the women there (in Hohenems), or else they would also turn to *Krä*. Klara seemed to enjoy keeping the source of her clothing exclusive. In 1816, Zirle cautiously asked what she should do about Brainle Hirschfeld, also from Hohenems, who asked for the same dress as Klara. Zirle also worked as a *Perlfasserin* for her friend in the remote Hohenems in 1813. She formed some extra pearls into a brooch in the form of a rose. Klara could wear it with a turban, like the high court master *Obersthofmeister* of the crown prince. Zirle seems quite ambitious, orienting herself on the courtly fashion for Klara's costume.¹⁸ Unfortunately,

15 Ludwig Steub, *Streifzüge durch Vorarlberg*, (1839), Edition 1908, 20-21, 162. For the statement about "grooming and accessories", Steub quotes and agrees with the Vorarlberg historian Josef Bergmann (1796-1872).

16 A summary from the twenty-five letters between Klara Levi-Löwenberg and Zirle Weil.

17 JMH LB, B 18/15.8.1819 (Moritz Löwenberg/Sbg. (?) to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems). JMH LB, B 127/23.5.(before 1813) (Klara Levi/Hohenems to Moritz Levi).

18 JMH LB, B 170/7.11.1821 (Zirle Weil/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems) I read the name as a clear "Krä" ("ayin" pronounced "tseyre"). JMH LB, B 110/14.11.1813 (Zirle

it is not possible to reconstruct the extent to which Klara had a chance to wear these things in her rural environment and what impression she made with them. But for us, what is once again made clear is the amount to which not only the social and cultural life of these upper class rural Jews was oriented on the city, but also their consumer behaviour.¹⁹

Jewish – non-Jewish Relationships

The starting point for my evaluation of the letters of the Löwenberg collection for information about the everyday life of the writers was to determine what we could say about the concrete encounters between Jews and non-Jews from this correspondence. It thus becomes obvious that, for example, in the inner-Jewish letters of this correspondence, those persons mentioned by name –with a few exceptions – can be identified as Jews precisely due to their names. In excess of 200 people are named in the inner-Jewish correspondence.²⁰ Mixed in are members of the families of the Augsburg Jewish community (Obermayer, Seligmann, Binswanger, Ettinger, Westheimer, Kaula, Levinau, etc.), who were able to gain residency in the city as of 1803, then the Hohenems Jewish families (Reichenbach, Hirschfeld, Lämmle, Brentano, Rosenthal, etc.), families of the Viennese Jewish upper class (Wertheimstein, Wertheimer, Königswarter, Biedermann. etc.), and also many who carried names typical for the southern German rural Jewish families such as Wertheimer, Guggenheimer, Dreifuss, Mändli, Landauer, etc.. The few people with non-Jewish names, who are named in the correspondence, are business partners (e.g. the Bankers Fröhlich in Augsburg), servants (not the employees in the educational occupations such as private tutors, clerks, etc. but the lower servants such as the Löwenberg's stableboy and coachman, Johann, or a certain "Gebhart", who was meant to deliver something) or the craftsmen and women who Zirlle had to arrange for Klara in Augsburg (the seamstress Mamsel Kramich, and also the tailor *Krä*).

Commercial trade was already a central structural point of contact between Jews and non-Jews in the Early Modern Era. The findings from the Ullmann-Löwenberg correspondence for the early nineteenth century also confirm this. A striking change from the premodern era, however, is the intense participation of these upper class families in the bourgeois social life of the city, which must have brought them into frequent contact with non-Jews of their social class. We know of the phenomenon of the Court Jew who participated in the courtly festivals of his noble client from the premodern era. But they presented an exception, and Jewish women and children were not at all involved in this social life. Although the contact between Jews and non-Jews at balls, theatre and concert performances, and in museums of the nineteenth century long remained limited to the upper classes, nonetheless an important new field for daily contact between Jews and non-Jews had opened up. The conclusions described previously which were derived by analysis of the persons named in the Löwenberg correspondence, lead us to believe that personal friendships were mainly between Jews; that networks of personal friends were formed among Jews. Newsworthy information about other persons, the correspondence suggests, only concerned family members and Jewish acquaintances. That did not change significantly over the course of the nineteenth century. According to the historian Marion A. Kaplan, in the second half of the nineteenth century the personal relationships between Jews and other citizens were still marked by distance. The more intimate the circles around a Jewish family, the fewer the number of non-Jews whom one encountered there.²¹

