Alina Gromova / Felix Heinert / Sebastian Voigt
(eds)

Jewish and Non-Jewish Spaces in the Urban Context

Neofelis Verlag

German National Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the German National Library:
http://dnb.d-nb.de

Cover Design: Marija Skara
Printed by PRESSEL Digitaler Produktionsdruck, Remshalden
Printed on FSC-certified paper.
ISBN (Print): 978-3-943414-44-8
ISBN (PDF): 978-3-943414-89-9

Contents

Borderlands of Identity and Interaction

Becoming Metropolitan, (Re-)Imagining Community

Mapping (Non-)Jewish Spaces of Memory, Narration and Representation

Epilogue

Foreword
Jewish Cultural Practice and the Production of Space

All human existence, as Amir Eshel has put it, is „fundamentally connected to and manifested in space".[1] In the context of Jewish history and culture, this connection contains an additional dialectical tension: "between cosmos and makom",[2] between the places of the material world, manifest in houses, streets, markets, synagogues, and those of the spiritual heritage, in texts, prayers, images, or memories. Life conditions in the Diaspora – among the nations – have brought about a specific poetics of space as a result of this *in-between-ness* and of the physical and mental confrontation between these two worlds. The starting point of Eshel's discussion is Jacob's dream: the awe-inspiring encounter ("ma nora ha-makom ha-zeh!") is expressed in spatial terms; from then on, Jacob's role will be "contingent upon his inhabitating, imagining, depicting, giving meaning to, transgressing – in short, being in – this certain place".[3]

Jewish topographies emerge from and can be discussed in the framework of such – cultural – activities: to inhabit, to imagine, to depict, to give meaning to, to transgress. To be in a place. The wide variety of cultural practices both among Jews and in their relationship with others is a product of the meeting between "traditions of place" and "visions of space", to use the terms that Julia Brauch, Anne Lipphardt and Alexandra Nocke have chosen for the subtitle of their book,[4] an outcome of the Potsdam-based postgraduate research group *Makom* (2001–2007). Following Lily Kong's assertion „that space is open, contingent and is the outcome of (rather than the container

1 Amir Eshel: Cosmopolitanism and Searching for the Sacred Space in Jewish Literature. In: *Jewish Social Studies* 9,3 (2003), pp. 121–138, here p. 124.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., p. 126.

4 Julia Brauch / Anna Lipphardt / Alexandra Nocke (eds): *Jewish Topographies. Traditions of Place, Visions of Space*. Aldershot: Ashgate 2008.

for) complex social processes", and Henri Lefebvre's claim that "space is at once result and cause, product and producer",[5] most researchers agree that enactment and creativity are key notions for our understanding of being in places.

One of the most visible and widely discussed examples of such enacted spaces is the *eruv*, the Sabbath border, a complex network of spatial activities that creates (or produces) – for one day of the week – a *Jewish space*, a kind of private space surrounded by public spaces, within which the law that forbids carrying on a Sabbath is suspended. Inner-Jewish debates about the use and validity of eruvim concern questions of observance and transgression; public debates, as Barry Smith and others have shown, raise questions of ownership and belonging: "Opponents of the eruv argued that public property cannot be designated for the use of a particular group", and non-Jews have expressed their uneasiness about "living in a territory identified with a religion that is not [their] own".[6] In defence of the concept, Manuel Herz argues: "Abstracted from its religious context and analysed upon its urban strategy, the eruv stands for a seeding of an urban realm that nevertheless remains accessible to all groups of society and open to all uses."[7] Justifications of *eruvim*, or of other forms of ritual practices that engage with public space (the temporal building of *sukkot* or the construction of synagogues), require knowledge of "Jewish Conceptions and Practices of Space", as Charlotte Fonrobert and Vered Shemtov have titled their Stanford conference of 2003 and the ensuing publication.[8] Similarly to Eshel, they argue "that neither individual nor community can experience time in this world without claiming, occupying, naming, shaping, negotiating, and losing 'real' space."[9]

This is the context for the present volume that brings together, and into dialogue, research from two of the most innovative fields in current Humanities:

5 Lily Kong: Mapping 'new' Geographies of Religion: Politics and Poetics in Modernity. In: *Progress in Human Geography* 25,2 (2001), pp. 211–233; quoted in Fraser McDonald: Towards a Spatial Theory of Worship: Some Observations from Presbyterian Scotland. In: *Social & Cultural Geography* 3,1 (2002), pp. 61–81, here p. 64; Henri Lefebvre: *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell 1991, p. 142.

