

2012 · VOLUME 6 · NUMBER 1

NAHARAIM

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEUTSCH-JÜDISCHE LITERATUR UND KULTURGESCHICHTE
JOURNAL OF GERMAN-JEWISH LITERATURE AND CULTURAL HISTORY

*A Publication of the Franz Rosenzweig Minerva Research Centre
The Hebrew University Jerusalem*

EDITED BY

Ashraf Noor, Jerusalem

IN COOPERATION WITH

Steven Aschheim, Jerusalem

Aleida Assmann, Konstanz

Jeffrey Barash, Paris

Dan Diner, Jerusalem/Leipzig

Jürgen Fohrmann, Bonn

Carlo Ginzburg, Pisa

David Groiser, Oxford

Werner Hamacher, Frankfurt am Main

Paul Mendes-Flohr, Jerusalem/Chicago

Gabriel Motzkin, Jerusalem

Ritchie Robertson, Oxford

Eric Santner, Chicago

Sigrid Weigel, Berlin

Yfaat Weiss, Jerusalem

Irving Wohlfarth, Paris

DE GRUYTER

Inhalt

Ashraf Noor

Editorial — III

Gershom Scholem

On Franz Rosenzweig and His Familiarity with Kabbala Literature — 1

Enrico Lucca

Gershom Scholem on Franz Rosenzweig and the Kabbalah. Introduction to the Text — 7

*

Grant Henley

Confronting *Kulturpolitik*: Testimonialism, Narrative Transgression, and Jewish Historiography in Jurek Becker's *Jakob der Lügner* (1969) — 20

Silvana Lattmann

Brunngasse 8 — 38

Ashraf Noor

“Missing”: Silvana Lattmann on Memory and Recollection — 64

Zuzanna Dziuban

Framing Absence – Reframing Memory: Spatialities of Holocaust and World War II Memory in Contemporary Poland — 83

Jeffrey Andrew Barash

Über die Unfähigkeit zu denken: Hannah Arendts Eichmann-Deutung — 108

*

Jüdisches Sprachdenken IV

Lina Barouch

Ludwig Strauss: Polyglossia and Parody in Palestine — 121

Bernd Csitkovics

Jewish Identity and Multilingualism in Rafael Seligmann's Fiction — 148

Editorial

If a number of articles that have appeared hitherto in *Naharaim* have been devoted to the work of Franz Rosenzweig, this is because of what Hegel would have called the “substantielles Interesse” of his thought. Central concerns of the German-Jewish tradition and of its relation to modernity are addressed in his philosophy. An important part of the intellectual heritage embraced by the Franz Rosenzweig Minerva Research Centre since its inception has consisted of the rigorous interpretation of Rosenzweig’s thought. The founder of the Centre, Stéphane Mosès, and the long-term director of the Centre, Paul Mendes-Flohr, fostered this research on the basis of their own vital engagement with Rosenzweig’s philosophy and their awareness of the need for a precise analysis of its ramifications for modern Jewish thought. This issue of *Naharaim* begins with an as yet unpublished set of reflections by Gershom Scholem on Rosenzweig, in which the question of revelation and mysticism in the latter’s work *Der Stern der Erlösung* is at stake. The exposition of this question in the following article by Enrico Lucca places it into the larger context of Scholem’s thought and relates it to the positions to which Scholem was responding in his remarks.

The second group of texts in this issue is devoted to the topics of history and memory. In the first two contributions to this group, Grant Henley and Silvana Lattmann are concerned with problems of testimony, memory, and recollection. The first article consists of the critical analysis of a work by Jurek Becker, while the second text is a work of literature in its own right. In the subsequent article, by the undersigned, an introduction is given to central aspects of Lattmann’s narrative in the context of contemporary thought on memory and recollection. If these three texts are located within the context of the relation of literature to history and memory, the fourth one in this group, by Zuzanna Dziuban, examines architecture and memorial landscapes in connection with the latter two instances.

In Jeffrey Barash’s following article the themes that the previous four texts considered in terms of art are scrutinised from the point of view of philosophy, considering Hannah Arendt’s analysis of the trial of Adolf Eichmann. This public enactment of history, memory, and forensic judgment provoked Arendt’s elucidation of the themes of thought and judgment in her major philosophical works of the ’sixties and ’seventies.

