

semantic meaning (sometimes exceeding the precepts of the post-hermeneutic theoretical approach). Given the strong connection between the readings and the specific qualities of the poems, Holzmüller's readings do not yield abstractly summarizable 'results,' per se, but it is worth mentioning a few particular strengths. First, her treatment of previous scholarship on the poems (and, in the next section, their settings) is thorough and effective, as for example when she reflects on the claims of a long line of scholars about the "Unantastbarkeit" of "Wandrer's Nachtlied II" and lists the words whose removal each claims would destroy the poem (232–233) before explaining the phenomenon as a result of the work's material-linguistic qualities (233ff.). Moreover, in contrast to many approaches focused on formal structuration, Holzmüller keeps the historical-cultural development and connotations of various forms in view (for example in her analysis of the relation between lineation in "Wandrer's Nachtlied I" and the "Abendlied-Strophe" [200–211]). Finally, her reading of the tensions and conflicts between various schemata for formal organization (in "Wandrer's Nachtlied II") provides a model for readers striving to give non-reductive accounts of formal interactions and effects (259–261).

The third section, which analyzes and compares settings of the two poems by Johann Friedrich Reichardt, Carl Loewe, Franz Schubert, and Hugo Wolf ("Wandrer's Nachtlied I") and Carl Friedrich Zelter, Schubert, and Robert Schumann ("Wandrer's Nachtlied II"), is similarly impressive. Holzmüller acknowledges Goethe's virtuosic shaping of *Sprachklang* as a problem or challenge for musical setting (one attested to by Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and Johannes Brahms, among others [289]) and reflects on the rarity of music-theoretical analyses that take into account the fact that song settings always involve the interaction of *two* sound systems (linguistic and musical), not merely the fitting of a (musical) sound system to a thematic (linguistic) content. In addressing this shortcoming, her own analyses attend above all to the ways in which composers' settings take up the material-structural components of Goethe's poems: how, for example, does each composer handle Goethe's deviations from the traditional Abendlied-Strophe in the first Nachtlied or the ambiguous groupings of lines in the second? Holzmüller likewise gives an illuminating account of the ways in which composers respond not only to the poem but to one another's treatments of linguistic-material quandaries. There is some risk here that readers with a background in only one of literary studies or musicology will struggle with the poem or song sections, but Holzmüller's exceptionally clear prose and obvious expertise in both fields should ameliorate such difficulties. As a whole, the volume draws on the sophistication of post-hermeneutic thought while avoiding many of its pitfalls; Holzmüller's study is a model for work that takes linguistic material seriously in its own right while remaining attentive to the historical and cultural as well as aesthetic forces shaping that material.

University of Wisconsin–Madison

—Hannah V. Eldridge

Jewish Philosophical Politics in Germany, 1789–1848.

By Sven-Erik Rose. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2014. xiii + 381 pages. \$40.00.

With *Jewish Philosophical Politics in Germany*, Sven-Erik Rose has written an important study that does much to illuminate the ways in which German Jewish intel-

lectuals from the late eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century responded to German and European philosophy and especially to the writings of Kant, Hegel, and Spinoza. Rose begins by noting how, even as Jews increasingly took part in German cultural life, they continued before 1848 to find few “[tangible p]ossibilities [. . .] to participate in politics in German lands” (1). With political activity barred, philosophy entered the fray. Rose explores, that is, “how [. . .] the creative explosion of German philosophy provided resources”—the “conceptual tools”—that the thinkers considered here “drew upon to envision a place for Jews in the polity” and “to imagine the potential, terms, and consequences of [such] Jewish inclusion” (1). Rose focuses on the Kantian Lazarus Bendavid (1762–1832), Hegelian-oriented Jewish university students—Eduard Gans, Immanuel Wolf/Wohlwill, and Moses Moser—central to the short-lived *Verein für Cultur und Wissenschaft der Juden* (1819–1824), Karl Marx, the Spinozist liberal writer Berthold Auerbach, and the Spinozist early socialist and later proto-Zionist essayist Moses Hess.

