

FEATURES

REFLECTING ON THE PAST, ENVISIONING THE FUTURE: PERSPECTIVES FOR GERMAN-JEWISH STUDIES

*Joint Lecture of the Leo Baeck Institute (New York) and the GHI
October 16, 2003*

Liliane Weissberg
University of Pennsylvania

I.

On July 24, 2003, the German weekly *Die Zeit* published an article on Jewish culture in Germany, entitled in Yiddish “Der auserwählte Folk” (The Chosen People). The article concerned itself with Klezmer music, here described as the celebratory music of Eastern European Jews:

Another accordion, that would just be too much. Three can be heard already, in addition to five clarinets, and there are two violins as well. This crowd has more than a dozen players, and they jam quite loudly while drinking apple juice and beer, and once in a while, a violin or a trombone is heard, a player jumps into the middle of this group and produces a solo of his own. Another accordion, one deems, would result in a contrapuntal effect; another bass fiddle would destroy the musical framework. But then, a bass comes weaving into the room, and curiously enough, it works: the music continues. For each additional player added, the others do not even have to interrupt the piece.

Thomas Gross, the author of this essay, concludes that “[o]ne cannot accuse the people at this “Klezmer-*Stammtisch*” of lacking a sense of fundamental democracy, or a joy in playing.”¹ Among the disembodied instruments—some accordions, clarinets, violins, trombones, basses—the journalist finds players who would appreciate a sense of political democracy. This music, brought forth by a chaotic mix of instruments, a doubling and tripling of keys, and carried by much improvisation, may be the sign of a new Germany.

Berlin, the old and new German capital at the country’s new eastern border, has become a capital of Klezmer music as well. While Poland had

moved westwards in a territorial shift after World War II, Berlin, now located a mere half an hour by car from the Polish border, has found its place not so much in a Central Europe of the past, but in a new Eastern Europe, one that would celebrate its former, now vanished shtetls in the courtyards of a post-industrial German metropolis. At the same time, Berlin may not be unique—the Klezmer scene described may be distinctive, but ultimately not much different, perhaps, from the music played in the outskirts of Polish Kracow today. The description of a thriving musical scene evokes haunting images from the past. The reader envisions a resurrected Jewish population, one that does not mourn the dead, but celebrates its presence. The music seems to evoke the memory of an idyllic, life-affirming past, one that none of these people had experienced. But these musicians are no threatening Jews, no members of any world conspiracy, but simply members of a chaotic but stable and fundamentally democratic organization. We can rest assured: These are merely Jews at play.

A couple of paragraphs further into the *Zeit* article, however, the reader realizes that her assumptions have been wrong. Not Berlin's Jews are celebrating their chosenness here, but young Germans have become the new "auserwählte Folk." Musicians and Klezmer fans hold names such as Carsten Schelp or Heiko Lehmann, and they are reviving tunes that have been unknown to Berlin's gentile population, until fairly recently at least. Now, they are embraced with gusto, by the musicians and their audience alike. Klezmer seems to transcend the simple demands of fashion. Those young Germans, performing in Berlin's Hackesche Höfe or its former Scheunenviertel, a section of town that was populated by poor Eastern European immigrants before the war, are not just playing music. They are playing Jews. This role play has become very successful, and gives apparent satisfaction to actors and listeners alike, many of them tourists visiting the German capital, who encounter this phenomenon for the first time and wonder what it is that they encounter here. And while Klezmer music had previously been alien to any German-Jewish experience, it has come to identify Jewish culture—indeed, much more so than the aspirations of assimilating German Jews. Oddities abound. An event called "Klezmer as in Herder's time" was announced as the entertainment program for a conference celebrating the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the German philosopher and Protestant theologian Johann Gottfried Herder in Weimar in November 2003. It was sponsored by the city's Kulturamt and the Protestant Academy of Thuringia in a place that was largely deprived of a Jewish population in Herder's time, the eighteenth century.

Thus, we encounter a peculiar paradox. Jewish culture, we must suppose, can exist without Jews, and once the question of "authenticity"

is suspended, we may suggest the same for Jewish Studies—not necessarily by denying it a Jewish subject, but the need for Jewish agency. Indeed, if one looked at the many Jewish Studies departments that have sprung up, and received funding, at various German universities in recent years, one would discover a phenomenon not unlike that of the Klezmer musicians. In Germany, Jewish Studies is largely conducted by non-Jewish scholars. Academic degrees are, in turn, obtained by non-Jewish students, who travel to Israel or the United States to learn Hebrew, further their studies, or visit archives. Many of these Jewish Studies departments and institutes flourish in towns like Duisburg or Trier, which until very recently had no postwar Jewish communities at all. And even where both academic institutions and Jewish communities exist, the relationship between both is tenuous, to say the least. In Germany, one could argue, Jewish Studies has in recent years become a popular field for the exploration of one’s German identity via the study of an Other. But more than the study of one or the acquisition of another identity is at stake here. These departments have completed a shift that has taken place in Germany since the early nineteenth century. It is the shift from a field that should be able to give answers as to *who one is*—thus defining a person’s Jewish identity via historical reflection—to a study of a *subject matter*, which could then be made available to all (and even be made available for the purpose of a renewed, or virtual, identification). And what is true for Jewish Studies in general is true for German-Jewish Studies in particular.

II.

Indeed, one could describe German-Jewish Studies as Jewish Studies par excellence. The Bible, or ancient rabbinical writings, cannot be called particularly German inventions, of course. But one can argue that historical scholarship about these texts emerged, as a concerted effort, in German lands first. And this historical scholarship is a fairly recent phenomenon. Until the mid-eighteenth century, a notion such as “Jewish history” would have been quite unthinkable. Even the young Moses Mendelssohn maintained that “history” could not belong to Jews. Jews did not hold any civic rights; how could they possibly view themselves as part of a historical process?

But this political argument was only part of the problem at hand. There was, above all, the Jewish religion that seemed first and foremost to define the Jews. Did not the Jewish religion proclaim the Torah’s unchangeable truth? Were the rabbis not asked to explicate the Torah, interpret its meanings, rather than concern themselves with textual changes over time? Would a historical view of religious texts be heresy?

Did not God himself give this religion to his chosen people? Instead of history, Jews had tradition, and this was both a safeguard for religion and from the world “outside.”

But already the older Mendelssohn began to waver. The religious core was unchangeable perhaps, he argued, but the chosen people, the Jews themselves, could change. They had done so in the past—leaving Jerusalem, experiencing the diaspora—and they might do so in the future. Indeed, Mendelssohn demanded that their position within the society in which they lived be changed. Jews had to call for their emancipation.

