
Jews in American Drama, 1900–1918

Louis Harap

Culturally speaking, the twentieth century was well into its first few decades before it arrived in the United States. Enormous changes in American economic and political life occurred in the century's opening years. The country became a world imperialist power with the acquisition of Cuba, the Philippines, and Hawaii, and the intervention in Panama. Industrial expansion was rapid. With the power of Big Money came the countervailing force of populism and a widely influential "progressivism." But cultural changes were slow to follow. In the opening years of the new century the American theater continued as usual. The long-lived invidious stereotype of the Jew on the American stage was unimpaired. As M. J. Landa wrote of the British stage, equally applicable to the American, "the twentieth century was reached with the stage-Jew helplessly debased. If anything, his status had declined; he was simply an enslaved buffoon, condemned to outlandish gesticulation, to a specific make-up which must at least border on the foreign."¹ As for Jewish writers for the stage, they were few until the second decade. Jews did not, in fact, enter American literature significantly until our own century, and the poet Emma Lazarus in the latter third of the nineteenth was perhaps the only important Jewish figure up to that time.

Interestingly enough, however, there were four Jewish dramatists in the first third of the nineteenth century, Mordecai M. Noah, Isaac Harby, Jonas M. Phillips, and Samuel B. H. Jonah. Noah and Harby commanded considerable respect in literary circles, and drama historian Arthur Hobson Quinn has written that Noah was "probably the most important American playwright of the period next to James Nelson Barker" as a proponent and practitioner of a theater of the American nationality.² But none of these treated the contemporary Jew (with one minor exception), probably because they refused to portray their fellow Jews in the invidious stereotype so common to the period. An occasional Jewish playwright appeared afterwards, like Samuel Yates Levy, of Savannah, in mid-century.



*"If a feller wants to make a success in business
he should be a little up to date, ain't it?"*

Potash and Perlmutter

The "Stage Jew": Stereotypes and Caricatures

The situation of the Jew in the theater as the new century opened can be gathered from an article of 1901 in the *American Israelite*, reprinted from the *Indianapolis News*.

It is a curious thought that, with the growing influence of Jews in theatrical matters, so little respect on the stage is paid to the Jewish character or the Jewish traditions. It seems curious to people of this age who see men of Hebrew stock among successful leaders in all branches of endeavor, that racial prejudice ever militated those people, as a people. Everywhere, except on the stage, the Hebrew today is rated at his true worth, and it is well recognized by thinking people that the old gibes and smears have lost their point and force. It might be imagined that with the great preponderance of the theatrical business of this country in the hands of the Jews, that the frightful caricature of the Hebrew that has long served as a buffoon for the amusement of the unthinking would disappear, but there are no signs of any such change.³

No doubt the article exaggerates the extent to which Jews were "everywhere" treated according to their "true worth." But it did confront the reality and persistence of the "Hebrew" stage comic throughout the nineteenth century. It is not surprising that most of the Jews in the "theatrical business" at the close of the century did nothing to curtail use of the stereotype. They were entrepreneurs and, like any of this sort, aimed to please the public in the interest of maximum returns. In the theater this meant easy laughter from traditional Jew-baiting clichés. The Hebrew comics who specifically exploited these mannerisms further reinforced the invidious notion of the Jew, and they extended dialect humor to its outer limits, so that it became an aspect of the stereotype.

A stimulus for the currency of the Hebrew comic was the mass immigration from the 1880's onward, for the strange language and customs of the flood of East European Jews from the *shtetlach* and ghettos made them an easy butt for "humor." It was during this period that the Hebrew comic was added to the theater's repertory of German, Irish, and black comic figures in the wholesale exploitation of ethnic humor. Jewish comedians sometimes resorted to blackface in their vaudeville skits and theater appearances. They most often lapsed into demeaning Jewish dialect humor which, whatever their intentions, infringed the dignity of the Jewish people. These comedians

