The Middleman: Ludwig Strauss's German–Hebrew Bilingualism

Rachel Seelig

Prooftexts, Volume 33, Number 1, Winter 2013, pp. 76-104 (Article)

Published by Indiana University Press
DOI: 10.1353/ptx.2013.0001

For additional information about this article
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ptx/summary/v033/33.1.seelig.html

Access provided by University of Toronto Library (22 Mar 2014 09:47 GMT)

The Middleman:
Ludwig Strauss's German–Hebrew Bilingualism

RACHEL SEELIG

Shortly after immigrating to Palestine from Germany, Ludwig Strauss composed an ode to the bay of Haifa, which was soon enfolded into the volume Land Israel *(1935), the poet's extended paean to his new home. Although "An die Bucht" was initially published in German, Strauss actually produced two versions of the poem—one in German and one in Hebrew. In this article I trace the development of Strauss's German–Hebrew bilingualism as part of his vision of a continuous, multilingual national "Jewish canon." Situating his project within the broader discourse on the role of the Jew in German culture that unfolded during the first part of the twentieth century, I explore Strauss's attempt to divest from German culture in favor of cultivating a pan-Jewish* (alljüdisch) *identity. Yet analysis of Strauss's process of simultaneous auto-translation between German and Hebrew reveals that his poetic achievement surpasses his ideology. Strauss's German–Hebrew bilingualism was less an act of uprooting than a process of cross-fertilization, an ongoing attempt to inhabit the border between languages and landscapes as an alternative cultural space.*

BETWEEN LANGUAGES, BETWEEN LANDSCAPES

In 1934, shortly after immigrating to Palestine from Germany, Ludwig Strauss stood overlooking the bay of Haifa, his senses overwhelmed. The following poem ensued:

An die Bucht

Du legst Sand
Rein wie Feuer

PROOFTEXTS 33 (2013): 76–104. Copyright © 2013 by Prooftexts Ltd.

Um das blaue,
Sich schmiegende Meer,
Wie ein Liebender die Hand legt
Um eine Brust.

Nichts als
Schauen will ich —
Aber mit der sanften
Sichel deiner Schönheit
Schneidest du
Durch mein Herz,
Und meine Sinne wie Ähren
Fallen.[1]

To the Bay

You lay sand
Pure as fire
Upon the blue,
Nestling sea,
Like a lover lays his hand
Upon a breast.

I want only
To look —
But you cut
Through my heart
With the mild
Sickle of your beauty,
And my senses like stalks
Fall.

The terse two stanzas marked the end of a long and circuitous journey. In the winter of 1924, Strauss spent three months traveling through Palestine, marveling at the deserts and coastline that were so unlike the scenery of his native Germany.

During this first encounter he established with the exotic landscape "a relationship of passionate inwardness, which remained as good as mute."[2] It was only with his return to Palestine as an immigrant ten years later that the "preserved image" was transformed into verse. Standing "at the precipice of the Carmel," Strauss recalled, "abandoned for a while by the genius of the German language," the first "stammers" of a poem came forth—involuntarily—in Hebrew. The spontaneous linguistic transfer "loosened the tongue," and soon his affinity for the Mediterranean coast "gained expression in German."[3] The result was a felicitous bilingual composition and the centerpiece of the volume *Land Israel* (Land of Israel; 1935), Strauss's love letter to his new home.

For Strauss, the borderland between German and Jewish cultures that Franz Rosenzweig described as *Zweistromland* (land of two rivers), a translation of the biblical name for Mesopotamia (*Naharayim*), was a metaphor that became a reality.[4] In contrast to many of his German Jewish contemporaries, whose romantic image of the ancient *Hebräerland* (to invoke Else Lasker-Schüler's title) was cast in German, and unlike the Hebraists, for whom the physical transfer to Palestine was to be completed by adopting the renewed biblical tongue, Strauss's linguistic and geographical commitments were divided and complex. His departure from Germany was not matched by an abandonment of the German language but by the integration of Hebrew into a bilingual oeuvre. This unusual German–Hebrew bilingualism is remarkable not only for its rarity but also because of the cultural vision that undergirds it. Informed by the quasi-romantic desire for ethnic distinctiveness and autonomy that drove many expressions of "Jewish Renewal" during the first two decades of the twentieth century, Strauss's poetics was tied to the Cultural Zionist project of establishing an indigenous and authentic Jewish culture in Palestine. "Nationality," he commented, "is not a political but rather a cultural matter."[5]

But the mark of Strauss's achievement diverged from his proclaimed goal. The ostensible divestment from German culture was in fact the transfer—or perhaps translation—of German Jewish culture to a Jewish landscape. What was intended as an act of uprooting evolved into a process of cross-fertilization. Understood as such, Strauss's bilingual oeuvre exemplifies what Michael Kramer has described as assimilation as "an imaginative act."[6] Against the familiar view of assimilation as a betrayal or diminishment of cultural particularity for the sake of resembling the

majority culture, Kramer's "metonymic" definition of assimilation emphasizes the accretion and adaptation of aspects of the major culture in the establishment of a minor culture. By tracing Strauss's literary development alongside his geographical trajectory between Germany and Palestine, this article presents a counterexample to Jewish literary studies predicated on the dichotomy of homeland and exile and on the geographical boundaries such a division bespeaks. I argue that Strauss's peculiar bilingualism signals neither a divestment from German culture nor an infringement of the border between German and Hebrew, but rather an attempt to occupy this border as an alternative cultural space. It therefore serves as a model of a transnational, translational approach to literature that decenters entrenched doctrines of exile and rupture in favor of continuous cultural transfer and creative exchange.

MITTLER OR *SCHÖPFER*? THE CULTURAL ROLE OF THE GERMAN JEWISH POET

Conceived over the course of ten years between Strauss's first visit to Palestine and his eventual immigration, the poem "An die Bucht" straddles languages and landscapes. In order to understand the poem and its pivotal role within the poet's larger body of work, it is necessary to examine the development of Strauss's national vision and poetic program during the years prior to his first sojourn in Palestine. In 1912, Strauss took up his studies in Berlin, where he met Fritz Mordecai Kaufmann, who would become a dear friend and important influence. Strauss soon became a regular contributor to Kaufmann's journal, *Die Freistatt: Alljüdische Revue* (Sanctuary: Pan-Jewish Review), a short-lived enterprise (lasting barely two years, 1913–14) which purported to "serve the consciousness of a still small, yet growing, cohort of western-Jewish poets" by strengthening their ties with their East European Jewish counterparts writing in Hebrew and Yiddish.[7] In the mission statement that opened the inaugural issue, Kaufmann described Eastern Europe as the living "center" of Jewish culture to which assimilated German Jewry, stranded on the "periphery," must draw near.[8] The endorsement doubled as a challenge, not only to assimilated German Jews who had distanced themselves from their eastern coreligionists, but also to the so-called "Cult of the Ostjuden," whose

romantic conception of East European Jews, the editor maintained, betrayed minimal interest in either their contemporary culture or their material plight.[9] Distinguishing himself from proponents of Jewish renewal who looked eastward in their search for "authenticity," Kaufmann portrayed East European Jewish culture not as a mythical point of origin but as "living, flesh and blood," the foundation of a pan-Jewish (*alljüdisch*) identity.[10]

