

German Literature, Jewish Critics

THE BRANDEIS SYMPOSIUM



EDITED BY STEPHEN D. DOWDEN & MEIKE G. WERNER

German Literature, Jewish Critics

Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture

Edited by James Hardin
(*South Carolina*)

GERMAN LITERATURE,
JEWISH CRITICS
The Brandeis Symposium

Edited by
Stephen D. Dowden and
Meike G. Werner

CAMDEN HOUSE

Copyright © 2002 by the Editors and Contributors

Margarete Susman's letter to Erich von Kahler (endpapers) courtesy of
Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach and Erwin von Bendemann.

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation,
no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system,
published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted,
recorded, or reproduced in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

First published 2002
by Camden House

Camden House is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
PO Box 41026, Rochester, NY 14604-4126 USA
and of Boydell & Brewer Limited
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK

ISBN: 1-57113-158-2

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

German Literature, Jewish critics: the Brandeis symposium / edited by
Stephen D. Dowden, Meike G. Werner.

p. cm. — (Studies in German literature, linguistics, and culture)

Papers presented at a symposium held in 1997 at Brandeis University.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-57113-158-2 (alk. paper)

1. German literature — History and criticism. 2. Jews — Germany —
Intellectual life. 3. Germany — Civilization — Jewish influences. 4. Jews
in literature. I. Dowden, Stephen D. II. Werner, Meike. III. Studies in
German literature, linguistics, and culture (Unnumbered)

PT91 .G47 2002

830.9'00089'924—dc21

2002022299

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

AcZ_eUz_eYF_ZAUDeV V2^VZIR

5 ZIR Vc+ D^ VZ RAdZ_eYVAcZ_eUgVcZ_`VYZIS``RV_`eRZIS|VWcZ Tf dZ_
Z_eYVVS``ZE`gZh_eYVdZ RAdA|VdVWcè_eYVAcZ_eUgVcZ_`VcVS``Z

Peter Heller
In Memoriam

Contents

List of Illustrations	x
Acknowledgments	xiii
Introduction: Positions to Defend	
<i>Stephen D. Dowden and Meike G. Werner</i>	xv

1: Cultural Poetics

Academic Emigration and Intercultural Criticism: On the Role of Jewish Critics in Exile	
<i>Hinrich C. Seeba</i>	1
Reminiscences of a UFO	
<i>Egon Schwarz</i>	25
Panelists' Commentary	34
Discussion	39

2: Jüdische Philologen und ihr Kanon

Aufklärungskulturgeschichte: Bemerkungen zu Judentum, Philologie und Goethe bei Ludwig Geiger	
<i>Christoph König</i>	59
Vom wahren Weg: Eine Respondenz	
<i>Amir Eshel</i>	79
Panelists' Commentary	87
Discussion	93

3: A Tradition in Ruins

Trümmer im Gepäck: Margarete Susman, Bertha Badt-Strauss und Hannah Arendt in der Emigration <i>Barbara Hahn</i>	99
Eine Klassikerin der Literaturtheorie: Käte Hamburger <i>Gesa Dane</i>	121
Panelists' Commentary	131
Discussion	135

4: German-Jewish Double Identity

A Jewish Critic from Germany: Hermann Levin Goldschmidt <i>Willi Goetschel</i>	149
Response to Willi Goetschel <i>Thomas Sparr</i>	167
Panelists' Commentary	171
Discussion	177

5: Embattled Germanistik

Part of an Intellectual Autobiography <i>Walter H. Sokel</i>	189
Response to Walter Sokel <i>Marc A. Weiner</i>	207
Panelists' Commentary	213
Discussion	225

6: German Literature in the Public Sphere

An Appreciation of the Work of J. P. Stern, Siegbert Praver, and George Steiner <i>Ritchie Robertson</i>	237
Jewish Critics and German Literature in the Public Sphere: A Response to Ritchie Robertson <i>David Suchoff</i>	263
Panelists' Commentary	271
Discussion	277

7: Peter Demetz: On Marcel Reich-Ranicki

On Marcel Reich-Ranicki <i>Peter Demetz</i>	289
Notes on the Contributors	303
Index	309

Disclaimer:

The images in the printed version of this book are not available for inclusion in the eBook. To view these images please refer to the printed version of the book.

Illustrations

1.	Heinz Politzer on December 31, 1975 in Berkeley, courtesy of Hinrich C. Seeba	xxxvi
2.	Hinrich C. Seeba and Heinz Politzer, presentation of the Festschrift <i>Austriaca</i> in December 1975 in Politzer's home in Berkeley, courtesy of Hinrich C. Seeba	xxxvi
3.	Egon Schwarz, courtesy of Egon Schwarz	24
4.	Egon Schwarz at the entrance to the subway in New York, 1949, courtesy of Egon Schwarz	30
5.	Egon Schwarz with his wife Dorle and their children Rudolf and Caroline, Cambridge, Mass., Christmas 1957, courtesy of Egon Schwarz	30
6.	Egon Schwarz at the end of the 1970s among his students — on the left, Bernhard Zimmermann, courtesy of Egon Schwarz	33
7.	Peter Demetz, Neustift, summer 1958, courtesy of Peter Demetz	44
8.	Peter Demetz with his daughter Anne Marie, Connecticut, fall 1961, courtesy of Peter Demetz	45
9.	Adolf D. Klarmann (in Festschrift <i>Views and Reviews of Modern German Literature</i> , ed. Karl S. Weimar, München 1974)	48
10.	Ludwig Geiger, February 26, 1891 (© Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach)	58
11.	Peter Szondi and Gershom Scholem, Berlin 1971 (© Marlene Schnelle-Schneyder, Bochum)	78
12.	Eduard Berend and Käte Hamburger (© Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach)	88
13.	Margarete Susman (© Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach)	98

14.	Bertha Badt-Strauss, 1929, courtesy of Albrecht B. Strauss	112
15.	Käte Hamburger (© Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach)	120
16.	Hermann Levin Goldschmidt, 1997 (© Willi Goetschel)	148
17.	Gershon Shaked (© Dan Porges)	172
18.	Walter Sokel, April 1975 (© The Albert H. Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia Library)	188
10.	Walter Sokel and Peter Heller, courtesy of Stephen Heller	200
20.	Walter Sokel, 1999, courtesy of Walter Sokel	203
21.	Peter Heller teaching at SUNY Buffalo, 1988, courtesy of Peter Heller	217
22.	Peter Heller in the 1940s, courtesy of Stephen Heller	219
23.	J. P. Stern, St. John's College, Cambridge (© Cambridge University Library)	236
24.	Siegbert Prawer, Queen's College, Oxford 1989, courtesy of Siegbert Prawer	242
25.	George Steiner (© Jacques Sassier, Editions Gallimard)	250
26.	Marcel Reich-Ranicki (© ZDF Bilderdienst)	288
27.	Das Literarische Quartett, October 21, 1993: Sigrid Löffler, Ruth Klüger, Marcel Reich-Ranicki, Hellmut Karasek (© ZDF Bilderdienst)	290
28.	Das Literarische Quartett, November 18, 1996: Sigrid Löffler, Marcel Reich-Ranicki, Hellmut Karasek (© ZDF Bilderdienst)	290
29.	Peter Demetz, Klagenfurt, June 1993, courtesy of Peter Demetz	293
30.	Marcel Reich-Ranicki, reviewing Günter Grass' <i>Hundejahre</i> , 1963, courtesy of Marcel Reich-Ranicki, also in <i>Sein Leben in Bildern</i> , ed. Frank Schirmacher (Munich, 2000), 106	298