were nevertheless immensely popular. One-act plays and “monologues,” with some aspect of Jewish life as their butt, proliferated in the first few decades of the new century. How popular they were can be gauged from the fact that Edward D. Coleman’s bibliography of the Jew on the English stage (both British and American) listed 116 “Hebrew monologues” by one William McNally from 1915 to the 1930’s; and 61 such monologues and one-acters in the 1920’s and 1930’s by one Arthur Leroy Kaser. These must obviously have elaborated on the stereotype and used pseudo-dialect speech. In addition to dialect, these comics assumed a “grotesque Jew make-up” which consisted sometimes of “tall, rusty plug hats, long black coats, shabby pants, long beards which ran to a point,” and at others “crepe hair, misfit clothes, hat over ears.”⁴

The Popularity and Ultimate Decline of Ethnic Humor

There was occasional protest in the general as well as the Anglo-Jewish press against the denigrating stage treatment of the Jew. In 1912, a certain Montefiore Bienstock published a passionate protest against the “Hebrew Comedian” in the *American Citizen*. In this piece he fantasized a scene in which a Jew interrupts a Hebrew comic in action on the stage with cries of “This is an outrage” and “If the Jews have to break up every show in the country, it’ll break up such slander as this.” The audience encourages him to speak and he exclaims, “We have gone through bitter sorrow; we have been massacred; we have been tortured; and in America, . . . where all people are free and equal, it is vicious to mock us; to sneer at us; to make us ridiculous; to infer that we are criminals.” He urges Jews to the civil disobedience of breaking up all such performances.⁵ The theater manager, represented as a decent man who has now come to realize the offense to the Jews, comes to the stage and promises never again to engage such comics. But it was not until the extraordinary rise in ethnic sensitivity after World War II, which led to a general awareness of the dubious character of ethnic humor, that performances by ethnic comedians—black as well as Jewish and other ethnics—lost public approval and gradually almost disappeared from entertainment and the theater.

Such militancy on the issue as Bienstock’s fantasy was rare in those earlier years. No doubt much resentment was privately expressed and

sometimes broke out into print. But there is a division of opinion as to the negative quality and effect of ethnic and dialect humor even down to our own time. An acute critic like the late Henry Popkin deplored the passing from favor of this type of humor, while others welcomed its falling out of use. For instance, in his autobiography, *Minority Report* (1963), Elmer Rice looks back with regret at its passing. Writing about the days of "vaudeville fare," he observes that "one feature of vaudeville was the dialect comedians, German, Irish, Swedish, Jewish, Negro (the last often in blackface). They imitated accents and speech patterns and poked fun at characteristic traits and usages. There was nothing malicious or inimical about the caricatures; they were often enjoyed most by those who recognized their own idiosyncrasies."⁶ While Rice was accurately reporting the fact of enjoyment, he seems not to have realized that, however intended, such "caricatures" made fun of denigrated groups already the target of prejudice which was thereby reinforced.

The sense of Anglo-Saxon superiority was so pervasive that even ethnic groups took it for granted like good acculturated Americans. The severity of the damage it inflicted on an ethnic group varied with the status of that group within general society. Imitation of such accents as the German or Swedish were not damaging to the group concerned. While they were the objects of antiforeign prejudice when this prejudice flourished, they were not marked out for prejudice when acculturated. The case with other groups was quite different, as with blacks or Jews. Caricatures of blacks have always, down to our own day, been denigrating because equality is far from realized. The case of the Jews is similar though not nearly so extreme. The Irish caricature was damaging at a time when the Irish were harassed and a target of prejudice, but in more recent times this prejudice has been almost completely erased. As we have noted above, however, in the wake of World War II, with its searing demonstration of the evil of ethnic prejudice, dialect humor largely lost its effect as "comic." Elmer Rice notes that "today such good-humored raillery is taboo. Every racial, national and religious group has its zealous spokesmen who object to any allusion that might conceivably offend the most hypersensitive of their constituents. Where animosity does exist, censorship intensifies it. Ridicule, even invective, is often a safety valve." Rice himself was a political dissenter and even at times a radical, but he was, he said, "a

thoroughgoing assimilationist.”⁷⁷ It is not, therefore, difficult to understand his insensitivity concerning the validity of ethnic humor.