6 Barry Smith: On Place and Space: The Ontology of the Eruv. In: Christian Kanzian / Edmund Runggaldier (eds): *Cultures: Conflict – Analysis – Dialogue*. Frankfurt am Main: Ontos 2007, pp. 406–407.

7 Manuel Herz / Court Jester: The Politics of "Jewish Architecture" in Germany. In: *Jewish Social Studies* 11,3 (2005), pp. 58–66, here p. 58.

8 Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert / Vered Shemtov: Introduction: Jewish Conceptions and Practices of Space. In: Ibid., pp. 1–8.

9 Ibid., p. 4.

Jewish studies and Urban studies. This collection of papers represents both a continuation of earlier work and an innovative and original contribution: The relationship between Jewish and non-Jewish spaces in the urban context emerges as a useful platform, an arena in which ideas and approaches concerning different historical periods and geographical locations can be discussed.

It is the city, the urban context, that provides both inspiration and information for such an enterprise. This volume also contributes both the material sources and the original thinking that we need to overcome generalisations and essentialist attributions: "Jews have lived in cities for millennia and scholars have consistently studied Jewish urban life."[10] Yes, true – but what does this mean? Is there something like an "urban character", for individuals, for groups and communities, or even for cities?[11] What is the role and function of borders, limits, and margins for the study of Jewish and non-Jewish spaces?[12] What more can we expect from a new publication than productive new questions?

Joachim Schlör
Southampton, June 2015

10 Frankel Institute for Advanced Judaic Studies, Theme for 2007–2008: Jews and the City. https://www.lsa.umich.edu/judaic/institute/themes (accessed 14.06.2015).

11 What is Urban Character? Defining, Constructing and Regulating Urban Place Identity. Chief Investigator: Professor Kim Dovey. Funded by: ARC Discovery-Project Grant 2003–2005. http://www.abp.unimelb.edu.au/research/fund/wuc.html (accessed 14.06.2015).

12 Moritz Föllmer / Habbo Knoch: Grenzen und urbane Modernität. Überlegungen zu einer Gesellschaftsgeschichte städtischer Interaktionsräume. http.//hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/index.asp?id=788&view=pdf (accessed 14.06.2015).

Introduction

The concept of space has been widely debated in the fields of history, urban studies, ethnography, literary studies and other related disciplines in recent years. These debates have extended to the realm of Jewish studies, where the term "space" has been applied in various ways.[1] Among the most common theoretical premises for the contemporary discourse on space is Henri Lefebvre's concept of *espace vécu* (lived space).[2]

Yet the discussion of spatialization in Jewish history is far from over; there are still many open questions – and few empirical case studies – about the conception of Jewish space as a *fluid* process, rather than a fixed, closed or complete entity. Such an understanding would imply a conceptualization of Jewish space as an area – and object – of negotiations and controversies, to which the genesis of various discourses and divergent experiences can be traced.

It seems evident that processes of inclusion and exclusion have influenced Jewish and non-Jewish "identity politics" in urban spaces in various epochs and areas. Furthermore, urban space itself can be understood only in relation to adjacent semi-urban and rural environments, which must be taken into account when dealing with the notion of urban space. Hence, space must be understood not just as a physical entity or territoriality, but as a concept constructed and shaped by the discourses surrounding it as well as by the human

1 See among others *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures* 23,2 (2014): Jewish Space Reloaded!, ed. by Eszter B. Gantner / Jay (Koby) Oppenheim; Barbara E. Mann: *Space and Place in Jewish Studies*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP 2012; Julia Brauch / Anna Lipphardt / Alexandra Nocke (eds): *Jewish Topographies. Visions of Space, Traditions of Place*. New York: Ashgate 2008; Diana Pinto: The Jewish Space in Europe. In: Sandra Lustig / Ian Leveson (eds): *Turning the Kaleidoscope: Perspectives on European Jewry*. New York / Oxford: Berghahn 2008, pp. 27–40; Diana Pinto: A New Jewish Identity for Post-1989 Europe. *JPR Policy Paper* 1 (1996). http://www.jpr.org.uk/documents/A%20new%20Jewish%20identity%20for%20post-1989%20Europe.pdf (accessed 04.05.2015).

2 Henri Lefebvre: *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell 1997.

beings living in it.[3] Spaces are not just physical and geographical, but also symbolical, mental and social – all aspects which must be analyzed in order to obtain a complete picture of the relevance of space in Jewish and non-Jewish experience.