For Mendelssohn, as for many other Jews at that time, it was impossible to enter the debate about Jewish emancipation without thinking about the Jewish people in historical terms. Changes were desirable and even demanded, but while these changes seemed mostly to concern Jews as political subjects, they finally touched the religious core as well. Lazarus Bendavid would formulate this provocatively in his pamphlet on the *Characteristics of the Jews*, published in 1793. Jews had to prepare themselves for emancipation, he wrote, they had to earn it. If they wanted Prussia to change, they would have to change first. They would have to modify their religion, adjust it to their Christian surroundings, and hence become enlightened citizens.

Not every member of the Jewish community demanded major changes regarding their own religion or learning. Mendelssohn translated the Torah into German, but he still used Hebrew letters. The study of German was to be accomplished by degrees. But a discussion ensued, most vigorously led by Mendelssohn’s friends and students—the adherents of the so-called Haskalah, or Jewish Enlightenment—over whether the Jewish religion could enter the modern age at all, and still remain the same. Were religious rituals just ancient ceremonial laws to be abandoned? Could the sermons be held in German? Should prayers be translated? Suddenly, everything was possible, and open for discussion and alteration, even if nothing was possible, legally speaking, at first. And while the terms of the Jewish religion were discussed, reforms proposed, and definitions multiplied, Jews ceased to be understood as simply the adherents of a specific creed. Judaism was no longer only a religion. Germans had come to regard themselves as a “nation,” still divided into different principalities. They began to view Jews as a “nation” as well, but one without a country of their own. Jews internalized these claims and began to think of themselves as such a political unity. As one nation among others, even as a different nation from all others, Jews made a claim on history. All they had to do was to look at their “chosenness” in a slightly different way.

In 1812, Prussia finally granted a first emancipation to its Jews, who henceforth could carry legal names and become common soldiers in the Wars of Liberation. France had offered its own Jews emancipation already with the French Revolution, but after their liberation by Prussia, its Jews could turn into proper patriots and fight against France. But were these new citizens really proper Germans? And were they German Jews? Many German gentiles wondered, although they themselves were unsure as to what they were—Prussians? Bavarians? Germans? And Jews began to wonder, too, but perhaps in other ways. Were they still Jews?

Judaism, once severed from a stricter religion now defined as “orthodox,” did not seem to have much hold at all. And, with the German passport in hand, even the notion of separate nationhood seemed to dissolve. Only seven years after this emancipation verdict, and in the year of newly vigorous anti-Jewish unrest and attacks on Jews, a group of men met in Berlin to found a “Society for Culture and Science of the Jews” (Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft der Juden). The double significance of its name—being a society *of Jews*, and *for Jews*—hints already at its goal. Historical study should provide clarification of who one was, add to one’s self-respect, and help one accept oneself as a subject that was not deprived of any agency.

Thus, Eduard Gans, Heinrich Heine, and many others met in 1819 to discuss their Jewish identity and reflect on a Jewish past. Their meetings could be seen as emergency sessions of sort, to discuss philosophical, educational, and political issues that concerned, first of all, the Society’s membership. But during these meetings, Jewish Studies as Jewish historiography was born, and named *Wissenschaft des Judentums*.² Immanuel Wolf, a founding member of the group, was eager to describe the concept of the new “science of Judaism” that they wanted to pursue: “It is self-evident that the word ‘Judaism’ is here being taken in its comprehensive sense—as the essence of all the circumstances, characteristics, and achievements of the Jews in relation to religion, philosophy, history, law, literature in general, civil life and all the affairs of man—and not in the more limited sense in which it only means the religion of the Jews.”³

But Wolf’s claim was not only to widen the field of inquiry. He insisted on studying Judaism not only over time, but as the “characteristic and independent whole” in which it survived.⁴ Thus, Wolf did not stake out a special claim for German Jews. His goal was rather for Jews to declare themselves as a people and not just as a religion, to stake out a claim to nationhood, one that would cross state boundaries and would be able to survive the ongoing discussions on the variety of religious practices. The “Science of Judaism” was a product of Enlightenment efforts, and even permitted secularization. The orthodox Jew was the student of the Torah, the modern Jew was the student of Judaism. Wolf was eager to

explain: "The textual study of Judaism is the interpretative and critical understanding of the whole literature of the Jews, as the literature in which are defined the special world of the Jews and their unique way of life and of thought."⁵ "The history of Judaism," on the other hand, "is the systematic description of Judaism, in the forms it has assumed at any special time, and in all its aspects," and the "philosophy of Judaism has as its object the conception of Judaism as such."⁶ This is, of course, Kantian in its formulation, and Wolf's description hints at a universal system. Leopold Zunz, another early nineteenth-century Jewish historian, added the note of German idealism. He declared "the substance of Jewish history" to be "the inner spiritual life of the Jews."⁷ For Zunz, a different, but equally unifying aspect, gave room for a particular interpretation of a Jewish *Weltgeist*. The Jews' "external history—their suffering—is significant only insofar as it helps to explain some characteristics of their literary creativity," he wrote.⁸ A gentile surrounding could thus be instrumentalized, it served both an educational purpose and the development of the Jewish people. But at the same time, Zunz established a peculiar description echoed by many historians to come. Jews were not simply a people undivided, a people living across state boundaries. They were not only unified by their religion, but by their common experience of suffering. Zunz established what Salo Baron once famously described in regard to other, more recent authors, as a "lachrymose" history of the Jews.⁹

The early Society's journal, the *Zeitschrift*, appeared only in one year, 1822. A few years after the first meetings, the group disbanded, still arguing about its own by-laws and goals. Most of the Society's members converted to Protestantism, some out of conviction, most of them for pragmatic reasons, as they wanted to enter careers in law or in other academic fields that were closed to Jews. But their discussions not only influenced Zunz, but also Isaac Marcus Jost, perhaps the first major German-Jewish historian of the Jews. Indeed, he started to publish his history of the Jews in 1819, the year of the Society's founding, and continued to write it well into the mid-nineteenth century. "We view the Israelite people as historically unique," he wrote, not stressing the spiritual essence of the Jews as much as their existence as a folk.¹⁰

