

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Stähler, Axel (2009) Orientalist Strategies of Dissociation in a German "Jewish" Novel: 'Das neue Jerusalem' (1905) and its Context. *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 45 (1). pp. 51-89. ISSN 0015-8518.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1093/fmls/cqn060>

Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/14703/>

Document Version

UNSPECIFIED

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

ORIENTALIST STRATEGIES OF DISSOCIATION IN A GERMAN “JEWISH” NOVEL: *DAS NEUE JERUSALEM* (1905) AND ITS CONTEXT

ABSTRACT

This article traces notions of Jewish Orientalism current in German-speaking countries around the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century. Expounding the cultural context of its production, it focuses in particular on an anonymously published novel which provoked a short but heated debate among German-Jewish critics. Purporting to be the work of a Jewish author, but in fact written by a non-Jewish anti-Semite, *Das neue Jerusalem* appears to be situated quite deliberately at the interface between anti-Semitic and Zionist discourses and to be the vehicle of subversive strategies of dissociation: it presumes not only to speak *to* its Jewish readers but, from an (allegedly) inside perspective, to speak *for* them. Thus, in effect, it attempts to insinuate Orientalist stereotypes to its Jewish readers with the aim of relegating them quite literally to “their” place in the Orient (Palestine). But it is obviously also intended to intervene in the contemporary debate about the “authenticity” of Jewish cultural production and ventures to set prescriptive standards to proper Jewishness, especially in the field of literary production. For its gentile reader, the supposedly Jewish provenance of the novel confirms Jewish otherness, lends credibility to its allegations, and seemingly takes the edge off its anti-Semitism: Jewish dissociation appears to be justified and, indeed, mutually desirable.

Keywords: Orientalism; early 20th-century; German literature; Zionism; anti-Semitism; Jewish Renaissance; Jewish literature; synagogue architecture; Hauser, Otto; Herzl, Theodor; Bartels, Adolf

ANONYMOUSLY PUBLISHED in Germany in 1905, a novel with the title *Das neue Jerusalem: Ein jüdischer Roman* provoked a short but heated debate among German-Jewish critics.¹ While none of them thought to question the Jewish identity of the author, his conceptions of Jewishness and, especially, of the Zionist movement were strongly criticised.

The author of the novel was a certain Otto Hauser (1876–1944)² who had once belonged to the Viennese circle that surrounded Theodor Herzl (1860–1904).³ However, Hauser was not only not Jewish but first surfaced in the early years of the twentieth century as an ardent anti-Semite. Although he professed his admiration of the past of the Jewish people, Hauser demanded – for their own good – that Jews be excluded from German culture which, he claimed, was alien to them, their participation in it serving only to alienate themselves from their own true Jewish heritage and to pervert German cultural

purity. This standard notion of German anti-Semitism is already articulated in *Das neue Jerusalem*. It is ascribed to its Jewish protagonist, David Herzberg, who becomes the founder of a Zionist movement – in partial analogy to Herzl, who had died the year before.⁴ In fact, Herzl's writings – his programmatic *Der Judenstaat* (1896) as well as his novel *Altneuland* (1902) – to some degree provide a foil for Herzberg's own programmatic text, eponymous with the novel, in which he discusses Jewish morals and culture in the diaspora and which is a distillation of his own painful experience of (alleged) Jewish depravity and degeneration: the “new” Jerusalem is his vision of the restoration of the Jewish people to its true self.

Aesthetically not very ambitious and ideologically provocative, Hauser's novel is nonetheless of particular interest to any discussion of “Jewish Orientalism”. Not only does it reiterate and focus an Orientalist discourse current in Germany around the turn of the last century centred on stereotypes of the Jewish Other, but, purporting to be the work of a Jewish author, it moreover appears to be the vehicle of subversive strategies of dissociation, deliberately aimed at insinuating these very stereotypes to the Jewish reader. That this attempt proved to be partially successful is suggested by the response of German-Jewish critics to the novel which, in turn, reveals their Jewish Orientalism from within (especially as informed by Zionism).

By contextualising Hauser's text, by showing it to be paradigmatic in some respects and “exceptional” in others, and especially by situating it in the contemporary (Orientalist) discourse of Jewishness and Jewish cultural production, it is the purpose of this article to explore the interdependence of Jewish Orientalism from without and from within as it emerges in Hauser's novel and in the reaction it provoked among Jewish critics.

*

“Ich glaube, nur die Antisemiten können behaupten, daß Palästina unser Vaterland sei . . .”⁵ Naturally, Friedrich Löwenberg's initial scepticism is allayed in the course of Theodor Herzl's utopian novel *Altneuland*. It is, after all, Herzl's purpose to advertise Palestine as the historically legitimised and pre-determined location of the future Jewish State. Yet Löwenberg's objection was one not unfamiliar to Herzl and the early Zionists. It had been voiced, for instance, by the Viennese critic and satirist Karl Kraus (1874–1936) in his *Eine Krone für Zion* (1898).⁶ Himself an assimilated Jew very much opposed to Zionism and certainly not contemplating emigration, Kraus takes issue in his pamphlet with the emerging Zionist movement. In its very first sentence he equates the Zionist ambition to resettle the Jews in Palestine with the anti-Semitic objective of expelling them from their countries of residence:⁷

Einer der Herren, die sich jetzt als Geschichtsanwälte des jüdischen Volkes aufwerfen und mit seltsam gen Sonnenaufgang verdrehten Augen für die Rückkehr aller übrigen

Juden nach dem Stammland Palästina agitieren, ersuchte mich vor einiger Zeit, einen kleinen Beitrag zu jenen Zwecken beizusteuern, die man zionistische oder mit einem guten alten Wort antisemitische nennt.⁸

In Herzl's novel, Palestine is, at this stage, no more than a stopover in the itinerary of the assimilated Austrian Jew Löwenberg and his misanthropic gentile companion Kingscourt. Disgusted with human behaviour, and in the case of Löwenberg particularly with Jewish behaviour corrupted by an existence in exile, they seek the isolation of a secluded island.

The Palestine they visit on their way is stereotypically "Oriental" in its squalor. With the exception of one nostalgic moment in Jerusalem, it feels entirely alien to the "European" Löwenberg and nothing it offers can challenge his decision. Because he is himself a victim of life in the diaspora, alienated from himself and the traditions of his people, he lacks the vision to recognise the beneficial potential of a Jewish colonisation for both the degenerate Jewish people and the degenerate Jewish land as it had been propagated in Zionist discourse. Emphasising the disenchantment of the European travellers with this part of the Orient, Herzl's ambivalent portrayal of Palestine conforms strikingly to Orientalist stereotypes as described by Edward Said in his *Orientalism*.⁹ At night the walls of Jerusalem soar "in märchenhaftem Mondesglanz" (*Altneuland*, p. 47). But in the light of day the city is made repulsive by its human element:

Geschrei, Gestank, ein Geflirr unreiner Farben, ein Durcheinander zerlumpter Menschen in den engen dumpfen Gassen, Bettler, Kranke, hungernde Kinder, kreischende Weiber, heulende Händler. (*Altneuland*, p. 48)

The disappointment of Westerners, both Jewish and gentile, is reinforced by the comparison with Jerusalem's glorious past: "Tiefer konnte das einst so königliche Jerusalem nicht sinken" (*Altneuland*, p. 48). Now, the palpable manifestation of Oriental degeneracy, the stifling reek of decay, pervades everything (*Altneuland*, p. 46).

While *Der Judenstaat* was completed and published before he ever saw the country, Herzl wrote his novel after he had visited Palestine in 1898, and it may to some degree be informed by his own disenchantment with the reality of contemporary Palestine. What he envisages is a "Romantic redemptive project" precisely of the kind referred to by Said in his *Orientalism*.¹⁰ Indeed, what Said claims for Gérard de Nerval and others¹¹ may be true even more of Herzl. His novel, like other works of "Oriental-style European literature", was "based on personal experiences of the Orient" and renders "a comprehensive *interpretation*" of it which "is a form of Romantic restructuring of the Orient, a re-vision of it, which restores it redemptively to the present"¹² – or, in Herzl's case, to the future he sketches in his utopian novel. The "reinterpretation" and "rebuilding" of the Orient,¹³ or rather a distinct geographical entity within the Orient, is connected in Herzl's case to the "fulfillment of some deeply felt and urgent

project”¹⁴ – the settlement of the persecuted Jewish masses in Palestine and the creation of a Jewish model state.

Thus, when Löwenberg and Kingscourt return to Palestine twenty years later, the country has changed profoundly. Although some vestiges of the Oriental remain – and the word is chosen deliberately here because indeed the “Oriental” rests now merely in the externals, as becomes clear in the course of the novel – the dominant impression is one of “Europeanness”:

Es fand hier offenbar ein Verkehr aller Völker statt, denn man sah die buntesten Trachten des Morgenlandes zwischen Gewändern des Occidents. Chinesen, Perser, Araber wandelten durch die geschäftige Menge. Vorherrschend war freilich die Kleidung des Abendlandes, wie diese Stadt ja überhaupt einen durchaus europäischen Eindruck machte. (*Altheuland*, p. 68)

The change has been wrought by Jewish colonisation. Indeed, the colonising Jews, in true imperialist fashion, appear as emissaries, or even “missionaries”, of European, or Western, culture and civilisation in Herzl’s novel.¹⁵ Encountering a quasi-primordial state of neglect, they establish a new culture which would make use of the technical achievements of the West:

Das war einer der großen Vorzüge der Einrichtung einer neuen Kultur in diesen Gegenden gewesen. Gerade weil hier alles bis zum Ende des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts völlig vernachlässigt, in einer Art von Urzustand lag, hatte man gleich die neuesten und höchsten technischen Errungenschaften benützen können. [...] Die Erfahrungen aller Kulturvölker standen ja den jüdischen Ansiedlern, die aus aller Welt herbeiströmten, zu Gebote. (*Altheuland*, p. 144)

Being able to draw on the experiences of the civilised nations, that is to say the Western nations, the colonising Jews are extolled as model Europeans or Westerners who achieve a kind of redemption not only for (part of) the Orient and for themselves but, by creating a model society and choosing the best of the West (*Altheuland*, pp. 84–93), even for the civilised Occident.¹⁶

*

Herzl’s Orientalism is paradigmatic of a widespread Jewish Orientalism in German-speaking countries which was not restricted to the movement of political Zionism launched by him in 1897 and which took many forms. A very telling example is the architecture of synagogues.¹⁷

In the 1850s, the “Moorish” style had become popular for new city synagogues in Germany, with that of Leipzig (1855) as its paragon.¹⁸ In contemporary architectural theory, Arabic, or Moorish, architecture was considered to have been a precursor of the highly valued Gothic style.¹⁹ Yet it was deemed to be merely decorative and lacking in architectural character and thus inferior.²⁰ Most vociferous in discriminating between the Arabic and Gothic styles was Carl Schnaase (1798–1875) in his widely disseminated *Geschichte der bildenden*

Künste (1843–), which was used as a textbook by many German students of art and architecture. Emphasising the kinship of the Semitic peoples, the art historian moreover suggests that (ancient) Jewish architecture was closely related to the Arabic and that it was to be interpreted accordingly.²¹ Articulating and perpetuating numerous prejudices of, and polemics against, the Semitic peoples, Schnaase's *Geschichte* is indeed a "textbook" example of both latent and manifest Orientalism.²²

When, in the wake of Jewish emancipation, the need was felt to find genuinely "Jewish" forms of expression in cultural practices, the Arabic, or Moorish, style suggested itself.²³ The Gothic and even the Romanesque styles, less highly regarded in the middle of the nineteenth century, were firmly associated with Christian sacred architecture and might have been considered presumptuous in Jewish synagogues.²⁴ The Moorish style, however, redeemed (to some degree) by its purported precursor status to Gothic architecture, seemed appropriate to give a character of their own to Jewish sacred buildings and to distinguish them from profane and Christian sacred architecture.²⁵ The adoption of an Oriental style for the architecture of synagogues and the concomitant "admission" to an Oriental past did not mean, however, that Jewish congregations wanted to emphasise their "otherness" in any nationalistic sense.²⁶ Thus, on the occasion of the laying of the foundation stone in 1855 and, in 1860, of the opening of the new main synagogue (Hauptsynagoge) of Frankfurt, Rabbi Leopold Stein (1810–1882) repeatedly stressed Jewish loyalty to the German nation.²⁷ Indeed, a commemorative text in both Hebrew and German had been placed in the foundation stone in 1855:

zum Zeugnis, daß hier einst ertönen soll, die heilige Sprache der Schrift, die begeisterte Sprache unserer Vergangenheit, und mit ihr innig verschwistert, unsere Muttersprache, die theure und vertraute, die Sprache unserer Gegenwart und Zukunft [i.e. German]. Auf dem Grunde beider Sprachen erhebe sich das Heiligtum, welches wir auf dem Urgrunde der Vergangenheit bauen wollen in die Zukunft hinein.²⁸

In fact, the exterior of this synagogue, built by Johann Georg Kayser (1817–1875) between 1855 and 1860 and destroyed in 1938, combined both Moorish and Gothic elements. While the former seem to have been intended to show the remembrance of, and the attachment to, the old religion, the latter appear to have been meant to demonstrate the affiliation with the German nation.²⁹

In the face of an ever-increasing anti-Semitism, the danger of misunderstanding inherent in the use of Oriental architecture by Jewish communities led from the 1890s in many cases to the adoption of a neo-Romanesque style.³⁰ This style was favoured by the imperial house and had emerged since the late 1880s in sacred (Christian) as well as in profane architecture as a kind of national style. To build synagogues in the very same "German" style and to eschew any Oriental or particularly Jewish forms of expression was thus to declare unequivocally, and monumentally, Jewish loyalty to the German fatherland.³¹

The founding of the *Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens* in Berlin in 1893 coincided with this development. In Article 1 of its statutes it affirmed: “Wir deutschen Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens stehen fest auf dem Boden der deutschen Nationalität.”³² Its declared aims were the implementation of full civic rights for Jews and the struggle against anti-Semitism. In its early stages generally advocating cultural assimilation, the *C.-V.* (as it was called) would not have condoned the “separatist” Orientalism inherent in the Zionist ideologies.³³ Indeed, to the *C.-V.*, Herzl’s and the political Zionists’ Orientalism must have been just as unacceptable as that of the cultural Zionists. This had been articulated in Germany most comprehensively by Martin Buber (1878–1965).