This *alljüdisch* ideal represented a reaction to German *völkisch* ideology, with its equation of ethnic purity and creativity, which portrayed the Jews as having a corrupting effect on German culture and the economy. The fact that many of Germany's most prominent editors, publishers, critics, and art dealers were Jewish provided fodder for the antisemitic claim that increasing monetary success in "intermediary" fields was directly proportional to a lack of genuine creativity. The prevalence of this claim attested to a painful impasse for Jewish intellectuals; would they continue to contribute to German culture, to which they were denied any rightful claim, or redirect their energies to fashion their own? In support of the latter argument, Jakob Wassermann penned an essay promoting a doctrine of self-realization conceived along ethnic lines. Conceding to the Volkists an inherent link between ethnic identity and creative capacity, Wassermann posited a distinction between the cosmopolitan *Literat*, a catch-all for journalists, editors, and publishers, and the poet, or *Schöpfer* (creator), whose poetic capacity is inseparable from his "oriental" identity, or in Wassermann's strikingly völkisch terminology, his *Blutbewußtsein* (blood-consciousness).[11] That fewer Jews took on the role of poet than critic was, according to Wassermann, a clear sign of persistent self-deception and exilic weakness.

Like Wassermann, Strauss believed that the only way for the Jewish poet to reinvigorate his creativity was to abandon the role of *Literatenjude,* which meant divesting from bourgeois German culture, and to reestablish "a connection with Jewish culture, which today means East European Jewish culture."[12] His position gained sharper focus through an ongoing debate with the German-Jewish literary critic Julius Bab. Bab provoked the dispute with his essay, "Der Anteil der Juden an der deutschen Dichtung der Gegenwart" (The Participation of the Jews in Contemporary German Poetry), in which he argued that German Jews failed as poets because they were historically and constitutionally predisposed to the role of *Mittler*

(intermediary) within a foreign culture, insinuating a connection between the mediating role traditionally played by Jews in the European economy and their contemporary function as entrepreneurs, literary agents, translators, and critics.[13] Whereas Wassermann's portrayal of the intermediary role of the *Literat* was distinctly negative, Bab's version had an apologetic ring. Citing the example of the salon hostess Rachel Levin Varnhagen, who supported—but in no way "judaized"—Goethe's career, Bab sought to defend Jewish contributions to German culture while allaying suspicions about their corrupting influence. By affirming the role of the Jew as *Mittler* and denying his role as *Schöpfer*, Bab rebutted the malicious claim that the Jews not only dominated German culture but also threatened to contaminate it.

The opposite, Bab argued, was true: since the Jews lacked inherent creativity, they availed themselves of the surrounding cultural influences to which their diasporic station provided immediate access. Assimilation, according to this account, was not a denial of Jewish identity (and thus a hindrance to cultural productivity) but rather a productive path in its own right, "the open commitment to the experience . . . that we in truth are both Jewish and German, and that we can live only through a harmonious cooperation, an 'adaptation' [*Anpassen*] of these two elements."[14] Bab therefore rejected Strauss's call to pursue a hermetic Jewish identity cut off from German influences: "Who among the spokesmen of pure Jewish culture would be prepared to renounce every single one of the cultural assets that has come to him only via his Germanness, and without which the humanistic work [*Menschenarbeit*] of the past centuries would be lost to him?"[15] It was preposterous, moreover, to turn to the "ghettoized" culture of East European Jewry as a source of cultural inspiration and rebirth when East European Jews looked westward in their quest for enlightenment. Bab based his argument on the Hegelian conception of a universal high culture to which nations and individuals in search of enlightenment are naturally drawn but which nonetheless remains confined to the intellectual achievements of the West. How could German Jews "go to the *Ostjuden* to experience what art is," he asked incredulously, when it was Yiddish culture that wanted and needed a Western education?[16]

Strauss's rebuttal relied on an alternative understanding of culture, drawn from J. G. Herder, as a pluralistic anthropological category, that which distinguishes individual *Volksgeisten,* the "singular and wonderful spirits" of nations.[17] His commitment to East European Jewish culture as the source of ethnic pride and

particularity recalls Herder's extolment of the "primitive" cultures of the East as the bastion of all that had been annulled by the rationalism of the bourgeois West. Herder counted the people of Israel among these pure "Asiatic" nations, but argued that two thousand years of estrangement from their native land had caused the autonomous biblical nation to degenerate into "a race of cunning brokers," forced to idle as "parasitical plants on the trunks of other nations."[18] Echoing this view, yet purging its antisemitic sting, Strauss presented East European Jewry as the torchbearers of a pure and primitive Jewish *Volksgeist* that had been lost to German Jews, whose intermediary position within German society had sapped their creative vigor. Although he conceded to Bab that many contemporary German Jewish poets produced hackneyed verse, he insisted that this shortcoming was less a function of their Jewishness than a consequence of their assimilation. By relegating the Jews to the role of *Mittler,* Bab had denied them the potential to produce works of cultural value. As to his opponent's criticism of Yiddish literature, Strauss argued that Yiddish writers strove not for "Europeanization" but rather to "incorporat[e] the achievements of Europe into their oriental Jewish culture." This was precisely the lesson that German Jews could glean from their Eastern brothers: the quest for national self-realization did not require the extraction from European culture but rather a unique "effort to take *our* place within this culture."[19]

Even more troubling than Bab's denial of Jewish creativity, for Strauss, was the fact that such a disavowal came from a Jewish critic. In Strauss's view, Bab's perspective revealed the extent to which assimilation had adversely affected not only the quality of Jewish poetry but also the standards of Jewish literary criticism. Turning his opponent's argument on its head, Strauss proclaimed Bab the true *Mittler,* a handmaiden to German culture whose dogmatic adherence to its traditions prevented him from appreciating the unique characteristics of Jewish culture. Strauss took particular issue with Bab's claim that the Jews, lacking a fundamental "innocence of the senses [*die Unschuld der Sinne*]," are able to "operate only through idea, reflection, and comparison, and therefore will never be poets in the great, elementary sense of the word."[20] Ever the clever rhetorician, Strauss sought not to deflate this argument but rather to transform it into evidence of his opponent's debilitating assimilation and consequent weakness as a critic of Jewish poetry. In response to Bab, Strauss wrote: "The German detects [*erfaßt*] the sensual form and

senses [*ahnt*] the spirit in it. The Jew experiences [*erlebt*] the spirit and creates [*erschafft*] the sensual world from and in service of it."[21] The dominance of intellect and spirit, which Bab disparaged as overly cerebral, impenetrable by sensual experience and thus stifling of poetic sensibility, was in Strauss's estimation the defining feature of Jewish poetry! By transforming Bab's criticism into a positive defining characteristic, Strauss implied that the problem of Jewish creativity lay not with Jewish poets but with assimilated critics, whose "slavish" adherence to the norms of German culture had prevented them from adjudicating Jewish poetry on its own terms. Drawing upon Nietzsche's notion of "slave morality," Strauss maintained that Jewish critics could only become "masters" of their own domain by developing independent standards of creative production and evaluation.[22]