Taking up this challenge we organized a conference in November 2012, on "Jewish and Non-Jewish Spaces in the Urban Context" at the Institute of European Ethnology and the Georg Simmel Center for Metropolitan Studies at the Humboldt University, Berlin. International scholars from various disciplines gathered to discuss the role of space in Jewish and non-Jewish history, anthropology, cultural sciences, geography, architecture and literature. The central questions behind the conference were: How are Jewish spaces as well as Jewish-non-Jewish spatial relations constructed in various temporal, spatial and discursive contexts? What kinds of overlaps and borders emerge when disparate agents meet simultaneously in Jewish and non-Jewish spaces? Do urban contexts in various times and geographical regions affect the spatialization of the various divergent Jewish forms of self-identification, as well as their perception by the non-Jewish population – and if so, how? A central aim of the conference was to debate the existence of a general theoretical framework linking all the various case studies.

In the brief historiographical introduction that follows this general preface, Felix Heinert suggests one possible framework for historicizing some of the motivating issues behind this volume. Considering the spatial turn as a whole, he polemicizes against certain de-historicized conceptions of this – according to some – revolutionary "turn" in general, and certain influential historiographical traditions of forgetting and reinventing Jewish (and non-Jewish) spatiality in particular.

The articles contained in this volume adopt various methods and disciplinary perspectives. Nonetheless, they all share a common conceptual assumption – namely, that Jewish spaces develop only in relation to non-Jewish spaces. The discussions held during the conference revolved around the following focal points: What spaces are produced by the encounter between Jewish and non-Jewish agents in an urban environment? How is difference marked,

3 Cf. Martina Löw: *Raumsoziologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 2001; Martina Löw / Georgios Terizakis (eds): *Städte und ihre Eigenlogik. Ein Handbuch für Stadtplanung und Stadtentwicklung*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus 2011, and for a pronounced criticism of some implicitly essentialised conceptualizations of space *within* spatial turn: Jan Kemper / Anna Vogelpohl (eds): *Lokalistische Stadtforschung, kulturalisierte Städte. Zur Kritik einer ‚Eigenlogik der Städte'*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot 2011.

negotiated and, in the end, possibly spatialized? Where and how do spaces of contact as well as spaces of conflict emerge within modern Jewish history? Seeking to address the topic in a broad manner, we invited (cultural) historians, anthropologists, scholars of architecture and literature from Germany, Poland, Hungary, Switzerland, England, the USA, France and Israel. The present volume contains papers delivered during the conference as well as additional contributions intended to round out the broad geographical, epochal and thematic framework.

The first section of the volume, entitled "Historicizing 'Jewish Space', Deconstructing the 'Ghetto' – Early Modern and Modern Perspectives on Jewish Modernity," presents international historiographical analyses of Jewish space in early modern and modern contexts, addressing the controversial role of the ghetto as a Jewish space and depicting the Jewish spaces in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Ottoman Algiers.

In his article, "Making Sense of the 'Ghetto'. Conceptualizing a Jewish Space from Early Modern Times to the Present," Jürgen Heyde argues that the term 'ghetto' represents a phenomenon that is easy to exemplify, yet almost impossible to define. Despite – or perhaps because of – the widespread use of the term in various geographical, temporal and cultural contexts, there is no universally accepted definition of the term 'ghetto.' This is all the more striking considering that the origins of the term were firmly established decades ago. The article argues that an understanding of this term requires an investigation into the connotations and meanings ascribed to it in its various settings. This investigation is divided into four parts: The first addresses recent attempts at defining the term from historical and sociological perspectives. The second section analyses two texts fundamental for a modern-day understanding of the term 'ghetto': Louis Wirth's *The Ghetto* and Salo W. Baron's article "Ghetto and Emancipation". In the third part, the focus shifts further back to the time between the French Revolution and World War I, when the early modern ghettos were dissolved but the motif of the ghetto continued to play an important role in the debates about Jewish identity in the modern world. The fourth section focuses on the early modern period itself, when the term 'ghetto' emerged, a period later referred to as "the age of the ghetto". The example of Venice is used to highlight early usages and meanings ascribed to the term. The term 'ghetto,' Heyde argues, has always been an object of debate. Definitions and descriptions of the ghetto have been used to shape specific views of Jewish (and other) history, society and culture. While conceptualizations of the ghetto at any given time were influenced

by contemporary interests, they also added to the scope of our knowledge regarding the word's possible meanings. In the course of time, a wide range of connotations unfolded – a symbolic dimension that must necessarily be considered when discussing the ghetto as a Jewish space.

