



PROJECT MUSE®

Mixed Feelings: Tropes of Love in German Jewish Culture by
Katja Garloff (review)

Samuel J. Kessler

German Studies Review, Volume 41, Number 1, February 2018, pp. 166-168
(Review)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/gsr.2018.0014>



➔ For additional information about this article
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/687371>

Others will no doubt speak to the value of *Recoding World Literature* within German studies, a task I cannot undertake, but as someone who thinks, teaches, and writes about world literature I certainly hope our future has more works such as this in it—rich and insightful histories of the theory and practice of world literature as embodied in specific national or linguistic traditions. It seems logical that such histories should begin with Germany, given the history of *Weltliteratur* as a concept, but I welcome the telling of such stories in other contexts as well. A field with claims to universality can only benefit from such engagements with local specificity.

Alexander Beecroft, *University of South Carolina*

Mixed Feelings: Tropes of Love in German Jewish Culture. By Katja Garloff. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2016. Pp. 214. Paper \$29.95. ISBN 978-1501704970.

As Katja Garloff writes in her opening line, this book is about a particular figure of speech: “love.” More specifically, it is about how various sorts of love, denominated by their preceding adjectives (“unhappy love,” “interfaith love,” “romantic love,” “unrequited love,” and “revelatory love”), find expression in major works of German and German-Jewish literature over the past 250 years. Garloff’s main insight, and one that bears productive and fascinating analytic fruit, is that tracing the rhetoric of “love” can lead scholars toward a more nuanced understanding of the intricacies and difficulties of Jewish assimilation in modern German culture. The book, she writes, is about how noticing that the “obsession with love in German-Jewish thought and literature does not reflect naïveté about the political realities of emancipation but rather calls attention to its unfulfilled promises—and to the creative acts their fulfillment would require” (6). The “trope of love,” in other words, is not just about interpersonal interactions between Jews and Gentiles in the age of emancipation, but also addresses how art and creativity fulfill the role of cultural moderator when politics fails to achieve its most enlightened aims.

Mixed Feelings is divided into two main parts—the first focused on works clustered around the turn of the nineteenth century and the second on works from the early twentieth century—with a conclusion that brings her thesis to the present day. In Part 1, “Romantic Love and the Beginnings of Jewish Emancipation,” Garloff examines the writings of five authors, pairing works by a Jew and a non-Jew in the opening chapters: Moses Mendelssohn’s *Jerusalem* (1783) with Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s *Nathan der Weise* (1779), and Dorothea Veit’s *Florentin* (1801) with Friedrich Schlegel’s *Lucinde* (1799). A chapter is also devoted to the antisemitic stories of Achim von Arnim. Garloff describes her choices as focused on “the sociopolitical visions that become possible when Jewish emancipation is discussed in terms of love” (her emphasis, 21). For Mendelssohn and Lessing, she argues, love is about

coexistence, about carving out mutual but ultimately separate spheres within a single overarching polity. In the writings of Veit and Schlegel, whose personal love affair has immense symbolic resonance, love takes on an impervious individualization, a “romantic” quality that, in Garloff’s reading, “hinges upon the negation of Judaism, or its transformation into an unspeakable difference” (51). Finally, for Arnim, it is “ambiguity and ambivalence” that take center stage (76), with Arnim presenting various possible love affairs between Jews and non-Jews and then rejecting them because of a perceived inability of Jews (or their Jewishness) to truly be assimilated into German culture. Engaging with postcolonial theory, Garloff argues that “ambiguity, which expresses a *psychical* ambivalence about the process of modernization, ultimately enhances the *political* efficacy of antisemitism” (her emphasis, 91).