Acknowledgments

A DEBT OF GRATITUDE IS DUE to the German-American Academic Council for the grant that made the conference and the publication of these proceedings possible. Thanks are due also to Brandeis University and its Center for German and European Studies, under whose auspices the conference took place. As always, the Goethe Institut Boston was a valuable partner, and we are grateful to Jürgen Keil, its then director, for his advice, assistance, and financial support. After Meike Werner left Brandeis University, her new home institution, Vanderbilt University, continued to support the project. A special word of thanks goes to Karin Grundler-Whitacre, Administrative Assistant in the Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages at Brandeis University. Her able management of virtually every phase of organizing the conference and then in preparing the manuscript have been invaluable. Frau Viktoria Fuchs of the Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach graciously helped us find the Margarete Susman letter that we have used as endpapers for this book, and Susman's son, Erwin von Bendemann, has kindly allowed its reproduction. We are grateful to Jim Hardin and Jim Walker of Camden House for their friendly support and, especially, their long-suffering patience. Peter Heller, a lively interlocutor and a fine scholar, did not live to see these proceedings published. We dedicate this volume to his memory.

S. D.

M. W.

October 2001

Introduction: Positions to Defend

GERMAN LITERATURE, Jewish Critics — the title announces a tension. German literature — its writing, reception, and canonization — has long been bound up in an uneasy, often exclusionary relationship to German-Jewish history. “In the course of its historical development,” Egon Schwarz wrote in his memoirs, “German literature and culture has always stood in a certain tension to Judaism.”¹ For many Jews this tension became acute in the wake of the Holocaust. “The study of German literature and culture,” Schwarz notes with respect to his own turn to the field in 1949, “demands an explanation, perhaps even a justification, from a Jew who speaks and writes German, especially when it comes so soon after the Second World War and the massacre of Jews by Germans.”² On the one hand there is, then, a literature with a specific history of exclusion, and an event, the catastrophe itself, which for many Jews changed everything. But the matter is neither so simple nor one-sided. For German literature was also an opening, a point of identification, a world German Jews could enter and consider theirs, even if its language was also the language of the perpetrators.³

The second part of the dyad — Jewish critics — is also problematic, especially since in racist thought it was the Germans who created literature and Jews who criticized it.⁴ This opposition rested upon a still older idea according to which non-Jewish Germans worked and produced and eked out a living by the sweat of their brows while Jews were parasitic upon the labor of others. At first glance, the opposition German literature-Jewish critics would seem to reproduce this old trope of the anti-Semitic imagination.

Still, we must be mindful and not let our understanding of the past be sabotaged by a poisoned language. Trauma must not be allowed to close the gates of experience. There is a relationship between German literature and Jewish critics; it is complex and overdetermined; it has a history and it carries a burden; and it is constitutive for our field. This volume seeks to understand this relationship and to illuminate its intricacies.

I

The discovery, primarily in the 1980s, of the Holocaust as both a traumatic event and a scholarly subject, constituted the central axis around which thinking about Jewish critics and German literature turned.⁵ This was true, in the first order, with respect to the problem posed by German, the sullied language of the perpetrators; it also influenced thinking about the position from which critics, especially Jewish critics, explored German literature.

The pollution of language posed a general as well as a specific problem. In the first decades after the war, silence seemed to many critics — if not necessarily to poets such as Paul Celan, Nelly Sachs, and Rose Ausländer — the appropriate response to the Holocaust. “The world of Auschwitz lies outside speech as it lies outside reason,” George Steiner wrote in an essay on Kafka published in 1963: “To speak of the *unspeakable* is to risk the survivance of language as creator and bearer of humane, rational truth. Words that are saturated with lies or atrocity do not easily resume life.”⁶ Like Adorno’s famous verdict on poetry after Auschwitz, Steiner’s dictum focused on the inability of a diseased language to express traumatic experience. But Steiner’s insight that silence constituted the most defensible response to the Holocaust was also more specific. “The thing that has gone dead is the German language,” he had written in a still earlier essay.⁷ By the 1980s, this position, which Steiner had himself revised, no longer seemed tenable, for it necessarily remained deaf to the spoken utterances and the written testimony of the survivors of the Holocaust.

The importance of these voices, even when spoken in German, could no longer be repressed. A complicated reorientation took place in which silence gave way to language. There were many cultural landmarks of this transition: Lawrence L. Langer’s explications of the literary structure of Holocaust literature (already published in the mid seventies);⁸ the airing in 1979 of the American television series, *Holocaust*;⁹ the founding of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum (chartered in 1980 and opened in 1993); the establishment of the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies at Yale University in 1981; and the production of Claude Lanzmann’s epic film of Holocaust testimony, *Shoah* in 1985. The turn away from silence and toward language involved increasing attention to testimony, which offered the possibility, as Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub wrote with

respect to Lanzmann's *Shoah*, of "a return and a repossession of the living voice."¹⁰ This mandate to recover the voice, however fractured and distant, also underlies Geoffrey Hartman's plea that we listen to testimony. "The survivors' experience as experienced, their personal story and individual memories," he urged, "was only beginning to be heard."¹¹

Experience, as we know, does not come unmediated. The question of who spoke and with whose voice remained a profound problem that would divide generations and significantly alter the ground that made Jewish criticism of German literature possible. Here the shift was from the universalizing assumptions of the Enlightenment to truth claims derived from positions of subordination or difference, truth, in other words, with an attribute.¹² A measure of the gulf separating the two positions can be gleaned from the stances of two eminent critics: Peter Demetz and Sander Gilman. In his essay "On Auschwitz, and on Writing in German: A Letter to a Student," Demetz confesses his sympathy for those European liberals who had "great difficulty in perceiving human beings in closed terms of groups, collectives, classes, national loyalties, or ethnic determinants" and instead argues for seeing in each Jew or Gypsy murdered "a *reiner Mensch* (pure human being) in the sense of the eighteenth century."¹³ Demetz's cosmopolitan reluctance to affix religious and ethnic labels to the voices of survivors is consistent with an earlier generation's conviction that the Holocaust, far from being the endpoint of the "Enlightenment project," represents the overturning of the values of the European Enlightenment. A later generation, the one that came of academic age in the 1960s, was more sympathetic to the Frankfurt School and less interested in an earlier formal criticism that eschewed the potentially ideological valuation of literature. By the 1980s prominent scholars of this generation increasingly insisted that morally responsible literary reflection, especially with respect to German literature, must place the Holocaust at the conscious center of its work. "It is from the centrality of the Holocaust in the study of German culture that we must move," writes Sander Gilman in his *Inscribing the Other*. "The Holocaust remains for me . . . the central event of modern German culture, the event toward which every text, every moment in German history and, yes, culture, inexorably moved."¹⁴ Unlike Demetz, Gilman did not attempt to return to the voice of the "pure human being." Rather, and consonant with parallel attempts to establish the epistemological possibilities inherent in identity and difference, Gilman privileged the voice of the "outsider."