The final section of this issue continues the thematisation of “Jüdisches Sprachdenken” that has been carried out over several issues of *Naharaim*. In the first article in this group, by Lina Barouch, the question of language is examined in the work of Ludwig Strauss, the poet, translator, and literary critic, in

Palestine. The second explores the problem of multilingualism in the work of the contemporary author Rafael Seligmann. In each case, the tensions, mutual interference, and polyphonic multiplicity of languages reveal precarious, questioned identities in those who speak them.

We have edited *Gershom Scholem's* remarks in the opening text of this issue, to which he gave the title “Franz Rosenzweig and his Familiarity with Kabbala Literature“, following the guidelines set out in the Editorial of *Naharaim* V 1/2 with respect to the manuscript by Scholem on historiographical method and historical understanding that was published there for the first time. Scholem's comments have been left largely as they are found in the manuscript, whose content he himself revised. On occasion, we have made editorial emendations in order to patch the faulty English and make the meaning clear. We have indicated in the notes where there are German expressions and words that Scholem has evidently “smuggled” into English. False starts, incomplete sentences, and much of a linguistic usage that is sometimes far from being standard English remain, however, as a testimony to historical contingency. Scholem begins by considering a question of historical fact concerning Rosenzweig's familiarity with the Kabbalah. This is then developed into remarks that bear firstly on Rosenzweig's perspective on philology and hermeneutics, secondly on the question of whether Rosenzweig was familiar with kabbalistic theories of creation, and thirdly on the rôle of mysticism in Rosenzweig's philosophy of religion. As far as the first point is concerned, Scholem indicates that the attribution of a body of thought to one historical figure rather than another was of secondary importance to Rosenzweig. Secondly, he claims that Rosenzweig did not have any knowledge of kabbalistic conceptions of creation. Finally, he states that Rosenzweig, like Buber, was wary of mysticism and sought to maintain a distance to it. Nevertheless, according to Scholem, the second book of *Der Stern der Erlösung* contains what is in effect a mystical theory of revelation. He reveals the tension that is at work here. Although he does not develop this in detail, the features of Rosenzweig's complex attitude towards religious tradition under the conditions of modernity are indicated. Scholem is struck by the radicality of Rosenzweig's thought on revelation, and it is this radicality, despite the misgivings that he expresses elsewhere with respect to Rosenzweig's thought, which finds a resonance in his relation to this philosopher of religion.

Enrico Lucca focuses on this relation in his following elucidation of Scholem's comments, “Introduction to Gershom Scholem on Franz Rosenzweig and the Kabbalah”. Lucca sets out in his article the immediate context of Scholem's remarks by presenting the positions of Moshe Idel and Warren Ze'ev Harvey to which he responded. The main features of Scholem's disagreement with Rosenzweig, emerge, for example, from the former's commitment to Zionism and to

the entry of Judaism into history, from his anarchic instincts with an emphasis on personal, individual transformation through the return to Jewish tradition, one that could not be contained within an Orthodox framework, and from his emphasis on the apocalyptic elements in the idea of redemption. Lucca goes on to sketch the reasons for the reservations harboured by Scholem with respect to the Bible translation undertaken by Buber and Rosenzweig. The final section of Lucca's remarks is devoted to the thought of revelation in Scholem and Rosenzweig, exploring the tensions and possibilities offered by the idea of a relation between revelation and nothingness. In this understanding, revelation would be that which makes meaning and interpretation possible but which itself has no meaning. It is this negativity and the thought of the impossibility of the fulfilment of revelation that is the perspective on which Scholem draws in Jewish mysticism and which informs his conception of Rosenzweig's proximity to this perspective.