In her article, "Jewish *Shtetl* or Christian Town? The Jews in Small Towns in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 17th and 18th Centuries," Maria Cieśla analyses the social interaction between Jews and their non-Jewish Christian environment in the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which was home to the largest Jewish community in Europe at the time. Cieśla's analysis centers on the *shtetls*, or small towns where the majority of Jews lived. She argues that the image of the *shtetl*, as depicted in most literature on the subject, is often an oversimplified, idealised vision that ignores the complexity of social life. In order to elucidate that complexity, the author refers to Georg Simmel's concept of space, considering the manifold interactions between Jews and their Christian neighbours, and thereby approaching Christian-Jewish relations from a new angle. Cieśla bases her research mainly on hitherto unanalysed private archives and legal acts. By examining the Jews' economic activity in the market place, in the religious space of the synagogue and in their domestic spaces, she demonstrates the importance of all these areas for social integration between Jews and Christians. Cieśla concludes that the *shtetl* cannot be understood as a Jewish space alone; rather, it is necessary to consider its Christian elements as well.

In "The Nature of Jewish Spaces in Ottoman Algiers," Nora Lafi sets out from the observation that between the end of 15th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the Ottoman Empire appears to have been a safe haven for Jews from various parts of Europe, from Spain to Eastern Europe, the Black Sea and the Balkans. Ottoman cities where local Jewish communities had existed since ancient times – from Salonica to Jerusalem, Istanbul to Medina, Tunis to Bagdad and Sarajevo to Alexandria – welcomed new Jewish populations fleeing European persecutions. The new migrants were incorporated into the framework of the Ottoman policy of tolerance, which was itself rooted in medieval Islamic principles of protection and prescribed precise patterns of communal autonomy. In all these cities, the Jews were a fundamental component of urban life. Lafi analyses the relationship between the Jewish community and the urban space in the city of Algiers, one of the main Ottoman ports of North Africa. In Algiers, the reforms of the 19th century were implemented in a colonial and highly ambiguous form. The issue of the granting of 'equality' to the Jews by the French colonial authorities

was central in this respect; indeed, full equality was only given to the colonial settlers, and not to the rest of the Algerian population. The state authorities granted the Jews of Algiers broader access to the civic sphere, while at the same time excluding Algerian Muslims from it. According to Lafi, this biased reform produced a new divide between the Jews and the rest of the Algerian population, with severe consequences for the transformation of lived experiences within the urban space. Many Jewish families moved to the so-called 'European' city that was gradually being constructed on the ruins of part of the old city, which had been destroyed by the French between 1830 and 1832, or beyond the limits of the former walled city. Many small synagogues and workshops of Jewish artisans were destroyed in this first phase of colonial urbanism. It was only in 1845 that the construction of a monumental synagogue initiated a new phase in the relationship between the colonisers and the Algerian Jews. The day-to-day proximity between Jews and Muslims gradually waned, and many shared spaces on the micro-urban level disappeared. Many others, however, remained – based, as Lafi observes, on shared practices of sociability, such as cooking and music – until the exile of 1962, when, in the wake of Algerian independence, most Algerian Jews were forced to leave the country.

In "A Jewish Space in an Extreme Context? German Ghettoes for Jews in Eastern Europe during World War II," Frank Golczewski discusses whether Jewish ghettos built by the Germans in Eastern Europe during World War II can and should at all be labeled as Jewish spaces. He argues that while the ghettos have long been a subject of scholarly interest from the German perspective, the Jewish councils have often been seen merely as dependent auxiliaries. The very possibility of any kind of autonomous action or choice on the part of the Jews, who had been forced to live in special quarters set aside for them, was ruled out. Only in recent years have historians begun to approach these very specific spaces from a Jewish perspective. Through a discussion of the creation of the first ghettos in the General Government – documented in the so-called *Schnellbrief* of Reinhard Heydrich – and an explanation of the various stages of ghettoization on Polish territory, Golczewski shows that there is no single, unified "ghetto world," but rather a conglomeration of many spaces, each with its own characteristics. The picture is further complicated when the ghettos in the German Reich and the occupied Soviet territories are considered. Golczewski argues that the ghettos erected by the Germans were characterized by a certain ambivalence: they included both areas with some form of temporary self-administration as well as areas of clear non-Jewish

dominance; the *Judenbann* system as well as open, un-walled or walled ghettos. Even the strictest ghetto regulations were sometimes modified for pragmatic reasons; the question of whether a ghetto can be considered a Jewish space thus cannot be uniformly answered. During the first years of the war, before the Holocaust , many ghettos still possessed a measure of autonomy, and could therefore be classified as Jewish spaces – but this was only a temporary phenomenon. In their later stages, as Golczewski points out – following Tim Cole's terminology, who was the first to apply the notion of the 'spatial turn' to Nazi ghettos – the ghettos in Eastern Europe could no longer be considered Jewish spaces, but rather "waiting spaces for death".