Criticism — Jewish criticism — did not entail neutrality but rather meant “to burn with those fires which define you as the outsider.”¹⁵

Gilman emphasized the Jewish “I” of the critic. More precisely, he underscored the perspective of a Jewish critic of Eastern European background, and indeed *Inscribing the Other* is dedicated to the memory of his Jewish-Polish and Jewish-Russian grandparents. This manifest emphasis on particular identity constituted a departure from earlier Jewish critics who tended to identify with Jewish authors and, in doing so, indirectly underscored the particular value of the outsider’s critical gaze. Harry Zohn, who in 1939 at the age of fifteen was forced to emigrate from Vienna, self-confidently wrote about, and translated, Jewish authors at a time when few Jewish scholars of German literature writing in the United States focused on the specifically Jewish tradition within German literature.¹⁶ As a professor of German literature at Brandeis University from 1951 to 1996, Zohn understood himself as mediating between the world of Austrian and Jewish literature and the literary culture of the United States.¹⁷ In addition to his immensely important translations of Walter Benjamin, Theodor Herzl, and Gershom Scholem, he also drew attention to the critical edge of authors — such as Stefan Zweig, Kurt Tucholsky, and Karl Kraus — who did not occupy the center of the German literary canon in the postwar years. In Germany, Marcel Reich-Ranicki’s book, *Über Ruhestörer: Juden in der deutschen Literatur*, which appeared in 1973, thematized the role of German-Jewish writers — including Ludwig Börne, Heinrich Heine, Jakov Lind, and Jurek Becker, among many others — as occupying a position as outsiders and provocateurs who, precisely because of their marginal status as Jews, can offer privileged and challenging insight. In *Aussenseiter*,¹⁸ which appeared in 1975, Hans Mayer likewise took up this theme and argued that it was precisely this marginal position that led to a certain species of insight, and that this was not only true for Jews but also for women and homosexuals. If this held for writers, the argument could be made for critics as well, especially since both works — Marcel-Reich Ranicki’s *Über Ruhestörer* and Hans Mayer’s *Aussenseiter* — possessed highly autobiographical undertones.

By the 1980s, these early forays found wider scholarly resonance so that one could, in the words of Konrad Feilchenfeldt, talk about the “rediscovery of the ‘Jew’ in contemporary German literary scholarship.”¹⁹ This rediscovery occurred in an international context, as the German world of Germanistik developed increasingly close ties not only with the United States but also with Israel. Thus, for example,

one of the first efforts to understand the place of Jewish writers in the German literary canon emerged from a conference in Jerusalem (undertaken by the University of Göttingen and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem), whose proceedings were published by Suhrkamp as *Juden in der deutschen Literatur: ein deutsch-israelisches Symposium*.²⁰ The “rediscovery” was also marked by the publication of a number of important essay collections, including a two-volume work edited by Heinz-Dieter Weber and bearing the title *Juden in der deutschen Literatur* (1984–85),²¹ and a collection edited by Gunter E. Grimm and Hans-Peter Bayerdörfer entitled *Im Zeichen Hiobs: Jüdische Schriftsteller und deutsche Literatur im 20. Jahrhundert* (1985). These works, and there were others as well,²² signaled the beginning of a scholarly concern that was long overdue.

Yet these works concentrated on the place of Jews both as writers of and figures in German literature. They did not explicitly address the role of Jewish critics, whether inside or outside the academy. This line of research did not begin in earnest until the early nineties. In the context of a conference held in 1991 in Marbach am Neckar on the “Influence of Exile Scholars in the Germanistik of the Host Countries,” German and Austrian Jews who had been forced into exile and who had subsequently shaped Germanistik in their respective countries were invited to discuss their experiences.²³ These exile scholars — such as Hans Eichner, Paul Hoffmann, Hans Reiss, Henry Remak, and Guy Stern — seemed to represent the academic parallel of the “other Germany” and the conference, organized by Walter Schmitz in cooperation with the German Literary Archive in Marbach, marked the beginning of systematic research on the “scholarship of the exile community.”²⁴ But the conference focused on how the experience of exile influenced scholarship and not the specifically Jewish dimension of scholarship in exile. The first work to take up this specific question was written by David Suchoff, who in a special issue of the *Weimarer Beiträge* on “Germanistik in den USA” considered the place of “Jewish critics within American Germanistik,” and asked “what it means to be a Jew in postwar America and write on German literature.”²⁵ Suchoff addressed this question not just at the biographical level but also within the works of the critics themselves. Focusing especially on Erich Heller’s *The Disinherited Mind* and Heinz Politzer’s *Franz Kafka: Parable and Paradox*, Suchoff showed the way in which the Holocaust and post-Holocaust debates on Jewish identity might be traced in the writings of these Jewish critics of German literature.²⁶

II

Suchhoff's essay represents a fresh and significant turn. For, at least since Gadamer, we know that the perspective from which one views a literature and its history will have a bearing on critical or interpretive practices and their outcome. The presuppositions that inform the questions one puts to literature — the pressures exerted by historical circumstance, the life experiences shared by individual critics, experiences that had a bearing on what it meant to be Jewish or German (or more complexly: German-Jewish) — shape the framework that structures critical vision. The story of when, where, and how Jewish-German exiles or other Jewish critics may have reformulated their thinking and writing about German literature is part of the history of Germanistik. The same may be said of the still more difficult question of whether, how, and to what effect these views have influenced the practice of German literary and cultural studies.