In developing his argument, Rose departs from approaches by other scholars who argue either that anti-Semitism was only minor and incidental to German idealist philosophy or, conversely, constitutive of it. Rose focuses, rather, “primarily on Jewish intellectuals who tried to ‘think Jewish’ not only against, but also with, conceptual modes invented or reinvented during the classical age of German philosophy,” since the “German philosopher–Jewish Other binary” breaks down when such intellectuals try to “think through and intervene in the situation of Jews in political modernity” (3). Rose places Jewish subjectivity at the center of his study, approaching it not as “unself-conscious reflections, feelings, and behaviors” but “as explicit cultural discourse,” hence exploring the different ways that thinkers, Jewish and non-Jewish, reflected on and presented “Jewish subjects/subjectivity” (7). As inheritors of the Enlightenment, thinkers as different as Bendavid, Gans, Moser, Wolf, and Auerbach responded critically, at times even antagonistically, to the Jewish subjects/subjectivity they found in their world, but each addressed in his own way the question of how and under what conditions Jewish subjectivity could exist in harmony with the state or the national community; Marx and Hess eschew such “harmony,” the first seeking to “mobilize an image of Jewish subjectivity,” the second “an idiosyncratic interpretation of Jewish tradition,” each with the aim “to critique the liberal subject and the political states as harmful ideological illusions” (8).

Rose covers much material, ranging from Kant (especially the Second Critique) and Hegel (the *Phenomenology*, the philosophies of history, religion, and especially of *Wissenschaft*) to Eduard Gans on the Prussian State, the Jewish community, and again on *Wissenschaft*; from Feuerbach and Bruno Bauer to Marx’s development, by way of a pejorative notion of the Jew, of his materialist philosophy in *Über die Judenfrage*; and further on to the early works of Auerbach and Moses Hess, and the Spinoza who informed them. The arguments are too complex to do them justice in this review, but Rose frequently offers readings as incisive as they are counter-intuitive, even as—unlike others in recent years—he opts not to stress German Jewry’s subversive aspects. This recent emphasis, as Jonathan Hess showed in *Middlebrow Literature and the Making of German-Jewish Identity* (Stanford UP, 2010), neglects key aspects of German Jewish culture and thought. Rose, e.g., argues instead that even as he draws on Kantian ethics to advocate for both Jewish reform and emancipation, Bendavid resorts to a language of decapitation disturbingly akin to Fichte’s

notorious anti-Semitism. For Bendavid, Judaism is a “hydra” whose heads must be definitively cut off; Fichte saw “no means” of giving civil rights to Jews “other than, in one night, to cut off all their heads and replace them with others containing not a single Jewish idea” (quoted on p. 14).

On the *Culturverein*, Rose breaks with earlier accounts, shifting emphasis from the philologist-historian Leopold Zunz, a key founder of the modern *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, to the brilliant legal theorist Gans, which is not so surprising. His added emphasis on Wolf and Moser is, since neither “produced any *Wissenschaft* to speak of” (Wolf did write an important programmatic essay for the *Verein*’s short-lived journal) (145). Yet, the focus on all three figures supports Rose’s argument that philosophy substituted for political activity among German Jews who attempted to gain broad Jewish access to German society. The focus also supports Rose’s claim for the value of studying the competing approaches to Jewish subjectivity taken by both Jews and non-Jews in German philosophy.

Such a focus further allows Rose to offer an alternative to studies either seeking to expose anti-Semitism in Hegel’s work or exaggerating the assimilatory thrust of Bendavid or the *Verein*’s Hegelian members. By adopting a Hegelian view of the state, for example, Gans sought not to subordinate the Jewish community to the Prussian state, but to transform both. If Gans found problematic a Jewish community “marked by Enlightenment epistemology, subjectivism, and sheer banality” that “refused to be brought to a unifying scientific consciousness of itself,” he found even worse “a state that had barred access even to the most qualified *Wissenschaftsjuden*” (127).