YIDDISH AS *MITTLERSPRACHE*

By emphasizing the centrality of intellect and spirit to Jewish poetry Strauss aimed not only to expose the self-defeating nature of Bab's argument but also to establish the basis of a unique poetic legacy extending back to the Bible. Citing a verse from the Song of Songs, "his head is the finest gold" (Song of Songs 5:11), he observed that biblical imagery "does not offer a conceivable sensual image but rather vaguely affects the power of imagination by encouraging an intermediary emotion." The inheritor of this technique, according to Strauss, was Else Lasker-Schüler, whose poetry demonstrates "the transformation of this world in service of emotion, extracting the sensual phenomenon from its natural organism and placing it within a new spiritual one."[23] Although Strauss offered no specific examples from her work, evidence for his argument can be found in the poem, "Ein alter Tibbett-epich" (An Old Tibetan Rug; 1910), in which the blurring of time and space expresses the intensity of the connection between two fated lovers, their souls knotted together as in the threads of an exotic rug: "Strahl in Strahl verliebte Farben. / Sterne, die sich himmellang umwarben" (Strand in strand the enamored colors. / Stars that wooed each other heaven-long). What Lasker-Schüler lacked in terms of the "innocence of the senses," Strauss remarked, echoing Bab's terms, she made up for in the "subjective reevaluation of nature [*Umwertung der Natur*] . . . in which the spiritual, emotional, and even the psychic outweigh the sensual."[24] By

linking Lasker-Schüler's poetry with the Song of Songs, Strauss sought to reveal it as the progeny of classical Hebrew verse.

But how could the claim of a single literary tradition linking classical Hebrew with modern German be substantiated? Establishing such a connection meant overcoming an obvious barrier. After all, assimilated German Jews were as far removed from the religious sources as their German vernacular was removed from classical Hebrew. Strauss identified Yiddish language and literature as the missing link. Just as Eastern Europe constituted the physical midpoint between Germany and Palestine, Yiddish represented the nexus of German, to which it was linguistically tied, and Hebrew, with which it shared a religious and cultural bond. Yiddish literature, moreover, represented a reservoir of folk sources that communicated Jewish ethnicity in its most authentic form.

The discovery of Yiddish as the link between German and Hebrew is the crux of Strauss's only novella, *Der Mittler* (The Middleman), published in the January 1914 issue of *Die Freistatt*. As the title indicates, the novella was Strauss's last salvo in his debate with Bab, a final call for disengagement from the subservient role of "middleman" to German culture and the embrace of a distinctly Jewish creativity based on Jewish sources located in the East. The seemingly simple tale is an allegory for German Jewry's attempt to embrace German culture, only to be accused of infiltrating and defiling it. Yet the title does not only refer to the negative role of the Jews in German culture. Yiddish also emerges as a productive "mediating" language that awakens the protagonist to his authentic Jewish origins buried beneath a history of assimilation.

Der Mittler is the story of David R., a young German Jewish student who has been wrongfully convicted for the murder of his neighbor. From the confines of his solitary prison cell, he reconstructs the fateful day that led to his undoing while reexamining his own identity. Having delivered a letter to the neighbor that had arrived accidentally at his front door, he is welcomed warmly into her home. Her elegance and refinement rouse in him unfettered desire, which propels David to embrace her passionately before fleeing in shame. Upon returning home, he learns from a group of distraught community members that the neighbor has been found murdered on her divan. Since David was the only person to have been seen entering her home, he is immediately arrested and imprisoned.

David's invitation into the neighbor's home represents the limited acceptance of the Jews into the *Bildungsbürgertum*, which lured them with ecumenical promise, while the embrace and its misinterpretation as an act of murder suggest that assimilation was not matched by acceptance into German society at large. As his debate with Bab indicates, Strauss directed his critique less at antisemites than at assimilated German Jews. Indeed, although the outside community accuses David of murder, it is the embrace—or rather the desire behind it—that placed him in the quandary in the first place.

What was the origin of this unfulfilled desire? David's recollections suggest the seeds of self-destruction were sowed in his youth:

> From early on a dreamer by nature, my status among my friends combined two woeful roles: I was the weak and peculiar bloke whom they teased and abused without feeling guilty, for I was different from them; and I was the Jew, the clearly marked child of a despised and homeless nation.[25]

When his peers attack him, it is the beautiful neighbor who rushes to his defense. Responding to her kindness with obscenities rather than gratitude, David's puzzling behavior betrays an unconscious internalization of the hostility directed toward him. The German American sociologist Kurt Lewin likened Jewish self-hatred to the psychological effects of adolescent bullying: the negative self-image of the victim, which stems from the bully's "low esteem" for him, leads him to seek the acceptance of his oppressors by distancing himself from the image that has been cast upon him. Realizing that he is "unable to cut himself entirely loose from his Jewish connections and his Jewish past, the hatred turns upon himself."[26]

Viewed in this context, the bullies stand for the *völkisch* definition of a primordial German identity exclusive to ethnic Germans, while the elegant older neighbor personifies *Bildung,* the ideal of continuous education and moral improvement embraced by German Jews throughout the emancipation period as the key to entry into the educated middle class. By the turn of the century, the steady rise of an aggressive ethnic nationalism threatened to eclipse the humanistic ideal of an all-encompassing *Kultur* available to all, irrespective of ethnic origin and religious

background. Barred from entry into the closed circle of *Urdeutschtum* (essential or primordial Germanness) represented by the brutish boys, David is forced to acknowledge the futility of his desire for the refined older neighbor, the embodiment of a fading nineteenth-century ideal.[27] His frustrated longing demonstrates what Moritz Goldstein identified as the existential crisis of German Jewry: despite their exclusion from German society, they refused or found themselves unable to relinquish an idealized image of German culture and therefore remained "eternally halved" (*ewig-Halben*), hopelessly trapped in their "unhappy love" for a culture that would never accept them.[28] The deleterious consequences of self-hatred are revealed through David's psychological unraveling in prison. As flights of the imagination devolve into neurotic fantasies, David descends into a downward spiral of delusion and self-doubt and soon believes himself to be the culprit: "The life that I had toyed with would not leave me alone, it crept right into me."[29] Unable to disentangle reality from the perverse fiction, he ultimately confesses to a crime he did not commit, thus condemning himself to life in prison.