With these questions in mind, the editors invited a diverse set of speakers and respondents to a symposium held in 1997 at Brandeis University. We sought individuals as speakers, respondents, and panelists who would potentially represent a wide range of generational, critical, and national perspectives within the discipline of German literary and cultural studies. The audience of between three and four hundred listeners proved to be an additional resource. Many of them took advantage of the time offered for open discussion to contribute valuable observations.²⁷ The present volume comprises the lectures and responses from that symposium, and it includes nearly all the purely oral contributions that were spontaneous on the part of invited participants and listeners in the audience. The lectures have been published from the speakers' own prepared texts, as have the prepared comments of the designated respondents. But the rest — that is, panelists' commentaries, discussion from the floor, and the banquet speaker's after-dinner speech — were recorded and transcribed from audio tapes. In addition, the editors have provided annotations at various points in the oral commentary in the hope that they will prove informative to the readers of these pages.²⁸

In the first session Hinrich Seeba explores potential links between contemporary cultural criticism of a literary bent — “cultural poetics” — and the practice of German-Jewish literary critics in flight from Nazi Europe. In his lecture, he proposes that these figures — critics such as Heinz Politzer, Erich Heller, and Egon Schwarz — were long-

standing outsiders to the world of conventional scholarship on literature in Germany and Austria and, as such, were the intellectual descendants of writerly critics such as Heinrich Heine and Karl Kraus. Seeba emphasizes the difference between his training in German scholarship at postwar West German universities and the re-education he experienced at the University of California under the mentorship of Viennese émigré Heinz Politzer. He finds that Politzer and other critics of similar intellectual provenance (more often Austrian than German) championed a mode of critical discourse honoring not only conventional standards of scholarship but drawing also in equal measure on a special sensitivity to language. This sensitivity, Seeba suggests, was rooted in the particularities of Jewish assimilation in the German-speaking world as well as in a sense that criticism is itself a creative act. Moreover, he points out that the thought of figures such as Karl Lamprecht, Ernst Cassirer, and Georg Simmel — work that the generation of displaced intellectuals knew — found its way into the writings of the émigrés and anticipated the cultural poetics of today in a nontheoretical form.

In his complementary response to Seeba's lecture, Egon Schwarz offers his own experiences of extraterritoriality as a crucial and typical piece of the puzzle. Jewish critics, as perennial outsiders in Germany and Austria, were in a position to have a special perspective on German literature. Once again, Kraus and Heine serve as exemplars of the outsider as critic and gadfly, but so could figures as different as Adorno and Reich-Ranicki, or Gershon Shaked, Andrew Jaszi, and Ruth Klüger. The émigrés of Schwarz's generation, as exiles from their homelands and characteristically less than fully accepted and integrated members of the countries in which they sought sanctuary, continued (and in some instances still continue) to be what he calls UFOs: unidentified foreign outsiders. This standing suggests the potential relevance of personal biography to the history of Germanistik.²⁹

This question of the relevance of individual circumstance, or "positionality," to literary criticism incited much discussion. To some degree, one's point of view frames the standards of relevance for an interpretive act, and no point of view stands outside a particular time and place and set of historical circumstances. The question then becomes: To what degree did the experience of exile — to name only one of many contingencies — frame the view entertained by the important Jewish critics of German literature, who in turn helped shape the discipline as we have come to know it? In the case of Egon Schwarz, these experiences were of plain importance. He was drawn to

German literature not least by a curiosity about the historical forces that had so drastically affected his life. But Schwarz also emphasizes the ways in which the American context helped shape German studies. The student rebellion of the sixties and the decline of foreign language requirements also pushed forward the trend toward sociohistorical and cultural studies in German departments. As a result the émigré generation and their successors found themselves well placed to explore the meanings of their own experience, at least until the preoccupation with theory once again marginalized their characteristic essayism.

In the subsequent discussion, Peter Demetz and Dorrit Cohn — two émigré critics known for their formalist leanings — wonder aloud about how relevant the more personal contingencies may have been for the practice of literary criticism in general. They point out that they were at least not aware of so framing their own critical priorities, either as scholars or as teachers and mentors.³⁰ Other commentators recall a self-conscious reluctance among some members of the exile generation to call attention to themselves and their experience in the practice of criticism. Still, it is at least possible that these experiences affected the individuals who underwent them more than they consciously realized: for example, in choice of texts singled out for special study (one thinks of Demetz's exemplary edition of Lessing's *Nathan der Weise*),³¹ in figures included or excluded from their version of the German canon (Cohn began with a book about the fiction of Hermann Broch,³² then a nearly forgotten figure), in choice of interpretive method,³³ guidance of graduate students and so forth.

In the second session, Christoph König turns to the difficulties of Jewish literary scholars in the nineteenth century.³⁴ He focuses attention on the case of Ludwig Geiger, founder of the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*. Quoting from letters and other primary sources, König is able to show in vivid detail exactly what Geiger was up against and how poorly he judged the full extent of the forces arrayed against him. Geiger placed his faith in the values of the Enlightenment, and its light blinded him to the darker elements around him. König portrays him as a victim of his own faith in the universality of German high culture. An unconverted Jew, he sought refuge from the grosser elements of German anti-Semitism in the seeming meritocracy of the German university, in the universal ideals of science and scholarship, in Germany's high culture. He understood high culture in a rationalistic and cosmopolitan sense derived from the Enlightenment, as a sphere opposed to the nationalistic sensibility that associated the word "Kultur" with the

cultivation of those characteristics and accomplishments that bear German identity. This tradition has made *Kultur* particularistically *German*, meaning not French, not English, and — perhaps most emphatically — not Jewish. Here one thinks of Thomas Mann's pitched battle against his brother Heinrich over German "Kultur," which he depicted as dark and profound and opposed to the rationalistic, superficial, merely democratic French concept of civilization. Geiger's misprision of the character of German *Kultur* in his time is striking. Unable to become a regular professor in Berlin despite the help of so powerful an ally as Wilhelm Scherer, Geiger sought to enter the realm of public letters via the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, though even here his authority and legitimacy were contested.

Responding to König, Amir Eshel explores the parallel figure of Michael Bernays, a Jewish Wagnerite and German nationalist who converted and found a measure of success through assimilation. But Eshel approaches the topic from the interesting angle of his own schooling in Israel, where no representative of Jewish Enlightenment in Germany was given a hearing. Eshel seems to suggest that always and only to judge these figures from the perspective of the Holocaust — as if they are to be viewed with pity or disdain for not having been able to predict the future — is too limiting. He concludes with an extraordinary anecdote concerning the relationship between two of the most important German-Jewish intellectuals: Peter Szondi, who survived Bergen-Belsen, and Gershom Scholem, who proclaimed the German-Jewish symbiosis a pernicious fantasy and helped shape the views of Israeli and other concerned intellectuals toward the German world and its Jewish history. When offered a chair in Comparative Literature at Hebrew University, Szondi respectfully declined. Though he felt at home in Jerusalem, he wrote to Scholem, this feeling of being at home was one he could not bear. Just why Szondi returned to German literature and Europe is hard to say, but it may well have been simply his refusal to be driven out. When Walter Benjamin's friends were pleading with him to leave before it got to be too late, he replied that there were still positions to be defended in Europe. Like Benjamin, Szondi committed suicide. But this does not mean that they were wrong. It is probably true that Geiger's vision of the German culture was too optimistic — König suggests that Marcel Reich-Ranicki resembles him in this way — but the same cannot be said of Benjamin and Szondi. Their hard unblinking eye defines them as critics.