When the Science of Judaism (*Wissenschaft des Judentums*) was finally institutionalized in the second half of the nineteenth century through the founding of an Academy, the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (with its own scholars and publications to promote its ideas), history would finally enter rabbinical thought as well. Moreover, the school produced a kind of curriculum. Religious texts were not only studied and discussed, but dated, and also dated were the rabbis who explicated these texts, the Jewish communities in which they lived, and their gentile surroundings. But in this Academy, German-Jewish Studies

did not constitute a separate field. Yes, scholars wrote about German rabbinical scholars or German-Jewish communities. But the news about communities in Bavaria was reported alongside reflections on former communities in Spain, or the meaning of Aramaic words. Like Wolf before him, Abraham Geiger, who taught at the new institution, followed the tripartite distinction of philological, historical, and philosophical aspects of Jewish Studies. Geiger changed the borderlines of these three areas slightly. Literature and culture were now situated in the realm of history, while philology would stand alone and constitute a field in itself.¹¹ By the time Heinrich Graetz penned his *History of the Jews*, published in eleven volumes between 1853 and 1876, history reigned not only as an instrument of analysis, but as the *sine qua non*. Graetz's history was the first comprehensive, multi-volume history of the Jews ever to be written—those by Simon Dubnow and Salo Baron would follow in due course. "Judaism can be understood only through its history," Graetz would write, and historical study thus surpassed the study of religion in importance.¹²

Graetz's history of the Jews earned enormous popularity as well as scholarly interest, and established three characteristics for Jewish study that held firm for years to come. While Jewish history was perhaps no longer part of the history of the spirit, for Graetz it was *Geistesgeschichte*, intellectual history, nevertheless. It was also a history of suffering, a *Leidensgeschichte*, expressed by the experiences of the Jewish diaspora. "This is the eighteenth hundred-year era of the Diaspora, of unprecedented suffering, of uninterrupted martyrdom without parallel in world history," Graetz stated, hardly imagining the events of the twentieth century that lay ahead.¹³ Like his predecessors, Graetz was eager to create a history of the Jews in its "totality."¹⁴ Thus, German-Jewish history was integrated into the work's sweeping panorama of Jewish life and thought. And, considering its place in Graetz's eleven-volume oeuvre, it became nothing more than a footnote of sorts. Jews had lived in German lands since the Roman invasions of Germania, thrived in medieval communities, or carried a Germanic language, Yiddish, further East. Jews wrote in and studied German at least since the mid-eighteenth century; many of them had thrived economically and professionally in Germany and Austria since the emancipation. But could this compare to a history that was measured in millennia? Moreover, one question had not yet been asked: Were German Jews a subject to be studied in and of themselves?

In 1898, Adolf Kohut published an illustrated history of German Jews, less as a scholarly exercise than as a *Hausbuch für die jüdische Familie*, an uplifting work to be enjoyed at home that combined Jewish tradition with bourgeois values, comparable to the genre paintings of the time.¹⁵ Scholars such as Ludwig Geiger posed the question whether German

Jews constituted a separate field of study cautiously, as they pursued smaller, more limited areas of inquiry. Geiger wrote about prominent German-Jewish women, for example, or Jews who admired Goethe.¹⁶ Indeed, from the late nineteenth century until the Second World War, newly minted Jewish literary critics seemed to find it necessary to write about Goethe first, and often chose his work as a topic for their dissertations. Jewish philosophers declared their adherence to Kant, but touched Jewish topics quite rarely. The trajectory of acculturation was to leave the study of Judaism or Jewish matters behind. Thus, German Jews were studied, and contemporary German Jews gathered in religious, political, or social organizations. But they were not considered subjects of a separate field of study.

In the early twentieth century, many German Jews were perhaps not eager to think of themselves this way. Rather, they viewed themselves as part of other, different groups or larger visions. Those Jews who tried to assimilate would define themselves as Germans of Jewish religion, thus rejecting any claim of Jewish nationhood. Others looked to Zionism as an ideology that would integrate them into a larger Jewish population, and called upon Palestine as their destination. Gershom Scholem, for example, mentioned the Christmas celebrations in his parental home, and related how his study of Hebrew and preparation for emigration turned his understanding of himself as a “Jew” against his “German” past.¹⁷

Yes, Jews were German citizens, and many registered in Jewish communities. But we have also to consider those other venues of identification that they discovered via the reading of historical texts. There was the medieval Jewish community in Spain. Already Heine idealized the Spanish Jews, and the image of the aristocratic Sephardim became a means to express desire for another, glorious Jewish past, a bygone age of peaceful coexistence between different peoples and religions. German Jewish writers in the late nineteenth century invented stories of the Eastern shtetl, ghetto tales of a distant Eastern European land that never actually knew any ghettos. Thus, these authors promoted new mythologies for a German and Jewish reading public. Already then, those shtetls seemed idyllic, frozen in time. Writers like Ernst Bloch, Walter Benjamin, and Franz Kafka discovered the Eastern chassidim, known to many by the tales of the Baal Shem in Martin Buber’s rather free translation. But where could the German Jew be found? Scholars researched Mendelssohn’s life, or older community records, as part of their general interest in German history or Jewish history. In the early twentieth century, the answers to what a German Jew was were just too complex, and they resulted neither in an easy form of identification, nor in an easy definition of the study of a German-Jewish past. Perhaps Germany itself was too new a national construct to warrant further exploration.

III.

The Holocaust seemed to provide both an end to Jewish life in Germany and a culmination of that history of suffering, the *Leidensgeschichte* once conceived by nineteenth-century Jewish historians. Suddenly, the early twentieth-century Jewish culture in Germany seemed to rival the Spanish Golden Age in significance, and the Holocaust offered an end to Jewish life more tragic even than the Spanish inquisition. Within the trajectory of the Jewish histories already written, moreover, German Jewry was essential to Jewish history. And thus, it was after the Second World War that the idea of German Jewry as a special “ethnos” of sorts, and a special field of study, was really born.

When the Leo Baeck Institute was founded in 1955, it set itself the goal of preserving the German-Jewish legacy, and set a specific agenda. It has helped create the definition of German-Jewish history and culture, and thus a particular field of inquiry. German Jews were defined as a people that no longer existed, and the institute viewed itself in the role of an executor of the German Jews’ will, and charged with protecting their legacy. The posthumous nature of its subject of inquiry was further stressed by the Institute’s location, as it was established not in Germany but in New York (London, Jerusalem), and founded by those German Jews who were lucky enough to escape.