Essential to Buber’s Orientalism was his conception of a “Jewish Renaissance”.³⁴ This term he had defined in his well-known eponymous article in the first issue of the periodical *Ost und West: Illustrierte Monatsschrift für modernes Judentum* (founded in 1901) as the formation of a regenerated cultural and ethnic identity of the Jewish people.³⁵ The movement towards a Jewish Renaissance was meant to neutralise the supposed dichotomy between thought and action, to gather the creative powers and awaken the gift of Jewish painting, sculpture and poetry.³⁶ The Jewish Renaissance was, according to Buber’s cultural Zionism, the necessary prerequisite of any political solution to the “Jewish question” as pursued by the Zionist Organisation founded by Herzl. Buber urged that only once the Jewish Renaissance had been achieved was a Jewish State imaginable: “Uns liegt ein innerer Kampf ob, bevor wir den Weg der anderen Völker betreten.”³⁷

Where Herzl had envisaged in his novel what amounted to a mere transplant of European culture to the Orient – in his vision of *Altneuland* there are German, English, French, Italian and Spanish theatres (*Altneuland*, p. 91), and in his *Der Judenstaat* he actually proposed the new state to be a bulwark against Asiatic barbarism³⁸ – Buber anticipated the creation of a new Jewish cultural identity from the age-old origins.³⁹ His Orientalism, very different from Herzl’s, yet no less evident, rests in his own Romantic re-vision of the Jewish past in the Orient claiming Jewish uniqueness and dissociation from other Oriental peoples, even though the prohibitive character of the Jewish law may have resulted in transgression and the participation in the others’ “exotic orgies”:

Als wir noch das kleine weltbewegende Volk jenes seltsam gesegneten Erdenwinkels waren, da *schufen* wir Geistiges, aber wir waren voll starken expansiven Lebensgefühls, das oft genug überschäumte und sich, wenn das eigene Gesetz keinen Raum dafür liess, in den fremdartigen Orgien der unproduktiven Nachbarvölker auszuleben versuchte; und in Wahrheit blühten gerade aus diesem Lebensgefühl, lose in ihm ruhend wie Seerosen auf den Fluten, unsere grossen *Geistes-Schöpfungen* auf. Das Exil wirkte wie eine Folterschraube: das Lebensgefühl wurde verrenkt. Die äussere Knechtung der “Wirtsvölker” und die innere Zwingherrschaft des Gesetzes trugen in gleichem Masse dazu bei, das Lebensgefühl von seinem natürlichen Ausdruck, dem freien Schaffen in Wirklichkeit und Kunst, abzulenken; es verirrte sich in krankhafte Erscheinungen, wie Chuzpe und Chassidismus.⁴⁰

Even so, his characterisation of the Jewish Oriental past is hardly more than a reiteration of the well-established stereotypes which also informed, for instance, Schnaase's theory of Oriental (Semitic) art and architecture. The art historian had perceived a fundamental similarity in Arab and Jewish artistic development:

Es ist dieselbe Richtung des Monotheismus, des *Gegensatzes* zwischen einem geistig gedachten Gotte und der materiellen Natur, welche bei beiden ihr ganzes Wesen durchdringt und eine einseitige Schärfe des Verstandes neben einer gesteigerten Thätigkeit der Phantasie erzeugt.⁴¹

Buber likewise sees the origins of Jewish creativity in a "luxurious" abundance of the imagination which engendered Jewish creations of the spirit. However, while Schnaase is concerned exclusively with antiquity, Buber's perspective is diachronic. The Oriental "feeling of being alive", quenched by both external and internal suppression, is a quality modern Jewry (certainly Western Jewry), alienated from its origins, needs to recover. Only then can it completely regenerate and, by bringing to a new life its creativity, take its place among the civilised nations.⁴²

One attempt to further the Jewish Renaissance that combined aspects of both political and cultural Zionism in the so-called practical Zionism was the founding of the Bezalel museum and arts and crafts school in Jerusalem by Boris Schatz (1866–1932) in 1906.⁴³ Another was the establishment of the Jüdischer Verlag in Berlin in 1902 by Buber, Berthold Feiwel (1875–1937), E. M. Lilien (1874–1925) and Davis Trietsch (1870–1935). The Jüdischer Verlag printed 242 works of Jewish authors until it was closed down by the Gestapo in 1938.⁴⁴ In the *Israelitische Rundschau*⁴⁵ it had been advertised as follows:

Die neue Epoche der jüdischen Kulturentwicklung, die wir miterleben dürfen, hat auf allen Gebieten litterarischen und künstlerischen Schaffens bedeutsame Ideen und Werke reifen lassen. Wieder nach langer, langer Zeit sind die Bedingungen für ein Aufblühen des jüdischen Geistes und der jüdischen Kunst gegeben. Noch fehlt aber eine einheitliche Zusammenfassung des [*sic*] Schaffenden, ein Zentrum, von dem aus ihre Werke in alle Kreise des Volkes getragen werden sollen. Zugleich aber fehlt unserem Volke, das solange im Dunkel der Unbildung gefangen war oder durch eine fremddienerische und geschmacklose Litteratur verwirrt wurde, eine sowohl ethisch und ästhetisch einwandfreie als auch wahrhaft jüdische Sammlung erhebender, belehrender und nach jeder Richtung erzieherisch wirkender Bücher. Der Jüdische Verlag unternimmt es, diesen tiefen Bedürfnissen – der Schaffenden einerseits, des Volkes andererseits – Erfüllung zu bringen.⁴⁶

The objective, then, is to mediate between the Oriental and the Occidental and to create anew a literature that is ethically and aesthetically "truly Jewish".

*

Anticipating a new blossoming of Jewish literature, in 1888 the German-Jewish literary historian Gustav Karpeles (1848–1909) had published an anthology of Hebrew poetry in German translation with the title *Die Zionsharfe*.⁴⁷ In his

preface to this comprehensive anthology, in which he had gathered Hebrew poems from the eighth century to his immediate present, Karpeles laments: “Die Harfe von Zion ist verstummt.”⁴⁸ But then, assuming a special relationship between German and Jewish poetry, he continues:

Zum ersten Mal werden hier diese Stimmen der Klage und des Elends, aber auch der Freude und der nimmer rastenden Liebe gesammelt; zum ersten Mal werden sie, in deutschem Geiste nachgebildet, dem Geschlecht, dem es beschieden war, [den] neuen Morgen zu schauen, wie der Nation, die berufen ist, alle Völker dieser Erde zu einem Weltgespräch am deutschen Herde zu sammeln und so den Tempelbau jener Weltpoesie zu beginnen, den schon der greise Dichterstürm [i.e. Goethe] ahnte und plante, treu und bescheiden übergeben.⁴⁹

Finally he declares:

So erklinge denn die Zionsharfe von Neuem wieder! Und möge ihr Saitenspiel Liebe und Versöhnung wecken, möge es ihm beschieden sein, Israels Jugend zu den Quellen seiner Poesie zu führen und im deutschen Vaterlande für die alten Klänge aus Juda’s Dichterstern neue Teilnahme zu wecken.⁵⁰

Whether this was indeed the effect of the Jewish poetry anthologised by Karpeles must be considered doubtful, at least with regard to its German reception. In the 1880s the foundations of a decidedly anti-Semitic conception of literature,⁵¹ which sprouted ever more flowers of evil until 1945, had already been laid by some German scholars – most notorious among them perhaps Eugen Dühring (1833–1921) with his *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage* (1881).⁵² An unprejudiced “sympathy” for the “old sounds” was hardly to be expected, and the ostentatious optimism of the Jewish literary historian – evoking for corroboration Goethe’s idea of a global poesy – may well indicate his perception of this development and, perhaps, his defensive attitude.

In making the “fountains” of Jewish poetry more accessible to those German Jews who did not read Hebrew, Karpeles’ anthology may have been more successful. The Jewish literary heritage had assumed a distinct political and cultural significance not least among national-Jewish intellectuals. “Man kann gar wohl behaupten, die ersten Keime der zionistischen Idee, die soweit zurückliegen, sind rein dichterische,” Robert Jaffé (1870–1911) claimed in his essay on “Unsere Dichtung”,⁵³ published in 1898 in *Die Welt*, the “central organ” of the Zionist movement and founded the year before by Herzl. In his own day, Jaffé sees in Zionism a power which restitutes to the Jewish author the joy of being alive (similar to Buber’s “Lebensgefühl”) and which enables him to achieve “authenticity”.⁵⁴ For corroboration of his theory Jaffé quotes extensively from *Rembrandt als Erzieher: Von einem Deutschen* (1890). Published anonymously by Julius Langbehn (1851–1907) this pamphlet, in which Rembrandt is styled an artist of the Nordic race, later became the basis of National Socialist artistic theory. In it Langbehn prophesies the advent of a “secret emperor”, and he says, as quoted by Jaffé:

Wer ein echter Israelit ohne Falsch ist, wie die Bibel sagt, der wird sicherlich jenem künftigen Richter und Führer willkommen sein; willkommen als ein ehrlicher und vielleicht auch geistvoller Fremdling; von den "gefälschten" Juden, die zugleich Deutsche sein wollen, gilt dies nicht. Denn ehrlich und ehrenhaft ist nur der, welcher sich selbst treu bleibt. Echten Juden können sich echte Deutsche recht wohl befreunden; auch solchen, die sich wie Spinoza, Rahel, Börne nur ein edles abstractes Judenthum bewahrt haben, aber gegen alle unechten Juden werden alle echten Deutschen stets zusammenstehen.⁵⁵

With "Unsere Dichtung" Jaffé means, of course, Jewish, and more particularly, German-Jewish poetry. That he quotes for Jewish self-definition from an overtly anti-Semitic text is an example of the uncanny convergence of the Zionist and anti-Semitic discourses around the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century in German-speaking countries. Jaffé's emphasis on Jewish "authenticity" to be achieved by Zionism implicitly harks back to the established Oriental archetype of Jewishness, and his essay is a fairly early example of an attempt to give a theoretical foundation to the impact of Zionism on Jewish literature.

What this was – Jewish, or more precisely German-Jewish, poetry or literature – and what it was supposed to be all about, was a highly topical and fervently debated question in Germany around the turn of the century.⁵⁶ Its topicality it had achieved not least because of the confrontation with the anti-Semitism virulent in contemporary German literary studies. At the same time it was also the result of an "internal" Jewish debate on Jewish culture and, in particular, Jewish literary production in which the conflicting opinions of those in favour of assimilation and of those opposed to it clashed rather violently.

The German-Jewish literary historian Ludwig Geiger (1848–1919) variously contributed to this debate in support of the assimilationists. In his "Die deutsche Literatur und der Zionismus" (1905),⁵⁷ he exemplifies in detail his criticism of a Jewish-Zionist literature – with special reference to the novel that had just been published anonymously as *Das neue Jerusalem*. Attempting a generalisation, his appraisal may perhaps best be reduced to the formula that the literary prowess of the authors of Zionist works simply does not match their enthusiasm for the "cause". In addition, he denounces, as Karl Kraus had done before him, the uncomfortable proximity of Zionism and anti-Semitism, because both shared the premise that the Jewish "race" was incompatible with "deutscher Art und Sitte".⁵⁸ Geiger accuses Zionism of renouncing the reconciliation with German Christians and of inverting the attempts at a rapprochement he discerns in the German-Jewish literature of the past decades.⁵⁹ His criticism finally culminates in an ardent German-nationalist appeal to German-Jewish authors:

Der deutsche Jude, der in der deutschen Literatur zu Worte kommt, erkenne, wie er seit 1 1/2 Jahrhunderten gewohnt ist, nur in Deutschland sein Vaterland, nur in der deutschen Sprache seine Muttersprache, er nenne nur das deutsche Volk das seine, und nur die Zukunft dieser Nation sei und bleibe diejenige, an der seine Hoffnung hängt. Jedes Verlangen, mit seinen Glaubensbrüdern ein Volk zu bilden außerhalb Deutschlands ist, ganz abgesehen von seiner Undurchführbarkeit und von der krassen Undankbarkeit

gegen die Nation, in deren Mitte er lebt, ein Wahn: denn der deutsche Jude ist seiner Volkseigentümlichkeit nach ein Deutscher, und Zion ist für ihn das Land der Vergangenheit, nicht der Zukunft.⁶⁰

Geiger's criticism of Zionism and Zionist literature promptly provoked a polemical repartee by the lawyer Harry Epstein (1879–1973) – placed rather prominently on the front page of the *Jüdische Rundschau*.⁶¹ In analogy to Geiger's title, yet differing in one significant detail, Epstein's riposte was headed "Die jüdische Literatur und der Zionismus" (1905). His own scrutiny of the German-Jewish authors of the nineteenth century, whom Geiger too had considered, leads Epstein to a very different conclusion. The pursuit of Jewish subjects by these authors – among others he mentions Berthold Auerbach (1812–1882), Leopold Kompert (1822–1886) and Karl Emil Franzos (1848–1904), who had just died – he sees motivated simply by an interest in "cultural history". He states: "Jüdische Dichter waren sie nicht."⁶² The mere treatment of Jewish subjects Epstein does not consider to be sufficient to qualify this literature as Jewish. But the times, he claims, were changing:

[Ein] neues Geschlecht entstand, das seiner Kraft sich bewusst, entschlossen ist, sein Geschick mit eiserner Hand selbst zu zimmern. Rückwärts in seine herrliche Vergangenheit blickend, schöpft es die Kraft, vorwärts der Zukunft den Weg zu bahnen.⁶³

Geiger's aesthetically motivated criticism, levelled especially at the anonymous author of *Das neue Jerusalem*, Epstein counters by pointing out that the choice of authors⁶⁴ presented by Geiger was not at all representative, and then continues:

Als vor einigen Jahren die grosse Oeffentlichkeit durch den JUEDISCHEN ALMANACH zum ersten Male mit einem herrlichen Blütenstrauss jüdischer Kunst bedacht wurde, da ging ein Staunen durch die gesamte kunstverständige Welt. Man hätte nicht gedacht, dass in jüdischem Boden noch solche Kräfte schlummerten.⁶⁵

The *Jüdischer Almanach* for the year 5663 [i.e. 1902/03], thus extolled by Epstein, had been published by the Jüdischer Verlag in Berlin in September 1902 for Rosh ha-Shanah, the Jewish new year. Edited by Feiweil and Lilien, it had been the first publication of the new publishing house.⁶⁶ In his "Geleitwort" Feiweil announces his conviction, "dass dieses Buch [...] nach seiner Art, seiner Anlage und seinem Inhalt eine Fülle von neuen oder ungeahnten Kräften und Werten in sich birgt." These powers and values, he continues, are not just coincidental. Rather, he interprets them as "Ergebnis einer grossen und verheissungsreichen Entwicklung, für die man ein glückliches Wort gefunden hat: Jüdische Renaissance."⁶⁷ The *Almanach* was conceived to be instrumental in contributing to the advancement of this Jewish Renaissance. According to Feiweil, it was not only to promote a Jewish-moral ideal to give once more unity and firmness, national and individual self-confidence to the Jew.⁶⁸ It was also to propagate a distinctive Jewish-aesthetic ideal.⁶⁹ The criteria applied to decide which authors were to be included in the *Almanach* are an indication of its "all-Jewish" aspirations:

[V]on den Schaffenden haben wir alle, die wir fanden, zu Worte kommen lassen, jeden nach seiner Weise. So ist das jüdische Motiv oder die jüdische Anschauung in allen ihren Formen hier vertreten: als tief im Volkstum und in der Tradition wurzelnd, wie es meist die Produktion der Ost-Juden ist; als bewusst aus der europäischen Kultur heraus dem modernen National-Judentum zustrebend, wie es die Produktion der Zionisten Westeuropas ist.⁷⁰

The stereotypes enumerated here – of the *Ostjude* firmly rooted in the Jewish tradition and of the *Westjude* alienated from his culture yet reconstituting anew his cultural identity and identified here with *the* Western European Zionist – are commonplaces of Zionist discourse. To unite both was the declared aim of the movement. It had been articulated already in the title of the periodical *Ost und West* in which Buber had published his essay on “Juedische Renaissance” and which, according to its programme, sought explicitly

nicht nur die geographisch, sondern auch die kulturell auf verschiedenem Boden stehenden Elemente des Judentums einander wieder näher zu bringen durch Hervorhebung alles dessen, was uns eint oder einen kann, durch den Hinweis auf die gemeinsame Vergangenheit und besonders durch den Hinweis auf die heutigen Bestrebungen und Leistungen der Juden, in denen sich, bei aller Verschiedenheit, doch die gleichen ererbten Eigenschaften äussern.⁷¹

In addition to those authors distinguished for acknowledging the “national-Jewish” movement, there was, as Feiwel explains, another category of Jewish writers included in the *Almanach*:

Und dann bleibt noch das Schaffen jener westeuropäischen Schriftsteller und Künstler übrig, die unbewusst ohne ausgesprochen-nationalen Antrieb dennoch durch einen rassentümlichen Einschlag ihrem Werke eine spezifisch-jüdische Note geben.⁷²

Reminiscent of the “hereditary characteristics” evoked in *Ost und West*, the charged quality of Feiwel’s phrasing, which signifies indeed – just as Geiger had suggested – not only the acceptance of the racist premises of anti-Semitism but also their appropriation, hardly needs to be emphasised in our day.⁷³ Feiwel’s contention – “Wir glaubten, auch sie in den jungjüdischen Kreis ziehen zu dürfen”⁷⁴ – is further evidence of the aspirations manifest in the *Almanach* to recruit writers to the Jewish “cause” regardless of their individual self-definitions.⁷⁵

In this climate of an emerging Zionist discourse, and its anti-Semitic counterpart, Otto Hauser’s novel *Das neue Jerusalem* was conceived and published. Apostrophised by Geiger as “eine typische Erscheinung”,⁷⁶ it had indeed, as a literary work supposed to have been written by a Jewish author, been among the catalysts of the extended debate about Jewish artistic creativity and everything this entailed. Critical opinion has already been referred to, but there was a more focused discussion conducted in several reviews of the anonymously published novel.