In the session entitled "Tradition in Ruins," Barbara Hahn focuses attention on three women: Hannah Arendt, Margarete Susman,

and Bertha Badt-Strauss. Each was forced into exile, and each carried with her the broken pieces of a life and a tradition. Arendt and Badt-Strauss went to the United States and Susman went to Switzerland. It is Susman who provides the gripping image that Hahn offers as an embodiment of the experience of exile for Jewish intellectuals who were also emphatically German intellectuals. In her powerful confrontation with the fate of German Jewry and its path into the future, *Das Buch Hiob und das Schicksal des jüdischen Volkes*, Susman tells the story of a Jewish Germanist who in 1933 flung himself in front of an oncoming train and was torn to pieces. So it was figuratively with many German Jews, especially those who most fully invested themselves and their identity in the German tradition: writers, actors, cultural journalists, scholars of German language and literature. To compel a German to cease being German — to compel anyone to cease being what she is — destroys the self, tears it to bits. In Susman's vision, this soul-destroying coercion captures the fate of German Jews.

In American exile Hannah Arendt and Bertha Badt-Strauss continued to cultivate the German tradition, or what was left of it after the National Socialists seized control of it. So also did Susman in Switzerland. This much they had in common with the men who shared their fate. But Hahn calls our attention to the fact that these women more actively set about redefining that tradition. They were drawn not only to figures such as Lessing and Heine but also to Rahel Levin Varnhagen, Rosa Luxemburg, Charlotte von Stein and other women who were never quite taken seriously in a profession dominated by men. Work on forgotten or marginal women served at least in part as a kind of work on the self, a way of patching the broken bits of identity into a serviceable whole and at the same time as a way of redefining the scope of German culture and literature for the future. It is perhaps this point that must be stressed: along with grief, rage, and sorrow for a broken tradition and lives lost — what Germanists have conventionally thought of as literary “Trauerarbeit” — the work of Susman, Arendt, and Badt-Strauss is simultaneously creative and future-oriented. It has helped to enlarge, sharpen, and redefine our contemporary vision of the range and intellectual responsibility of Germanistik.

Gesa Dane responds to Hahn's lecture with an illuminating, and for the American audience overdue, portrait of Käte Hamburger's achievement. Somewhat younger than Susman, Arendt, and Badt-Strauss, Hamburger had aimed at an academic career in Germany, and unlike them she returned to Germany after the war. Evidently she too,

like Benjamin and Szondi, believed there remained important tasks for Jews in the German world. Still, the metaphor of a self torn to pieces may not be out of place in her case either. Dane emphasizes that Hamburger entertained no doubts about the end of the German-Jewish symbiosis — if it ever was a symbiosis. The nature of her writing before and after the Second World War shows distinctive differences of emphasis. Because her great work, *Die Logik der Dichtung*, is basically formalist in nature (a direct result, Dane points out, of Hamburger's work as a teacher of German language while in Swedish exile), one might be tempted to align her with the text-immanent school of criticism in the postwar German academy and its attempt to evade history and politics by focusing on the work or art as a phenomenon outside of time and place. Bracingly, Hamburger has a strong say on figures as diverse as Heine and Else Lasker-Schüler, Nelly Sachs, and of course Rahel Levin Varnhagen. Her reading of Levin Varnhagen takes sharp issue with that of both Susman, who aligns her with Romanticism in its gloomy Christian orientation toward death, and with Arendt, who places her in a tradition of Jewish suffering that culminates in the Holocaust. Hamburger's Rahel Levin Varnhagen is a life-affirming, non-Christian humanist, in spirit a kinswoman of Goethe. In this picture of Rahel lies a clue to Hamburger's critical disposition. Her criticism belongs not to the tradition of bloodless formalism but to that of liberal humanism which, as Ritchie Robertson points out, has a sharp critical edge that is revealed in her historically tempered criticism of Thomas Mann and Goethe.

Another figure who believed that there were still Jewish positions to defend in Germany and Europe was Hermann Levin Goldschmidt. In session four, Willi Goetschel discusses the place of this crucial figure in the history of modern Jewish letters. At a time when the modifier "German-Jewish" seemed a self-evident contradiction — as it still seems to many people — Goldschmidt argued eloquently and powerfully for a critical cultivation of German Jewry's legacy. Perhaps it is true that the expression "German-Jewish" entails a contradiction, but Goldschmidt is a theorist of contradiction — *Widerspruch* — as a form of discourse. He insists on the historical particularity and the autonomy of Jewish identity in the German-speaking world. Moreover, Goldschmidt refused to accept negative versions of Jewish identity, that is, definitions of Jewish identity imposed from the outside, whether as principal victim of Nazi genocide, as non-Christian, or as non-German. To be a Jew is first of all an affirmative mode of being. He saw it as the task of Jewish intellectuals, including literary intel-

lectuals, to face Jewish-German history squarely — including its contradictions — and, by working up a dialogue with the past, to assert a positive Jewish-defined vision of what it means to be a Jew in the second half of the twentieth century. Being Jewish is not to be defined against the background of some supposedly paradigmatic normalcy, Christian or otherwise, as if Judaism were a deviation from some salubrious ideal — like an illness that needs a cure. Historically, the “cure” for this condition has gone by different names, including expulsion, assimilation, baptism, repression, and Auschwitz. Jewish identity, any collective identity, should be a matter of self-determination, and literature is one of the scenes of such self-determination.

It is curious that Goldschmidt is not better known, given the sanity and clarity of his thought. Responding to Goetschel, Thomas Sparr offers a possible reason for this. Goldschmidt called for dialogue at a time when hardly anybody, German or Jewish or German-Jewish, was willing to talk. In fact, Sparr’s deliberations suggest that the prospects for dialogue still remain feeble on the German side of the divide. While some interest may be generated for the way in which Jews read German literature, he sees the lack of interest among German critics in Jewish literature as an unpropitious sign. And where there is interest — he cites the reception of Paul Celan and Nelly Sachs³⁵ — the specifically Jewish legacy remains misunderstood.

But just what the legacy of German Jewry should mean for the literary critic remains a point of heated contention. In session five, Walter Sokel gives a frank and candid account of his early years and motives for becoming a professor of German literature. As a refugee from Vienna to the United States, Sokel was drawn to the study of German not least of all by the realization that his memories, his roots, his very self were inseparable from the language and literature in which he had been reared. Living in a wartime America deeply hostile to the German culture with which he so strongly identified, Sokel experienced the potential annihilation of Germany as a threat to his own being. Consequently, he developed what might fairly be described as a sense of mission. He intended and intends in his work to demonstrate that the German-Jewish symbiosis was not a myth but an unrealized dream, that much of value has come from the German cultural sphere, that the Nazis were illegitimate interlopers, and that the Jewish contribution to German culture was and remains crucial. However many of his kith and kin the Nazis may have murdered, Sokel does not intend to let them kidnap German cultural history and the German-Jewish legacy as well.