Weil/Augsburg to Klara Levi/Hohenems). JMH LB, B 85/30.9.1816 (Josef Henle and Pepi Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems). Josef Henle reported to his sister that he was ill and had called for the King of Württemberg's private physician. This physician then held a conference with the "Rofe" (Hebrew name for doctor, which indicates a Jewish doctor as opposed to a court doctor). When it came to clothing and medical care, that which was fit for the princes and kings was also suitable for the Ullmann's.

19 Further consumer products that Klara bought in Augsburg were drinking chocolate, goose-dripping, and also clover salt. She sent farm products to Augsburg: sausage, smoked tongue and jomtev-fruits.

20 The databank of the inner-Jewish correspondence of the Löwenberg collection contains a data field that records all names cited in the correspondence. Many persons were merely listed with their first names. But also these names are clearly identifiable as Jewish names, and usually in their Yiddish form.

21 Marion A. Kaplan, 'Freizeit - Arbeit: Geschlechterräume im deutsch-jüdischen Bürgertum 1870-1914', in *Bürgerinnen und Bürger*, (ed.) Ute Frevert, Göttingen, 1988, 169-72, 172.

Travel

An evaluation of the Löwenberg-Ullmann correspondence in terms of all aspects of everyday Jewish life thematised therein would be beyond the framework of this work. However, I would like to conclude these observations with an aspect of everyday Jewish life to which, similar to sociability, a great deal of space and attention is devoted: mobility, or travel. Men in the rural Jewish communities, primarily employed in trade and money lending, had also travelled heavily in centuries previous, and the Jewish upper class, namely the Court Jews, also had to manage long distances to employ and maintain the inter-regional network on which their economic existence was based. Moritz Levi-Löwenberg's business day most likely did not differ greatly in this aspect from those of his ancestors. There is hardly a letter from an Augsburg Ullmann which did not report that Moritz had stopped by on one of his business trips to Vienna, Munich, etc. The correspondence from Moritz to Klara (from Metz, Vienna, Innsbruck, etc.) also contains letters that he wrote while on business trips. He promised her repeatedly that he would write regularly and in every letter he promised the next. In 1817, he had to appease her in a letter, urging her not to worry if she did not hear from him; the situation might arise that he is unable to write. Klara's disappointment or even complaints about the lack of letters from Moritz and the precision with which he announced his next letter is understandable if one thinks of how long these married couples were separated by these business trips: in one letter, whose date is unfortunately damaged, but which was written prior to 1813, Klara asks Moritz to please come home at least before Sabbath. After being away for over two months, she would particularly miss him on a boring "jomtev". Klara's yearning for her husband, far away from her due to his profession, is a motif repeated often in the letters to her sister in Augsburg.²²

Not only the men's business trips are reported, but also the journeys of the women and children. Among other things, they served to maintain the family network. Klara and her children, mainly the oldest daughter Mina/Wilhelmine/Miriam, about whom we learn of all the Löwenberg children, are often in Augsburg and also in Munich.²³ They probably visited the family of Klara's mother there, as she was a Wertheimer from Munich. Munich is also an oft-cited travel goal for the Ullmann siblings from Augsburg. Mina also often travelled with her father. In 1821, for example, she travelled with him from Augsburg to Baden (Württemberg). In 1824, Nina reported to her sister Klara in Hohenems that while changing horses in Darmstadt someone had told her about a Mina Löwenberg in Metz who was staying at the house of "Madam Ansbach".²⁴ Unfortunately, we do not find out from this letter whether Mina was there for her education or for other reasons. But in 1827 she married Abraham Lehmann from Blamont, a relationship that can possibly be traced back to this stay. The Löwenbergs had also previously been in contact with the Ansbach family. In 1819, Moritz from Metz reported to Klara that here in the *lovely Ansbach house* he had made many *charming acquaintances*.