The second section of the volume, entitled "Borderlands, Identity and Interaction," brings together historical analyses of the use and construction of Jewish and non-Jewish spaces in the 19th and 20th centuries. The research it contains on borders and transgressions within Germany and on the Prussian periphery reveals a close interaction between space and identity politics, paving the way toward new theoretical approaches to Jewish space.
Anne-Christin Saß discusses "Transnational and Transcultural Spaces in the Diaspora" as revealed in "The Case of Berlin 1900–1933." Employing the example of Eastern European Jewish migrants, her article examines the creation and alteration of communicative spaces in the urban landscape of Berlin during the first decades of the 20th century. The various communicative spaces established by the spatial strategies of the migrants correspond to particular types of modern urban places such as streets, boarding houses, cafés, union houses and flats, all of which were associated with specific features and experiences of space. The communicative spaces functioned as social and cultural contact zones, which stimulated multifaceted exchanges and transfers. They were, as Saß argues, places of encounter between East and West, between the foreign and the familiar, and were characterized by a deep-seated transnationalism and transculturality. In this way, the article questions the often hastily made assumption that distinct Jewish and non-Jewish spaces existed in the urban context, and refutes the image of Eastern European Jews as a highly segregated and secluded group in Western European cities, highlighting instead the complexity of the processes of differentiation and segregation within a specific urban space and culture.
In "A Border from a Jewish Perspective. Developments on the Prussian Periphery," Ruth Leiserowitz examines an important (trans-)national space for Jews in Eastern Europe. The region between Prussia and the Russian Empire was shaken by the events of the short 20th century, beginning with

the end of World War I. From the end of the 18th century until 1914, this area had developed into a key border region between two great powers; it had a high percentage of Jews, who often made up over fifty percent of the population in the small towns. Leiserowitz shows that borders in general, and this border in particular, play an essential role in historical evolution: they could be considered a kind of seismograph, a high-energy zone. Being a "Jewish area," the political vicissitudes of the region affected the Jews most of all. First, in 1916, the German army occupied the area. After Germany's defeat in World War I and its subsequent loss of much of its Eastern territory, the border was shifted and the region became part of the newly established Lithuanian state. But the conflicting territorial claims did not end there; the newly established nation states, with their respective perceptions of ethnicity, often marginalized the Jews. The Soviet invasion of 1940 ended with Nazi Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union, which turned the former border region into the foremost theater of the Holocaust. Some of the first massacres of Jews by the SS-*Einsatzgruppen* were committed on the territory of what had been Lithuania. The prospering Jewish culture there was almost completely destroyed. Leiserowitz demonstrates how political events since the early 19th century influenced the lives of Jews in the Prussian-Russian border region. She also underlines the relevance of borders, as spatial phenomena, as a central historical category within a transnational perspective on Jewish history. The view from the apparent periphery may shed light on fundamental developments, thus upsetting the traditional differentiation between center and periphery.

In "German-Jewish Borderlands. On 'Non-Jewish Jewish Spaces' in Weimar and Nazi Germany," Mirjam Zadoff discusses the notion of Jewish space as the space of 'non-Jewish Jews' (Isaac Deutscher) in the context of the Weimar Republic and Nazi Germany. Her discussion centres on the biography of Werner Scholem, one of the leading Jewish communists in Weimar Germany, whose experience offers insight into the complex and at times dialectic identity of non-Jewish Jews, situated at the interstices of two worlds. These inhabitants of these border spaces were defined by their highly individual experiences as voluntary political and public outcasts from the Jewish community who nevertheless remained linked to it through bonds of family and friendship. At the same time, this 'non-Jewish Jewish space' was shaped by the growing antisemitism in the Weimar Republic, and subsequently in Nazi Germany.

The volume's third section, "Becoming Metropolitan, Reimagining Community," addresses the ways Jews inscribed themselves into the urban spaces, politics (both Jewish and non-Jewish) and practices of daily (Jewish) life in various large cities, in a geographical spectrum extending from Western Europe through Central and Eastern Europe to the Russian Empire.