During the response and discussion of Sokel's lecture, a conspicuous rift comes into view. Marc Weiner pointedly wonders whether Sokel may be considered in any way typical of Jewish critics, whether literature and culture may be legitimately taken to be the vehicle of German values, and whether Sokel's "unabashed investment in the Enlightenment project as based on a belief in its goals of ethical-moral enhancement and improvement through education" might not be doomed from the start by what has become known as the dialectic of Enlightenment. Susanne Klingenstein expresses surprise that Sokel did not identify with the Jews but instead with their German oppressors. Sokel writes that the Allied bombing of German cities angered him more than the news of Nazi genocide. Conversely, news of the Holocaust filled him, as he writes, with "an abysmal sadness." Some Jewish professors of German literature — the example of Sol Liptzin is mentioned — abandoned the study of German literature altogether. Would this constitute an abandonment of the German Jewish legacy? Is an everlasting line of division between Germans and Jews to be upheld? Is "German-Jewish" as a modifier simply an oxymoron or, at best, a historical fantasy? These questions are not so pointedly asked, but they hang in the air, demanding an answer that is not forthcoming.

In the final session Ritchie Robertson explores the work of three prominent literary intellectuals who emigrated from Europe to Britain: Siegbert Praver, J. P. Stern, and George Steiner. Interestingly, none of the three is a native German: Praver comes from Poland, Stern from Czechoslovakia, and Steiner — though of Viennese roots — was raised in France and then educated in the United States before settling in Britain and Switzerland. Like Hinrich Seeba, Robertson emphasizes the elegant, essayistic character of the work they have done — he focuses on a major book by each figure — and hence their contribution to the intellectual public sphere. Each of the three, but especially Steiner, has been involved in literary journalism, transcending the narrowness of conventional scholarship. Robertson notes that their cosmopolitan reach of interest and experience contrasts markedly with the earlier provincialism typical of British Germanistik, some of which also demonstrated an element of hostility to Jews. But the exact meaning of Jewishness for Steiner, Stern, and Praver, personally or for the practice of their criticism, is harder to specify. Each is a Central European émigré with a strong orientation to German literature and cultural tradition, with perhaps an overriding sense of commitment to a liberal humanism in the tradition of Lessing, Marx, Freud, Kafka, and Schoenberg. Each suffered at the hands of Germany, the source of

that tradition, because of his Jewish background. As different as they are individually as Jews, historical circumstance has forced them into a common context.

As exiles, their simultaneous detachment from and involvement in German literary tradition is perhaps one key among others to their critical accomplishments. Each has such a distinctly different sense of his own Jewishness and its relation to criticism that they evince little in common other than the experience of exile from their original homelands. Still, as David Suchoff observes in his response to Robertson, these are critics whose exile might conventionally seem to place them either in the tradition of the Wandering Jew or of assimilated figures in denial of their identities. One might suppose that each suffered from a sense of dividedness, a rift within that drives imaginative ambition. On the contrary, Suchoff observes in them a manifest commitment to confronting and exploring “a contradictory legacy that participates in and dissents from the notion of the German itself.” The problem is not Jews who are divided against themselves so much as a German tradition that is schizophrenic in its dealing with Jews.

In the category of public intellectual, no Jewish critic of German literature, indeed, no literary critic of any sort is more of a public figure than Marcel Reich-Ranicki. Peter Demetz’s discussion of Reich-Ranicki and his work concludes our volume. Like a good many of the critics under discussion at this conference, Reich-Ranicki is emphatically a liberal humanist; he is secular and Jewish in no sense other than that imposed upon him by family experience and conventional prejudice. Still, his longtime associate ventures the opinion that Reich-Ranicki’s Jewish affiliation may fairly be defined by a sense of “solemn loyalty to his kin and his continued solidarity with those, past and present, who have been humiliated, disadvantaged, persecuted, and killed.” In his book, *Über Ruhestörer: Juden in der deutschen Literatur*, published in 1973, Reich-Ranicki was one of the first postwar intellectuals to explore and affirm the specific role of Jewish writers, intellectuals and other disturbers of the German peace. Both Reich-Ranicki and Demetz himself could be included under the telling rubric of *Ruhestörer*. Like the critics he describes, Reich-Ranicki (along with Demetz) belongs to the tradition of German and European Enlightenment, with its confidence in skeptical critique, reasoned engagement, and public discourse.

In his lecture on Ludwig Geiger, Christoph König notes in passing that Reich-Ranicki’s confidence in the enlightened liberalism of German culture may be misplaced. Is there now a place for Jews in

Germany, or did Jews who returned there fall victim to an illusion about a German culture that has never really existed? Many participants of the conference referred to the existence of a German-Jewish symbiosis as a delusion, a one-way street, a lie. Perhaps high culture invidiously masks the true state of affairs in German life. On the other hand, as a refugee from Nazi terror in wartime Poland — both as an internee of the Warsaw ghetto and later on in hiding — Reich-Ranicki doubtless knows a good deal about German culture, both high and low. His return to Germany and to the German public sphere, as Demetz remarks, suggests a man determined to transform himself from the object of history into a shaper of the modern world. And in Germany, Reich-Ranicki has indeed become an extraordinarily influential shaper of public discourse about literature. But he was not the only one. Taken as a group, Jewish critics of German literature have powerfully shaped modern intellectual life, both inside and outside the university.

— THE EDITORS

Notes

¹ Egon Schwarz, *Keine Zeit für Eichendorff: Chronik unfreiwilliger Wanderjahre*, 2nd ed., with a new epilogue and an essay by Hans-Albert Walter (Frankfurt am Main: Büchergilde Gutenberg, 1992; first published in 1979), 276.

² Egon Schwarz, *Keine Zeit für Eichendorff*, 276. Similar statements can be found in Ruth Klüger, *weiter leben: Eine Jugend*, 4th ed. (Munich: dtv, 1995), 202; or Hans Eichner and Walter Sokel, quoted in *Lebenswege und Lieblingslektüren österreichischer NS-Vertriebener in den USA und Kanada*, ed. Beatrix Müller-Kampel in cooperation with Carla Carnevale (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000), 13.

³ See the overviews in Hans Schütz, *Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Eine deutsch-jüdische Literaturgeschichte im Überblick* (Munich: Piper, 1992); *Yale Companion to Jewish Writing and Thought in German Culture, 1096–1996*, edited by Sander L. Gilman and Jack Zipes (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1997); and Dieter Lamping, *Von Kafka bis Celan: Jüdischer Diskurs in der deutschen Literatur des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998). — For a recent critical discussion of the discourse on German-Jewish literature with suggestions for further reading, see Andreas B. Kilcher, “Was ist ‘deutsch-jüdische Literatur’? Eine historische Diskursanalyse,” *Weimarer Beiträge* 45 (1999): 485–517; and Amir Eshel, “Schreiben auf Jüdisch? Writing in Jewish?” *Germanic Review* 75 (2000): 91–98.