Similar to the Institute’s calling, the field of German-Jewish Studies was conceived as one that dealt with a culture that was lost. Wolf, Jost, Zunz, and Graetz had asked for the place of history within the study of Judaism. Now, German-Jewish culture itself emerged as historical, as a thing of the past. The extent to which this past was conceived as such is documented quite poignantly in one of Hannah Arendt’s books. Arendt had begun to write the biography of a Jewish woman, Rahel Levin Varnhagen, in the late 1920s in Berlin. In 1933, Arendt fled Germany and completed her book in Paris. It was not published until 1957, on behalf of the Leo Baeck Institute, and in English translation. Arendt writes in her preface to the book:

The German-speaking Jews and their history are an altogether unique phenomenon; nothing comparable to it is to be found even in the other areas of Jewish assimilation. To investigate this phenomenon, which among other things found expression in a literally astonishing wealth of talent and of scientific and intellectual productivity, constitutes a historical task of the first rank, and one which, of course, can be attacked only now, after the history of the German Jews has come to an end. The present biography was written with an awareness of the doom of German Judaism (although, naturally, without any premonition of

how far the physical annihilation of the Jewish people in Europe would be carried); but at that time, shortly before Hitler's coming to power, I did not have the perspective from which to view the phenomenon as a whole. If this book is considered as a contribution to the history of the German Jews, it must be remembered that in it only one aspect of the complex problems of assimilation is treated: namely, the manner in which assimilation to the intellectual and social life of the environment works out concretely in the history of an individual's life, thus shaping a personal destiny. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that the subject-matter is altogether historical, and that nowadays not only the history of the German Jews, but also their specific complex of problems, are a matter of the past.¹⁸

Arendt's statement shows the shift from the consideration of an individual to the exemplary for German-Jewish Studies, a field conceived by declaring its subject a posthumous one. German-Jewish Studies is here defined as *Trauerarbeit*, the work of mourning for an irrecoverable good. It is from the point of view of the present, by viewing it after its annihilation, that one would study German-Jewish life, appreciate its past existence, and theorize about its rise and decline.

Arendt's words have become emblematic of the constitution of the field. German-Jewish Studies may predate other fields of ethnic inquiry, such as research on Latinos, Blacks, or Asian American Studies in the United States. Because of its assumptions, it has largely denied itself a political presence, such as a continued fight against discrimination. Much as with any archaeological subject, the history of German Jews was concluded before its proper study could begin. Suffering was no longer part of its subjects, but moved to the side of the historians, who had to do the work of mourning. For Arendt, as for other German Jews of her generation, the task, moreover, was one of witnessing. And while the parties of guilt or innocence seemed fairly divided between Germans and Jews, both Germans and Jews were asked to come forth in testimony, but Jewish survivors in particular were given no other choice.

History as witnessing does not call for critical distance. It may not even call for historical analysis first, but for memorialization. In the case of the early descriptions of German Jews and German Jewish life, moreover, it often had an apologetic tone. Already in Arendt, the fate of German Jews not only emerges as a specific, defined area of historical reflection, but as an area of specific significance for Jews and Germans alike. The unique importance of German Jews would, moreover, turn them into the ideal subject for traditional historical writing, in which Arendt, however, took only very limited part. In their uniqueness, Ger-

man Jews could rival world leaders as important agents of events. And while Arendt remained one of the few authors to publish on German Jewish history in the fifties—even her own publisher, Klaus Piper, thought that a German audience may not have been “ready” yet for Jewish subjects¹⁹—the kings and queens of history volumes were soon rivaled by their modern-day Jewish equivalent, the Nobel prize winners, famous scientists, wise philosophers, and talented artists.

The view that German Jews were particularly talented, mostly affluent people well adjusted to German society was perpetuated in many of these biographies. This work contributed to a sense of mourning, enforced the shock of the Holocaust, and provided a certain consolation for Jews. It countered Nazi statements that Jews were nothing but vermin infecting a healthy social body by producing, for popular culture as well as school textbooks, a reverse image of the Jew. Not an understanding of Jewish religion or history was in demand, but a kind of hagiography of the Jew. The Jews in question, moreover, were always assimilated; their Jewishness had to be brought to a point of disappearance, insisted upon by others rather than by themselves. If Walter Rathenau, for example, was defined as an important personality, it was because he was a great human being first, and a Jew second. And the loss of many German Jews was to be mourned because they had been good and even patriotic Germans, not because they were good Jews. At first, the existence of a so-called German-Jewish symbiosis was hardly in doubt, but this came at the cost of utter Jewish assimilation. No Klezmer music was in vogue yet.

While reversing the racial stereotypes of the past, this early work insisted on a peculiar distinction. There was no discussion as to what Judaism was, but the labeling of Jews proceeded in largely racial terms, independent from religion or the subject’s self-understanding. In some cases, the terms of the Nazi persecution continued to supply the reasoning for that, but mostly, the racial definitions have proved to be of a peculiar longevity, even in scholarly studies. Even today, Jewish Studies institutes in Duisburg or in Potsdam are sponsoring biographical studies of persons who were Christians or of no religion and did not view themselves as Jews, but had a Jewish grandparent or a parent who was born a Jew. Thus, they not only research Jews, but search for them, and find them in rather unexpected places. Right after the war, racial terms still defined Jewish subjects, and descriptions like “Halbjuden” (partial Jew) were often used (and are, at times, still used today).

There were exceptions. Selma Stern continued her pre-war studies of the social and political status of Prussian Jews, for which she had conducted archival research before the war, collecting countless documents. Her book on German Court Jews appeared in the United States in 1950.²⁰ Jacob Katz continued to publish numerous books on the period of Jewish

emancipation in Germany and on Jews in the nineteenth century. This work was mostly done in the United States or Israel, not in Germany.

The real shift in the study of German Jews occurred much later, many years after the end of World War II. In the seventies and eighties, following the changes in historiography and the political landscape, historical writing on German Jews changed as well. Social history demanded the study of whole population groups, as well as the consideration of class. There was no longer an interest in the German-Jewish heroes of the previous generation. A group of scholars trained in the late sixties, in the time of the student revolution, questioned previous scholarly assumptions, and not only cared for Jews as victims, but for the underprivileged among the German Jews. The study of Jewish women established itself in the forefront of these socio-historical reflections, exemplified by the early work of Monika Richarz in Germany, or Marion Kaplan in the United States. A group of American women historians, including Kaplan, Atina Grossmann, and Deborah Hertz, met to discuss new terms of Jewish history. This work led to the discovery of new leading figures for the history of German political movements as well as feminist theory. Studies that were published in the United States as well as in Germany described the lives of Jewish workers, the entrance of Jews into the academic professions, and urban life in big towns as well as smaller villages. Critical theory was considered, and students of the Frankfurt School, like Micha Brumlik or Dan Diner, reconsidered Adorno and Horkheimer's *Dialectics of Enlightenment* and the experience of the Holocaust in the face of a longer view of Jewish history.

Social history was followed by local history. By the mid-1990s, most Jewish cemeteries in Germany had been amply described, and ongoing research projects in Hamburg, Duisburg, or Aachen have deciphered the inscriptions on gravestones. Books or pamphlets describing Jewish life not only in individual towns, but even in particular city quarters, were published, providing scholarly studies and tourist guides in one. Today, a reader can learn about the Jewish communities not only of towns or villages like Münster or Ichenhausen, but also of Frankfurt-Niederrad or Berlin-Steglitz. This local work was largely conducted by scholars affiliated with German universities, and much of it bears the marks of formal master's theses and dissertations.