Das neue Jerusalem is programmatic both in a poetological and in a political sense, and quite clearly Hauser sought to inscribe his novel into the developing Zionist discourse whose central motifs he appropriated consistently. Obviously, its anonymous publication aimed deliberately to suggest that the novel's author was Jewish, and it seems plausible to assume that this was an anti-Semitic motivated strategy to bolster the ideological point of view of the Zionists in the internal Jewish debate, thus to further the process of dissociation initiated by Zionism with the aim of the final emigration of the Jews from Germany.⁷⁷ Contemporary response suggests that indeed the novel's subtitle – "Ein jüdischer Roman" – as well as its Zionist subject matter led people to believe that its author was of Jewish descent. This, at least, is suggested by a number of reviews which focus mainly on the novel's treatment of Zionism.⁷⁸ Although both the pro-Zionist reviewers of the *Jüdische Rundschau* (Ernst Kalmus) and *Die Welt* (W.) and the aggressively anti-Zionist Ludwig Geiger⁷⁹ agreed in their slating criticism of the aesthetic qualities of the novel, they differed markedly in their assessment of its Zionist contents, even though all of them rejected the novel in this respect as well.

Ernst Kalmus (1864–1959), whose short review concludes with the lament "Armer Zionismus!", saw in the novel quite simply an "elende[s] Machwerk" which he did not think worth his trouble to review in any detail. His scathingly ironic reference to an "ausführliche und ernsthafte Besprechung, deren Sültschönheit und Gedankentiefe dem Original nicht nachsteht"⁸⁰ is directed at Geiger's review in *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*.⁸¹ Geiger, too, had rejected the novel. In his case, however, it was, apart from its aesthetic inadequacies, precisely its pro-Zionist bias that riled the "assimilated" liberal German of Jewish faith. Geiger concludes his review: "So wenig wie das 'neue Jerusalem' eine Notwendigkeit und ein Heil für die Juden Europas ist, so wenig ist David Herzberg der ersehnte Messias."⁸² The reviewer of *Die Welt* who signed himself "W." (possibly Siegmund Werner⁸³) judged it similarly to Kalmus, who read *Das neue Jerusalem* as a travesty of Zionism. Like the other two critics, W. denounced the anti-Semitic tendency of the novel and protested, as they did, against its negative depiction of diaspora Jewry:

Wer solche Behauptungen aufstellt wie der Verfasser des Buches "Das neue Jerusalem", der ist entweder ein lächerlicher Ignorant oder ein dummer Verleumder. Nirgends tritt die absolute Unfähigkeit des Verfassers klarer zutage als da, wo er über diese Dinge ganz im Argöt der ekelhaftesten antisemitischen Schandblätter spricht. Es ist vollkommen unnötig, das zu widerlegen.⁸⁴

However, acceding to the Zionist critique of Jewish assimilation in the novel, W. agrees that there are "einzelne gute Beobachtungen über das Treiben der jüdischen Grossbourgeoisie der Taufjuden und des verrottesten Assimilantentums" in the novel.⁸⁵ His criticism is therefore directed mainly at the character of the protagonist (denounced as contemptible also by Kalmus

and Geiger), at the quality of his Zionism, and at the implicit association of the real movement with the effete dreamer:

Ich muss es entschieden ablehnen, dass der zionistisch angehauchte "Held" des Buches etwa als ein Typus eines zionistischen Juden angesehen werde. Was an leuchtendem, vollwichtigem, geistigem und sittlichem Metall in unserer Bewegung liegt, soll durch einen solchen Jammereisen, der haltlos hin- und herschwankt, bis er aus rein sentimentalen Gründen zu seinem Volke zurückfindet, nicht zu einer wertlosen Legierung herabgedrückt werden.⁸⁶

The novel's obvious Orientalism is addressed in none of the reviews directly, although its premises concerning the "otherness" of the Jewish people are confirmed by the anti-assimilationist stance of the Zionist reviewers, most explicitly by W.

*

The cover illustration of Hauser's novel itself is an instance of a widely disseminated popular Orientalism (see Figure 1). It had been executed by Curt Liebich (1868–1937), in his time a well-known and much-employed illustrator, among whose works, unsurprisingly because symptomatic (in Said's terminology) of a latent Orientalism current in Europe at the time are several other illustrations informed by similarly obvious Orientalist stereotypes. Even a cursory look at the iconography of Liebich's title vignette for *Das neue Jerusalem* reveals its Orientalist provenance. Yet nothing in the title vignette proper appears to be particularly "Jewish" at first glance, and it might as well have adorned the covers of the popular adventure novels of Sophie Wörishöffer (1838–1890) or Karl May (1842–1912) set in the Near Orient. There are ruinous walls, white, domed houses and, almost in the centre of the composition, a slender tower resembling a minaret reaching into the dark sky. Incidentally, the very architectural elements featured in Liebich's vignette are described in Schnaase's *Geschichte der bildenden Künste* as typically Arabic. But even more to the point is the art historian's interpretation, which reads almost like an exegesis of Liebich's composition:

In der Einfachheit und Formlosigkeit der Wände, in dem Mangel plastischer Gliederung erkennen wir die Abstraction von der Natur, die Einsamkeit des Gedankens, die willkürliche Verbindung der Gegensätze. In den schlanken Minarets, die sich so kühn über die niedrigen, flachen Dächer erheben, ist ein deutliches Bild dieser monotheistischen Frömmigkeit gegeben. Die Kuppel mit ihrer bald flachen, bald geschwungenen, bald schwellenden Form ist ein reiner Ausdruck orientalischer Üppigkeit.⁸⁷

While the affinity and kinship of Arabs and Jews had also been emphasised by Schnaase, and would have been "latent" knowledge in the eye of the contemporary beholder too, recognition of the particular arrangement of these architectural elements may have demanded a more intimate familiarity with the




Figure 1: The cover design of Otto Hauser's novel *Das neue Jerusalem. Ein jüdischer Roman* (1905); the title vignette was designed by Curt Liebich (private collection, by permission).

ancient buildings of Jerusalem. In a slightly distorted perspective, obviously due to the format and other compositional deliberations, the vignette shows the so-called Tomb of David from an unusual point of view. For a comparison, see Figure 2, a well-known albumen print of the same cluster of buildings by Félix Bonfils (1831–1885), dating probably from around 1870 to 1880 and used also for postcards, which may even have provided the artist with his inspiration. For the knowledgeable reader this structure is resonant with meaning, referring to that King of Israel who first took possession of Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 11.4–7) and whose namesake the protagonist of the novel is, his own death at the end of the novel prefigured by the intimations of death conveyed by the edifice.

Yet it is especially the ornamental frame which surrounds the title vignette proper that establishes a more particular and more readily recognisable affinity between the “Oriental” and the “Jewish”, and a closer look at the cover design as a whole seems therefore to be indicated. This is all the more true because it was, of course, precisely this cover design as a whole that the contemporary reader and even the prospective buyer of the book would have been confronted with on



Figure 2: Félix Bonfils (or workshop), “Tombeau de David sur le Mont Sion – Tomb of David on Mount Zion” (albumen print, c. 1870–1880; University of Pennsylvania Museum, image #165606).

first sight, perhaps enticing the casual browser to buy the book and certainly suggesting a particular and (it may be suspected) familiar discursive framework. In fact, it will appear that the cover design fulfils its function of introducing the literary text and its central motifs very well indeed and, although magnificently lacking in subtlety, proves to be a very “clever” piece of work.

In an outline suggestive of the stereotypical image of the tablets of the Ten Commandments, situated above and partly superimposed on the title vignette, the main title is displayed rather prominently. It is connected to the vignette proper by a bright Star of David whose intensity and position in the night-blue sky above the Oriental buildings behind which the first glimmer of dawn lightens the horizon seems to suggest the Star of Bethlehem and any associations of redemption this may evoke.⁸⁸ The topicality of the image may be judged, for instance, by its occurrence in a roughly contemporary poem by Heinrich Grünau (1869–1937; i.e. Heinrich Grünzweig), “Den leidenden Brüdern!” (1901):

Seht Ihr dort das Licht im Osten?
 Brüder! Auf! Es tagt! Es tagt!
 Hell erglänzt schon über Zions
 Stolz erhabenes Gefild
 – Wie ein Zeichen der Erlösung –
 Davids leuchtend Zauberschild!

Strahlet auf gleich einer Sonne,
 Die dem Leidensmeer entstieg . . .
 Brüder! Brüder! Hallelujah!
 Dort im Osten winkt der Sieg!⁸⁹

Above the tablets, and reminiscent of representations of the divinity in Christian art, an eye in an aureole is placed in the apex of the ornamental frame. (The triangle in which the eye is then usually situated and which symbolises the Holy Trinity is, of course, omitted here.) In this particular, as also with the tablets and the brightly shining Star of David/Bethlehem, Christian iconography is alluded to, appropriated in some measure to the Jewish context and re-interpreted, suggesting perhaps the analogy of a common religious and cultural origin of Judeo-Christian monotheism and moral values and of an eschatological plan promising redemption by re-establishing Jewish existence in the Orient. Indeed, the novel's very title, *Das neue Jerusalem*, signifies redemption in both Jewish and Christian apocalyptic thought.⁹⁰ From another perspective, to apply Christian iconography to the Jewish context may, however, also be interpreted as the subjection of the Jewish tradition to an alleged Christian, that is Western, superiority in whose thought patterns and terms it is expressed.

A particular Jewish context is established also by the eight squares flanking this central arrangement, each of which is diagonally divided into blue and white triangles and in each of which a golden Star of David is placed. Blue and white are the traditional colours of the *tallit*, the Jewish prayer-shawl, which were adopted just a few years earlier by the First Zionist Congress at Basle (1897) together with the Mogen David, the Star of David, to form the Zionist flag, now that of the State of Israel. The same "Jewish" colour scheme is repeated in another compartment at the bottom of the cover in which, quite prominently featured, the subtitle explicitly announces the book in gilded letters to be "Ein jüdischer Roman".

All of this is important mainly because it provides an insight into the publication's Orientalist strategies of Jewish dissociation. For the cover design appears to be part of an effort to sustain the "authenticity" fiction of the anonymous novel as being "Jewish" and at the same time to equate the (stereo)typically Jewish with the (stereo)typically Oriental. It has to be conceded, however, that Liebich, for one, was not necessarily apprised of the author's identity and "racial" background. Yet, his Jewish-Orientalist conception resulting from his reading of the novel is nonetheless obvious. Much more "sinister" appear the author's attempts at constructing a Jewish Orientalism, because they are charged ideologically much more than Liebich's stereotypicality, which in itself is merely repetitive.

*

In *Das neue Jerusalem* the author's ideological beliefs appear at their most blatant and concise in the programmatic text supposedly written by David Herzberg,

the protagonist of the *Bildungsroman*. It commences with the relentless castigation of the "old" Jerusalem, which is his term for Jewish existence in the diaspora. Owing, in his view, to a conflict of identities and, finally, the loss of Jewish identity, Herzberg perceives Jewish existence in the diaspora to be contaminated by abysmal degeneracy and moral depravity (*Jerusalem*, pp. 351–63). The more than three hundred pages preceding the draft of Herzberg's programmatic text depict his life and suffering in the "morass" of Jewish assimilation. By its graphic illustration, the relation of this squalor serves to prepare his criticism and to justify the Zionist orientation resulting from it as an ethical imperative.

Herzberg's return to his people is prompted after numerous disappointments among assimilated Jews by the experience of a Seder celebration in the home of a poor, unassimilated Eastern Jewish family. The well-known words of the Pesach-Haggada – "*Dieses Jahr hier, das nächste Jahr in Jerusalem, dieses Jahr Knechte, das nächste Jahr frei!*" (*Jerusalem*, p. 326) – afterwards serve to inspire his pamphlet. Herzberg uses the urgency of these words and his own overwhelming love for the Jewish people to justify the relentless accusations of his pamphlet:

Mußte es denn sein? Ja, es mußte sein. Auch in diesen Worten war ja seine Liebe, aber die Liebe, die traurig ist, weil sie so viel Häßliches, Gemeines, Widerliches sieht, das sie hassen muß. Und dennoch läßt sie nicht ab zu lieben, so groß ist sie. (*Jerusalem*, p. 351)

Visualising Jewish diaspora existence makes him recognise:

Dies war das alte Jerusalem, mit seiner Eitelkeit, seiner Arroganz, seinem Größenwahn, den schon das nächste Jahrzehnt Lügen strafen mußte. Und so mußte es bleiben, solange der Jude unter den fremden Völkern noch Jude war. Erst wenn er in ihnen so völlig aufgegangen, daß ihn auch nicht die leiseste Erinnerung mit seinem Volke verband, wenn der eine Ahn, der Jude gewesen, Generationen weit hinter ihm lag, dann erst war diese traurige Scheinwelt zerstört, aber zugleich mit ihr auch er. Wann aber war das möglich? (*Jerusalem*, p. 360)

Even complete assimilation is, then, no more than a deceptive solution because it entails the loss of a proper identity. Moreover, the process of assimilation would take much too long, and the very willingness to assimilate perpetuates the vicious circle of eternal self-abasement and contempt by the peoples for which "the Jew" himself is to blame the most (*Jerusalem*, p. 362):

Eben dadurch, daß er sich so willig dem fremden Volke anglich, machte er sich verächtlich, durch diese weibische Schwäche und Eitelkeit. Die großen Geister, die den Juden verachteten, taten es, weil sie ihn die Güter seines Volkes aufgeben sahen und weil er kein höheres Ziel kannte, als vergessen zu machen, daß er Jude war. So zeigte er sich selbst als Verächter seines Volkes, und wie kann ein Volk geachtet werden, das sich selbst verachtet? (*Jerusalem*, pp. 362–3)

Only a few years earlier, in 1902, Theodor Herzl had argued quite similarly in his utopian novel. Looking back from the happy reality of the new Jewish state, its protagonist reflects on the "[schmähliche] Zeit, in der die Juden sich alles jüdischen [*sic*] schämten" (*Altneuland*, p. 288). He concludes: "Und sie

konnten sich noch über die Geringschätzung wundern, die ihnen zu teil wurde, da sie doch wahrlich keine Selbstachtung an den Tag gelegt hatten" (*Altneuland*, p. 288). In the utopia of *Altneuland*, the Jews have raised themselves "aus diesem tiefsten Zustande" (*Altneuland*, p. 289); "Das Judentum sah jetzt einfach darum anders aus, weil die Juden sich seiner nicht mehr schämten" (*Altneuland*, p. 289).