Opening the second group of texts, centred upon memory and recollection, *Grant Henley* begins his remarks in his article "Confronting *Kulturpolitik*: Testimonialism, Narrative Transgression, and Jewish Historiography in Jurek Becker's *Jakob der Lügner* (1969)" by commenting on the surprising fact that the DDR censors accepted the film script and the novel of *Jakob der Lügner* despite the divergence of these from the tenets of socialist realism. After outlining the reception of the novel in the DDR and in the BRD, Henley considers the themes of narrative and testimony in the novel, discussing the relation of these elements in Becker's work to the forms that they take both in the religious tradition, that is in sacred discourse, and in other Jewish testimonial accounts that seek to preserve memory. In each of these cases, Henley outlines the ways in which Becker develops forms of "narrative transgression". In doing so, he emphasises the importance of Becker's choice of comedy as the mode of presenting trauma. Henley's discussion of Becker's relation to existing Jewish forms of testimonial accounts takes place with respect to the contrast between history and historiography, on the one hand, and memory, on the other, that has formed the backdrop of so many of the debates in the last few decades on the nature of historical existence and the ways of representing it. Orientating himself to the positions set out by Yerushalmi, Henley points out parallels between two atypical forms of mediaeval memorial writing and the narrator in Becker's novels. As much as Becker transgresses against both the narrowly sacred and other typical Jewish modes of preserving memory, an emphasis on the eye-witness account is found in those particular cases of mediaeval writing that can be recognised in Becker's narrative figure in *Jakob der Lügner*. The framework of this latter narrative, however, is that of hopelessness, with no redemptive perspective save the envisioned possibility of being understood as prophetic testimony on the part of future readers.

In the following text, “Brunngasse 8”, a work of fiction by *Silvana Lattmann*, the relation to the past comprised by forms of narrative memory and recollection is also contrasted to historiography. The interplay of the present with various levels of the past is enacted in the narrative. In the following article by *Ashraf Noor*, “‘Missing’: Silvana Lattmann on Memory and Recollection”, a commentary is given on these aspects of Lattmann’s text, the Italian original of which appeared as a book in Novara, in the publishing house Interlinea Edizioni, in 2011.

From the fictional eye-witness in Becker and the imaginative reenactment of the past in Lattmann the perspective shifts in *Zuzanna Dziuban*’s article “Framing Absence – Reframing Memory: Former National Socialist Camps in Poland as Memorial Landscapes” to memorial architecture and landscapes. Both Lattmann’s text and the commentary that is devoted to it invoke the idea of an architectonic structure in which the relation between the present and the past is enacted in narration. Dziuban, for her part, describes this relation as it is made concrete in two contexts of commemoration in present-day Poland: the first comprising the Katyń massacre and those who died in the tragedy of the aeroplane crash in Smoleńsk and the second consisting of the victims of the Holocaust. The general context in which Dziuban carries out this analysis is that of the collective memories of historical and cultural trauma in Poland. This takes place within her consideration of the wider horizon of the attempt to integrate Eastern European memory into European memory politics. Dziuban is thus concerned with a double contextualisation, which involves tracing the shifts and the overlapping of frames of memory between and within these two dimensions. While the focus of her analysis is on Holocaust memory, this is examined in its interrelations both with larger European patterns and policies of memory and with Polish historical and cultural traumas. Dziuban seeks to understand the function of these ways of framing memory for identity politics. It is in this perspective that she discusses in her article the traumatic sites of Katyń, Smoleńsk, and Belzec. Delineating the manner in which collective memory is connected to these sites is important in order to understand its rôle in contemporary political struggles in Poland. Dziuban engages in a detailed discussion of strategies of spatial commemoration that seeks to reveal the way in which localisation and symbolisation function in collective memory. The aim of Dziuban’s work is to replace what she sees as the unproductive competition between collective memories in Poland, involving European-based and secular Holocaust memory, on the one hand, and other Polish narratives of trauma, on the other hand, with a view of the mutual references between sites of memory that is multi-directional, interrelational, and open to continual reconstrual and reworking.