The turning point occurs when David receives a visit from his mother. Turning to him tenderly, she addresses him using a name she had never used before:

> And then, stroking my hair: "My boy." And then, something she had never called me before: "My Dovidleh." With these words, which released a boundless pain in my heart, I saw the simple house of those old village-Jews, my grandparents; I saw myself as a child during my beautiful vacations with these chaste and simple, honest and happy people; the name that my mother had just called me for the first time was the name that her mother, in tender moments, called my grandfather.[30]

The sound of David's diminutive Yiddish name—Dovidleh—awakens in him the memory of his simple, noble lineage and, in turn, the recognition of his own innocence. It is this new self-awareness that facilitates honest written expression: "And so my days elapse, identical and clear in the bitter surroundings and care of the prison. Occasionally I write verses and just recently began writing the story of my life, which I see before me in ever-clearer lines from an uncorrupted distance."[31]

The epiphanic moment stands in contrast to an earlier episode in which David flees the neighbor's home after the embrace and attempts unsuccessfully to calm his nerves by reciting a favorite German poem: "But I was unable to recall a single word, and traveled farther and farther away."[32] David's inability to reassemble the familiar poem signals his parasitic relationship to German culture; relegated to the role of the *Mittler,* he is able only to imitate. Only when he acknowledges his ethnic origins—a moment of self-discovery caused by the intrusion of Yiddish—that David discovers his latent creative prowess and is transformed into a *Schöpfer,* a true and honest poet.

Strauss challenged the *völkisch* dogma that marked the Jew as "other," while simultaneously succumbing to the German fantasy of linguistic and cultural purity, by constructing a parallel myth of origins located in the language and landscape of the ancient Middle East. Yet he found himself in a quandary: denied ownership of German, his natural medium of expression, and unable to communicate fully in any other language, he faced what Kafka described as the impasse borne of three linguistic impossibilities: "The impossibility of not writing, the impossibility of writing German, the impossibility of writing differently."[33] The only way to justify his continued relationship with German while endorsing divestment from German culture was to establish a cultural and linguistic intermediary connecting the primordial Hebraic *Volksgeist* with contemporary German-Jewish culture. Not *Muttersprache* (mother tongue) but *Mittlersprache* (mediating language), Yiddish was the link between Strauss's "mythic language" (Hebrew) and his natural "vernacular" (German).[34] Ironically, it was this intermediary language, Yiddish, that would allow the German Jew to overcome his intermediary role within German culture.

Through the discovery of Yiddish as *Mittlersprache* Strauss overcame not only a major theoretical dilemma but also a significant obstacle in his creative life. In 1919, following a long hiatus in correspondence, he wrote to Martin Buber that he had experienced a "unique internal and external crisis" upon returning to Berlin after the war. Overwhelmed by the "ghastly and noisy mechanisms" of the young Weimar capital and repulsed by "the stressful political commotion that accompanies every party action," he left his urban environs for a ten-day vacation in Buckow, a picturesque lake town just east of Berlin. Far from the pandemonium of

the metropolis, he "swam, rowed, hiked and a hail of verses descended" upon him.[35] Indeed, during the brief vacation Strauss wrote enough poems to form an entire volume, which was published in 1921 under the title *Die Flut—Das Jahr—Der Weg* (The Flood—The Year—The Way). He also immersed himself in the world of Yiddish literature. In particular, the stories of Mendele Moykher Sforim (S. Y. Abramovitch) and the Yiddish verse of Ḥayim Naḥman Bialik captured his imagination, as did a collection of Yiddish folk songs, which he translated and later published under the German title *Ostjüdische Liebeslieder* (East European Jewish Love Songs).[36]

Ostjüdische Liebeslieder betrays the profound influence of Buber's Hasidic folktales, which purported to enliven the spirit (*Geist*) of the original Yiddish text in the language and aesthetic format most accessible to German readers. Buber claimed faithfulness to the original despite having taken significant artistic license in translation. Any perceptible omissions or changes, he protested, were made in service of the true spirit of Hasidism as it was revealed to and filtered through him, not as a translator but as a "narrator in a chain of narrators, a link between links."[37] Echoing Buber, Strauss wrote in his introduction to the collection of folk songs that he had "resisted Germanization [*Verdeutschung*] at all costs," and sought only to "carr[y] out in German a reflection of the Jewish spirit as it became a poetic event [*dichterisches Ereignis*] in the folk song."[38] With respect to editorial choices, the selections were made "based on two motives alone: the extent to which the linguistic form of the Yiddish poem appeared consummate or especially distinctive, and the extent to which this provided the impulse for imitation [*Nachahmung*]." Upon close inspection, these motives appear contradictory, since the impulse for imitation stems from a perceived "linguistic proximity" between Yiddish and German, which would mitigate any "distinctiveness." Strauss was confident that the German reader would "easily and automatically adapt the translation to the linguistic world [*Sprachwelt*] of the German folk song," since the Yiddish language "has received so much from German and has transformed so much of its noble old linguistic material in sound and meaning through its own folk spirit."[39] By presenting pieces that appeared to reflect the culture of the East and the aesthetic sensibilities of the West in equal measure, Strauss catered to his German-speaking audience while cleverly circumventing the charge of imitative *Verdeutschung* (Germanization).[40]

Strauss's Yiddish translation project is a consummate example of what Michael Brenner has described as the "dialectical" thrust of Jewish renewal, which "was characterized neither by a radical break with the past nor a return to it." The proponents of Jewish renewal "used distinct forms of Jewish tradition, marking them as authentic," and presented them according to the "demands of contemporary taste and modern cultural forms of expression."[41] Strauss understood that in order to bring the *alljüdisch* ideal to fruition he would have to consolidate the traditional content of the East with the aesthetic proclivities of the West. Translation presented an opportunity to preserve the uniqueness and authenticity of the Jewish *Volksgeist* while making it accessible to a German-speaking audience, while Yiddish *qua Mittlersprache* was an essential third term in the construction of a continuous, multilingual Jewish literary tradition linking modern German culture to the ancient biblical sources. Though Strauss was hardly a Yiddishist in the traditional sense, his mission as translator corresponds to Anita Norich's definition of "Yiddishism" as a particular "worldview" that privileges intersection, accretion, adaptation, and interdependence, and which is therefore the opposite of Hebraism, focused on authenticity, autonomy, and independence.[42] Strauss's Yiddish translations were intended to promote an "authentic," autonomous pan-Jewish culture, yet his selection process and translation techniques adapted the linguistic and cultural fields of Hebrew and Yiddish to the German Jewish *Sprachwelt*. As an exercise in creative assimilation, his translations provided the foundation for his own bilingualism, to which we now turn.

BUILDING A BILINGUAL LANDSCAPE

Blending linguistic and stylistic influences from the Psalms to Friedrich Hölderlin, *Land Israel* "mediates" between languages, landscapes, and cultures. Cultural and linguistic translation is rendered concrete in the poem "An die Bucht," the heart of the volume and the only poem Strauss published in both German and Hebrew. The poem did not evolve linearly, from Hebrew to German, but rather by way of simultaneous auto-translation back-and-forth between the two. "Necessity" drove Strauss to compose in Hebrew, he remarked, for only the ancient and indigenous tongue could enliven the Palestinian landscape; yet the initial inarticulate "stammers" served to "loosen the tongue," allowing him to overcome his speechlessness and

write again in German. Menachem Perry observes that simultaneous auto-translation, in contrast to delayed auto-translation (executed after completion or even publication of the original text in another language), allows for limitless innovative possibilities, since there is no "original" source text to which the translator must remain faithful. When undertaken by a bilingual writer, the process is particularly complex because it requires the transfer not only between languages but also between traditions, which invariably leads to "bold shifts" in translation.[43]

If we compare the Hebrew version with the German, several "bold shifts" emerge:

El ha-mifrats

shata ḥol,
tohar dolek,
saviv layam hatakhol
umitrapek
keshit ohev yad
'aley shad.

ulenafshi saḥti: 'uri ḥazi!'
ve'atah bamagal harakh
shel yafyakh
batarta ḥazi,
veḥushay kashibalim yiplu,
yikhlu.