IV.

But this academic work was not always written for history departments. In the 1980s, Jewish Studies established itself as a field at German universities. The older field of *Judaistik*, often part of Near Eastern Studies departments, would continue in places such as the Free University Berlin,

where chairs like Peter Schäfer (who recently moved to Princeton) have led the field to international prominence. *Judaistik* centers on the study of Hebrew, the Hebrew Bible, and the rabbinical tradition. It combines philological with historical work and the consideration of religious tradition. Most programs of *Judaistik* concentrate on the study of ancient and medieval Jewry, and *Judaistik's* representatives find their way only slowly and gropingly to the study of Jewish life in modern times. *Jüdische Studien*, in contrast, would view itself as a largely historical field, not necessarily wedded to the study of Hebrew or other Jewish languages, like Yiddish or Ladino, or the study of ancient texts. Instead, *Jüdische Studien* concentrates on Jewish culture, which would include the study of acculturated or assimilated Jews. Most programs of *Jüdische Studien* are administered by historians with a more general training in German history—such as the Moses Mendelssohn Center for European Jewish Studies in Potsdam, chaired by Julius Schoeps, or Leipzig's Simon Dubnow Institute for the study of Middle and Eastern European Jewry, chaired by Dan Diner—and they concentrate primarily on Jewish life, history, and literature since the emancipation period, the eighteenth century. Needless to say, a rivalry ensued between the departments of *Judaistik* and *Jüdische Studien*, with each denying the other's claim to serious scholarship or scholarly relevance. For representatives of *Judaistik*, *Jüdische Studien* ignores the core of Jewish language and learning. For representatives of *Jüdische Studien*, *Judaistik* has lost touch with modern Jewry and contemporary political issues.

The study of German-Jewish literature followed as a secondary field, often fighting for a place in the departments of Jewish Studies. Only a single chair in German-Jewish literature exists in Germany, and at a Technical University, namely Aachen; it is integrated into the department of German literature. But many German departments are more than willing to consider the study of German-Jewish authors. Already shortly after the war, authors like Heine or Kafka were reintroduced into the curriculum, but they were rarely studied within a religious or ethnic context.

Earlier than in Germany, the study of German-Jewish literature took hold in the United States, where it has flourished. Here, it could associate itself with a newly established interdisciplinary field called cultural studies that has tried to cross the boundaries between literature and history. Unlike the German pre-war *Kulturwissenschaften* that curiously survived in the former GDR, cultural studies does not concentrate on well-established cultural icons. It has a critical and largely leftist agenda. Similar to social history, it looks at figures of seemingly minor importance, everyday behavior, and ephemeral events. Sander Gilman's work, especially his study *Jewish Self-Hatred* of 1986, ushered in a series of works concerned with stereotypes of the Jewish body and of Jewish behavior,

and spawned new studies on anti-Semitic ideologies that would concentrate on German examples, but reach far beyond them.

The adoption of discourse theory led to the discovery of a minority discourse that added new authors to the list of already established ones. More recently, the development of post-colonial theory has led to a reconsideration of early modern German-Jewish writing (see the work by Jonathan Hess) as well as that of the twentieth century (see the work by Katja Garloff).²¹ In general, German-Jewish Studies in the United States were more easily integrated into current research in social, literary, and cultural theory, while work done in Germany remained largely on a fact-finding mission, and was often more cautious in its approach. This reflected not only the potentially sensitive matter of studying any aspect of German Jewry after the Holocaust, seen by some as a scholarly need as well as a postwar reparation effort, but also the generally more conservative academic scene at German universities.

Until the 1980s, the study of German Jews was a relatively neglected topic at Israeli universities, and the study of the German language, an important means to access information, had long been thought of as taboo. But with the establishment of the Rosenzweig Center for the Study of German Jewry at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, a chair in Prussian-Jewish studies at Bar Ilan University in Ramat Gan, and a Center of Excellence at the Ben Gurion University in Beersheva, this has changed, largely due to German funding. In Jerusalem, work has concentrated on early twentieth-century authors, on emigrants like Else Lasker-Schüler, whose papers are housed at the Hebrew University. At Bar-Ilan, the stress is more on the research of the German-Jewish Enlightenment. Shmuel Feiner of Bar-Ilan and David Sorkin of the University of Wisconsin, are among the most important historians of Jewish life in the late eighteenth century. While Sorkin has been largely concerned with the works of Mendelssohn and other German Jews, Feiner has studied both German and Hebrew texts by German as well as Eastern European authors to provide a fuller picture of the international aspect of the Haskalah, as well as the Jewish counter-Enlightenment. The early twentieth century, in particular the Weimar Republic, as well as the time of the Emancipation, are probably by now the best, though not yet sufficiently, researched eras in German-Jewish Studies. And the recently established triangle of Germany, the United States, and Israel has been complicated by research institutes in London, Oxford, and Sussex, and a flurry of books and articles by Enzo Traverso, Jacques Le Rider, Dominique Bourel, and Ursula Isselstein, published in France and Italy.²²

In the 1990s, the very structure of German-Jewish Studies has made it the prime area for work on memory, an area in which much research in cultural studies has been done. Here, it is not the question of history that

has moved into the center, but that of the memoir, the oral account, the cultural inheritance via narratives. James Young's studies of Holocaust memorials in Germany come to mind, binding them in a comparative context, but also work more closely associated with Pierre Nora's *Lieux de memoire*, a concerted effort that tried, however, to establish the cultural memory of France, and hence of a still existing population.²³ More attention has been paid to Jewish philosophy as well. Poststructuralist theories have led to interesting readings of texts by Mendelssohn and others, conducted by scholars like Jeffrey Librett or Peter Fenves, and an essay by Jacques Derrida on Kant and the Jews has opened up new perspectives as well.²⁴ Paul Mendes-Flohr has published work on Martin Buber, and much has recently been published on Franz Rosenzweig; Leora Batnitzky, for example, wrote on Rosenzweig's view of religion, and Eric Santner on his relationship to Freud.²⁵ Hermann Cohen's work has moved into the foreground of research through studies by Astrid Deuber-Mankowsky or the late Gillian Rose.²⁶ The question of Freud's relationship to Judaism continues to be widely discussed among historians and psychoanalysts. Jan Assmann's recent study of the figure of Moses has added to the work on cultural memory as well as that on Freud.²⁷