In Otto Hauser's novel, Herzberg too sees the only solution for the Jews in their return to their true nature (*Jerusalem*, p. 363) – the necessary condition for such a return, a return also to their independence of other peoples, is a place of rest and peace towards which the yearning of the whole Jewish people is directed, a place where it can assemble and which it possesses unconditionally:

Nur *ein* Land konnte ihr volles Eigentum werden, Erez Israel, das Land ihrer Väter. Dort sollten sie wieder ein eigenes Volk werden, das alle seine Kräfte dazu verwendet, in sich groß, frei und stolz zu werden, damit es sich selbst wieder achten kann. Und dann wird es jedes Volk achten um der Größe willen, die es sich selbst errang. Dann war die Knechtschaft Israels unter den fremden Völkern zu Ende und in neuer Jugendkraft trieb es nun auch seine schönsten Blüten: eine ganz ihm eigene Literatur und Kunst. (*Jerusalem*, p. 364)

Hauser's reference (through Herzberg) to Jewish literature and art is of special interest here. A substantial passage in Herzberg's pamphlet serves to criticise the Jewish "Geistesaristokraten" (*Jerusalem*, p. 357) whose influence on German culture he understands to be equally detrimental to Germans and Jews and which, at the same time, he considers to be a symptom of the repulsive efforts at assimilation of modern and depraved Jewry in the West (*Jerusalem*, pp. 357–60). The debate on the nature of Jewish literature and art was, as has been shown, in full swing around the turn of the century, and it is quite obvious that Hauser intervened in this debate with a view not only to the further political but also to the cultural aims of Zionism which in effect so closely resembled his own objectives.

*

As has been suggested, the debate was not confined to its Jewish participants. Perhaps most vehement on the part of German literary scholars was Adolf Bartels (1862–1945)⁹¹ with his "Das Judentum in der deutschen Literatur" (1903).⁹² The essay is Bartels' response to a review of his *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (1901/1902), by the German-Jewish critic Eugen Holzner, in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*. Holzner had extracted from Bartels' opus magnum as the author's opinion:

Von allen Gefahren, die dem deutschen Volkstum jemals gedroht, ist die vom Judentum ausgehende die schrecklichste. Von dorthier stammt die bewußte Verfälschung deutscher Literatur und Dichtung. Schmarotzend im deutschen Nationalkörper hausend, verdirbt das Judentum den Charakter der deutschen Literatur.⁹³

Bartels' attempt at repudiating this allegation rests mainly in censuring Holzner for his "typically Jewish" megalomania. For the inferior Jewish literary production, he claims, could not, of course, inflict any lasting damage on German literature. Yet in substance his essay confirms Holzner's reading. In it Bartels suggests the project of a detailed "Geschichte des Judentums in der deutschen Literatur"⁹⁴ in which he would have exposed the dangerous and detrimental influence of Jews on German literature and towards which he considers his essay to provide some preliminary work. Incidentally, it was Otto Hauser who, thirty years later, took up Bartels' suggestion with the publication in 1933 of his *Die Juden und Halbjuden der deutschen Literatur*.⁹⁵

As the gravest defect of German-Jewish literature Bartels denounces its alleged lack of creativity and artistic power, which he notices even in Heine, Auerbach, Franzos and Schnitzler: "[A]uch sie wirken mehr durch interessante Ansätze, Beleuchtung, Tendenzen, Effekte als durch sorgfältige und gewissenhafte Modellierung."⁹⁶ The correspondence between this appraisal and the Orientalist assessment of Arab architecture in architectural theory as outlined above is striking. On the one hand there is character and form, on the other Oriental diffuseness and mere decorativeness. Indeed, Bartels on the same page quite openly reverts to Orientalist stereotypes when, castigating Jewish frivolity in sexual matters, he says that this of course was owing to the Oriental origin of the Jews and that it was tempered only by a certain decadent fatigue, sometimes mistaken by ignorant Germans for morality.⁹⁷ In addition, Bartels denounces as the most dangerous and subversive Jewish characteristics their radicalism, their desire for sensation, their frivolity, and their vanity:

Viel gefährlicher sind natürlich die angedeuteten zersetzenden Eigenschaften des Judentums, sein Radikalismus, seine Sensationslust, seine Frivolität, seine Eitelkeit, um so mehr, als sie fast nie durch wahrhaft gestaltende Kraft ausgeglichen werden.⁹⁸

In an Orientalist discourse these characteristics may be explained, of course, just as well by Jewish Oriental origins. However, in marked contrast to those mid-nineteenth-century exponents of architectural theory mentioned above, Bartels not only identifies and assesses the Jewish/Oriental but does so with the objective of eradicating it from German literature. Accordingly, in his essay he provides in effect an annotated list of authors of Jewish descent writing in German. He concedes, however:

So ganz leicht ist es nicht, das Judentum in der Literatur überall zu entdecken, und die Juden erheben jedesmal ein Freudengeschrei, wenn man einen Nichtjuden als Juden und einen Juden als Nichtjuden hinstellt. Die Schwierigkeit liegt aber keineswegs in der Unsicherheit unserer Rassentheorie, sondern zunächst an dem Vertuschungssystem der Juden selbst (wobei die Taufe eine große Rolle spielt) und dann daran, daß der jüdische Dichter und Schriftsteller natürlich mit unseren deutschen Poesie-Elementen wirtschaftet.⁹⁹

To this he adds somewhat later: "Je größer ein jüdischer Dichter ist, um so mehr springt natürlich das Jüdische ins Auge, mittlere Talente und wenig ausgeprägte Persönlichkeiten können ihr Judentum am längsten verbergen."¹⁰⁰

Bartels' views on German-Jewish literature as he had expounded them in his *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* and in his essay were obviously absorbed and recycled by Hauser in *Das neue Jerusalem*. Once more, he voiced his opinions on Jewish creativity in literature and art in Herzberg's pamphlet:

Der Jude ist, solange er Jude bleibt, als Zugehöriger zum Judentum, sowohl religiös wie auch nur sozial, ein Fremder im Lande. Die Kultur, die dieses besitzt, ist ohne sein Zutun entstanden, er hat keinen Teil an ihr, er kann sie sich nur aneignen, wie man eine Sache kauft. In diesem Sinne ist sie dann sein. So ist er auf geistigem Gebiete immer nur Nachahmer, niemals Selbstschöpfer. Denn schaffen kann man nur aus dem Eigenen, wie Gott die Welt aus sich erschuf. (*Jerusalem*, pp. 359–60)

Hauser himself had quoted – presumably in his own translation – in his novel a counter-example of some “genuine” Jewish literature which, although it had been conceived in the diaspora, was at least written in Hebrew and expressed the poet's “proto-Zionist” yearning for the lost homeland quite effectively. Indeed, David's reading of Yehuda Halevi's (c. 1075–1141) “Ode to Zion” (*Jerusalem*, pp. 334–7) contributes instrumentally to his rebirth in the Jewish spirit, relating this suggestion of the wholesome effects of a truly Jewish poetry on the Jewish mind to the contemporary debate on a Jewish Renaissance. At the same time, the alleged Jewish provenance of the novel indicates the role Hauser envisaged it to play. For it is imbued, then, with a model character for its Jewish readers not only in view of its protagonist but also with regard to its very subject matter and its aesthetic “achievements”.¹⁰¹

*

Much later, in the preface to his *Geschichte des Judentums* (1921), Hauser not only acknowledged authorship of his novel but explained its genesis in the larger context of his interest in the Jewish people.¹⁰² He says that it was supposed to provide a sketch of one of the Jewish “Geistesströmungen unserer Zeit”¹⁰³ and with some pride he confirms that, at the time, it had not been recognised as his work.¹⁰⁴ His *Geschichte* he suggests to have been written for non-Jews as well as for Jews. One of its declared objectives, beyond the “mere representation” of Jewish history, was to aid its readers in rising above their interest and in clarifying their attitude towards the “controversial people” – be it from the perspective of the non-Jew, the Semite or the Jew.¹⁰⁵ Hauser justifies the suitability of his work for this end with the acknowledgement of his indebtedness to the “anthropologische Geschichtsauffassung”¹⁰⁶ developed by Joseph Arthur Comte de Gobineau (1816–1882), Georges Vacher Marquis de Lapouge (1854–1936), and Ludwig Woltmann (1871–1907), all of whom were engaged in the formulation and dissemination of the pseudo-scientific theories of racial difference which provided the grounds also of “scientific” modern anti-Semitism.¹⁰⁷

The conclusions Hauser arrives at in his *Geschichte des Judentums* are the same as those he had articulated in his earlier novel. He envisages two alternative solutions to the Jewish question – assimilation and Zionism:

[Assimilation] ist die *eine Lösung der Judenfrage*, wie sie nicht irgendwelche Maßnahmen, sondern die Zeit selbst bringen wird. Sie schließt für unsere Nachfahren, für Juden wie Nichtjuden, noch viele harte Kämpfe ein, Kämpfe, die noch mehrere Male das nichtjüdische Volk dem Haß ihrer Gäste preisgeben und diese hinwieder der Vergeltung überliefern werden. *Juden und Nichtjuden werden danach Feindschaft gegeneinander hegen, solange eines von ihnen lebt. Und länger leben werden die Nichtjuden.*

Die *andere Lösung* ist die, die der *Zionismus* bietet: die Sammlung des völkisch bewußten Teils der Judenheit in Altneuland, während der sich assimilierende in den Wirtvölkern aufgeht und untergeht, die Aufrichtung eines jüdischen Staates, einer jüdischen Kultur, die auf eigenem Wege nach den höheren gemeinsamen Zielen der kulturfähigen Menschheit streben. Dieser Staat wird neben den anderen Kulturstaaten stehn, gewiß einer ihrer besten, getragen von der ganzen reichen Begabung jener Auslese des jüdischen Volkes. Er wird seine Kräfte für sich selbst verwenden und damit dem Schaffenden jedes Berufs die Wurzel geben, die ihre Säfte aus dem wahrhaften Muttergrund trinkt, und dadurch die Befriedigung, das volle Einssein mit sich. *Ein Land, das wüste [sic] war, wird durch Fleiß und Tüchtigkeit aufs neue erblühen, ein Volk, das zwar die Herrschaft ausüben konnte, aber von seinen Sklaven immer verachtet wurde, wieder die Achtung erwerben, die man seinen fernen Vorfahren zur Zeit König Sauls und Davids und des sittlichen Eifers seiner Propheten zollen muß, und der Gast, der aus diesem Lande zu uns kommt, wird aufrechten Nackens und franken Blicks unter uns weilen, frei von falscher Demut, frei von Dünkel, Mann vor Männern, wir – Deutsche, Franzosen, Engländer, Slawen, er – Jude.*¹⁰⁸

Hauser's pose here is that of the unbiased, yet ostentatiously benevolent, observer who, from the vantage point he ascribes to his "anthropologische Geschichtsauffassung", presumes to speak openly to the Jewish "Other". In contrast, in his earlier novel, Hauser attempts to speak to the Jewish "Other" on the sly, as it were, by assuming its very identity and by speaking *for* it.¹⁰⁹

Said, referring to William Lane's *Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (1836), states in his *Orientalism* that

[the] Orientalist can imitate the Orient without the opposite being true. What he says about the Orient is therefore to be understood as description obtained in a one-way exchange: as *they* spoke and behaved, *he* observed and wrote down. His power was to have existed amongst them as a native speaker, as it were, and also as a secret writer.¹¹⁰

This seems to be precisely Hauser's attitude, too. The obvious failure of Jewish assimilation, as demonstrated in his novel, confirms that in this direction the exchange is indeed unsuccessful. Yet Hauser, like Lane posing as a Muslim in Egypt to observe and write about his experience,¹¹¹ claims familiarity with things Jewish to such a degree that often Jews took him to be Jewish: "Oft galt ich Juden als Jude."¹¹² (Intriguingly, Adolf Bartels, too, suspected Hauser to be of Jewish descent, which he suggested in 1925 in his "Der Fall Otto

Hauser".¹¹³) Posing as Jewish – again to observe and to write – Hauser, too, seems to have indulged in this particular form of Orientalist “mimicry”, and his novel, which he claims is based on his “wissenschaftliche und persönliche Kenntnis des Judentums”,¹¹⁴ as much as his *Geschichte*, appears to be the outcome of his endeavours. It is only with regard to Said’s conclusion that “what he [i.e. Lane] wrote was intended as useful knowledge, not for them [i.e. the Orientals], but for Europe and its various disseminative institutions”¹¹⁵ that a further differentiation may be called for in this particular case. For while in essence Said’s statement appears to hold true for Hauser’s novel as well as for his *Geschichte*, like the *Geschichte*, his novel too seems to have been written also, or even predominantly, for a Jewish readership.

Accordingly, in *Das neue Jerusalem* Hauser deliberately avoided an allegedly objective vantage point of observation, and in this his “Orientalist” strategies differ from those discussed by Said, who argues that Lane, for instance, remained “always aware of his difference from an essentially alien culture”.¹¹⁶ According to Said,

that is one thing that Lane’s prose never lets us forget: that ego, the first-person pronoun moving through Egyptian customs, rituals, festivals, infancy, adulthood, and burial rites, is in reality both an Oriental masquerade and an Orientalist device for capturing and conveying valuable, otherwise inaccessible information.¹¹⁷

In the case of Hauser’s novel this distance is deliberately levelled. If anyone at all, it is the protagonist who maintains his otherness by rising above the depravity of Jewish life in the diaspora. Yet Hauser still follows the same “narrative” convention discerned by Said in Lane’s *Account*.¹¹⁸ Lane’s objective, according to Said, is to make “the Egyptians totally visible, to keep nothing hidden from his reader, to deliver the Egyptians without depth, in swollen detail”¹¹⁹ – Hauser, of course, takes a “walk” not “through Egyptian life”,¹²⁰ like Lane, but through diasporic existence. And it is precisely because Hauser’s novel was written for Jewish consumption and was thus meant to insinuate itself subversively into Jewish self-perception and self-definition that the obvious European impersonator-observer-narrator does not surface at any point in his novel. For its gentile reader, on the other hand, the supposedly Jewish provenance of Hauser’s novel, by providing knowledge, not only confirms Jewish otherness but lends credibility to its allegations and seemingly takes the edge off its anti-Semitism: Jewish dissociation appears to be justified and, indeed, mutually desirable.