There is also frequent talk of travelling *ins Bad* (to the spa). Josef Henle seems to have especially appreciated this form of leisure activity and relaxation as he frequently reports on various stays at spas. Also Nina Ullmann must have been a passionate traveller. In 1825, she reports to her sister in Hohenems of a ten week journey to health resorts which had brought her to a number of villages: from Augsburg to Aschaffenburg, Wiesbaden, Schwalbach, Schlungenbad, Mainz, Neuwied, Nordhausen, Darmstadt, Frankfurt, Heidelberg, Mannheim, Stuttgart and Ulm.²⁵ This high mobility of women and children, people who were not travelling for business reasons nor for the purpose of securing their material existence but rather for relaxation and pleasure (or, to live up to bourgeois class expectations), mirrored a general trend in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Western and Central Europe: increasingly, territory within the forming nation states was comprehensively opened up through transportation technology. Of course, this development had primarily economic and political-administrative reasons behind it, but it nonetheless enabled an ever-larger group to travel for reasons other than business. Similar to the way in which the further development of communication

22 JMH LB, B 125/19.11.1817 (Moritz Löwenberg/Vienna to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems). JMH LB, B 127/23.5.(? before 1813) (Klara Levi/Hohenems to Moritz Levi).

23 JMH LB, B 21/7.11.1811 und JMH LB, B 112/21.6.1812 (Josef Henle Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Levi/Hohenems).

24 JMH LB, B 50/? .8.1821 (Zirle Weil/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems). JMH LB, B 130/12.12.1824 (Nina Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems).

25 JMH LB, B 88/8.2.1825 (Nina Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems). The list of locations is written in Latin letters.

technology presented the prerequisites for the unfolding of the bourgeois letter-writing culture in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the development of the territories through transportation technology in these decades also presented the necessary conditions for a travel culture which presented an important aspect of the bourgeois way of life.

In the correspondence we find out very little about the religious practices of these families. The numerous festivals of the social surroundings of those writers who mention them were made a theme as occasions for a social gathering and as prominent events within family life. The festivals of the Jewish yearly cycle, for example, are also important reasons for correspondence. Details about the religious practices or even the religious significance of these festivals, however, are not mentioned. Josef Henle writes in an incidental remark to his sister that the Ullmans in Augsburg had observed the “yohrtsayt” memorial for the deceased father. However, there is not a single word in any of the letters about the children’s or the young men’s religious education. On the other hand, education (private tutors to teach writing and reading and also teachers for hand work and dancing, governesses, etc.) was certainly a theme in the letters, although not handled in great detail. We can thus assume that the young men in these families no longer received any truly thorough religious education. The prohibition of work on the Sabbath, however, was still observed. Moritz thus writes to Klara in 1817 that he had had to wait for the end of the Sabbath in order to write her a letter and therefore he is now in a great hurry as the post is about to depart. We also learn about the introduction of a “new” ritual in the practices of these families. In 1810, Josef Henle Ullmann complains to his sister in Hohenems that his workload was so great at the moment that he could not even find time for his “Sonntagsspaziergang”. Moritz observed the writing prohibition on the Sabbath on the one hand, and also made these casual remarks about the bourgeois institution of the Sunday stroll on the other, which shows us how self evidently the elements of a Jewish and bourgeois life could exist side by side.²⁶

The inner-Jewish letters of the Löwenberg collection from the nineteenth century are a rich source for the reconstruction of everyday Jewish life in the early decades of the process of embourgeoisement of the Jews in the German-speaking areas. However, conclusions about the entire Jewish community should not be made from the actors in this correspondence, all of whom can be considered part of the upper class, living their daily life in correspondence with the many elements of a bourgeois culture. The noticeable trend in these testimonies is the increasing disappearance of visible cultural borders between Jews and non-Jews. And as the nineteenth century progressed, this process of embourgeoisement steadily expanded to encompass the entire community.

26 JMH LB, B 122/15.1.1809 and JMH LB, B 4/12.8.1810 (Josef Henle Ullmann/Augsburg to Klara Levi/Hohenems). JMH LB, B 28/22.11.1817 (Moritz Löwenberg/Vienna to Klara Löwenberg/Hohenems).