In Part 2, “The Crisis of Jewish Emancipation and Assimilation,” Garloff traces the story of Jewish integration and religious/ethnic difference into the twentieth century, where it comes into conflict with homogenizing and racializing nationalist tendencies. In three chapters, Garloff examines the works of Ludwig Jacobowski, Max Nordau, Georg Hermann, Sigmund Freud, Otto Weininger, Arthur Schnitzler, Franz Rosenzweig, and Else Lasker-Schüler, all of whom “seek to wrest love away from biologist thought and reinstate it as a model of sociopolitical integration” (98). Because of the many political trends with which Jews were engaged by the early twentieth century, across these chapters Garloff uses each writer as a cipher through which to address larger social concerns, such as race, nationalism (of which Zionism was the uniquely Jewish facet), and gender. Chapter 5, “Eros and Thanatos in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna,” is an excellent example of Garloff’s method at work. Concerning Freud, the dean of writing on human psycho-sexuality, she makes the remarkable observation that “Freud maintained a resonant silence about the subject of Jewish-Gentile sex and love” (130), and concludes with the thesis that “Freud intentionally shunned the (usually antisemitic) equation between Jewishness and sexuality in favor of a universal theory of Eros” (131). After an extensive rereading of both Schnitzler and Weininger, she argues that both writers “associate freedom with men and Gentiles, and the lack thereof with women and Jews” (138). In all these chapters, Garloff employs her unique heuristic of “tropes of love” to demonstrate that the personal/sexual/romantic relationship between Jews and non-Jews continued to be a powerful literary force even a century after Jewish emancipation had been (mostly) completed. In her conclusion, she brings this theme to the present day.

The chief shortfall of the volume is that Garloff focuses almost exclusively on standard texts. As mentioned above, her readings of those works are often fresh, adding new insights that will certainly become a part of the standard secondary literature for each of these classic works. But it would have been interesting to see Garloff investigate some of the other Jewish writings—which we might call “middlebrow”—that were popular and widely read in the nineteenth century, such as those by Leopold

Kompert or Salomon Kohn. The conclusions reached by Garloff's rereading of the canon are astute, and they add much to the traditional narrative about elite Jewish interactions with their non-Jewish fellow countrymen. However, analyzing popular novels whose readership would have been slightly more conservative, and perhaps more religious, might help to broaden the applicability of her "trope of love" analytic.

That she focuses on well-known texts, however, should not detract from the book's main accomplishments, and this concern stems mainly from the desire to see Garloff's discursive investigation applied to literature that has been unfairly neglected. In the end, this book should be an essential read for anyone interested in Jewish-Gentile relations in modern German literature.

Samuel J. Kessler, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*

Prophecies of Language: The Confusion of Tongues in German Romanticism. By Kristina Mendicino. New York: Fordham University Press, 2017. Pp. 281. Paper \$24.87. ISBN 978-0823274024017.

In her recent monograph, Kristina Mendicino argues that G.W.F. Hegel, Wilhelm von Humboldt, Friedrich Schlegel, and Friedrich Hölderlin find the origin of human language in moments of disruption of a temporal and conceptual continuity: human speech is crystallized in the moment that self-articulation comes to a halt. The romantics' philosophy of language is thus portrayed as antithetic to the view that human language emerges in a developmental process, a perception that the author attaches to the Enlightenment. Subsequently, Mendicino seeks to establish that prophecy—a trope which, as she cogently demonstrates, was central to romanticism—is emblematic of the caesura of articulation. Taking prophetic speech to function as a liminal act where the human and the divine cross ways, Mendicino argues that the romantics have constituted a new theological primal scene to represent language's emergence. Prophecy has replaced the image of Adam naming objects in his surroundings, the scene which informed manifold inquiries into the origin of language in the previous generation.

Demonstrating the eminence of translation in the period both as a concept and as a practice, Mendicino highlights their engagement with ancient Greek motifs. She thus opts to stress "the structural similarities between translation and prophecy, which both imply speaking for, with, and in the place of another" (13). Similar to translation, prophetic speech seems instrumental for communication; yet, a closer look at both media reveals their role as a substitute, and disrupts the notion of successful articulation. This structural focus, Mendicino argues, adds a new perspective to the rich scholarship on prophecy and on translation around 1800.

The introduction proposes that romantic thought dismantles the allocation of a