Fields that have received rather little attention are in the visual arts. Biographies of German Jewish film directors and actors abound, but despite recent exhibitions of work by Moritz Daniel Oppenheim in Frankfurt and New York, or exhibits on German court Jews and Jewish artists, including German-Jewish ones, at the Jewish Museum in New York, not much has been done in the realm of the traditional arts.²⁸ German Jewish religious art needs further research, and the question of whether a secular Jewish art exists at all needs to be discussed. More work has been done on Jewish art historians, as this profession, just as psychoanalysis, has been long viewed as a particularly "Jewish" field. Thus, new studies on Ernst Gombrich or Aby Warburg, conducted by Louis Rose, Charlotte Schoell-Glass, and others, have furthered the discussion on the establishment of the academic discipline.²⁹ The recent restaging of Kurt Weill's *Eternal Road* in Chemnitz and New York has made its audience aware of a religious and secular musical tradition that is still under-researched. And, while German-Jewish studies have largely focused on two periods, the eighteenth and early twentieth centuries, the beginning and the end of the flourishing of German-Jewish culture, much work has to be done on nineteenth-century German-Jewish literature and history as well. With the exception of Glickl von Hameln, moreover, who has recently been a subject of a conference in Hamburg, and to whom Natalie Zemon Davis has dedicated a section of a book, we know little, and certainly not enough, about the Western Yiddish-speaking Jews of the medieval and early modern period.³⁰ Research on medieval manuscript and early mod-

ern book production is needed. German-Jewish Studies will have to look back beyond the period of emancipation.

V.

That said, it is, most of all, time not only to add further areas of research, but to change the trajectory of German-Jewish studies. Let us return to Gross's article on the Klezmer groups in Berlin. As he describes the music, he also remarks on the negative reaction by the Berlin Jews. But what are they reacting against? Do they object to gentiles playing Jewish music? Do they mind the fact that Klezmer has become a privileged "Jewish" entertainment? Perhaps. But more may be at stake. Just as German Jewish Studies had defined its subject as a posthumous one, these musicians occupy a place that they would consider empty. Where there are no Jews, virtual Jewry abounds (this too has received recent scholarly attention).³¹ But who would like to be declared non-existent or dead?

By declaring Germany free of Jews, or by granting an occasional Jew the status of a rare museum exhibit, postwar Germans were able to insist both on the prominence of a few and the invisibility of the group as a whole—something that Jews in Germany curiously both objected to and desired. Invisibility seemed to assure a safety of sorts, even if it meant that Jews in Germany belonged to the living dead. By declaring German-Jewish history to be concluded, Jewish Studies departments in Germany, too, could easily justify their indifference to the concerns of contemporary community life.

But the German Jewish community exists. In the early postwar years, its members may have preferred the status of remnants, as many thought of emigration.³² With the growing immigration from the former Soviet states since 1989, the number of registered Jews has jumped from 20,000 in the 1960s to close to 100,000 today. It has now become the fastest-growing community in Europe. And although the population figures are still low, Jews have become a political force. Barely visible after the war, they first took to the streets in the 1970s in pro-Israel demonstrations. They became even more visible by turning their attention to German affairs. In 1985, a group of Jews stormed a Frankfurt theater stage to protest the production of a purportedly anti-Semitic play by Rainer Maria Fassbinder that featured a ruthless and vengeful Jewish real estate developer.³³ In the same year, Jews protested the visit of Ronald Reagan to Bitburg, a cemetery that includes graves of former Nazi officers, and entered political parties and city councils.³⁴ The community assumed political agency by making public declarations. Other protests, statements, and discussions followed.³⁵

Ignatz Bubis, a former real estate developer who was thought to be the model for the main character in Fassbinder's play, led the German

Jewish community in the 1990s. Bubis proved to be anything but ruthless or vengeful. For the first time, a head of the Jewish community spoke not only on the Jewish community's behalf, but also on behalf of other minorities, like the Turkish guest workers, whose numbers had already exceeded that of the Jewish population in Germany. Thus, Bubis assumed a political role far beyond that of the leader of a religious organization. He experienced unheard-of popularity as a voice of moral concern. He was not only visible, but even discussed as a possible candidate for the German presidency. Born in a small Polish town, Bubis gave Breslau, the place of birth listed in his war-time papers, as his place of origin to confirm his own status as a German Jew.

Michel Friedman, then a member of the Jewish Central Council (Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland), went further than Bubis, by insisting on voicing his opinion on political topics beyond minority issues. His intervention was regarded as a "Jewish point of view," and he was given his own talk show, entitled *Achtung, Friedman!* (Attention: Friedman!). Because of a scandal involving his personal life, he had to leave both his prominent position in the Central Council and resign from his talk show, but he has continued as a political commentator, speaks on local networks, and works as an editor of political books for the Aufbau Verlag in Berlin, where he is under contract to publish two books of his own political interviews per year. Henryk Broder, a journalist, publishes his musings on political and cultural affairs in various newspapers, but above all in the political weekly *Der Spiegel*. His articles often concern Jews in Germany and abroad, as well as anti-Semitism. His popular website is entitled in English "Big Broder is Watching You."³⁶ Commentaries by Maxim Biller, Raphael Seligman or Michael Wolffsohn address a wider public in popular dailies; they, too, are consciously writing as Jews. All of them, although to different degrees, are eager to argue issues of ethics and moral conscience, although the role of being a country's conscience is more than difficult to maintain.

In the past decade, Jews have chosen more public professions in the media and at the universities, and have begun to call themselves German Jews, and not just Jews living in Germany. Even though they or their parents are mostly immigrants from Eastern European countries, they have cautiously begun to forge a connection to a pre-war German past. Like the Klezmer musicians, they, too, do not know much about the former shtetls, and many are still struggling with their own Jewish identity. To be a German Jew has thus become a learning process, pointing to the future. But most of the newer, younger Jews in Germany have a peculiar historical advantage. When the German government eased its immigration laws to raise its number of Jewish citizens, it invited Jews who were not affected by the traumatic experiences of the past. These

new citizens and their families did not experience the Holocaust; here no feelings of guilt or demands for reparation would connect Germans and Jews. The new Jewish population's point of negative identification would have to be the Stalin purges, which took place in another country. For them, Germany is an economic wonderland.