⁴ See for example Adolf Bartels, *Kritiker und Kritiker: pro domo et pro arte. Mit einem Anhang: Das Judentum in der deutschen Literatur* (Leipzig: Avenarius, 1903). On Bartels, the most prominent anti-Semitic literary critic, see Steven

Nyole Fuller, *The Nazis' Literary Grandfather: Adolf Bartels and Cultural Extremism, 1871–1945* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996).

⁵ A telling marker of this late discovery by the scholarly community is the publication history of Raul Hilberg's magisterial *The Destruction of the European Jews*, which was first published in the United States in 1961 but received little attention. It was a book, the political philosopher Judith Sklar supposedly said, that "had been published too early" (see Raul Hilberg, *The Politics of Memory: The Journey of a Holocaust Historian* [Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996], 123). Hilberg revised, expanded, and republished the English edition as a three-volume work in 1985; in Germany, a translation of the original did not appear until 1982 (by a small publishing house) and no major German publisher saw it into print until S. Fischer Verlag brought out the expanded version in 1990.

⁶ George Steiner, "K" (1963), in *Language and Silence: Essays on Language, Literature, and the Inhuman* (New York: Atheneum, 1967), 123.

⁷ George Steiner, "The Hollow Miracle," in *Language and Silence: Essays on Language, Literature, and the Inhuman* (New York: Atheneum, 1967), 96. For a discussion of the controversy ignited by this essay, which was written in 1959, see Amir Eshel, "Die hohle Sprache: Die Debatte um George Steiners 'Das hohle Wunder,'" in *Deutsche Nachkriegsliteratur und der Holocaust*, ed. Holger Gehle, Doron Kiesel, Hanno Loewy, and Stephan Braese (Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus, 1998), 317–30.

⁸ Lawrence L. Langer, *The Holocaust and the Literary Imagination* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1975); *The Age of Atrocity: Death in Modern Literature* (Boston: Beacon P, 1978); *Versions of Survival: The Holocaust and the Human Spirit* (Albany: State U of New York P, 1982); more recently *Art from the Ashes: A Holocaust Anthology* (New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995) and *Preempting the Holocaust* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1998).

⁹ It is indicative, for example, that directly after the television series "Holocaust," the *New German Critique* in 1980 devoted three special issues to "Germans and Jews."

¹⁰ Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, "Foreword," in *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), xix. The argument is elaborated in the same volume in Felman's penetrating article "The Return of the Voice: Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah*" (204–84).

¹¹ Geoffrey H. Hartman, "Introduction" to the volume he edited on the occasion President Ronald Reagan's visit in 1985 to the military cemetery in Bitburg, *Bitburg in Moral and Political Perspective* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1986), 2. The volume is dedicated to "all who have contributed to the Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies at Yale." In his "Polemical Memoir" Hartman also reflects on his own support of Jewish Studies since the 1980s as "a variant of 'opening of the canon'" (Geoffrey Hartman, "Polemical Memoir," in *A Critic's Journey: Literary Reflections, 1958–1998* [New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1999], xi–xxxi, here xxvii).

¹² For one key text defining this position see Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Larry Grossberg (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1988), 271–313.

¹³ Peter Demetz, *After the Fires: Recent Writing in the Germanies, Austria, and Switzerland* (San Diego, New York, and London: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1986), 30.

¹⁴ Sander L. Gilman, *Inscribing the Other* (Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 1991), 17. An earlier version of this introduction "How and Why Study the Other?" was published in a special issue of the *German Quarterly* on "Germanistik as German Studies: Interdisciplinary Theories and Methods" as "Why and How I Study the German," *German Quarterly* 62.2 (1989): 192–204, with a critical response by Leslie A. Adelson, "Der, die oder das Holocaust? A Response to Sander L. Gilman's Paper," *German Quarterly* 62.2 (1989): 205–9.

¹⁵ Sander L. Gilman, *Inscribing the Other* (Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 1991), 17.

¹⁶ Zohn wrote his dissertation on "Stefan Zweig as Mediator in Modern European Literature" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1952). See also his *Wiener Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays* (Tel-Aviv: Olamenu, 1964), a collection of essays on Arthur Schnitzler, Stefan Zweig, Richard Beer-Hofmann, Peter Altenberg, and Karl Kraus; *Österreichische Juden in der Literatur: Ein bio-bibliographisches Lexikon* (Tel Aviv: Olamenu, 1969); and "... ich bin ein Sohn der deutschen Sprache nur ...": *Jüdisches Erbe in der österreichischen Literatur* (Vienna and Munich: Amalthea, 1986).

¹⁷ See Lola Fleck's interview with Harry Zohn in 1993: "Ich habe mir meine Muttersprache nicht vermiesen oder rauben lassen," in *Lebenswege und Lieblingslektüren österreichischer NS-Vertriebener in den USA und Kanada*, ed. Beatrix Müller-Kampel in cooperation with Carla Carnevale (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000), 219–54, which also provides an extensive bibliography of Zohn's critical works, translations, and editions.

¹⁸ Hans Mayer, *Outsiders: A Study in Life and Letters*, trans. Denis M. Sweet (Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1982). German original: *Aussenseiter* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1975).

¹⁹ Konrad Feilchenfeldt, "Die Wiederentdeckung des 'Juden' in der Neueren deutschen Literaturwissenschaft nach 1945," in *Zeitenwechsel: Germanistische Literaturwissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, ed. Wilfried Barner and Christoph König (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1996), 231–44.

²⁰ *Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Ein deutsch-israelisches Symposium*, ed. Stéphane Mosès and Albrecht Schöne (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986).

²¹ Vol. 1 issued as *Der Deutschunterricht* 36.4 (1984) and vol. 2 as *Der Deutschunterricht* 37.3 (1985).

²² See, for example, Claudio Magris, *Weit von wo: Verlorene Welt des Ostjudentums* (Vienna: Europaverlag, 1974); Charlene A. Lea, *Emancipation, Assimilation and Stereotype: The Image of the Jew in German and Austrian Drama, 1800–1850* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1978); Klara Pomeranz Carmely, *Das Identitätsproblem jüdischer Autoren im deutschen Sprachraum: Von der Jahrhundertwende bis zu Hitler* (Königstein/Ts.: Scriptor, 1981); *In den Katakomben: Jüdische Verlage in Deutschland 1933–1938*, ed. Ingrid Belke (Marbach: Marbacher Magazin 25, 1983); Siegbert S. Prawer, *Heine's Jewish Comedy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983); *Juden und*

Judentum in der Literatur, ed. Herbert A. Strauss und Christhard Hoffmann (Munich: dtv, 1985).