Invidious Jewish stereotypes appeared conventionally in the plays of many non-Jewish dramatists in the first decade of the new century. One of the most popular playwrights of the pre-World War I period, Clyde Fitch, included a Jew in a few of his plays, once as a moneylender in his eighteenth-century comedy of manners, *Beau Brummel* (1890), and again as a gambler, vulgarian, and generally shady character in *The Lady in the Case* (1905). In C. W. Hancock’s *Down on the Farm* (1906), comic relief is provided by an “old clothesman,” described in the play’s stage directions as wearing “Black suit, shabby, black beard, Jew make-up.”⁷⁸ An extremely bad play, Franklin P. Norton’s *Financier of New York* (1915), portrays a pawnbroker who combines the worst features of Shylock and Kit Marlowe’s Barabas. A pawnbroker also appears as an appendage to Sing Sing Prison in Winchell Smith and John E. Hazard’s *Turn to the Right* (1916); he alternates between straight English and dialect speech and caters to the clothing needs of released prisoners.

The fact that these plays were written by non-Jews does not by any means suggest Jewish writers did not also resort to the stereotype and dialect humor on the stage. Indeed, the plays which most extensively exploited this type of humor at that time were the *Potash and Perlmutter* series of plays. These were based on an extremely popular series of short stories by Montague Glass, originally published in 1909, that described the adventures of the Jewish garment-business partners Potash and Perlmutter. The stories were collected into a book in 1910, and additional books in succeeding years portrayed the two “funny” men as partners in various other industries. In 1913 they first appeared on the stage in *Potash and Perlmutter* with great success, and the same characters continued to appear into the 1930’s. The two men did not speak in dialect so much as in outrageously ungrammatical English with Yiddishized word order. The mood of the play is relaxed and bland and purports to be amusing. Their business dealings are pervaded by an atmosphere of petty dishonesty which is meant to invite indulgence. Sometimes the situations are funny, but throughout the onlooker (and the author) necessarily feel superior and condescending toward the patently harmless, well-intentioned joking pair. But sharp practice seems second nature to them and somehow pertains to their Jewishness.

Enter a New Kind of Jewish Character

Despite the persistence of the invidious treatment of the Jew on the stage, an awareness of its nature became clear to the playwrights themselves early in the century. It would indeed have been remarkable if the Progressive Era in United States history in the early 1900's had not somewhat influenced the theater and, specifically, its treatment of Jews. These were the years of the settlement houses, the social gospel, the muckrakers, and of the social legislation introduced after Teddy Roosevelt, who became president in 1901, carried forward his "trust-busting" campaign. At the same time the wave of pogroms in tsarist Russia created widespread sympathy for the Jews.

One of the effects of the progressive and reform movements was to give playwrights pause concerning their treatment of the Jewish characters in their plays. It dawned on them that Jews, too, were complete human beings with individualities and sensitivities which might be bruised by ridicule and by judgment via the stereotype. What ensued was a parade of plays which playwrights thought would at last do justice to the Jews. One might assign symbolic significance to the fact that the very first play presented in the first year of the Harvard Dramatic Society in 1908 was Allen Davis's *The Promised Land*, a play which won a competition judged by George Pierce Baker, Winthrop Ames, and *Boston Transcript* critic H. T. Parker ("H.T.P."), and was dedicated to George Pierce Baker. The central character of the play was a transparent representation of Theodor Herzl from his shocked awakening to the anti-Semitism in the Dreyfus Case to his organization of, and work for, world Zionism.