To the Bay

You place sand,
Burning purity,
Round the azure sea
Clinging
Like a lover's hand
Placed upon a breast.

I said to my soul: "Awake and behold!"
While you with the soft sickle
Of your beauty
Cut through my chest,
And my senses like stalks fall,
Finish.

In contrast to the free-verse structure of the German version, the Hebrew version is comprised of two balanced six-line stanzas with a consistent rhyme scheme. It is also markedly shorter, a mere twenty-eight words, as opposed to forty-four in German. Amos Oz once quipped that "Hebrew favors total contraction [*tsimtsum totali*]" because long before it could be written in ink it was carved painstakingly into stone.[44] The economy of words in the Hebrew version would confirm Strauss's claim that inarticulate Hebrew "stammers" came forth before pen was put to paper in German.

The Hebrew version also abounds in wordplay that is entirely absent in German. Whereas the final line of the German poem reads, "Und meine Sinne wie Ähren / Fallen" (And my senses like stalks / Fall), in Hebrew the stalks "fall" (*yiplu*) and "are finished" (*yikhlu*), bringing the poem to a stronger sense of completion in both sentiment and sound. Strauss was imitating a central feature of biblical poetry: the inseparability of sound and lexical meaning. The musicality of biblical verse, he observed, is never purely decorative. Repetition is always a result of parallelism, which is used exclusively for conceptual emphasis, while the absence of vowels in Hebrew means that assonance and rhyme are achievable only as a consequence of morphological or syntactical variation, which likewise serve the thematic focus. Strauss offers the following example from Psalm 131:

Kegamul ʿaley imo
Kegamul ʿalay nafshi.

Like a weaned child to his mother,
Like a weaned child to me is my soul.

The verse disguises chiasmus, a verbal pattern common in biblical verse wherein separate clauses are brought into closer contact with each other through a reversal of

structures. As Strauss notes, "'Like a weaned child' [*kegamul*] in the first verse opposes 'my soul' [*nafshi*] in the second verse, and 'to his mother' ['*aley imo*] in the first verse opposes 'to my soul' ['*alay nafshi*] in the second."[45] The structure is symmetrical and inverted. Yet, the chiasmus is "obscured by two deceptive phenomena": anaphora, a repeated word at the start of successive clauses, as in the repetition of *kegamul* (like a weaned child) at the beginning of the first and second verses, and paronomasia, a form of word play that deliberately exploits an ambiguity between similar-sounding words for rhetorical effect, as in *kegamul 'aley imo* (like a weaned child to its mother) vs. *kegamul 'alay nafshi* (like a weaned child to me [is] my soul). The syntactical arrangement creates a repetitive pattern, while the morphological variation serves the inversion. The structure serves not only to sustain the rhyme but also to highlight the final—and most important—word of the verse: *nafshi* (my soul). Marked by the letter *yod,* which denotes the first-person, this final syllable amplifies the theme of private supplication, thus fulfilling Strauss's claim that sound and meaning in biblical verse are utterly intertwined.

The biblical techniques of repetition, continuous rhyme, and wordplay were adopted and augmented by the Hebrew poets of medieval Spain, to whom Strauss regularly turned for inspiration.[46] He was particularly intrigued by the medieval poets' proclivity for *tsimud,* a rhetorical term for the juxtaposition of words that are either perfect homonyms or share certain similar sounds, and he sought to imitate the various forms of *tsimud* in "el ha-mifrats."[47] An example of one form, *tsimud shoneh 'ot* (change of a single letter, or consonance), can be found in the coupling of *yiplu* (fall) and *yikhlu* (fade or disappear). Another example is the pairing of *yad* (hand) and *shad* (breast): in the first stanza, the soft hand of the sand embraces the breast of the sea, while in the second it is the poet's breast (*ḥazi*) that is touched by the vision of the bay.[48]

A second form of *tsimud,* known as *tsimud nosaf* (repetition of a single syllable with an additional syllable in the second word), is produced by the pairing of *ḥol* (sand) in line one with *takhol* (azure) in line three. The resulting rhyme almost brings the blueness of the sea physically closer to the shore to which it "clings" (*mitrapek*):

shata ḥol,
tohar dolek,
saviv layam hatakhol

You place sand,
Burning purity,
Round the azure sea.

When compared with the same verses in German, the line slotted between the rhymed verses reveals another "bold shift":

Du legst Sand
Rein wie Feuer
Um das blaue . . .

You lay sand
Pure as fire
Upon the blue . . .

The German version contains a three-word simile: the adjective (*rein*) and noun (*Feuer*) are linked by *wie* (as). In Hebrew, by contrast, noun and adjective effectively trade places to create a two-word line comprised of the adjective or participle "burning" (*dolek*) and the noun "purity" (*tohar*). The physical noun in German (fire) is replaced by an abstraction in Hebrew (purity), and yet the abstraction is rendered concrete. This subtle yet significant variation demonstrates what Strauss described as the defining characteristic of Jewish poetry: rather than describing the sensual world directly, a spiritual concept is transformed into a sensual phenomenon.

Perhaps the boldest shift occurs in the first verse of the second stanza: *ulenafshi saḥti: 'uri ḥazi!'* (And I say to my soul: awake and behold!). This allusion to Isaiah 60:1—*kumi ori* (arise and shine)—is strikingly absent from the German. Moreover, the allusion contains a crucial variation: *ori* (shine) is replaced with *ḥazi* (behold), which reappears three lines down as a homonym (*tsimud shalem*), "my chest." The latter definition of the word *ḥazi*, with the final letter *yod* indicating the first-person possessive, brings to mind the recurrent rhyme of Psalm 131, which

perpetuates the sound and rhythm while maintaining emphasis on the personal nature of the speaker's divine praise. Strauss likewise sought to weave together sound and meaning, which results here in a kind of secular supplication to the glory of nature. The speaker does not simply describe the scenery before him but rather addresses it in a humble apostrophe akin to prayer.

Martin Buber, in a manner befitting his own religious philosophy, admired this poem for the way in which "the vital power of the biblical soul, the dialogical, overpowers the poet."[49] Strauss had gestured toward the idea of poetry as dialogue in an earlier ode, the only poem that emerged from his first visit to Palestine in 1924. In "An den Berg Tabor" (To Mount Tabor), the intensity of the speaker's encounter with the Galilean peak, a metonym for divine creation, exceeds naturalistic description. Reinforcing the dictum that spirituality informs sensual experience, sight is perceived sonically as the speaker beholds the mountain's "sonorous curve" (*singender Bogen*), which melds with the voice of God as it "rises and falls" in cascades. The speaker does not experience the synesthetic event passively:

Langsam bin ich aus mir hingezogen,
Einen Ruf von weit beständig und leis im Ohr.
Tabor, meine Seele lehnt in deinen Bogen,
Bittender Pilger ins noch verschlossene Tor.