But with the new growth of Jewish communities, a simple fact has become more obvious still: Germany was never quite without Jews. This was finally discovered by German-Jewish Studies, too. Recent work has focused on the memoirs of Jews hidden in Germany during the war, as well as the arrival of Eastern European Jews in German Displaced Person camps. Studies written, and exhibitions curated, by Michael Brenner or Rachel Salamander have drawn attention to life in these camps, as well as to the emerging post-war Jewish communities.³⁷ The sociologist Y. Michal Bodemann has published on post-war German politics in regard to its Jewish population and on post-war Jewish life; the psychologist Kurt Grünberg has worked with experiences of survivors and published various studies describing their post-war lives.³⁸ A four-part television series written by the journalist Richard Chaim Schneider, entitled *Wir sind da* (We Are Here) was aired a couple of years ago. It told the history of post-war Jews in Germany to a wider audience; the series is meanwhile available as an audio book.³⁹

American scholars such as Sander Gilman, Karen Remmler, Leslie Morris, and others have edited anthologies of or on post-war German-Jewish literature.⁴⁰ A consciously Jewish literary scene has emerged in Austria in particular, with authors such as Robert Schindel, Doron Rabinovici, or Vladimir Vertlieb.⁴¹ In the 1980s, these and other scholars had concerned themselves with the literature of the past, or with the literature of survivors in exile. Now, they have begun to focus on the current social and literary scene. New topics include, for example, the comparison of Turkish and Jewish minority discourse in Germany today. At the University of Potsdam, a team of scholars has studied the acculturation patterns of recent Russian Jewish immigrants,⁴² and many other sociological and educational studies are in progress.

It is too early to say what shape the Jewish community in Germany will take, but right now, it has become a laboratory of sorts. As in a previous century, there is discussion regarding religious diversity. The Hochschule für Jüdische Studien in Heidelberg, an institution associated with the local university but partially funded by the German Jewish Central Council since 1979, has decided to expand its offerings. It will not only train teachers of Jewish religion but, for the first time in Germany, rabbis as well. In Potsdam, a different rabbinical seminary has recently been founded, and has been named after Abraham Geiger. It will train Reform rabbis, although Reform Judaism has not yet been officially rec-

ognized by the German Jewish community at large. These religious discussions will have to be studied. Questions of multilingualism demand future research. As in the United States today, but within a different context, members of the German Jewish community are asking what it would mean to be "Jewish" today. While Jewish life in Germany may still proceed on a different path than in other European countries, it has begun to look outward, to its gentile surroundings again, and to Europe as a whole.

It is still difficult for Jewish Studies to rethink its original framework. In the 1990s, Michael Meyer edited a four-volume history of German Jews, published in English and German, which provides a counterpoint to the universal histories of the past.⁴³ It concludes, however, in 1945. Similarly, a social history of everyday life (*Alltagsleben*), edited by Marion Kaplan and published in Germany earlier this year, begins with a study of the seventeenth century, and ends in 1945.⁴⁴ But how should German Jewish history after 1945 be written?

Two years ago, the Leo Baeck Institute of New York established a second office in Berlin. One of the reasons was to bring its materials closer to their researchers, as most of the scholars using the archives had been Germans who traveled to New York. And again, it may not be insignificant that this office was established within a museum, the new Jewish Museum by Daniel Libeskind, which functions as a kind of Holocaust Memorial as well. But the move to Berlin also signifies more than a "return" of documents to their absent owners. It points forward to a greater integration of German Jewish Studies into German Jewish life, and to a future that nobody after World War II was able, or wanted, to imagine.

Notes

¹ Thomas Gross, "Der Auserwählte Folk," *Die Zeit* 31 (July 24, 2003), Feuilleton, 35 (translation mine).

² See, for example, Julius Carlebach, ed., *Wissenschaft des Judentums: Anfänge der Judaistik in Europa* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992).

³ Immanuel Wolf, "On the Concept of a Science of Judaism," trans. Lionel E. Kochan, in Michael A. Meyer, ed., *Ideas of Jewish History* (New York: Behrman House, 1974), 143.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 143.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 153.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, 157.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ See, for example, Salo Baron, *History and Jewish Historians* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1964), 64, 88, 96.

¹⁰ Isaac Marcus Jost, "The Rigors of Jewish Historiography," trans. Michael Meyer, in Meyer, ed., *Ideas of Jewish History*, 177.

- ¹¹ Abraham Geiger, "The Developing Idea of Judaism," trans. Ernst J. Schlochauer, in Meyer, ed., *Ideas of Jewish History*, 163.
- ¹² Heinrich Graetz, "Judaism Can Be Understood Only Through Its History," trans. Noah Jonathan Jacobs, in Meyer, ed., *Ideas of Jewish History*, 219. See also Heinrich Graetz, *The Structure of Jewish History and Other Essays*, trans. Ismar Schorsch (New York: Jewish Theological Seminar of America, 1975).
- ¹³ Graetz, "Judaism," 229.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 221.
- ¹⁵ Adolf Kohut, *Geschichte der deutschen Juden: Ein Hausbuch für die jüdische Familie*, illustrated by Theodor Kutschmann (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag (Ges. M.B.H.), 1998–99).
- ¹⁶ See, for example, Ludwig Geiger, *Die deutsche Literatur und die Juden* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1910). Compare also Jacques Ehrenfreund, "Erinnerungspolitik und historisches Gedächtnis: Zur Entstehung einer deutsch-jüdischen Wissenschaft im Kaiserreich (1870–1914)," in Ulrich Wyrwa, ed., *Judentum und Historismus: Zur Entstehung der jüdischen Geschichtswissenschaft in Europa* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2003), 39–61.
- ¹⁷ See Gershom Scholem's autobiography, *From Berlin to Jerusalem: Memories of my Youth*, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken, 1980).
- ¹⁸ Hannah Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen: The Life of a Jewess* (London: East and West Library, 1957), xii–xiii.
- ¹⁹ See my introduction to my critical edition of *Rahel Varnhagen: The Life of a Jewess* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 44–47.
- ²⁰ Selma Stern, *The Court Jew: A Contribution to the History of the Period of Absolutism in Central Europe*, trans. Ralph Weiman (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1950).
- ²¹ Jonathan Hess, *Germans, Jews and the Claims of Modernity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002) and Katja Garloff, *Words from Abroad: Trauma and Displacement in Postwar German Jewish Writers* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, forthcoming).
- ²² See, for example, Enzo Traverso, *The Jews and Germany: From the "Judeo-German Symbiosis" to the Memory of Auschwitz*, trans. Daniel Weissbort (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995); Jacques Le Rider and Dominique Bourel, eds., *De Sils-Maria à Jérusalem: Nietzsche et le judaïsme, les intellectuels juifs et Nietzsche* (Paris: Cerf, 1991); Dominique Bourel, *Moses Mendelssohn et la naissance du judaïsme moderne* (Paris: Gallimard, 2004); and Ursula Isselstein, *Studien zu Rahel Varnhagen: Der Text aus meinem beleidigten Herzen* (Torino: Tirrenia stampatori, 1993).
- ²³ See James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993) and Lawrence D. Kritzman, ed., *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*, 3 vols., trans. Arthur Goldhammer (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).
- ²⁴ Jeffrey S. Librett, *The Rhetoric of Cultural Dialogue: Jews and Germans from Moses Mendelssohn to Richard Wagner and Beyond* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000); Peter Fenves, *Arresting Language: From Leibniz to Benjamin* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001). In regard to Jacques Derrida's work, see, for example, his *Schibboleth pour Paul Celan* (Paris: Galilée, 1986).
- ²⁵ Paul Mendes-Flohr, *From Mysticism to Dialogue: Martin Buber's Transformation of German Social Thought* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989); Leora Batnitzky, *Idolatry and Representation: The Philosophy of Franz Rosenzweig Reconsidered* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Eric Santner, *On the Psychotheology of Everyday Life: Reflections on Freud and Rosenzweig* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001).
- ²⁶ See Astrid Deuber-Mankowsky, *Der frühe Walter Benjamin und Hermann Cohen: Jüdische Werte, kritische Philosophie, vergängliche Erfahrung* (Berlin: Vorwerk, 2000); Gillian Rose, *Judaism and Modernity: Philosophical Essays* (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1993).