The issue of the Jewish character in theater was thrust into public discussion by one of the leading dramatists of that day, Augustus Thomas, in a speech in May 1908. He created a sensation by declaring, "The next great play will deal with the American Jew, the far-seeing, philanthropic, sweetly domestic Jew." He was even more specific. "Not the Jew of Shakespeare, not the Russian Jew"—meaning the revolutionary or poverty-stricken immigrant type—"or the persecuted Jew but the American Jew, who is philanthropic, far-seeing and, above all, sweetly domestic"—meaning the rich, socially acceptable, civic-minded, family-loving, kindly Jew—in short, the ideal, middle-class Victorian Jew. Thomas continued to urge his conception in Chicago early in the next year, although this time he added a sanitized

“socialism” to his demands. “Great plays,” he said, remain to be written about the American Jew and about socialism. “I mean,” he added, so there would be no mistake, “the American Jew of fine qualities as we know them, and I don’t mean the dull kind of socialism one hears from platforms and in speeches but a sort of celestial socialism that we sometimes read about.”

Thomas’s call for plays about Jews was widely discussed in the press, and an article in Chicago suggested that Thomas himself was the playwright who could best answer his own call—as indeed he did a few years later. But the writer acutely warned that such a play should, besides being good theater, “avoid flattery.” Another writer, in *Theater Magazine*, noted that Thomas’s appeal “aroused much comment.” “There had been plenty of plays,” he continued, “with Jews presented in both favorable and unflattering lights, but Mr. Thomas’ conception of the Jew as the hero of an impressive drama of our national life came home to the people of the theater with the force of a moral idea.”¹⁰

A spate of plays with “favorable” Jewish characters followed Thomas’s call, perhaps in response to it or perhaps because the authors were responding to the same atmosphere that prompted Thomas himself to issue the challenge. A writer in *Current Literature* (August 1909) remarked that “the continuous influx of Jewish blood has aroused playwrights to the dramatic possibilities of interest in the question of intermarriage between gentiles and Jews.” And many indeed were involved in this issue, which proved so very common in fiction as well, because of its actuality in the life of the two peoples. Israel Zangwill’s *The Melting Pot*, in which intermarriage was one aspect of Zangwill’s thesis about the amalgamation of all ethnic groups into one American nation in which the original ethnic character of each would be “melted down” into a single national character, had opened in Washington in 1908 to great acclaim. The play as such was poor, melodramatic “clap-trap,” as some critics called it, but had sociological importance in popularizing the notion of the melting pot and the assimilation of all immigrant groups. Two other plays, more likely to have been inspired by Thomas’s challenge, focused their dramatic centers on intermarriage. Thomas Addison’s *Meyer & Son* (1909) makes all its characters very, very good, and the *American Hebrew* noted that the author “means well,” and that “if there is of-

fense in flattery, Mr. Addison is an offender, but probably an unconscious one."¹¹

Another play, *The House Next Door* (1909), by Hartley Manners, is set in England. The son and daughter of an impoverished English baronet fall in love with the daughter and son, respectively, of their wealthy Jewish neighbor, a financial genius who has just been knighted and has bought the house next-door to the baronet. The baronet is a Jew-hater, and the parents of both families reject intermarriage. But by some incredible reversal, the parents of both couples agree to the marriages and all ends harmoniously. The original Austrian play from which the Manners play was derived was, appropriately enough, a farce. Philip Hale in Boston, on February 20, 1909, said of the play that it contained a Jew who was "a saint-on-earth, who preaches mercy, drips forgiveness, and speaks copy-book platitudes of peace, goodwill and generosity, while his Gentile [is] in his old age, proud, irascible, tyrannical toward his family, utterly unbearable, after having squandered his money and reduced his wife and children to poverty." Most of the reviews, however, were favorable.

John Corbin's *Husband* (1910), however, was a departure from the female Jewish stereotype. Rebecca Levine is a "Jewish lady from the East Side." She is a social activist, participant in politics, a "free-love" advocate, writer of a book on "Socialism and the Family." The author's own notion of marriage is also the final view of Rebecca Levine, who awaits her lover, a political prisoner, on his release from jail. "Free love," she exclaims; "Since Noah and the Ark, men and women have talked and tried it and still go in couples."¹² The play is superficial and largely rhetorical but is interesting as an early effort to create a contemporary "advanced" Jewish woman on the stage. In 1911, Louis N. Parker provided the famous *Disraeli* as a vehicle in which George Arliss became famous for many years on the stage and in film. This favorable portrait of Disraeli virtually identified Arliss for decades with the glorified likeness of the famous man.