Out of myself I am slowly emerging,
I hear from afar your call constant, sedate.
My soul, Tabor, against your curve inclining,
Supplicant pilgrim at the unopened gate.

The concluding image of the "unopened gate" evokes the Yom Kippur prayer service, *Ne'ilah* (translated literally as "closing"), during which the gates of Heaven are held open to receive final affirmations and penitential prayers. Yet the dialogue does not end here, for the poem is only "realized" (*bewährt*) when the encounter between the speaker and the mountain is reproduced between the poet's "creation" and the reader, who is likewise a "listener."[50] Strauss maintained that poet and listener must play equally active roles: "Poet and listener—this is not: creator and receiver, but rather: discoverer and sustainer; both receive in creating, both create in receiving" (*Dichter*

und Hörer—das ist nicht: Schaffender und Empfangender, sondern: Entdecker und Bewahrer; beide empfangen im Schaffen, beide schaffen im Empfangen).[51] The poem only comes into being through a lived encounter wherein sound and meaning (*Wortschall und Wortbedeutung*) exist as one.[52] This point is made audible throughout the final stanza in which the divine voice enters the speaker's ear (*Ohr*) and is echoed in his utterance of the mountain's name (*Tabor*) before the unopened gate (*Tor*). Internal rhyme creates the effect of a damper pedal, sustaining the poem's last note through extended vibrations: *Ohr . . . Tor . . . Tabor. . . .*

Although the dialogical dimension stamps Strauss's nature odes with "Jewish" spirituality, they nonetheless expose strong thematic ties to German Romanticism, especially to the work of Friedrich Hölderlin, to whom Strauss dedicated extensive scholarly attention.[53] The dominant theme of natural purity recalls Hölderlin's *Hyperion*, in which the eponymous hero returns to ancient Greece and discovers in the idealized landscape of his youth the site of primordial unity and a template for the utopian community of the future. "To be one with all—this is the life divine, this is man's heaven. To be one with all that lives, to return in blessed self-forgetfulness into the All of Nature—this is the pinnacle of thoughts and joys, this the sacred mountain peak, the place of eternal rest. . . ."[54] Strauss took up Hölderlin's glorification of Greece as a model for his portrayal of the Land of Israel, another mythological space that has been transformed into a real country yet retains the messianic promise of a "brotherhood of human beings."[55] A clear example of this utopian vision can be found in the poem "Orangenhain" (Orange Grove). In this poem, the cosmic, social and historical dimensions of the land are combined with a single image, a cluster of oranges resembling numerous suns pressed up against each other with "neighborly intimacy."[56] Emphasizing doubling and dialogue, the poem projects a confederacy of nations and the peaceful coexistence of inhabitants, who together are the first to establish a "love-language of fruits" (*die Liebessprache der Früchte*). The glorified natural image renders the messianic dream immediate while also earning the poem a place in the German poetic tradition.

TRANSGRESS, TRANSPLANT, TRANSLATE

Strauss was among the idealistic post-assimilation German Jews whose rejection of bourgeois values and search for cultural authenticity went hand in hand with a deepened interest in East European Jewish culture. Moving beyond the purely symbolic engagement with Hebrew and Yiddish typical of his peers, however, he produced criticism, fiction, translations, and poetry that span three languages. Furthermore, he regarded his oeuvre as part of a single multilingual Jewish literary tradition extending from the Psalmist's praise to the folk songs of the shtetl to modern German Jewish verse. As a proud proponent of Cultural Zionism who also marched under the banner of *Alljudentum*, Strauss envisioned a unified tradition comprised of Eastern and Western influences and firmly rooted in the rejuvenated ancient Jewish homeland. Divestment from German culture was, in his view, a precondition for achieving this cultural ideal. Yet the underlying Romantic notions of cultural authenticity and indigenousness driving his work bear a striking resemblance to the *völkisch* sentiments that denied the Jews a legitimate claim to German culture. As a product of its age, Strauss's cultural vision was, ironically, deeply indebted to the very ideology it reacted against.

But poetry transcends ideology. To the same degree that Strauss's engagement with Jewish sources surpassed the symbolic his proclaimed disengagement from German culture did not. Immigration to Palestine and mastery of Hebrew were not matched by abandonment of German. On the contrary: Strauss's encounter with his newly adopted landscape actually revitalized his ability to write in German and allowed him to redefine his ties to the German Romantic tradition. The poems he wrote in and about Palestine do not demonstrate the "extraction of the Jewish spirit from German culture," as Buber argued, but rather the mutual translation and transplantation of German culture into the Jewish landscape and of the Jewish landscape into German culture, as well as the cross-fertilization of German and Hebrew languages and traditions. In fact, *Land Israel* would not have materialized without the continual transgression of geographical, linguistic, and cultural borders. "Transgression" in this context loses its negative legal and moral connotations (as in sin or crime) and regains its more positive literal definition: "to step across."[57]

Indeed, Strauss's oeuvre surpasses his ideology. It does not belong to a unified *alljüdisch* tradition, as he claimed, but rather to two cultural-linguistic systems whose borders interpenetrate and overlap. Why, then, has the poet escaped critical attention from both German and Hebrew literary scholars? Perhaps he has been denied entry into "the canon" of Modern Jewish literature because this very concept—which he himself mythologized and embraced—does not exist as such. Strauss's work becomes visible only within a reformed paradigm of Jewish literary study, a model akin to what Dan Miron has called has termed the "new Jewish literary thinking," which relinquishes the notion of a "continuous" multilingual body of texts linked by a single ideological commonality in favor of a diverse collection of "contiguous" literatures written in several different languages.[58] In his discussion of Jewish literary bilingualism, Miron invokes a mathematical metaphor to distinguish between "integral" bilingualism and "differential" bilingualism. In "integral" bilingualism, two languages function like separate integers, meaning they are used within the same cultural space without possessing specific roles. In "differential" bilingualism, by contrast, two languages or two varieties of the same language ("high" and "low") function like "fractions," meaning they are assigned different roles or functions. In keeping with notions of canon formation underlying neo-romantic projects of national and cultural renewal, Strauss privileged a differential model wherein Hebrew, Yiddish, and German operate as separate yet interdependent pieces of a cohesive Jewish canon. Yet the product of his own German–Hebrew bilingualism and auto-translation achieves quite the opposite effect. The German and Hebrew versions of his ode to the Haifa bay are by no means direct translations of each other but rather emanate from and thus belong to two separate—albeit interpenetrating—literary traditions.