- ²⁷ Jan Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997).
- ²⁸ In regard to the exhibitions at the Jewish Museum in New York, see the following catalogues: Vivian B. Mann and Richard I. Cohen, eds., *From Court Jews to the Rothschilds: Art, Patronage, and Power, 1600–1800* (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1996) and Emily Bilski, ed., *Berlin Metropolis: Jews and the New Culture, 1890–1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).
- ²⁹ Louis Rose, *The Survival of Images: Art Historians, Psychoanalysts, and the Ancients* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2001) and Charlotte Schoell-Glass, *Aby Warburg und der Antisemitismus: Kulturwissenschaft als Geistespolitik* (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1998). An English translation is forthcoming with Wayne State University Press.
- ³⁰ Natalie Zemon Davis, *Women on the Margins: Three Seventeenth-Century Lives* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995). See also the following conference proceedings: Monika Richarz, *Die Hamburger Kauffrau Glikl: Jüdische Existenz in der frühen Neuzeit* (ser.) Hamburger Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Juden 24 (Hamburg: Christians, 2001).
- ³¹ Ruth Ellen Gruber, *Virtually Jewish: Reinventing Jewish Culture in Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
- ³² See, for example, Lea Fleischmann, *Dies ist nicht mein Land: Eine Jüdin verlässt die Bundesrepublik*, with an afterword by Henryk M. Broder (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1980), or the interviews collected by Micha Brumlik et al, *Jüdisches Leben in Deutschland seit 1945* (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag bei Athenäum, 1986); Henryk M. Broder and Michel R. Lang, *Fremd im eigenen Land: Juden in der Bundesrepublik*, preface by Bernt Engelmann (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1979). In English translation, see Peter Sichrovsk, ed., *Strangers in Their Own Land: Young Jews in Germany and Austria Today*, trans. Jean Steinberg (New York: Basic Books, 1986).
- ³³ See the documentation *Die Fassbinder-Kontroverse, oder, Das Ende der Schonzeit*, ed. Heiner Lichtenstein, afterword by Julius H. Schoeps (Königstein/Ts.: Athenäum, 1986).
- ³⁴ See Geoffrey Hartman, ed., *Bitburg in Moral and Political Perspective* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986).
- ³⁵ See, for example, Gerd Wiegel and Johannes Klotz, eds., *Geistige Brandstiftung? Die Walser-Bubis Debatte* (Cologne: PapyRossa, 1999) and Amir Eshel, *Jewish Memories, German Futures: Recent Debates in Germany about the Past* (Bloomington: Robert A. and Sandra S. Borns Jewish Studies Program, Indiana University, 2001).
- ³⁶ <http://www.big-broder.de>. An anthology of Henryk Broder's texts has just appeared in English translation in Sander L. Gilman and Lilian M. Friedberg, eds., *A Jew in the New Germany*, trans. Broder Translators' Collective (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004).
- ³⁷ See, for example, Michael Brenner's study and collection of interviews in Brenner, *Juden in Deutschland 1945–1950* (Munich: Beck, 1995), and Jacqueline Giere and Rachel Salamander, eds., *Ein Leben aufs neu. Das Robinson-Album: DP-Lager, Juden auf deutschem Boden 1945–1948* (Vienna: Christian Brandstätter, 1950). The latter book is also an exhibition catalogue.
- ³⁸ Michal Y. Bodemann, ed., *Jews, Germans, Memory: Reconstructions of Jewish Life in Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996) and *In den Wogen der Erinnerung: Jüdische Existenz in Deutschland* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2002); Kurt Grünberg, *Liebe nach Auschwitz—die zweite Generation. Jüdische Nachkommen von Überlebenden der nationalsozialistischen Judenverfolgung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und das Erleben ihrer Paarbeziehungen* (Tübingen: Edition Diskord, 2000).
- ³⁹ Richard Chaim Schneider, "Wir sind da!" *Juden in Deutschland nach 1945* [sound recording] (Munich: Hörverlag, 2001). See also an accompanying volume with interviews, Schneider, ed., *Wir sind da! Die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland von 1945 bis heute* (Berlin: Ullstein, 2000).
- ⁴⁰ Sander Gilman and Karen Remmler, eds., *Reemerging Jewish Culture in Germany: Life and Literature since 1989* (New York: New York University Press, 1994), and Leslie Morris and

Karen Remmler, eds., *Contemporary Jewish Writing in Germany: An Anthology* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002).

⁴¹ See, for example, Robert Schindel, *Gebürtig* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1992), Doron Rabinovici, *Suche nach M. Roman in zwölf Episoden* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997) and Vladimir Vertlieb, *Zwischenstationen* (Vienna: Deuticke, 1999).

⁴² See, for example, Julius H. Schoeps, Willi Jasper, and Bernhard Vogt, eds., *Ein neues Judentum in Deutschland: Fremd- und Eigenbilder der russisch-jüdischen Einwanderer* (Potsdam: Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg, 1999).

⁴³ Michael Meyer and Michael Brenner, eds., *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, 4 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996). See also Brenner and David N. Myers, eds., *Jüdische Geschichtsschreibung heute: Themen Positionen Kontroversen* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2002)

⁴⁴ Marion Kaplan, ed., *Geschichte des jüdischen Alltags in Deutschland: Vom 17. Jahrhundert bis 1945*, trans. Friedrich Griese, Georgia Hanenberg, and Alice Jakubeit. This project was sponsored by the Leo Baeck Institute, New York, and an English edition is forthcoming.