In her article, "Space for Reflection: Synagogue Building in Nineteenth-Century Urban Landscapes," Saskia Coenen Snyder follows Henri Lefebvre, Michel de Certeau and David Harvey in adopting the assumption that space and location are not neutral categories, but concepts replete with political and ideological meaning. Urban landscapes and buildings contribute to the construction of social relations; yet their significance is often fluid and open to interpretation rather than intrinsic. This shifting meaning is, in turn, continuously contested and called into question, as the author demonstrates using the example of the Oranienburger Straße synagogue in Berlin. While many scholars see the construction of this synagogue as a triumph of Jewish emancipation in 19th century Germany, Coenen Snyder rejects a simplistic perspective, arguing that the history of the synagogue's construction – which lasted nearly two decades, from the first petition to the building's completion in 1866 – was fraught with ambivalence: the synagogue was repeatedly used, by various actors at various times, to (re-)define both Jewishness and Germanness. In addition, the Jewish community had to deal with numerous obstacles placed in its path by the Prussian state regarding every aspect of the building, from its location to its design. The synagogue was constructed at a time when the "Jewish question" was already very much alive within German society, and Jews frequently encountered considerable antisemitic resentment. Coenen Snyder shows that even the synagogue's generally positive reception contained an element of ambiguity: its architecture was seen by many as overly fantastic and "Oriental" – qualities that seemed to underscore the Jews' otherness and foreignness to the German *volk*.

In his contribution, "The Emergence of the First European Jewish Metropolis in Warsaw, 1850–1880," François Guesnet shows the significance of the fact that over the course of a single generation, between 1850 and 1880, the general population of Warsaw doubled, while the number of Jews living in the Polish capital grew threefold, from below 40,000 to over 120,000. The Jews of Warsaw, he contends, outgrew their own capacity to form a community, and morphed into a Jewish metropolis. Guesnet assesses this transformation by looking at the way Jews experienced the Polish metropolis, how they marked spaces as "Jewish," shared and enjoyed "neutral" spaces, and asserted their presence in the face of contestation.

In "Jewish Quarters as Urban Tableaux," Eszter Gantner discusses the concept of the 'Jewish quarter' as it has been applied to Budapest's 8th district in media debates since the beginning of the millennium. This district, which has been under UNESCO protection since 2002, has drawn the attention of various NGOs working to protect its cultural and architectural heritage and to combat the unregulated sale, demolition and construction of buildings in the neighborhood. Gantner analyses the relevant literature on the cultural and architectural reconstruction of Jewish quarters and concludes that the "Jewish nature" of a "Jewish quarter" is generally determined by the Jewish population that used to live or now lives in the given area. With regard to Budapest, however, the author raises the following question: What if the Jewish population, whose relationship to Judaism is heterogeneous, ranging from religious to secular and cultural, does not constitute a distinct group – neither in its appearances nor its practices? Gantner observes that in many cities and towns of continental Europe, including Budapest, the Jewish population tends not to leave clearly recognizable traces in the cityscape. She also stresses the fact that most European cities with historic Jewish quarters no longer have a significant Jewish community; all that remains is a consciousness of memory and an architectural heritage. To describe this Jewishness that exists primarily in relation to architectural heritage and memory, the author suggests the term 'urban tableau,' which she defines as an assemblage of images underlying the perception of 'Jewishness' in European cities and towns bereft of their Jewish communities. Using the examples of Paris, Krakow and Berlin, Gantner discusses the role of urban tableaux and the practices relating to the culture of memory involved in the construction of "Jewishness" and the definition of what constitutes a "Jewish quarter."

In his essay, "Jewish, Urban, Imperial and Other Spaces. The Spatial Momentum in the Historiography of the Russian-Jewish Experience," Alexis Hofmeister discusses the multifaceted relations between Jews and gentiles in the urban environment of the Russian Empire in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Through an examination of several Jewish autobiographies, Hofmeister uncovers various perspectives on the relationship between Jewish and non-Jewish space. Mary Antin remembers her childhood in a small town as having been sharply divided between the Jewish *shtetl* and the unknown, mysterious place called Russia that surrounded it. From her perspective, America is the promised country providing refuge to Jews fleeing persecution in their old home, which becomes, in retrospect, a non-Jewish space. At the same time, Antin sees the *shtetl* as a lost paradise. Osip Mandelstam, by contrast, does not associate Jewish space with small towns and non-Jewish space with urban

environments. In his autobiography, written in Moscow, he recalls his childhood in St. Petersburg as having been characterized by "Judaic chaos" as well as anti-Jewish violence. Hofmeister points out that the historicity of spatial perception has been addressed, in historical discourse, in three main fields: the history of Jewish migration, the history of the *shtetl* as a space of life as well as memory, and the history of the pogrom as a history of the fight over public space. Comparing the cases of three different urban spaces – Kiev, Odessa and Yekaterinoslav (Dnepropetrovsk) – Hofmeister argues for revising the notion of a segregated Jewish space in the cities of Imperial Russia. In some parts of the cities, Jews and non-Jews would live and work side by side, while each group also created separate spaces of its own. These parallel processes gave rise to permanent conflicts over the meaning and function of urban space, but also enabled Jews to experiment with Jewish urbanity.