Paradoxically, Hauser’s novel, while obviously purveying anti-Semitic stereotypes, and consequently an example of literary anti-Semitism, defined by Mark H. Gelber as the “potential or capacity of a text to encourage or positively evaluate antisemitic attitudes or behaviors”,¹²¹ can thus also be seen, due to the admiration of its author of the “properly” Jewish character which emerges in its Zionist tendency, in the tradition of literary German philo-Semitism as it has been outlined by Alan Levenson.¹²² In its ambivalence, it is similar to Hermann Jaques’s *Das Kreuz des*

Juden (c. 1904),¹²³ a novel classified by Levenson as philo-Semitic, even though it "contains numerous anti-Jewish stereotypes, fails to realistically consider Jewish existence, and is animated by a *völkisch* sensibility".¹²⁴ Jaques – who, like Hauser, was not Jewish – also discussed Zionism in his novel. He associates it with Ada Salanda, a Jewess of exotic and intoxicating beauty, her voice "weich und träumerisch wie ferne, rauschende Wasser südlicher Nächte; in ihren orientalischen, etwas geschlitzten Augen glühte ein seltsames Licht",¹²⁵ and who, similar to David Herzberg, pleads that Jews should no longer expend their intellectual and financial power in foreign lands. However, as Levenson points out, in Jaques's novel Zionism "includes the threat of Jewish domination"¹²⁶ and is therefore ultimately rejected in favour of the Jewish protagonist's escape from Europe on a ship devoted to scholarship – "a bizarre cross between Darwin's *Voyage of the Beagle* and Theodor Herzl's *Altneuland*", as Levenson calls it.¹²⁷

Another example of a non-Jew writing "Zionist" fiction, and reaching a similar conclusion to Hauser, is Luise Algenstaedt (b. 1861) in her novel *Ums Land der Väter* (1912).¹²⁸ However, the case is put much more bluntly here and not at all softened by the subversive adoption of the Jewish perspective. In her novel, she tells the story of the return to the land of their fathers of the Jewish families of a Russian village in the early years of the twentieth century. In marked contrast to Hauser, Algenstaedt, who was the daughter of a Protestant minister and herself for a time a deaconess, envisages in her novel the conversion to Christianity to be the basis of Jewish redemption.¹²⁹ Yet like Hauser, she links Jewish redemption to the possession of the Land and employs current stereotypes of Zionist discourse. For instance, she blames Arab-Turkish neglect and mismanagement for the barrenness of the old-new homeland,¹³⁰ which yearns as much for its "children" as they yearn for it,¹³¹ and she even elaborates on the Biblical promise of the land of milk and honey when her child protagonist Samuel in his ramblings on Mount Carmel chances on some wild honey.¹³²

In Algenstaedt's novel, too, the convergence of the anti-Semitic and Zionist discourses becomes evident, as well as their common Orientalist discursive framework. A German surveyor in Ottoman services who helps to establish the new Jewish colony comments on Arab culture: "Es ist eine zurückweichende Kultur – sie weiß es selbst, daß sie die niedere ist und daß dem jüdischen Volk sein altes Recht wieder zuteil werden muß."¹³³ When, in consequence, he is praised by his Jewish clients for not being an "Anti" he succinctly observes: "Antisemit? Ich leugne nicht, daß ich es in meiner Heimat gewesen bin, aber *hier* kann man es nicht mehr sein. Hier haben Sie das Hausrecht. Sie gehen hier einer großen Zukunft entgegen."¹³⁴ Later in the novel, the interconnectedness of anti-Semitism and Zionism is discussed quite explicitly. Again it is the German surveyor who, from his outside perspective, is able to explain this to his Jewish protégés, and what he says is reminiscent of Hauser's attitude: "Es ist unlogisch, Antisemit zu sein, wenn man nicht zugleich Zionist ist. Aus Feindschaft wie aus Freundschaft muß man Zionist sein."¹³⁵ Yet Zionism alone

is not considered sufficient by the surveyor to provide a solution to the “Jewish question”: “Der bloße Zionismus kann Ihrem Volk das Leben nicht bringen. Aber er muß dazu helfen, daß es nicht stirbt. Er muß es zusammenhalten. Haben doch so viele es im Stich gelassen.”¹³⁶ With the missionary zeal inherent in Algenstaedt’s novel, the German continues: “Aber das Größte steht noch aus: Ihr Volk kann weder leben noch sterben – bis es in seinem Messias lebt.”¹³⁷

Although similar in some of its inferences to Hauser’s *Das neue Jerusalem*, the different ideological basis of Algenstaedt’s novel does not permit her to take up the Jewish perspective as Hauser had done. There is no question that the advice her novel would give to Jewry comes from without – from the German surveyor and, in effect, from the Christian author – and Algenstaedt does nothing to conceal her authorial identity. Intriguingly, Ludwig Geiger, who had accepted the Jewish authorship of *Das neue Jerusalem* without hesitation, in his review of Algenstaedt’s novel in *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*¹³⁸ speculates on the potential significance of her views if the author were Jewish:

Gehörte die Verfasserin dem Judentum an, verriete sie in ihren Erfindungen und Deklamationen wirklich des Endziel zionistischen Strebens, so müßte man in ihren Darlegungen eine große Gefahr erblicken; da sie aber nur ihre Gedanken, man könnte fast sagen, ihre seltsamen Träumereien verrät, so wird man sich über ihre Anschauungen nicht sonderlich aufregen, denn daß diese nie und nimmer zur Wirklichkeit werden können, wird jeder Verständige einsehen.¹³⁹

Conceding Algenstaedt’s technical and aesthetical mastery, he then concludes that the novel’s ideological/religious bias can appeal neither to Jews, both religious and Zionist, nor to Christians:

Denn gläubigen Christen kann ihre Erzählung und das Ziel, auf das sie lossteuert, nur höchst unwillkommen sein; den Juden, die an ihrem Glauben wirklich festhalten und selbst den Zionisten, die ein reines jüdisches Volkstum oder die Entwicklung eines wirklichen jüdischen Staates begehren, muß dieses Zukunftsbild widerwärtig erscheinen.¹⁴⁰

That Geiger took the anonymous *Das neue Jerusalem* much more seriously as a threat may, perhaps, be an indication of the subversive potential of this novel.

*

But what are Hauser’s Orientalist strategies of dissociation, and what is it actually that his text insinuates to the Jewish reader? In answer to these questions I will concentrate on three paradigmatic but not exhaustive examples: Hauser targets Jewish self-appreciation with regard to externals (physiognomy); he attempts to induce Jewish self-abhorrence (with regard to diaspora morality, or rather immorality), and he envisages Jewish self-knowledge and self-improvement in confrontation with the German Other.

David is described as being like “eine dunkle Blüte aus einem fernen erträumten Osten, schön, ob auch dunkel, mit diesen scharf ausgeprägten und

doch so fein gezeichneten Zügen, diesem vielen Schatten bis zu den wenigen Lichtstellen abgetönt . . ." (*Jerusalem*, p. 142); he is said to have a beautiful head "mit diesen edlen Zügen eines Königssohnes aus dem Morgenland" (*Jerusalem*, p. 144). David himself had first become aware of his Oriental appearance when confronted with the unconcerned "naturalness" of a German classmate of his – Arthur Steingräber, who is "groß, schlank, blond und zart wie ein Mädchen von Gesicht, nicht gerade schön, aber doch mit großen blauen Augen" (*Jerusalem*, p. 20). Lost in admiration for the Germanic "Other", he feels himself perform ugly. In the relation of David's perception of his outward appearance, the narrator accordingly delivers himself of a litany of stereotypes:

Der jüdische Familienzug um den Mund, der schwere, satte Blick aus den großen mandelförmigen Augen, die Nase mit dem verräterischen Bug und dem bezeichnenden Ansatz, die Stirne selbst in ihrem blassen Gelb, auf dem wie ein leichter Schatten von Olivgrün lag. . . Er mußte sich häßlich finden, vielleicht nicht eigentlich das, aber zu alt für seine Jahre. (*Jerusalem*, p. 37)

His conclusion refers to two well-established clichés of Orientalist discourse – Oriental physiognomical otherness and indolence – and it is only much later in the novel that David comes to accept his "Jewish" appearance:

Das Jüdische in seinem Gesichte, das ihn als Knaben fast abgestoßen hatte, schien ihm nun durchaus nicht häßlich, weil es doch völlig harmonisch war. Und in der Harmonie vielleicht liegt die Schönheit. (*Jerusalem*, p. 182)

His all-pervading and distinct Jewishness makes David the "prototypical" Jew, and only because he is that, because his unadulterated Jewishness is visible in all parts, can it be harmonious and consequently beautiful in its wholeness. Ironically, the very concept of beauty in harmony in itself is Western (Platonic). Thus, in Hauser's novel, Western aesthetics, while defining Jewish "otherness", at the same time subversively provide the framework for Jewish "self"-awareness, insinuating to Jews "universal" and "eternal" Western values against which their Jewishness is to be measured.

David is confronted twice with Arthur Steingräber, and both passages are central to the novel as they epitomise not only German-Jewish relationships as Hauser sees them but also his ideology. In each case the encounter with this particular and "prototypically" German "Other" results in furthering David's self-knowledge and self-improvement, leading him eventually to his redemption. David's development is obviously intended to be paradigmatic of the direction Jewish aspirations should take, and the concept of the *Bildungsroman* appears to be transferred from the individual to the collective.

The first encounter makes David recognise his "otherness" and awakens in him an intense (non-sexual) desire for the "Other":

Aber etwas trennte ihn von dem Blondem, etwas tief in seinem Wesen; er konnte sich ihm gegenüber nicht frei, nicht gleich fühlen. [. . .] Er wußte sich keine Antwort, und es sollte noch lange dauern, ehe er sie fand. Er sah nur die Tatsache. Aber nicht wie andere, daß

ihn dies mit Haß oder auch nur mit Neid erfüllt hätte. Er fühlte nur um so größer seine Liebe zu ihm, dem Stolzen, Freien, der sie nie erwidern würde; mit dieser Unmöglichkeit wuchs sie noch. (*Jerusalem*, p. 23)

The true nobility of the Aryan makes David acutely aware of the disgusting degeneracy and immorality of his Jewish peers: “Das Wesen der anderen widerte ihn an. Sie waren frech, vorwitzig, geil, gemein, niedrig. Ihre Gespräche untereinander troffen von Lüsternheit [. . .]; sie kannten kein höheres Ziel als ihre Reife” (*Jerusalem*, p. 20). This is strongly contrasted by a veritable paean on Arthur:

Er war rein und heilig an seinem ganzen jungen Körper, wie seine junge Seele rein und heilig war. Das Unheilige, das Gemeine hatte keine Macht über ihn, und wenn es sich je wie Schimmel über einen Teil seines Wesens gelegt haben mochte, so tauchte er unter in einer kalten klaren Flut und badete sich rein von ihm und war wieder blendend wie karrarischer Marmor, der eben gebrochen ward. (*Jerusalem*, pp. 28–9)

David’s own otherness is more subtle. He abhors sexual depravity – in fact, he remains a virgin to the very end of the novel. His is rather an otherness in essence which encompasses paradigmatically the whole dilemma of Jewish exile and assimilation. For a while, he and Arthur, without ever becoming close friends, form a kind of companionship. Together, they go on walks and it is particularly their respective response to “nature” which creates in David an awareness of his otherness:

In dieser Natur wanderten sie. Da ward Arthur ein völlig anderer, oder besser gesagt, da offenbarte sich erst sein ganzes Wesen. [. . .] Und David dagegen? Er konnte nicht springen und singen; wenn er bloßköpfig ging und die Jacke öffnete, sich einen Zweig abschnitt und die Luft peitschte, so war es nur Nachahmung, war es nur, weil er dem Kameraden gleich sein wollte. Von selbst hatte er keinen Antrieb dazu. Er hatte auch ein Auge für die Natur, sah alles, sah es vielleicht besser als jener, hätte es mindest besser beschreiben können, aber sie wirkte nicht in dieser Weise auf ihn. In ihm war nichts, das sich in der Natur so entfalten mußte. Und tief empfand er diesen Unterschied. (*Jerusalem*, pp. 24–5)

Contrasted to the Aryan’s “natural” habitat is that of the Jewish boy. The selective description of his home, a luxurious display of riches and heavy fabrics, suggests an Oriental interior which, once he has experienced the other’s naturalness, seems stifling to David (just as Löwenberg in *Altneuland* had perceived the stifling atmosphere in Palestine prior to its “redemption”; cf. *Altneuland*, p. 46):

Durch diesen blonden Germanen, seinen Antagonisten, hatte er ein anderes Leben kennen gelernt als jenes war, das daheim zwischen den kostbaren Tapeten auf persischen Teppichen über Parkettböden geführt wurde, ein Leben, das des äußeren Reichtums nicht bedarf, um reich zu sein, reicher als man es in Gold jemals sein kann. Hier war Freiheit, Sicherheit, Aufgehen im Leben, hier war Schönheit. [. . .] Doppelt widerlich war ihm nun das Leben daheim, die Luft schien ihm dumpf, stickig von den vielen Teppichen und den schweren seidengefütterten Vorhängen und Portieren. Etwas beengte ihn, gleichsam von innen heraus. (*Jerusalem*, p. 29)

David's second encounter with Arthur Steingraber provides a preview of the opinions he will later articulate in his pamphlet. At the time, he is with a newspaper, "shirking" his military service, for which he is actually, and unsurprisingly, physically unfit. He meets Arthur, who by now is an army officer, in a literary café. Distancing himself from his loud-mouthed company of (mainly Jewish) journalists and literary celebrities, David once more accompanies Arthur on a walk and they discuss the inevitable subject. Disgusted with the crowd of Jewish literary men, Arthur holds forth:

[E]in Jude soll Jude sein, dann wird er auch etwas zuwege bringen. Aber ihr Juden schmuggelt euch in unsere Kultur ein, an der ihr keinen geistigen und keinen seelischen Anteil habt, lernt euch ihrer Sprache in Wort, Tönen, Farben oder Stein zu bedienen und glaubt damit, uns gleich zu sein. Aber das werdet ihr nie. Geradeso wie wir euch nie für uns ebenbürtig halten werden. (*Jerusalem*, p. 233)¹⁴¹

To David's question whether to be accepted by their German "hosts" the Jews should become Christians, he answers:

Es wäre ein Weg, aber es ist euer Untergang und bedeutet für uns wahrscheinlich eine Herabsetzung unserer Rasse. Wir fürchten das. Ich meine, ihr sollt wagen, Juden zu sein. Dann wird euch auch ein Arier achten können. Denn ihr zeigt, daß ihr selbst einen Stolz habt und euch ihm gleich haltet. Solang ihr nur sein wollt, wie er ist, seid ihr Knechte. Vielleicht ist das eure Natur, – traurig dann, – aber ihr habt doch in der Zeit, da ihr ein Volk wart, ganze Männer gehabt. – Bin ich wirklich Antisemit, wenn ich das sage? (*Jerusalem*, p. 234)

Again, Arthur's views will find their way into David's pamphlet, and even at this early stage he confesses to having had similar thoughts:

Nein, es war mir lieb, dies von dir zu hören. Denn du meinst es gewiß ehrlich. Und ich will dir auch sagen, daß ich oft ganz dasselbe empfunden habe. Ich weiß gut, daß uns nur fehlt, ein Volk zu sein, und wir könnten wieder Männer hervorbringen, die für uns groß sind und nicht ihre Kraft an andere Völker verschwenden müssen. (*Jerusalem*, p. 236)

Yet although David is already undergoing some change in the state of his mind, it is only through Arthur's "sincere" intervention that he reaches a higher level of self-knowledge, an awareness as to the desperate situation of his people. Prompted by this second encounter with the prototypical German "Other", he is propelled once more on his course of self-improvement.