It is not only his resistance to categorization along national lines that has relegated Strauss to the sidelines of literary history. From the perspective of both German and Hebrew literary studies, Strauss's work is considered anachronistic, and is therefore easily dismissed. Scholars of German Jewish culture regard Strauss's linguistic pluralism as the property of a fringe group committed to the erasure of divisions between East and West; the majority of German Jews, they maintain, did not feel such a strong connection to their coreligionists from the East. Strauss's bilingual ambitions appear equally incompatible with a 1930s and

1940s Palestinian reality, in which Hebrew monolingualism was quickly becoming the rule. As Miron observes, Jewish literature in Palestine developed during this period "against the backdrop of fierce ideological struggles" that forced writers to make crucial choices, "first and foremost [that of] a specific linguistic matrix."[59] If the Zionists rejected Yiddish as the language of exile and victimization, German suffered even greater consequences as the language of perpetrators. With the rise of Nazism, moreover, the "German–Jewish dialogue" was labeled a foolish fantasy, rendering German–Hebrew literary bilingualism practically unimaginable.[60] The perceived anachronism of Strauss's work has to do not only with its linguistic features but also with stylistic ones. Strauss's debt to Hölderlin distances it from the avant-garde German poetry of the interwar years, just as the influence of classical Hebrew distinguishes it from the erasure of Jewish elements and the emphasis on the vernacular typical of Hebrew poetry from the same period. In light of normative linguistic and stylistic boundaries that inform both German and Hebrew literary historiographies, Strauss is "out of place" in both traditions.

Yet it is his misfit status that makes Strauss the hero of the present study. His peripatetic journey between languages and landscapes demands a model of literary study that replaces the linguistic and stylistic borders imposed by nationalized and formalist approaches to literature with a transnational perspective that privileges transfer, translation, and transformation. As a cultural fugitive who transgresses such borders, Strauss dwells in what Homi Bhabha calls the "in-between spaces" that emerge in moments of historical transformation, not as sites of disruption, but as "enunciative boundaries" of new voices and identities.[61] Although Strauss was ideologically beholden to the Romantic myth of initial subjectivity, his cultural work betrays a process of radical "hybridity." Through compounded acts of transgression and translation his work fulfills Bhabha's claim that "the boundary becomes the place from which something begins its presencing," the site where new forms of culture are produced.[62] Ironically, the role of *Mittler* that Strauss struggled to overcome became a source of genuine creativity.

But where do we locate the "in-between"? How do we read between languages? The predicament of the contemporary critic was shared by the poet himself. True to form, Strauss posed this very question in verse:

> *Wo ist die Sprache [Lippe] in der ich alles sagen kann, was in mir ist? Meine zwei Sprachen [Lippen] sind das Lippenpaar meines Herzens.*[63]
>
> Where is the language [lip] in which I can say everything that is within me? My two languages [lips] are the lip-pair of my heart.

German at once masks and unveils the double-entendre of the Hebrew word *safa,* meaning "language" and "lip." What emerges is a failed yet felicitous pun that conveys the burden and blessing of bilingualism. German and Hebrew are the inseparable yet irreconcilable lips with which poetry is spoken.

Scholion Interdisciplinary Research Center in the Humanities and Jewish Studies
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

NOTES

1 Ludwig Strauss, *Land Israel* (Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1935), 16. All translations are my own.

2 Strauss, *Dichtungen und Schriften,* ed. Werner Kraft (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1963), 699.

3 Ibid., 700.

4 Franz Rosenzweig, *Zweistromland: kleinere Schriften zu Glauben und Denken* (Berlin: Philo, 2001).

5 Strauss, "Beitrag zur Kunstwart-Debatte," in *Gesammelte Werke Band 4: Dramen Epen, Vermischte Schriften,* ed. Tuvia Rübner and Hans Otto Horch (Darmstadt: Wallstein Verlag, 1998), 446.

6 Michael P. Kramer, "The Art of Assimilation: Ironies, Ambiguities, Aesthetics," in *Modern Jewish Literatures: Intersections and Boundaries,* ed. Sheila E. Jelen, Michael P. Kramer, and L. Scott Lerner (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 303.

7 Fritz Mordecai Kauffmann, "Zum Programm der Freistatt," *Die Freistatt: Alljüdische Revue* 1, no. 1 (April 1913): 4.

8 Ibid., 13.

9 The term "Cult of the Ostjuden" refers to a small yet prominent cohort of young German Jewish writers and intellectuals whose disenchantment with the bourgeois mores of their parents' generation was matched by a renewed fascination with the Jewish culture of Eastern Europe. For more on the subject, see chapters five and six in Steven E. Aschheim, *Brothers and Strangers: The East European Jew in German and German Jewish Consciousness, 1880–1923* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982).

10 The "patron saint" of Jewish Renewal was Martin Buber, whose writings and lectures on Hasidism and the "Spirit of the Orient" inspired young German Jewish idealists in search of cultural authenticity to embrace the perceived nobility of life in the shtetl as the antithesis of the spiritless character of the German Jewish bourgeoisie. See Martin Buber, *On Judaism,* ed. Nahum N. Glatzer (New York: Schocken Books, 1967). On the influence of Buber's Orientalism, see Paul Mendes-Flohr, "Fin de Siècle Orientalism, the Ostjuden, and the Aesthetics of Jewish Self-Affirmation," in Paul Mendes-Flohr, *Divided Passions: Jewish Intellectuals and the Experience of Modernity* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1991), 77–132.

11 Jakob Wassermann, "Der Jude als Orientale," in *Vom Judentum,* ed. Hans Kohn (Leipzig: Kurt Wolff Verlag, 1913), 5.

12 Strauss, "Ein Dokument der Assimilation," *Die Freistatt* 1, no. 14 (April 1913): 19.

13 Julius Bab, "Der Anteil der Juden an der deutschen Dichtung der Gegenwart," *Kölnische Zeitung*, September 17, 1911.

14 Bab, "Assimilation," *Die Freistatt* 3 (June 1913): 172.

15 Elizabeth Albanis suggests that Bab's views on the German–Jewish relationship were strongly influenced by the poet Richard Dehmel, with whom he shared a close relationship. In Dehmel's "Kultur und Rasse" (*Tag,* 1908), a fictitious dialogue between a Berlin Jewish artist and a non-Jewish German poet, the former insists that his talent derives from his pure Semitic lineage, whereas the latter argues that cultural achievements result from ethnic and cultural mixing. Eventually, the artist concedes that a certain amount of racial mixing is necessary for a better race to evolve. Elisabeth Albanis, *German-Jewish Cultural Identity from 1900 to the Aftermath of the First World War* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2002), 153.

16 Bab, "Assimilation," 176.

17 J. G. Herder, *Reflections on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind,* ed. Frank E. Manuel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), 5; Bab, "Assimilation," 140.

18 Ibid.

19 Strauss, "Ein Dokument," 19.

20 Ibid., 15.

21 Strauss, "Beitrag zur Kunstwart-Debatte," *Gesammelte Werke Band 4,* 445.

22 Strauss, "Ein Dokument," 18. Nietzsche defined "master-morality" as the property of strong-willed individuals who demonstrate courage, truthfulness, and an accurate sense of self-worth: "The noble type of man experiences *itself* as determining values; it does not need approval; . . . it is *value-creating.*" Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), 39.