Thomas's *As a Man Thinks*

Most of the attempts to portray a human Jewish figure foundered on lack of real knowledge of the Jews and the problems they faced, or on the depth of prejudice endemic in the Christian world, as well as on the

limitations of the dramatic talent of the playwrights. Would Augustus Thomas do any better when he turned his own hand to the "great play" of his conception? The highly selective nature of both the character and the class on which he projected his challenge would lead one to doubt the adequacy of his vision. His *As a Man Thinks* (1911) confirms these doubts. Like so many others, the action of his play centered on intermarriage. The Jew who was intended to meet Thomas's criteria, Dr. Seelig, was a wealthy, highly respected doctor. His daughter, Vedah, is at first nearly deceived into a marriage with a Jewish scoundrel, De Lota, but then falls in love with the non-Jewish sculptor Burrill, whose father admires Dr. Seelig as a physician but blackballs his application for admission to an exclusive social club. Vedah tells her father that she wishes to marry Burrill, but he objects, chiding her, "Whenever the daughter quits us the religious welfare of the whole world is the loser."¹³ The couple marries nevertheless. Then Burrill's father is brought round to agree quite magically; Dr. Seelig's approval, if indeed he ever gives it, which is left unclear, is tacit only. The play is well intended but genteel, weak in its motivations, and dramatically unconvincing, since the arguments for and against intermarriage are scarcely confronted. All these limitations were really implicit in the content of the author's original challenge.

In his review of the play in the *American Hebrew*, the American Zionist leader Louis Lipsky remarked that "Thomas has certainly missed writing the great American Jewish drama." Another reviewer noted that Thomas had "begged the question" and the play was hardly "a great drama." Clayton Hamilton wrote that Thomas failed to "say anything significant" about the "status of the cultured Jew in present day New York society," and that he had indulged in "rhetorical eulogy of the Semitic race." On the other hand, H. T. Parker, in the *Boston Transcript*, was enthusiastic over the portrait of Dr. Seelig. Perhaps Thomas's defense of the wealthy cultured Jew was animated more strongly by loyal class feeling than by goodwill toward the Jew as such. An anecdote by Edna Ferber arouses our suspicions about Thomas. She relates that while he was directing her *McChesney* play in 1915, he stumbled on her name despite having seen her every night for weeks. When she told him her name, he replied, "Yes, yes, of course, Ferber, Ferber. I never can remember those Jewish names." Ferber adds that she stalked out, slamming the door.¹⁴

A notable effort by a non-Jewish dramatist to create a Jewish character with an occupation like that of an ordinary human being is Max Rosenbaum in James Forbes's play about show business, *The Show Shop* (1914). The play has no other special distinction for us. Max is good-natured, shrewd, careful to show a maximum profit like any other theater manager, Jewish or not. He received no invidious treatment or any special positive or negative qualities. A similar effort at a more nearly human treatment of the Jewish character was achieved by Rachel Crothers in her *A Little Journey* (1918), in which a Jewish traveling salesman, an ordinary, decent man, is treated no differently from the other passengers on a transcontinental train. When the train has an accident, he rises to the occasion and is helpful in rescuing and comforting the injured. But even in this friendly vignette of a Jew, Crothers has him say that the first thought to occur to him after the accident is that he has no life insurance, and must get it at once after his return home.

Dreiser's *The Hand of the Potter*

It is not surprising that when Theodore Dreiser turned to the theater he should make the same break with the past as he did in his fiction. In his *The Hand of the Potter* (1918) he applied the new realism to his interest at the time in Jewish life on the East Side. Michael Gold, the future author of *Jews Without Money*, had earlier led Dreiser on a guided tour of the ghetto and even invited Dreiser to a Friday evening meal at his Orthodox home. The plot of Dreiser's play centers on the mentally unbalanced twenty-one-year-old Isidore, son of an immigrant Jewish family. Already guilty of child molesting, Isidore again assaults an eleven-year-old girl and kills her; he is pursued by police and hides out; and he finally follows the paternal advice to commit suicide by gas.