The anti-Semitic stereotypes of cultural corruption through Jewish indolence, complacency and verbosity underlying Arthur's successful harangue are evidently Orientalist in their provenance. Even more pervasive in Hauser's novel is the topic of Jewish moral corruption, which, again, is indicative of an Orientalist discourse. Jewish frivolity as it had been castigated by Adolf Bartels is projected to a large degree on Jewish women in Hauser's novel.¹⁴² David's own mother, by her improper attentions, induces "einen verruchten Ödipusträum" (*Jerusalem*, p. 18) in him when he is still a little boy. Eventually she elopes with his private tutor and is responsible for the economic collapse of

his father's firm. During his military service, for which he proves to be physically unfit, David is taken by his comrades to a brothel where he meets a Jewish girl (*Jerusalem*, pp. 275–81). Nothing, of course, is further from his mind than fornication. Instead, he tries to talk to the girl and reform her. She, too, eloped from home with the private tutor of her brother – not because she loved him but simply because of some dark desire. “Wir sind heiß,” she tells David, and: “Unser Blut ist schuld. Wir passen nicht hierher. Wir sind anders als die anderen. Für uns sollte es andere Gesetze geben” (*Jerusalem*, p. 277). Myrta conforms wholly to the stereotype of the sensual Oriental woman. There are, of course, other examples of female sexual promiscuity in Hauser's novel. The most notable, perhaps, an episode reminiscent of the biblical story of Potiphar's wife (*Jerusalem*, pp. 300–2). David, by now himself private tutor to a Jewish boy, is tempted by his mother who turns out to be the mother also of the girl in the brothel. When he rejects her advances she accuses him wrongly of perpetrating unnatural practices with her son Israel (*Jerusalem*, p. 304).

There is indeed a special bond between David and the boy, but it is pure and innocent, and later in the novel Israel will emerge as the embodiment of the promise of a Jewish future in the Orient. For in the end, David, ever more sickly and close to death, leads a small group of settlers to Palestine. In analogy to Moses and, in a way, to Herzl, both of whom were allowed to view the land but not to settle there, he is granted to see Jerusalem in his last moments.¹⁴³ Tied to the back of his mule, and the Angel of Death already at his side, David is led by his “disciple” Israel towards Jerusalem:

Da flammte mit einemmal der Osten auf, rot-golden, hoch.

“David, sieh, David!” rief Israel, “unten die Stadt! Siehst du? Die hohen Mauern ganz in Gold! Die Dächer! Die Minarete! David, siehst du?”

Er riß die Augen groß auf, noch einmal:

“Jerusalem!”

Und Israel schritt weiter, die Zügel in der Hand, ins Morgenrot. (*Jerusalem*, p. 410)

Thus, we are to assume, David concludes his life and thus also concludes Hauser's novel, its very last word once more evoking the promise of the Orient to the Jewish people.¹⁴⁴ Incidentally, the architectural features enumerated by Schnaase, and informing Liebich's title vignette, too, are invoked at the end of the novel (with the one exception of the dome¹⁴⁵). Gilded by the rising sun they are virtually “transfigured”. In the dawn of a new day the old city itself appears to be renewed, a pledge of the promise of regeneration also to the Jewish people, represented by the boy with the meaningful name, Israel Juda, who will take possession once more of the “promised” land in the Orient.

*

Although chronologically far beyond the scope of the present article and indeed meriting a study of its own, Eugen Hoeflich's (1891–1965; later Moshe Yaaqov

ben Gavriel)¹⁴⁶ concept of "Pan-Asiatism" needs to be mentioned because, in a way, it may ultimately be interpreted as the product of Orientalist strategies of Jewish dissociation as promoted by Zionism – or by Hauser. The idea of Pan-Asiatism, strongly informed by Buber's idea of cultural Zionism, emerges in Hoeflich's writings from the end of the second decade of the twentieth century, following his time in 1917 as an Austrian officer with the Ottoman army in Palestine.¹⁴⁷ Yet it is articulated most succinctly perhaps in his *Die Pforte des Ostens. (Das arabisch-juedische Palaestina vom panasiatischen Standpunkt aus)*,¹⁴⁸ an extended version of his *Der Weg in das Land* (1918) published in 1923, where he maintains that "the Jew" belongs to the Oriental family of peoples to whose bosom – emancipating himself from Europe – he must return. In fact, he envisages an alliance of all Oriental peoples against European hegemony and claims that the basis of any true Zionism was a brotherly Jewish-Arab alliance. Contemporary political Zionism and the very idea of a Jewish nation state he sees as beholden to the "Denkkategorien des Westens".¹⁴⁹ In consequence he asks:

[K]ann es Sinn einer jüdischen Sendung sein, eine neue Galuth, einen neuen Fremdkörper, entorientalisierte Orientalen, im Orient einzunisten, bestenfalls die widerliche Fratze widerlichen Levantinertums zur Schau tragend, ein Bastard Europas und eines vergewaltigten Orients zu sein?¹⁵⁰

The question is, of course, rhetorical, and Hoeflich's conclusion is rather: "Wir wollen zurückkehren – aber nicht als Europäer."¹⁵¹

Hoeflich's vision of the Orient is no less Romantic than Herzl's or Buber's, and one may wonder if it is not also as Orientalist as theirs. For although Hoeflich propagates the mutual acknowledgement of Arab and Jewish cultures¹⁵² and keeps writing against all kinds of cultural presumption,¹⁵³ he quite clearly presupposes some kind of Jewish superiority (inter alia a greater nimbleness of the mind¹⁵⁴) and the possession of a truth that the Jewish people may impart to the Arabs:

Die Gelegenheit, dem arabischen Volke die Wahrheit zu lehren, ist für das jüdische Volk grenzenlos, wenn wir unter Wahrheit das unter jeder Bedingung Wahre, nicht das durch die Verhältnisse Europas bedingt Wahre erkennen. Diese Wahrheit beginnt nicht mit der Einführung des maschinellen Betriebes in die Hausindustrie, nicht mit der Propagierung europäischer Kleidung und nicht mit dem Größenwahn eines jüdischen Staatsgedankens und endet nicht mit der Umwandlung Palästinas in ein Großkaufhaus, in dem alles, nur nicht menschliches Glück und menschliche Güte zu bekommen ist; uns erscheint die Wahrheit in allen jenen Versuchen, aus denen der Araber immer wieder und wieder zu sehen gezwungen ist, daß wir ihm kein artfremdes Europa aufzupropfen wollen, daß wir, im Gegenteil, bereit sind, all das, was wir uns erzwingen, ihm zum Mitgenuß freizustellen, [sic] Der Araber muß erkennen, daß der jüdische Gemeinschaftsgedanke nach der Verwirklichung jener Lebensaxiome strebt, die dem individuellen wie dem gesellschaftlichen Machtwillen polar entgegengesetzt sind und der Auswirkung einer moralischen Sendung von größter absoluter Wichtigkeit schrankenlose Möglichkeiten bietet. Das ist

die Wahrheit, das ist das Streben, die Wege, die zu den großen Zielen des Morgenlandes führen, freizumachen, für Juden wie für Araber.¹⁵⁵

Hoeflich's wariness of technical progress, European clothes and even the concept of the department store are manifestly a rejoinder to Herzl's vision of *Altneuland*.¹⁵⁶ Significantly, Hoeflich had headed the first and most substantial section of his book with the title "Neualtland",¹⁵⁷ thus inverting Herzl's title and emphasising the past rather than the present. His denunciation of the will to power – at a time when, after the First World War, the failure of the "old" imperialist Europe seemed obvious in so many ways – is motivated more particularly by the alleged arrogation of Zionism through British imperialism¹⁵⁸ which he perceives ultimately to be the reason for the Arab uprisings of 1921. Yet, like Herzl, and like Buber, Hoeflich still believes in a Jewish mission in the Orient. He seems enmeshed in the very discursive framework he sets out to fight, and although many of his ideas – inspired among others by Mahatma Gandhi¹⁵⁹ and Rabindranath Tagore¹⁶⁰ – are couched in terms later used by postcolonial criticism, his dilemma is that, after all is said and done, Hoeflich – his own change of name to "M. j. ben gawriël" as yet only indicated in brackets on the title page¹⁶¹ – is still writing from the perspective of the Westerner harking back to some indistinct and mainly imagined Oriental heritage and its future recovery.

The same dilemma was, of course, also Herzl's and Buber's. Like Hoeflich they themselves were, at least culturally, certainly no "Orientals". In fact, only as Westerners could they have fashioned their own particular brands of Orientalism which extended to re-visions of the Orient and, to varying degrees, of the self as Oriental. More paradoxically still, owing to their Semitic origins, these Orientalist Occidental Jews, no less than all other Jews, were ascribed an Oriental character from without to mark them as alien – as Hauser, too, had done in his novel. Discussing the supposedly invariable German perception of the Jew as "Asiatic", Moritz Goldstein (1880–1977) in his essay "Deutsch-jüdischer Parnaß" (1912),¹⁶² which sparked off the so-called *Kunstwart* debate,¹⁶³ had inferred from this actuality the necessity of Jewish relocation in the Orient. He, too, suggests Jewish belief in the feasibility of assimilation to be a fallacy. Anticipating the "liberal" Jew's objection – "Was willst du? Ich habe das Ghetto innerlich und äußerlich abgelegt und bin im Vollbesitz westeuropäischer Kultur. Niemand könnte aus meinen Schriften merken, daß mein Urahn mit Kaftan und Schläfenlocken einherging" – he concedes: "Den Juden zum Europäer zu wandeln war freilich die Aufgabe – vor 150 Jahren." Yet, he then continues: "Wer aber heute noch immer nichts weiter von sich verlangt, als daß er sich des Europäertums bemächtigt, der ist von vorgestern."¹⁶⁴ For his own generation, "die glücklich-unglücklichen Erben westeuropäischer Kultur",¹⁶⁵ he envisages only renunciation and resignation: "Der deutsche Frühling ist auch uns ein Frühling, wie der deutsche Winter unser Winter war, und gegen diesen seit unzähligen Generationen miterlebten Wechsel der Jahreszeiten, was bedeutet unserm Herzen der östlich blaue Himmel, unter

dem Palmen, Zedern und Oliven gedeihen? Ein Wunder allenfalls."¹⁶⁶ Yet his hope is nonetheless that there will be once again generations of modern, educated, "European" human beings, who will have been young on Jewish soil and in a Jewish nation, "mit jüdischem Heimat- und Sprachgefühl, fern unsern Nöten, fern auch unsrer Halbheit."¹⁶⁷ The achievement of "Europeanness" for Goldstein, as it was for Herzl, seems thus to be a desirable, even necessary, condition of Jewish existence. Yet it needs to be built on the stratum of some Jewish particular which, by inference, thriving on Jewish soil under the Oriental blue sky like palms and cedars, appears to be "Oriental".¹⁶⁸

*

Ranging from an architectural Orientalism instrumentalised towards the definition of a religious identity to a racially conceived Orientalism utilised for Jewish national and ethnic self-definition, Jewish Orientalism in German-speaking countries took many guises around the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century, and in many ways it may seem to be paradigmatic of the real or imagined liminality of Jewish existence in the "Occident". Because it was open to misconstructions in an environment suspicious of Jewish otherness, the former soon subsided. It was, however, replaced through Zionism by the latter in pursuance of Jewish dissociation, an objective shared by anti-Semites with disastrous consequences.

Of the several Orientalisms discussed here, the most idiosyncratic and, perhaps, elusive, aiming at total Jewish dissociation and decidedly anti-European, is Eugen Hoeflich's Pan-Asiatic vision. More conciliatory and targeting especially Jewish cultural self-definition with reference to the Jewish pre-exilic past is that of Martin Buber. Moritz Goldstein's wistful imagining of future Europeans on Jewish soil, although admitting to the necessity of transcending mere "Europeanity", is more obviously Orientalist in the sense of Said. Finally, Theodor Herzl's pseudo-imperialist vision of Jewish model Europeans colonising the degenerate Orient may have been construed in contemporary opinion as the enfranchisement of the Oriental (the Jew). Yet, in truth his vision is nothing less than the wholesale endorsement of Orientalism: the attempted complete re-creation of the Oriental as the Occidental – with all the consequences ensuing thereof as discussed by post-colonial theorists.¹⁶⁹

To varying degrees all of these Jewish Orientalisms appear to be products of a convergence of the anti-Semitic and Zionist discourses which Otto Hauser in his "Jewish" novel, situating himself at the "interface" between the two, exploited to his own subversive ends. That he could, indeed, insinuate himself with his novel into this particular "blanket" discourse was, of course, possible only because it was in fact extant. *Das neue Jerusalem*, I think, should be read as a direct commentary on a specifically Jewish Orientalism and, more particularly, on Herzl's vision. Where Herzl construed a fundamentally European utopia set

in the redeemed Orient, Hauser elaborated rather the alleged actuality of a degenerate Jewish diasporic existence in Europe, from which may be inferred, as a positive image may be deduced from a negative, his own idea of a redemptive Jewish existence in the Orient. Conceived in a discursive framework of Jewish as well as non-Jewish Orientalism and German anti-Semitism, *Das neue Jerusalem* in effect substitutes Herzl's Orientalist vision from within with one from without. Yet, by purporting to originate from within it actually suggests an "authenticity" which is meant to validate its perspective as an authoritative inside one. As such it insinuates to, and appropriates for, the Jewish "Self/Other" Orientalist stereotypes which annul and revoke Herzl's identification of the Jew with the European. Hauser's novel is, however, not only Orientalist in quite literally relegating Orientals to "their" place; it is, moreover, Orientalist also in that it presumes to set prescriptive standards to proper Jewishness in all areas of human endeavours – not least, assuming some authority also as to the form and content of Jewish achievements in the field of literature.

When Hauser's anonymously published novel was discussed in the contemporary German-Jewish press by various critics who were themselves enmeshed in the same discursive framework into which Hauser so effectively if not, perhaps, subtly had inscribed his text, they may not have suspected just how much of an "elende[s] Machwerk" and how little of a "typische Erscheinung" this subversive novel really was.

AXEL STÄHLER

Comparative Literary Studies
University of Kent
Canterbury CT2 7NZ
United Kingdom

NOTES

¹ [O. Hauser,] *Das neue Jerusalem: Ein jüdischer Roman* (Stuttgart, 1905). Hereafter referred to as *Jerusalem*.

² Hauser's authorship is acknowledged in an advertisement prefixed to his *Geschichte des Judentums* (Weimar, 1921) and in its preface, *ibid.*, p. vi. For his biography, see *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon, 1815–1950*, edited by the Austrian Academy of the Sciences (Graz & Cologne, 1959), Vol. 2 (1959), s.v. "Hauser, Otto". Hauser's autobiographical sketch "Von mir und über mich", prefixed to his translation of F. Coppée's *Der Wanderer* (Weimar, 1921), pp. v–xx (p. v), reveals an irritatingly egotistic personality: "ich [mag] ein Eigener sein, einer von jenen schier mythisch gewordenen Deutschen, denen die Auswirkung ihrer Begabung alles gilt, der Gewinn nur soweit in Betracht kommt, als er die Freiheit sichert."

³ For Hauser's connection to Herzl, see M. G. Fumits, "Die Judenthematik im Frühwerk Otto Hausers", Dissertation, University of Graz (Austria) (1989), pp. 67–8 and 77–8.

⁴ See also O. Hauser, "Meine drei jüdischen Romane: Entstehungsgeschichte", *Die Botschaft* 2 (1927), 91–107 (p. 94).

⁵ T. Herzl, *Altneuland* (Leipzig, [1902]), p. 43. Hereafter referenced in the text as *Altneuland*.

⁶ K. Kraus, *Eine Krone für Zion* (Vienna, 1898).

⁷ For Kraus and his criticism of Zionism, see, e.g., S. L. Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (Baltimore & London, 1986), pp. 237–8.

⁸ Kraus, *Krone*, p. 3.