Jeffrey Barash’s article “Über die Unfähigkeit zu denken: Hannah Arendts Eichmann-Deutung” is related to the problem of the framing of Holocaust mem-

ory since Arendt's analysis of the trial of Adolf Eichmann shows that the court served as a locus for testimony, recollection, and remembrance. The framing of the past that took place during the trial was decisive inasmuch as it became a focus for the enactment of collective memory. Arendt was critical of central features of the trial, regarding the showcasing of witnesses as being a form of instrumentalisation that goes beyond the figure of Eichmann. Barash is concerned with another aspect of her thought with respect to the trial, however. The pithy phrase "Banalität des Bösen" with which Arendt characterised Eichmann has provoked a great deal of comment, often hostile. Arendt's claim was that Eichmann's recourse to stock phrases and expressions was an aspect of the blindness to reality and to other human beings that accompanies what she calls the incapacity for thought. Thinking and judgment entail the capacity for looking at the world from the perspective of others. Arendt's later analyses of the Kantian schematism and its connection with judgment relate concretely to what she experienced in observing Eichmann. Relinquishing this activity of thought connected with judgment by submitting oneself to stock phrases and putative iron-clad unquestioned commands is to make oneself susceptible to moral blindness. Thought in its combination with judgment entails acknowledging a multiplicity of perspectives on the world. Arendt showed that philosophers are much prone to withdrawal from the world through the avoidance of such plurality, which is often denigrated as being the realm of mere opinion. The blindness to the world exhibited by Eichmann is thus potentially shared by those who are thinkers by profession. The process of a single mind following its own train of thoughts is potentially tyrannical since it imposes this single point of view on everyone. Arendt shows how the combination of thought and judgment in her sense also involves recollection. In contrast to this, figures such as Eichmann reveal a lack of judgment and memory in a similar way to intellectuals who were not personally involved in atrocities, either on the organisational or the personal, physical level, but who supported the National Socialist regime on the level of ideas. Barash argues from the fact that these intellectuals were not "banal" to the claim that it is necessary to revise Arendt's conception of the "Banalität des Bösen". He concludes that in this light Arendt's position that banality is the "essence" of evil is untenable.

The final two articles in this issue are concerned with the multiplicity of languages and their interrelations as being a major component of the experience of Jews. As noted above, a continuing series of articles in this journal has reflected upon this phenomenon. *Lina Barouch* devotes her article "Polyglossia and Parody in Palestine" to the theme of bilingualism in Ludwig Strauss's literary works and in his translations. She shows how Strauss enacted the dynamics present in the encounter between two or more languages. Parallels are drawn in

her article with Rosenzweig's thought on the diachronic and synchronic fluidity of language. Barouch does not analyse Strauss's Hebrew poems in depth here but concentrates rather on his German and bilingual texts. In particular, she scrutinises Strauss's literary relations with Lea Goldberg and his translations of her poetry. A further step in her article undertakes a painstaking discussion of the forms of hybridity, parody, and play in Strauss's collections of poems *Kleine Nachtwachen*, published in 1937. The mutual echoing and mirroring of German and Hebrew is a salient feature in these poems. Barouch's aim in her article is to reveal Strauss's belief in the essential fluidity of language, his view of translation as bearing messianic possibilities, and the rich creative potential of his polyglot writing.

Bernd Csitkovic's article "Jewish Identity and Multilingualism in Rafael Seligmann's Fiction" focuses on the plurality of languages in the context of the representation of Jewish life in post-Holocaust Germany. Csitkovic's emphasises the interest of Seligmann's novels as an antidote to depictions of Jews in post-Holocaust German fiction that are often patronising, despite their good intentions. He points out the tensions that Seligmann reveals in this Jewish life. The complex relations between German and the elements of Yiddish and Hebrew that are incorporated into Seligmann's novels *Rubinsteins Versteigerung* and *Die jiddische Mamme* are indicators of the crisis of identity that these texts exhibit. Csitkovic's problematises the way in which Yiddish and Hebrew are used in these novels. The view that Seligmann may encourage by the incorporation of these languages is that there is an increased presence of Jewish culture and Jewish languages in Germany. Csitkovic's emphasises, however, that this is belied by the fact that there are salient mistakes in Seligmann's Yiddish and Hebrew and that the lexis of these languages in the novels is very impoverished. He concludes that rather than expressing a revival of Jewish culture in Germany Seligmann's novels reveal tenuous, uncertain, and unstable Jewish identities.

Ashraf Noor