23 Strauss, "Ein Dokument," 15.

24 Ibid., 16.

25 Strauss, "Der Mittler," *Die Freistatt: Alljüdische Revue* 10 (January 20, 1914): 557.

26 Kurt Lewin quoted in Clement Greenberg, *The Collected Essays and Criticism: Affirmations and Refusals, 1950-1956*, vol. 3, ed. John O'Brian (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 45.

27 On the tension between humanistic and ethnic definitions of culture in the construction of German Jewish identity, see Paul Mendes-Flohr, "The Berlin Jew as Cosmopolitan," in *Berlin Metropolis: Jews and the New Culture, 1890–1918*, ed. Emily D. Bilski (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 23–26.

28 Moritz Goldstein, "Deutscher-judischer Parnass," *Der Kunstwart* 25.11 (March 1912): 281–94.

29 Strauss, "Mittler," 582.

30 Ibid., 587.

31 Ibid.

32 Ibid., 579.

33 Franz Kafka, *Letters to Friends, Family, and Editors,* trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Schocken, 1977), 289.

34 I base this linguistic continuum loosely on Deleuze and Guattari's discussion of Kafka's languages, which they identify as vernacular (Czech), vehicular

(German), referential (Yiddish), and mythic (Hebrew). As a German-language writer in Prague, Kafka wrote in the "deterritorialized" vehicular (official bureaucratic and commercial) language, which was distinct from the vernacular (the language of territorialization). Traces of Yiddish, the language of "sense and culture," and Hebrew, the mythic language of spirituality and religion, serve to "deterritorialize" German. In Strauss's case, German was both the vernacular and the vehicular language; thus, a trilingual model is more appropriate in this context. Yiddish, for Strauss, represents the "nomadic movement of deterritorialization that reworks German language," but that also "reterritorializes" German by providing a linguistic and cultural link with Hebrew. See Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), 23–25.

35 Tuvia Rübner and Dafna Mach, eds. *Briefwechsel: Martin Buber–Ludwig Strauß, 1913–1953* (Frankfurt a.M.: Luchterhand Literaturverlag, 1990), 69.

36 Strauss acknowledged Fritz Mordecai Kaufmann and Rivka Kaufmann (Strauss's first wife and Kaufmann's sister) for introducing him to the world of Yiddish folklore and music. In 1919, Kaufmann published *Die schönsten Lieder der Ostjuden* (The Most Beautiful Songs of the *Ostjuden*), a collection of Yiddish folk songs in German translation. Strauss's volume appeared the following year, and was soon followed by *Gedichte* (Poems), a collection of Yiddish poems by Ḥayim Naḥman Bialik. He also proposed a full translation of Mendele's *B'emek ha-bokhe* for publication in Buber's journal, *Der Jude,* noting that "the work is worthy of Germanization and will be able to find German readers." See Rübner and Mach, *Briefwechsel,* 73.

37 Buber, *The Legend of the Baal Shem* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995), xiii.

38 Ludwig Strauss, "Nachwort," *Ostjüdische Liebeslieder: Übertragungen jüdischer Volksdichtung* (Berlin: Welt-Verlag, 1920), 82.

39 Ibid., 82–83.

40 The relationship between German and Yiddish folk songs is a subject that demands greater scholarly attention. Benjamin Harshav briefly discusses the influence of the German folk song on Yiddish poetry in his essay, "On Free Rhythms in Yiddish Poetry," in *The Field of Yiddish: Studies in Yiddish Language, Folklore and Literature,* ed. Uriel Weinreich (The Hague: Mouton, 1965), 219–66.

41 Michael Brenner, *The Renaissance of Jewish Culture in Weimar Germany* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1996), 5.

42 Anita Norich, "Hebraism and Yiddishism: Paradigms of Modern Jewish Literary History," in *Modern Jewish Literatures: Intersections and Boundaries,* ed. Sheila E. Jelen, Michael P. Kramer, and L. Scott Lerner (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 338.

43 Menachem Perry cited in "Auto-Translation," in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies,* 2nd ed., ed. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (New York: Routledge, 2009), 181.

44 Amos Oz, "Hirhurim al ha-safah ha-ivrit: lamah ragshu goyim, ayzen-baton, galili, dayan v'rabin," in *B'or ha-tkhelet ha-azah* (Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim, 1979), 26.

45 Strauss, "Zu Psalm 131," *Gesammelte Werke Band 2,* 286.

46 For instance, in Yehuda Halevi's *Yitav be'eynekha na'im* (It is pleasant to be good in your eyes), the word/syllable *li* ("to me" or "for me") drives the rhyme and meter of the entire poem. Strauss admired Yehuda Halevi's ability to "pair a dynamic, rhythmical feeling with the image of a clear and wonderful picture." See Strauss, "Mishirato shel yehuda halevi," in *Bedarkey hasifrut* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1975), 103.

47 Scholars disagree on the precise number of forms of *tsimud;* some count only eight, others as many as ten. Nine types of *tsimud* are identified and explained in Shulamit Elizur, *Shirat hahol haivrit bisfarad hamuslemit,* vol. 3 (Ramat Aviv: The Open University of Israel, 2004), 127–30.

48 Shimon Sandbank, "Aryeh ludvig shtraus: 'perek tehilim shav ligvulo,'" in *Shete berekhot baya'ar: kesharim umakbilot ben hashirah ha'ivrit vehashirah ha'eropit* (Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv, 1976), 87.

49 Buber, "Geleitwort," in Strauss, *Schriften und Dichtungen,* 13.

50 Strauss, "Tat und Dichtung," in ibid., 33–34.

51 Strauss, "Der Mensch und die Dichtung," in *Gesammelte Werke Band 2*, 24.

52 Ibid., 22.

53 Strauss's doctoral dissertation at the Aachen Technical Academy was entitled "Hölderlins Anteil an Schellings frühem Systemprogramm" (1929). This was followed by a number of scholarly publications, most notably the monograph *Das Problem der Gemeinschaft in Hölderlins 'Hyperion'* (1933).

54 Friedrich Hölderlin, *Hyperion and Selected Poems,* ed. Eric L. Santner (New York: Continuum, 1990), 3.

55 Strauss, *Dichtungen und Schriften,* 175.

56 Strauss, *Land Israel,* 26.

57 Mae G. Henderson, "Introduction: Borders, Boundaries and Frame(work)s," in *Borders, Boundaries, and Frames: Essays in Cultural Criticism and Cultural Studies*, ed. Mae G. Henderson (London: Routledge, 1995), 2.

58 Dan Miron, *From Continuity to Contiguity: Toward a New Jewish Literary Thinking* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2010).

59 Ibid., 37.

60 Gershom Scholem, "Against the Myth of the German-Jewish Dialogue," in *On Jews and Judaism in Crisis: Selected Essays,* ed. Werner J. Dannhauser (New York: Schocken, 1976).

61 Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 2.

62 Ibid., 10.

63 Strauss, *Schriften und Dichtungen*, 12.