While critics granted that Dreiser drew the East Side background with authenticity and greeted his courage in tackling this bit of psychopathology, they faulted the clumsiness of his plot structure. There is no special reason why the family should have been Jewish except that, as Dreiser told Gold, he wished to write about East Side Jews. The term "tragic" was often applied to the play. However, this seems to me dubious, since Dreiser makes amply clear that there is no free-

dom of will in this young man's behavior—an essential element in tragedy. Isidore's behavior is uncontrollably determined by his nature. Dreiser puts his theory in the mouth of the policeman, Quinn, who discovers the young suicide. Isidore and those like him are “no more than any other person with a disease. He can't help it. There's something that pushes him in spite of himself.” Indeed, Quinn goes so far as to enunciate Dreiser's theory about “chemisms” of human behavior. “Sometimes,” says Quinn, “I think we're naht unlike the formula they give you in the chemical laboratory.” While the play left the impression, wrote Ludwig Lewisohn, “of the purposeless display of mere pain,” it “failed to rise from an immediate vision of the protagonist's depravity to the height of the tragic idea he was representing.”¹⁵ There is no suggestion in the play of the anti-Semitism which Dreiser was later to exhibit. The immigrant working-class Jewish family is treated by Dreiser throughout with dignity and compassion.

Plays by Jewish Dramatists

The delineation of Jewish characters by Jewish dramatists of the time was no less mixed than that by non-Jewish authors. Most conformed to the theater conventions regarding Jews on the stage. For instance, Max Marcin, in his very popular play *Cheating Cheaters* (1916), includes a crooked Jewish lawyer in collusion with a gang of thieves who finances their robberies and recruits thieves for the gang but lives in perpetual fear of exposure and arrest, which finally happens. Some Jewish playwrights did depict Jews as ordinary, fallible beings. Joe Weinstein in Edgar Selwyn's *The Country Boy* (1916) is one such, a theater ticket speculator, but essential to the plot. He is on his way to achieving a financial interest in the movies and is an active participant in the play's banter. However, a line spoken to him by a black domestic is significant in light of the relation of blacks and Jews. She complains to Weinstein, “White folks don't appreciate what I do,” and adds hastily, “Course I don't mean you, Mr. Weinstein. If all the folk were like you—!”¹⁶

The best-known and most successful Jewish playwright in the pre-World War I period was Charles Klein. He was born in 1867 of a wealthy Russian Jewish family associated with the arts in England.

From there he immigrated to the United States in 1883 and successfully produced his first play in 1891. Of the thirty plays he wrote, twenty-two were produced, and perhaps ten were successful. So active was he in theatrical affairs that he became president of the Authors' Producing Society, whose aim was to protect authors from producers' tampering with their original texts. Klein was a master of commercial theater technique and was a play doctor as well as a play reader for the producer Frohman. As one paper said of him in 1901, he had a "monopoly of technique . . . and . . . is . . . so to speak, a theatrical trust of stage trickery." In 1906 the press described him as an "ardent follower of the Christian Science crowd." Among his successful dramas were *The Music Master* (1914) and *The Lion and the Mouse* (1905). Some of his plays, like *Maggie Pepper* (1911), include Jewish characters. In this play the Jew is a stock figure, a dress jobber whose function is to provide comic relief in a particularly objectionable way. In 1915 Klein sued to be named as co-author of the highly lucrative *Potash and Perlmutter* play, for which one may assume that he was the play doctor. He then embarked for Europe on the ill-fated *Lusitania* and the case became moot. Arthur Hobson Quinn wrote of him that his "melodramas were among the most successful in the first decade of the new century."¹⁷

Conclusions

From our examination of the plays with Jewish characters in the first two decades of the new century, we can see the beginnings of the break-up of the conventional, invidious figure of the Jew which had rigidly prevailed in the theater for centuries. This trend was fused with the germination of a mature American drama in these decades which was to emerge in the period between the two world wars. The way was being prepared in the early 1900's by the revolt in the several literary genres. In the theater this rebellion found substantial expression in the founding of the Provincetown Playhouse and the Neighborhood Playhouse in 1915, and in the organization of the Theater Guild in 1919, all experimental theaters. The early Eugene O'Neill, the first great American playwright, was nurtured by the Provincetown, and his early plays from the late teens into the mid-twenties were all produced by this company.