²³ The proceedings including the discussions were published as *Modernisierung oder Überfremdung? Zur Wirkung deutscher Exilanten in der Germanistik der Aufnahmeländer*, ed. Walter Schmitz (Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 1994). Among the invited scholars were Richard Thieberger, Paul Hoffmann, Hans Reiss, Guy Stern, Egon Schwarz, Friedrich Georg Friedmann, Henry Remak, and Hans Eichner. Three years earlier, in 1988, and on the fortieth anniversary of the "Anschluss," the Österreichische Gesellschaft für Literatur cooperated with Harry Zohn in inviting eleven American Jewish scholars of German literature, who had been forced into emigration from Austria in 1938/39, to a symposium in Vienna. The contributions of the symposium are published in *Leben mit österreichischer Literatur: Begegnung mit aus Österreich stammenden amerikanischen Germanisten 1938/1988*, ed. Dokumentationsstelle für neuere österreichische Literatur and Österreichische Gesellschaft für Literatur, Zirkular, Sondernummer 20, April 1990. The colloquium included the following participants: Wolfgang Kraus, Harry Zohn, Walter A. Sokel, Joseph Fabry, George Wellwarth, Evelyn Torton-Beck, Peter Heller, Carl Steiner, Franz Bäuml, Alfred Hoelzel, Susan E. Cernyak-Spatz, Herbert Lederer, Walter Grossmann, and Egon Schwarz. See also the English translation, *Language and Culture: A Transcending Bond: Essays and Memoirs by American Germanists of Austro-Jewish descent*, ed. Susan E. Cernyak-Spatz and Charles S. Merrill (New York, Berlin, Bern, Frankfurt am Main, Paris, and Vienna: Lang, 1993).

²⁴ See the treatment, and further references, in Walter Schmitz's "Vorbemerkung," in *Modernisierung oder Überfremdung? Zur Wirkung deutscher Exilanten in der Germanistik der Aufnahmeländer*, ed. Walter Schmitz (Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler, 1994), vii–xix, here xii. See also Regina Weber, "Zur Remigration des Germanisten Richard Alewyn," in *Die Emigration der Wissenschaften nach 1933: Disziplingeschichtliche Studien*, ed. Herbert A. Strauss, Klaus Fischer, Christhard Hoffmann, and Alfons Söllner (Munich: Saur, 1991), 235–56; Weber, "Der emigrierte Germanist als 'Führer' zur deutschen Dichtung? Werner Vordtriede im Exil," in *Exilforschung: Internationales Jahrbuch*, vol. 13 (Munich: Edition Text und Kritik, 1995), 137–65; Carsten Zelle, "Emigrantengespräch: Ein Brief Richard Alewyns an Karl Viëtor," *Euphorion* 84 (1990): 213–27; Zelle, "Karl Viëtor: Zum Gedächtnis seines 100. Geburtstages," in *Giessener Universitätsblätter*, Dec. 1992, 25–42; Gisela Hoecherl-Alden, "Germanisten im 'Niemandland': Die exilierten Akademiker und ihre Wirkung auf die amerikanische Germanistik (1933–1955)," (Ph.D. diss. University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1996); and most recently *Lebenswege und Lieblingslektüren österreichischer NS-Vertriebener in den USA und Kanada*, ed. Beatrix Müller-Kampel in cooperation with Carla Carnevale (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000), which includes interviews with Walter Sokel, Peter Heller, Herbert Lederer, Hans Eichner, Egon Schwarz, Harry Zohn, Dorrit Cohn, Ruth Klüger, and Evelyn Torton-Beck. See also Meike G. Werner, "Germanistik in the Shadow of the Holocaust. The Changing Profile of the Professoriate, 1942–1970," in *German Studies in the USA: A Historical Handbook*, ed. Peter Uwe Hohendahl et al. (forthcoming).

²⁵ David Suchoff, "Jüdische Kritik in der amerikanischen Nachkriegsgermanistik," *Weimarer Beiträge* 39.1 (1993): 393–409, here 394.

²⁶ Erich Heller, *The Disinherited Mind: Essays in Modern German Literature and Thought* (Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1952); Heinz Politzer, *Franz Kafka: Parable and Paradox* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1962).

²⁷ See the review by Thomas Steinfeld, "Gross und klein: Jüdische Germanisten der ersten Stunde in Amerika," in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Oct. 1, 1997.

²⁸ The editors would like to thank Hanne Knickmann from the German Literary Archive in Marbach, a member of a collective group of scholars working on an *Internationales Germanistenlexikon*, for her help in procuring information on a number of scholars of German literature. For further information, one may now consult the *Internationales Germanistenlexikon 1800–1950*, ed. Christoph König, in association with Birgit Wägenbaur, and assisted by Andrea Frindt, Hanne Knickmann, Volker Michel, Angelika Reinthal, and Karla Rommel, 3 vols. (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 2002). An extended version of the three volumes will be available on CD-ROM.

²⁹ In addition to Schwarz's autobiography *Keine Zeit für Eichendorff*, published in 1979, see George Steiner, *Errata: An Examined Life* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1997); Marcel Reich-Ranicki, *Mein Leben* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1999); and Geoffrey Hartman, "Polemical Memoir," in *A Critic's Journey: Literary Reflections, 1958–1998* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1999), xi–xxxi.

³⁰ Peter Demetz, "On Auschwitz, and On Writing in German: A Letter to a Student," in *After the Fires: Recent Writing in the Germanies, Austria, and Switzerland* (San Diego, New York and London: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1986), 18–56. See also Lola Fleck's interview with Dorrit Cohn, "Emigranten, alles Emigranten . . .," in *Lebenswege und Lieblingslektüren österreichischer NS-Vertriebener in den USA und Kanada*, ed. Beatrix Müller-Kampel in cooperation with Carla Carnevale (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000), 255–73.

³¹ Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Nathan der Weise. Vollst. Text. Dokumentation*, ed. Peter Demetz (Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1967).

³² Dorrit Cohn, *The Sleepwalkers: Elucidations of Hermann Broch's Trilogy* (The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1966).

³³ Egon Schwarz, for example, reflects on this question in his essay "Method and Memoir of the Emigré Scholar: A Viennese Consciousness in the Andes," in *Latin America and the Literature of Exile*, ed. Hans-Bernhard Moeller (Heidelberg: Winter, 1983), 91–96.

³⁴ In 1999 Christoph König in cooperation with Barbara Hahn and the Marbacher Arbeitskreis für die Erforschung der Geschichte der Germanistik organized a conference on "Jüdische Intellektuelle und die Philologien in Deutschland 1871–1933." The conference proceedings appeared as *Jüdische Intellektuelle und die Philologien in Deutschland 1871–1933*, ed. Wilfried Barner and Christoph König (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2001).

³⁵ Thomas Sparr, "Zeit der Todesfuge: Rezeption der Lyrik von Nelly Sachs und Paul Celan," in *Deutsche Nachkriegsliteratur und der Holocaust*, ed. Stephan Brae-

se, Holger Gehle, and Hanno Loewy (Frankfurt am Main, New York: Campus, 1998), 43–52.

1: Cultural Poetics