The last section of the volume, "Mapping Jewish and Non-Jewish Spaces of Memory, Narration and Representation," combines historical, cultural and literary approaches to Jewish and non-Jewish space. It shows how memory, imagination and narration charge physical space with symbolic meanings, transforming it into an arena for the negotiation of cultural (and other) possessions.

In "Gypsy Spaces and Jewish Spaces as Hyper-Liminal Spaces of Inversion. Longing for the Shtetl and Gypsy Camp," Monica Rüthers describes Jewish and Gypsy spaces in which people belonging to borderline communities are put on stage at public festivities. These events take place in touristic spaces set apart from the actual living spaces of the minorities, who thus become, simultaneously, performers and "performed." The 1990s saw an upsurge in the interest in Yiddish language, Klezmer music and Chassidism. Starting from the mid-1980s, there has also been a growing fascination with Gypsy music and culture, both in Europe and the United States. The most attractive of these performance spaces are situated in European borderlands and address a heterogeneous public. In light of this fact, the author takes a comparative approach, using spatial concepts to elucidate the structural similarities between Gypsy space and Jewish space. In considering the question of how an exploration of Gypsy spaces can help us better understand Jewish spaces, Rüthers compares two prominent cultural events, the Kraków Jewish Culture Festival and the Gypsy pilgrimage to Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer. The aggregation of liminal elements seems to promise a transformative experience. In these spaces, Jewish and Gypsy past and present are imagined and exoticized in atemporal enactments whose subjects are dead Jews or "timeless" Gypsies – figures that, collectively imagined, become symbols in popular memory.

Emphasis is placed on tradition and the exotic, pre-modern "other". Locals, visitors and members of minorities are all involved in these "enactments of heritage." Jewish and Gypsy spaces are loci of social inversion that provide the minorities with a precarious temporary status and the "Europeans" with settings in which to negotiate new identities.

In her article, "In the Cellars and Attics of Memory: Mapping Jewish and Non-Jewish Spaces in Contemporary Poland," Magdalena Waligórska discusses the renegotiation of the topographies of 'Jewish' and 'non-Jewish' spaces in contemporary Poland. Analyzing the attempts of local actors to revitalize, commemorate and create Jewish spaces, she identifies two main types of cultural projects: those initiated by Jewish museums, festivals, community centers and other cultural institutions on the one hand, and virtual projects seeking to recover and reconstruct, using digital media, traces of Polish-Jewish architecture on the other. The far-reaching discussion of Jewish spaces that developed in Poland after 1989, as mapped out by scholars, photographers, artists, writers and also tour operators, serves as a backdrop to Waligórska's analysis. She examines the particular case of the Jewish district of Krakow, Kazimierz, as a place in which the "rediscovery" of Jewish space has been closely interwoven with a recent, non-Jewish historical narrative. As a UNESCO World Heritage site, Kazimierz has become one of the main Jewish heritage tourism sites in Central Europe. Since the 1990s, the creation of a tourist infrastructure with cafés, restaurants, concerts and festivals has accelerated the gentrification of the area. It has also provoked protests – both from the quarter's non-Jewish residents, who complain about being driven out of their homes, and the local Jewish inhabitants, who fear an affront to the memory of the historical Jewish community. Waligórska analyses the debates in the media shaped by this recent history, which has led to a heated discussion about "the legitimate and illegitimate uses of a space loaded with conflicting memories and myths". She observes that the fears and hopes of the local Jewish and non-Jewish elements in Kazimierz, together with the change in the local economy and memoryscape, have led to "a new wave of nostalgia about the post-1945 *non-Jewish* Kazimierz" with its proletarian character – sentiments that echo antisemitic stereotypes of Jewish territory appropriation on the one hand and longing for the Communist past on the other. Following de Certeau, Waligórska concludes that the stories and legends attached to a particular place by Jewish and non-Jewish groups are closely interwoven, and that it is from their interconnectedness that the "identity of space" arises. Whether the space is defined as Jewish or non-Jewish depends entirely on the observer.