Jewish playwrights of importance also emerged at this time. Elmer Rice, the first outstanding American Jewish dramatist, produced his first play, *On Trial*, with success in 1914, and continued to present experimental and innovating plays. This play introduced the flash-back into the theater. By the time the United States recovered from the effects of World War I, the American theater was already embarked on its flourishing career as a world theater. In the interwar period some half-dozen American Jewish dramatists were among the leading figures in the American theater. With this maturity came the introduction of fuller humanity to Jewish characters and a diminishing resort to the stereotype. Indeed, it is accurate to state that the pre-World War I period saw the removal of the Jewish stage stereotype from the dead center which it had inhabited for centuries to a less prominent and less insidious role in the American theater.

Louis Harap received his doctorate from Harvard University, where he served as librarian of the Library of Philosophy and Psychology. He is the author of *The Image of the Jew in American Literature*, an important contribution to the history of the American Jewish experience.

Notes

1. M. J. Landa, *The Jew in Drama* (ca. 1926; reprint ed., Port Washington, N.Y., 1968), p. 207.
2. Arthur Hobson Quinn, *A History of the American Drama from the Beginning to the Civil War*, 2d ed. (New York, 1943), p. 156.
3. "Stage Character of the Jews," *American Israelite* 47, no. 40 (April 4, 1901): 1, reprinted from the *Indianapolis News*. For a survey of the Jew in nineteenth-century United States drama, see my *The Image of the Jew in American Literature* (1974), pp. 200-238.
4. Edward D. Coleman, comp., *The Jew in English Drama: An Annotated Bibliography*, with a Preface by Joshua Bloch, and "The Jew in Western Drama: An Essay and a Checklist" (1968), by Edgar Rosenberg (New York, 1968), pp. 147-150, 160-163; Douglas Gilbert, *American Vaudeville: Its Life and Times* (New York, 1940), p. 288; Joe Laurie, Jr., *Vaudeville: From the Honky-Tonk to the Palace* (New York, 1953), p. 177.
5. Montefiore Bienstock, "The Hebrew Comedian," *American Citizen* 1 (1912).
6. Elmer Rice, *Minority Report: An Autobiography* (New York, 1963), pp. 73, 416.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 416.
8. C. W. Hancock, *Down on the Farm* (New York, 1906), p. 53.
9. "Next Great Play on American Jew," *New York Telegraph*, May 9, 1908; *Chicago Tribune*, Jan. 10, 1909.

10. Charles W. Collins, "The Drama of the Jew," *Theater Magazine* 9, no. 96 (February 1909).
11. *American Hebrew* 84, no. 18 (March 5, 1909): 475.
12. John Corbin, *Husband* (Boston, 1910), pp. 58, 216.
13. August Thomas, *As a Man Thinks* (New York, 1911), p. 112.
14. Louis Lipsky, review of *As a Man Thinks*, *American Hebrew* 89, no. 1 (May 5, 1911); review, *Current Literature*, May 1911; Clayton Hamilton, review, *Bookman*, January 1911; "H.T.P." [H. T. Parker], review, *Boston Transcript*, Feb. 27, 1912; Edna Ferber, *A Peculiar Treasure* (New York, 1939), p. 218.
15. Theodore Dreiser, *The Hand of the Potter* (New York, 1918), p. 199; Ludwig Lewisohn, review, *Nation* 113 (April 28, 1921): 162-163.
16. Edgar Selwyn, *The Country Boy* (ca. 1910; New York, 1917) p. 58.
17. Quinn, *History of the American Drama*, p. 204.