⁹ See, e.g., E. W. Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, with a new Afterword (London, 1995), pp. 100–1 and 184.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Herzl's obvious Eurocentric bias was perceived, for instance, by Achad Haam (1856–1927; originally Ascher Ginzberg), one of the founders of cultural Zionism, who complained in a lengthy review of *Altneuland* inter alia: "Gleich allen anderen sozialen Institutionen in Altneuland ist auch die Akademie nur die Kopie einer europäischen Einrichtung, nämlich der Pariser Akademie": "Altneuland", *Ost und West* 3 (1903), cols 227–44 (col. 242). His reproach was countered furiously and fiercely by the incensed Max Nordau (1849–1923), who insisted: "In der Tat: 'Altneuland' ist ein Stück Europa in Asien. Da hat Herzl genau das gezeigt, was wir wollen, worauf wir hinarbeiten. Wir wollen, dass das wiedergeeinte, befreite jüdische Volk ein Kulturvolk bleibt, so weit es dies schon jetzt ist, ein Kulturvolk wird, so weit es dies noch nicht ist. Wir ahmen dabei niemand nach, wir benützen und entwickeln nur unser Eigentum. Wir haben an der europäischen Kultur mitgearbeitet, mehr als an unserem Teil; sie ist unser in demselben Masse wie der Deutschen, Franzosen, Engländer. Wir gestatten nicht, dass man einen Gegensatz zwischen Jüdisch, unserem Jüdisch, und Europäisch konstruiere. Achad-Haam mag die europäische Kultur etwas Fremdes sein. Dann sei er uns dankbar dafür, dass wir sie ihm zugänglich machen. Wir aber werden nie zugeben, dass die Rückkehr der Juden in das Land ihrer Väter ein Rückfall in Barbarei sei, wie unsere Feinde verleumderisch behaupten. Seine Eigenart wird das jüdische Volk innerhalb der allgemeinen westlichen Kultur entfalten, wie jedes andere gesittete Volk, nicht aber ausserhalb, in einem kulturfeindlichen, wilden Asiatentum, wie Achad-Haam es zu wünschen scheint": "Achad Haam über 'Altneuland'", *Die Welt* (13 March 1903), 1–5 (p. 2). Daniel Boyarin has suggested that the Zionist project itself may be understood as "the most profound sort of assimilationism, one in which the Jews become like all the nations": "The Colonial Drag: Zionism, Gender, and Mimicry", in: *The Pre-Occupation of Postcolonial Studies*, ed. F. Afzal-Khan & K. Seshadri-Crook (Durham, NC, 2000), pp. 234–56 (p. 236). Boyarin accordingly interprets Herzl's Zionism as "masquerade colonialism, parodic mimesis of colonialism, Jews in colonial drag", as *colonial mimicry* in Homi Bhabha's sense, through which Jews would escape the stigma of Jewish difference (p. 256). For the concept of colonial mimicry, see H. K. Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse", *The Location of Culture* (London & New York, 1994), pp. 85–92, esp. pp. 85–6.

¹⁶ See, e.g., "Ihr [i.e. the Jews] könntet das Versuchsland für die Menschheit machen [...], auf dem alten Boden ein neues Land schaffen. Altneuland!" (*Altneuland*, pp. 56–7).

¹⁷ For the following paragraphs I am indebted to H. Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen in Deutschland: Geschichte einer Baugattung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (1780–1933)*, 2 parts (Hamburg, 1981), esp. I, pp. 251–309 and 394–6. For virtual reconstructions of synagogues in Germany destroyed in 1938, see Technische Universität Darmstadt, *Synagogen in Deutschland – Eine Virtuelle Rekonstruktion*, <www.cad.architektur.tu-darmstadt.de/synagogen/inter/menu.html> (last accessed 14 May 2008).

¹⁸ For a detailed discussion of the architecture of the synagogue of Leipzig, built in 1855 by Otto Simonson (b. 1829), see Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen*, I, pp. 265–75.

¹⁹ See *ibid.*, I, p. 251.

²⁰ See, e.g., C. Schnaase, *Geschichte der bildenden Künste*, Vol. 3: *Geschichte der bildenden Künste im Mittelalter*, part 1: *Altchristliche, byzantinische, muhammedanische, karolingische Kunst*, 2nd, corrected and enlarged edn (Düsseldorf, 1869), p. 491. For other examples, see Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen*, I, pp. 251–2.

²¹ Schnaase, *Geschichte der bildenden Künste*, III.1, pp. 491–2.

²² Cf. Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen*, I, p. 253.

²³ Another option would have been the Egyptian style, which, however, suggested the land of servitude and was thus not appropriate. See *ibid.*, I, p. 256.

²⁴ See *ibid.*, I, p. 257.

²⁵ See *ibid.*, I, p. 258.

²⁶ There was, however, as I. D. Kalmar claims, a certain defiance noticeable among Zionists who endorsed the Oriental style; see "Moorish Style: Orientalism, the Jews, and Synagogue Architecture", *Jewish Social Studies* 7 (2001), 68–100 (p. 90).

²⁷ See Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen*, I, pp. 299–300.

²⁸ Quoted from Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen*, I, p. 300.

²⁹ See *ibid.*

³⁰ Kalmar notes that in a global context the period between 1880 and 1914 saw “perhaps the greatest proliferation of Moorish-style synagogues” (“Moorish Style”, p. 89), but acknowledges the impact of anti-Semitism in German-speaking countries (*ibid.*, pp. 88–90).

³¹ For examples of this style, see documentation of the synagogues of Cologne (in Roonstraße; 1895), Strassburg (1898), and Düsseldorf (1904), none of which survives. See Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen*, II, figs 318, 323 and 333. To adopt a purely “German” style was of course still ambivalent, because it could be construed in anti-Semitic discourse as denying their own heritage and appropriating and corrupting the German heritage. For a similar phenomenon in German-Jewish literature, see the discussion of Hauser’s novel below.

³² Quoted from Hammer-Schenk, *Synagogen*, I, p. 395; see also J. Reinharz, “Deutschtum and Judentum in the Ideology of the Centralverein Deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens 1893–1914”, *Jewish Social Studies* 36 (1974), 19–39 (pp. 20 and 28–9). For the background to this declaration, see I. Schorsch, *Jewish Reaction to German Anti-Semitism, 1870–1914* (New York, 1972), pp. 107–17.

³³ See Schorsch, *Jewish Reaction*, p. 117; for a change in policy in the early twentieth century, see *ibid.*, p. 187, and E. Friesel, “The Political and Ideological Development of the Centralverein before 1914”, *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 31 (1986), 121–46 (p. 129).

³⁴ From among the many publications on the Jewish Renaissance, see, e.g., M. H. Gelber, “The jungjüdische Bewegung: An Unexplored Chapter in German-Jewish Literary and Cultural History”, *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 31 (1986), 105–20; M. Berkowitz, *Zionist Culture and West European Jewry before the First World War* (Cambridge, 1993), and G. Rosenfeld, “Defining ‘Jewish Art’ in *Ost und West*, 1901–1908: A Study in the Nationalisation of Jewish Culture”, *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 39 (1994), 83–110.

³⁵ M. Buber, “Juedische Renaissance”, *Ost und West* 1 (1901), cols 7–10.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, col. 10.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ See T. Herzl, *Der Judenstaat: Neudruck der Erstausgabe von 1896* (Augsburg, 1986), p. 69. See also R. Robertson, “‘Urheimat Asien’: The Re-orientation of German and Austrian Jews, 1900–1925”, *German Life and Letters* 49 (1996), 182–92 (p. 187), and, for a discussion of Herzl’s *Altneuland* in the context of the so-called *Kulturfrage*, M. Bunzl, “The Poetics of Politics and the Politics of Poetics: Richard Beer-Hofmann and Theodor Herzl Reconsidered”, *The German Quarterly* 69 (1996), 277–304 (pp. 284–7).

³⁹ Buber, “Juedische Renaissance”, col. 9. For the further development of Buber’s Orientalism, see Robertson, “‘Urheimat Asien’”, pp. 186–8.

⁴⁰ Buber, “Juedische Renaissance”, cols 9–10.

⁴¹ Schnaase, *Geschichte der bildenden Künste*, III.1, p. 491. Intriguingly, Schnaase sees in Arabic art and architecture “eine höhere Entwicklung und grössere Eigenthümlichkeit”, while he concedes that in Jewish art and architecture a stronger “Naturgefühl” is evident (*ibid.*, III.1, pp. 491–2).

⁴² For a comprehensive discussion, see Berkowitz, *Zionist Culture*, pp. 90–1, 129–30.

⁴³ For the Bezalel, see, e.g., *ibid.*, pp. 139–42, and, unacknowledged by Berkowitz, I. Oltuski, *Kunst und Ideologie des Bezalels in Jerusalem: Ein Versuch zur jüdischen Identitätsfindung* (Frankfurt am Main, 1988), esp. pp. 130–4. For Orientalist motifs in Bezalel art and for its indebtedness to Orientalist aspects of Art Nouveau, see *ibid.*, p. 55. The name is derived from Exodus 35–7; Bezalel and Oholiab decorate the ark.

⁴⁴ For the history of the Jüdischer Verlag, see A. Schenker, *Der jüdische Verlag, 1902–1938: Zwischen Aufbruch, Blüte und Vernichtung* (Tübingen, 2003); for a bibliography of its publications, see *ibid.*, pp. 537–605.

⁴⁵ Since May 1901 the official organ of the Zionist Organisation of Germany and renamed *Jüdische Rundschau* in October 1902. The new title refers to a national rather than a religious identity.

⁴⁶ Anonymous, “Jüdischer Verlag”, *Israelitische Rundschau* (21 March 1902), n. p. [7].

⁴⁷ G. Karpeles (ed.), *Die Zionsharfe: Eine Anthologie der neuhebräischen Dichtung in deutschen Übertragungen* (Frankfurt am Main, [1888]).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. v.

⁴⁹ Ibid. Goethe's conception of a "Weltliteratur" had also been evoked by Buber as an explanation of, and justification for, the emergence of the movement of the Jewish Renaissance. See Buber, "Juedische Renaissance", col. 7.

⁵⁰ Karpeles, *Zionsharfe*, p. vi.

⁵¹ See A. B. Kilcher, "Was ist 'deutsch-jüdische Literatur'?", *Weimarer Beiträge* 45 (1999), 485–517 (p. 489).

⁵² For Dühring and others as representatives of a "völkische Germanistik", see, e.g., Kilcher, "Was ist 'deutsch-jüdische Literatur'?", pp. 489–93. The general relationship between Germans and Jews had already been the object of the so-called *Berliner Antisemitismusstreit* of 1879/80, of which Heinrich von Treitschke (1834–1896), editor of the *Preußische Jahrbücher*, and the liberal historian Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903) were the main protagonists. It had been sparked off by von Treitschke's anti-Semitic reaction to the eleventh volume of the monumental *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart* (1853–1875) by the German-Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz (1817–1891). Although by 1881, when Dühring's book was published, the conflict had somewhat receded from the public awareness, von Treitschke's assault was instrumental in first preparing the stage for widespread anti-Semitism in circles of German academia and the bourgeoisie. For a comprehensive documentation, see K. Krieger (ed.), *Der Berliner Antisemitismusstreit 1879–1881: Eine Kontroverse um die Zugehörigkeit der deutschen Juden zur Nation*, Kommentierte Quellenedition, im Auftrag des Zentrums für Antisemitismusforschung, 2 vols (Munich, 2003). On von Treitschke's observation that "there will always be Jews who are nothing more than German-speaking Orientals", see Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred*, p. 214.

⁵³ R. Jaffé, "Unsere Dichtung", *Die Welt* (8 July 1898), 13–15 (p. 13).

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 14.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 15. Jaffé quotes almost verbatim from Langbehn; cf. *Rembrandt als Erzieher: Von einem Deutschen*, 23rd edn (N.p., n.d. [1st edn 1890]), pp. 41–2.

⁵⁶ Much better known is, of course, the so-called "Kunstwart-Debatte" which had been triggered by M. Goldstein's essay "Deutsch-jüdischer Parnaß" in the periodical *Der Kunstwart* in 1912. For the *Kunstwart* debate, see below, note 163.

⁵⁷ L. Geiger, "Die deutsche Literatur und der Zionismus", *Kölnische Zeitung*, Erste Beilage zur Sonntags-Ausgabe (22 January 1905), 1.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ H. Epstein, "Die jüdische Literatur und der Zionismus", *Jüdische Rundschau* (3 February 1905), 45–6.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Apart from the anonymous author of *Das neue Jerusalem*, Geiger mentions Max Nordau, Theodor Herzl, the Dutch-Jewish author Herman Heijermans, Max Viola, Hermann Jaques and Richard Huldshiner; see "Die deutsche Literatur und der Zionismus", p. 1. Just about two months earlier, the reviewer for the London *Jewish Chronicle* of Lucas Cleeve's [i.e. Adelina Georgina Wolff], *The Children of Endurance*, signing himself A. M. N., had also noted that of late there was "a continually increasing fashion for the Jewish question to be taken up by the novelists"; see "The Children of Endurance", *The Jewish Chronicle* (4 November 1904), 23.

⁶⁵ Epstein, "Die jüdische Literatur und der Zionismus", p. 45.

⁶⁶ See *Jüdischer Almanach 5663*, ed. B. Feiwel & E. M. Lilien, 2nd edn (Berlin, n.d. [1904; 1st edn 1902]) and Feiwel's "Geleitwort zur ersten Auflage", pp. 13–20 (p. 13). Properly speaking, it was the second publication (see Schenker, *Der Jüdische Verlag*, pp. 46 and 77). For the *Jüdischer Almanach 5663*, see I. Bertz, "Jüdischer Almanach 5663", *Jüdischer Almanach 1996*, ed. J. Hessing (Frankfurt am Main, 1995), pp. 10–24, and Gelber "The jungjüdische Bewegung", pp. 112–14; for a collection of reviews compiled by the Jüdischer Verlag under the title *Jüdische Renaissance*, see Schenker, *Der Jüdische Verlag*, pp. 53–4 and n. 171. Reviews were also reprinted in an appendix to the second edition of the *Jüdischer Almanach* (1904).

⁶⁷ Feiwel, "Geleitwort", p. 13.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 16.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 18–19.

⁷¹ Anonymous, "Ost und West", *Ost und West* 1 (1901), cols 1–4 (cols 3–4).