Diana Popescu's essay, "Between Poetics and Politics. The Eruv and the Wall in Recent Contemporary Artistic Imagination," engages the contradictory nature of two Jewish spatial markers: the historically prevalent eruv, or Jewish ritual enclosure, and the modern and conflict-ridden Israeli wall or security fence. Popescu explores how both spatial markers alternately allow and block contact with the "other"; their ambivalent nature is expressed in artworks such as American Jewish artist Ben Schachter's delicate thread-on-paper maps of *eruvin* (2010), Sophie Calle's *L'Erouv de Jérusalem* (1996) and other recent artistic responses to the wall such as Ravit Cohen Gat and Moshe Gerstel's installation *Next Year in Jerusalem* (2005) and Eyal Weizman's maps, which form part of the group project *Borderlinedisorder* (2002). Popescu shows how artists reflect on the entanglement of the respective spatial politics and poetics of the eruv and the wall, and suggests that these two ambivalent phenomena represent flip sides of the same coin. She also asserts that artistic reflections on spatial practices are important because they force us to reconsider old practices and help us reach a deeper understanding of the effect of such statements on contemporary audiences.

In his article, "Locating Jewish Identities in Naomi Alderman's *Disobedience*", Martin Kindermann analyses various strategies for depicting urban space and its semantic layers as an element of the construction of Jewish identities in Alderman's novel. Based on a relativistic notion of space, he describes space as a relational network in constant motion. He begins by outlining the literary representation of space in general, using the notion of the border as a central element of the spatial network. He then proceeds to establish a correlation between the key concepts of space and the strategies through which Jewish identities are constructed. Kindermann's analysis shows that processes of mutual permeation bring about a hybridization that blurs the seemingly clear-cut borders between the respective semantic sub-spaces. Drawing on Jurij M. Lotman's model of the semiosphere, he aims to observe these semiotic dynamics within the polyvalent space of the semantic border more closely. Alderman's novel constructs urban space as a hybrid structure: Ronit and Esti, the protagonists, are portrayed as hybrid identities, being at once British, Jewish, homosexual and bi-sexual (respectively), secular and orthodox. The literary space of Alderman's text is revealed as a highly polyvalent network of relations that evidences conflict rather than coherence. Mediated by three distinct narrative voices that create a complex narrative framework, the text establishes a polyphonic context that mirrors the intratextual spatial structure of the narrative itself. The author outlines the complex processes of the construction of meaning inscribed in the spatial framework of the city. As

the setting for the negotiation of various attempts to construct Jewish identities, urban space is also a space of articulation: conflicting semantic spheres give rise to processes of hybridization, thereby questioning bi-spatial notions with regard to locating Jewishness. The seemingly straightforward conflict between Britishness and Jewishness is thus eventually discarded in favor of much more complex notions of space and identity that lead us, by means of multiple perspectives and a narrative mobility capable of elucidating the conditions for the perception and formation of space, toward a richer understanding of the ambivalent construction of Jewish identity.

Wolfgang Kaschuba, former director of the Institute of European Ethnology at the Humboldt University of Berlin, concludes the volume with the epilogue, "'Jewish Quarter' and 'Kosher Light'. On the 'Migrantisation' of Jewish Urban Space." He investigates how the collective memory of the Holocaust in Germany, and particularly in Berlin, has changed in comparison to previous decades. The young generation – the children of those born soon after World War II – have no direct connection to the Holocaust, and must therefore "immigrate" into the relevant memorial landscape, similarly to those who have immigrated to Germany over the past decades, and who do not share the 'German' memory-*topos*. Instead of a "morality"-bound collective remembrance and "national heritage" – as Jewish history and Jewish life were defined in previous decades – we are now dealing with a confused concept of memory that is fragmented, variable and detached from its concrete historical context. Particularly in urban environments characterised by cultural and ethnic diversity, the Jewish *topos*, which incorporates not just the Holocaust but also religion, music and food, becomes not only 'foreign,' but exotic and even 'stylish'. Terms such as 'Jewish quarter', 'Klezmer' or 'kosher-burger' have become new labels promoted by the German capital as a way of presenting the Jewish *topos* to new groups and new generations in Germany.

We hope that the various contributions in this volume demonstrate the fertility of the interdisciplinary and transnational approaches to Jewish space(s). In addition we also want the book to encourage further research by raising questions and providing new perspectives from international scholars. Stimulating critical research is in our opinion the best effect a book can have.

Alina Gromova, Felix Heinert, Sebastian Voigt
Berlin / Marburg / Munich, March 2015