- ⁷² Feiwel, "Geleitwort", pp. 18–19.
- ⁷³ For the currency of this conception in cultural Zionism, see, e.g., Gelber, "The jungjüdische Bewegung", pp. 113–14.
- ⁷⁴ Feiwel, "Geleitwort", pp. 18–19. For a discussion of the term "young-Jewish", see, e.g., Gelber, "The jungjüdische Bewegung", esp. pp. 105–7.
- ⁷⁵ Cf. Berkowitz, *Zionist Culture*, pp. 134–5.
- ⁷⁶ Geiger, "Die deutsche Literatur und der Zionismus", p. 1.
- ⁷⁷ The novel was published by Adolf Bonz & Co., established in 1876 as an offshoot of the venerable Metzler'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung in Stuttgart and specialising in (popular) fiction. Although Bonz published some German classics and, e.g., some of Ludwig Ganghofer's "Heimatromane", it was not programmatically anti-Semitic. In fact, with Karl Emil Franzos it published also one of the leading German-Jewish authors of the nineteenth century. When Hauser's novel provoked some antagonism, it was, as Hauser put it in 1927, "klanglos in den Hintergrund [gestellt]" by Bonz, although by then, according to the author, it had almost been sold out (Hauser, "Meine drei jüdischen Romane", p. 94).
- ⁷⁸ For reviews of *Das neue Jerusalem*, see L. Geiger, "Das neue Jerusalem", *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums* (6 January 1905), 8–9; E. Kalmus, "Das neue Jerusalem: Ein jüdischer Roman", *Jüdische Rundschau* (3 February 1905), 50, and W., "Das neue Jerusalem", *Die Welt* (17 February 1905), 13; not properly a review of the novel but discussing it in much detail is Geiger's essay on "Die deutsche Literatur und der Zionismus" mentioned earlier.
- ⁷⁹ Later in the same year, 1905, Geiger denounced Zionism as dangerous to the German state and demanded the passing of emergency legislation to pursue Zionists as enemies of the state; see *Lexikon deutsch-jüdischer Autoren*, ed. R. Heuer (Munich, 1992–), Vol. 8 (2000), s.v. "Geiger, Ludwig Moritz Philip", esp. pp. 336–7.
- ⁸⁰ Kalmus, "Das neue Jerusalem", p. 50.
- ⁸¹ Geiger, "Das neue Jerusalem". The *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums* (appearing between 1837 and 1922) promoted emancipation and was reform-oriented; in 1908 Geiger became its editor. For the history of the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, see H. O. Horch, *Auf der Suche nach der jüdischen Erzählliteratur: Die Literaturkritik der "Allgemeinen Zeitung des Judentums" (1837–1922)* (Frankfurt am Main, 1985), pp. 13–32.
- ⁸² Geiger, "Das neue Jerusalem", p. 9.
- ⁸³ Werner (1867–1928) was editor of *Die Welt* in Vienna from 1897 to 1899 and from 1903 to 1905, when the paper was relocated to Cologne.
- ⁸⁴ W., "Das neue Jerusalem", p. 13.
- ⁸⁵ Ibid. This pattern of self-criticism and criticism is already prefigured in Herzl's reaction to Eugen Dühring's anti-Semitic hate-mongering. See H. Mittelmann, "Threatened Masculinity and the Ambivalence of Being a Jew: The Image of Women in Theodor Herzl's Literary Writings", *Seminar* 43 (2007), 301–17 (pp. 306–7).
- ⁸⁶ W., "Das neue Jerusalem", p. 13.
- ⁸⁷ Schnaase, *Geschichte der bildenden Künste*, III.1, p. 487.
- ⁸⁸ To read this shimmer of light as dawn is, of course, already an interpretation, which is, however, borne out not only by the text but also by the very idea of the Orient, the East in which the sun rises – *ex oriente lux*.
- ⁸⁹ H. Grünau, "Den leidenden Brüdern!", *Jüdische Volksstimme* (1 February 1901), 5.
- ⁹⁰ While Christians believe in the coming of the "heavenly" Jerusalem, in the Haggadah the restoration of the earthly Jerusalem is also envisaged; see, e.g., *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Vol. 9 (1971), s.v. "Jerusalem", cols 1378–1593, esp. cols 1556–60.
- ⁹¹ Bartels was himself also a writer and poet who participated in the so-called *Heimatkunstbewegung*, which was in some respects a precursor to the "blood-and-soil" literature of the Third Reich.
- ⁹² A. Bartels, "Das Judentum in der deutschen Literatur", *Kritik und Kritiker* (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 102–24.
- ⁹³ Quoted from Bartels, "Das Judentum in der deutschen Literatur", p. 102.
- ⁹⁴ Bartels, "Das Judentum in der deutschen Literatur", pp. 103, 119.
- ⁹⁵ O. Hauser, *Die Juden und Halbjuden der deutschen Literatur* (Danzig & Leipzig, 1933). Before that, in 1913, the so-called *Semi-Kürschner*, a decidedly anti-Semitic reference work of German-Jewish biography, had been edited by Philipp Stauff (1876–1923) with the clearly stated aim to further the direction of study Bartels had taken; a new edition was published as *Sigilla veri* in 1929. Bartels'

project, and later also Stauff's, was countered by various attempts at Jewish self-representation and self-assertion. Ludwig Geiger had published his *Die deutsche Literatur und die Juden* in 1910; Gustav Krojanker's (1891–1945) *Juden in der deutschen Literatur* appeared in 1922 and, with a much larger scope, Siegmund Kaznelson's (1893–1959) *Juden im deutschen Kulturbereich* in the year after Hauser's *Die Juden und Halbjuden der deutschen Literatur* (and, of course, the "Machtergreifung"), in 1934. Significantly, both Krojanker's and Kaznelson's books were placed with publishing houses with a Zionist bias, the Welt-Verlag and Jüdischer Verlag respectively. Interestingly, Krojanker's title reads almost like Bartels', but significantly he, like Geiger before him, substitutes "Judentum" for "Juden" and thus emphasises the contribution of particular individuals to German literature rather than that of a racially defined group. Kaznelson's title may be read along similar lines; here, it is interesting that he expanded his subject from literary production to culture as a whole. Of special interest is the appendix in Kaznelson's publication which provides a table of non-Jews mistakenly thought to be Jews. Its first edition was prohibited and confiscated by the Gestapo early in 1935; see Schenker, *Der Jüdische Verlag*, pp. 439–42.

⁹⁶ Bartels, "Das Judentum in der deutschen Literatur", p. 120.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 104.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 105.

¹⁰¹ This may have had an added piquancy for Hauser because it must have appeared to him as an inversion of the alleged "Verjudung" (the Jewish infiltration and appropriation) of German letters.

¹⁰² In 1927 Hauser gave a fuller account of the genesis of *Das neue Jerusalem* and his two other "Jewish" novels, *Spinoza* (1907) and *Judas Ende* (serialised in 1923–1925), in his "Meine drei jüdischen Romane". In her dissertation, "Die Judenthematik im Frühwerk Otto Hausers", Fumits discusses all three novels.

¹⁰³ Hauser, preface to *Geschichte des Judentums*, p. vi.

¹⁰⁴ See also Hauser, "Meine drei jüdischen Romane", pp. 94–5.

¹⁰⁵ Hauser, preface to *Geschichte des Judentums*, p. vii.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. v.

¹⁰⁷ For a discussion of the term "modern anti-Semitism", see, e.g., S. Volkov, *Jüdisches Leben und Antisemitismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: 10 Essays* (Munich, 1990), pp. 59–62 and 88–9.

¹⁰⁸ Hauser, *Geschichte des Judentums*, pp. 525–6.

¹⁰⁹ With his Zionist bias, Hauser did not conform to the National Socialist view. He was, in fact, viewed with suspicion by Alfred Rosenberg (1893–1946), from 1923 to 1938 the editor of the *Völkischer Beobachter*, which was the central organ of the NSDAP (from 1920). In an unpublished letter to Rudolf Müller, Rosenberg, referring to Hauser's *Geschichte*, had censured the author's ambivalent attitude towards the categorical rejection of Jewry as a whole and had accused him of an entirely uncritical glorification of Zionism; see Rosenberg's letter from 3 July 1929 as quoted by Fumits, "Die Judenthematik", p. 21. Hauser himself, although initially supporting National Socialist rule, later rejected it for its character as a mass movement; see *ibid.*, pp. 21–2. Hauser remained indeed friendly with the Zionist writer Marek Scherlag (1878–1962); his unpublished correspondence with Scherlag from 1904 to 1926 is held by the Hebrew National and University Library in Jerusalem (see *ibid.*, pp. 17 and 236–7).

¹¹⁰ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 160.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Hauser, preface to *Geschichte des Judentums*, p. vi.

¹¹³ See A. Bartels, "Der Fall Otto Hauser", *Jüdische Herkunft und Literaturwissenschaft: Eine gründliche Erörterung* (Leipzig, 1925), pp. 169–88. Hauser demanded a public retraction and provided a genealogy to prove his Aryan origins; see Fumits, "Die Judenthematik", p. 76. It is quite interesting in this context that in *Sigilla veri* (1929), the second edition of Philipp Stauff's *Semi-Kürschner* of 1913, the Jewishness of the anonymous author of *Das neue Jerusalem* is still insisted upon. In fact, the author of the entry is completely taken in by Hauser's surreptitious attempt to suggest the Jewish authorship of the novel when he writes: "Der Verfasser, zweifellos Jude, weiß seinen Volksgenossen bittere Wahrheiten zuzurufen, und weiß auch weiter, daß diese Wahrheiten gerade die jüdische Presse gegen ihn aufbringen werden. Deshalb verschweigt er seinen Namen. Das aber ist bezeichnend für ihn, denn diese Furcht zeigt, daß er doch nicht der Freiheitskämpfer ist, als den er sich ausgibt [...] frei und offen im Kampf der Meinungen [...]"

seine Überzeugung zu vertreten [...]. Andererseits halten wir diese Scheu für unbegründet; denn die jüdische Presse wird alles daransetzen, den Roman totzuschweigen, um ihm nicht durch abfällige Kritik noch mehr Reklame zu machen." *Sigilla veri. (Ph. Stauff's Semi-Kürschner). Lexikon der Juden, -Genossen und -Gegner aller Zeiten und Zonen, insbesondere Deutschlands, der Lehren, Gebräuche, Kunstgriffe und Statistiken der Juden sowie ihrer Gaunersprache, Trugnamen, Geheimbünde, usw. 2., um ein Vielfaches verm. u. verb. Aufl. unter Mitw. gelehrter Männer u. Frauen [...] im Auftrage d. "Weltliga gegen die Lüge" in Verb. mit der "Alliance chrétienne arienne"*, ed. E. Ekkehard (n.p., 1929), Vol. 1, pp. 225–6. For a discussion of this passage, see Horch, *Auf der Suche*, pp. 221–2, who, in 1985, was not yet aware of the identity of the anonymous author, and Fumits, "Die Judenthematik", p. 132. A few years later, obviously in order to forestall similar "allegations", Heinrich Siemer, on the frontispiece to his philo-Semitic novel *Juda und die Anderen* (Berlin, 1928), stressed his German ancestry; see A. Levenson, "The Problematics of Philosemitic Fiction", *The German Quarterly* 75 (2002), 379–93 (p. 393).

¹¹⁴ Hauser, preface to *Geschichte des Judentums*, p. vi.

¹¹⁵ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 160.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 163.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 162.

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 163.

¹²¹ M. H. Gelber, "What is Literary Antisemitism?", *Jewish Social Studies* 47 (1985), 1–20 (p. 16) (italics in the original).

¹²² Levenson, "Philosemitic Fiction".

¹²³ See H. Jaques, *Das Kreuz des Juden* (Dresden, n.d.). The novel is mentioned by Geiger in his article on "Die deutsche Literatur und der Zionismus", p. 1.

¹²⁴ Levenson, "Philosemitic Fiction", p. 389.

¹²⁵ Jaques, *Kreuz*, p. 145.

¹²⁶ Levenson, "Philosemitic Fiction", p. 390.

¹²⁷ Ibid., p. 391.

¹²⁸ L. Algenstaedt, *Ums Land der Väter* (Berlin, 1912).

¹²⁹ Christian Zionism of a similar variety had a longer tradition in English literature. An early example is Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna's *Judah's Lion* (1843). Tonna, however, elaborating the (supposedly) shared destinies of England and Israel, and, as Eitan Bar-Yosef has shown, in keeping with the metaphorical appropriation of the "Holy Land" through vernacular biblical culture in Victorian England, presented "the Jewish colonization of Palestine as a quintessentially British project"; see *The Holy Land in English Culture 1799–1917: Palestine and the Question of Orientalism* (Oxford, 2005), p. 199.

¹³⁰ Algenstaedt, *Ums Land der Väter*, p. 2.

¹³¹ Ibid., p. 6.

¹³² Ibid., pp. 34–5.

¹³³ Ibid., p. 43.

¹³⁴ Ibid., pp. 43–4.

¹³⁵ Ibid., p. 246.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ L. G[eiger], "Ums Land der Väter", *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums* (21 February 1913), 95.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ For the "linguistic poverty" ascribed to the Jews by Hauser and Bartels, see Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred*, pp. 226–7.

¹⁴² This reflects Eugen Dühring's invectives against Jewish immorality as well as Herzl's misogyny, discussed by Mittelman in "Threatened Masculinity", pp. 306–7.

¹⁴³ See also Hauser, "Meine drei jüdischen Romane", p. 95.

¹⁴⁴ When David was forced to take his leave from Israel, he was shown to walk all alone into the dusk (*Jerusalem*, p. 305). He is then almost at the nadir of his passage through the hell of Jewish diaspora existence, which is then followed by his gradual ascent until, once more united with Israel, he sets his eyes on Jerusalem.

¹⁴⁵ Considering the sensuality of the dome suggested by Schnaase's interpretation of the swelling shape as a pure expression of Oriental "Üppigkeit", it may well be that because of this association no dome features in the vision of the new Jerusalem.

¹⁴⁶ For Hoeflich, see Wallas' edition of, and extensive commentary on, his diaries: E. Hoeflich, *Tagebücher 1915 bis 1927*, ed. & commentary by A. A. Wallas (Vienna, Cologne & Weimar, 1999), and A. A. Wallas, "Der Pförtner des Ostens. Eugen Hoeflich – Panasiat und Expressionist", *Von Franzos zu Canetti: Jüdische Autoren aus Österreich. Neue Studien*, ed. M. H. Gelber, H. O. Horch & S. P. Scheichl (Tübingen, 1996), pp. 305–44.

¹⁴⁷ See, e.g., his *Der Weg in das Land: Palaestinensische Aufzeichnungen* (1918), *Feuer im Osten* (1920), and *Der rote Mond* (1920). Hoeflich's project of a journal, promoting his ideas, failed in 1925, after one year; on *Das Zelt: Eine illustrierte jüdische Monatsschrift für Kunst, Literatur und Wissenschaft*, see A. A. Wallas, "Das Zelt: Jüdische Kunst zwischen den Weltkriegen", *Jüdischer Almanach 1996*, ed. J. Hessing (Frankfurt am Main, 1995), pp. 25–35.

¹⁴⁸ E. Hoeflich [later Moshe Yaaqov ben Gavriel], *Die Pforte des Ostens. (Das arabisch-juedische Palästina vom panasiatischen Standpunkt aus)* (Berlin & Vienna, 1923).

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 26–7.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 57–61.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 60–1.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 55–6.

¹⁵⁶ See above, and for the reference to the department store in Herzl's novel, see *Altneuland*, pp. 113–15.

¹⁵⁷ Hoeflich, *Die Pforte des Ostens*, pp. 11–109.

¹⁵⁸ Thus he interprets the Balfour Declaration; Hoeflich, *Die Pforte des Ostens*, pp. 19–30.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 91–4.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 80–1.

¹⁶¹ The official change of name was effected only in March 1927 when Hoeflich/ben Gavriel emigrated to Palestine; see Hoeflich, *Tagebücher 1915 bis 1927*, p. 563.

¹⁶² M. Goldstein, "Deutsch-jüdischer Parnaß", *Der Kunstwart* 25 (1912), 281–94 (p. 286).

¹⁶³ For a comprehensive discussion of the *Kunstwart* debate, see J. H. Schoeps *et al.* (eds.), *Deutsch-jüdischer Parnaß: Rekonstruktion einer Debatte*, Menora 13 (Berlin, 2002).

¹⁶⁴ Goldstein, "Deutsch-jüdischer Parnaß", p. 288.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 290.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 291.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 292.

¹⁶⁸ That Goldstein completely disregards the Sephardic Jews, as did the vast majority of Ashkenazi Zionists in this period, is another form of Jewish Orientalism which unfortunately cannot be dealt with in the scope of the present article.

¹⁶⁹ As laid out, e.g., by Bhabha in his "Of Mimicry and Man" and applied to Herzl's Zionism by Boyarin in "The Colonial Drag".