In the second part of the book—Chapters Four, Five, and Six, devoted to Marx, Auerbach, and Moses Hess, respectively—Rose focuses more specifically on thinkers who enlisted their notions (not always positive) of Jewish subjectivity and tradition in order to criticize power and the state, and to transform the modern world (radically, in two cases). With Auerbach, Rose focuses on the early Spinozist phase, arguing that when he began writing *Dorfgeschichten*, the writer abandoned not Spinoza but only the search for “a usable past for German Jews through nostalgic depiction of Jewish life” (236); Spinoza was for Auerbach “an all-reconciling figure and a model for an inclusive liberal Germany” (*ibid.*)—a thesis somewhat at odds with David Sorkin’s claims for Auerbach as exemplar of a (secular) Jewish subculture. In Hess, Rose charts a trajectory opposed to that of Auerbach, a one-time friend. The Hess of the 1840s sought not an “imagined ethical community of the German Volk,” but a “radical activist version of Spinoza’s ethics that saw the free exercise of thought and the radical reshaping of social institutions as indissolubly wedded” (266). By 1862, Hess produced his “late meditation on Jewish nationalism, *Rome and Jerusalem*,” often read as a proto-Zionist treatise, which “embrace[d] [. . .] nations as humanity’s vital organic units” (268). This turn to nationalism, so “out of step with mainstream German-Jewish sensibilities,” displayed indeed its problematic sides—e.g., Hess’s turn to “mid-nineteenth race discourse” (270). It deeply offended Auerbach, to whom Hess sent a copy in the hope of reconciliation (271). Yet the apparent break with socialism remained incomplete. He viewed nations “as crucial if humanitarian socialism is to have real existence,” and retained as important themes “the Jews as ultimate redeemers of humanity and Spinoza as the ultimate articulation of the Jewish tradition,” leading Rose to find “strong continuities between his Spinozan socialism

of the 1840s and his vision of Jewish nationalism two decades later” (268), even while conveying ambivalence about the later work.

The fourth chapter, on Marx, is one of the most suggestive, but in some ways the most difficult to integrate into the volume as a whole. This stems in part from the larger problem Marx poses for a range of obvious reasons: there is, first, Marx’s Protestant conversion as a child and own apparent distance from, even indifference to the Jewish community; there is the fact of Marx’s main published utterance about Judaism, his now-notorious essay “On the Jewish Question”; and there is Marx’s sheer towering stature. One reads most of the other (Jewish) figures in this volume primarily for historical reasons, or because the questions they engaged with remain relevant in the context of Jewish modernity (and arguably that of other minorities as well); the interest in Marx, even in the post-communist age, is typically in more general (or “universal”) terms, appealing to a probably broader audience, but one including many members unconcerned with Jewish history or thought. At the same time, the chapter on Marx is ingenious—offering not an apology of Marx for his essay but a knowledgeable, creative, and highly provocative attempt to explain the role of the essay in the development of Marx’s thought, and particularly in regard to the early Marx’s attempts to overcome Hegelian idealism and work out his dialectical-materialist philosophy. Others, like Allan Megill (*Karl Marx: The Burden of Reason*, 2002), read Marx’s “Jewish Question” essay as far less central to that development, but Rose makes a strong case for it. In lieu of summarizing the argument, suffice it to say that Rose elegantly makes the case that for Marx, Jews “have the virtue of [. . .] embodying the real problem [of capitalism and modern society] rather than illusory solutions (Christian salvation, political rights, and so forth)”—embodying it indeed viscerally and graphically (190).

Rose has written an excellent study—deeply engaged, knowledgeable, and provocative—a study that goes some way to re-defining the terms by which one might comprehend the relationship between Jews and German idealist and post-idealist philosophy. Rose’s readers will no doubt find things here to disagree with, but to do so seriously will require serious engagement with this work and its claims.

University of Virginia

—Jeffrey Grossman

Jewish Pasts, German Fictions: History, Memory, and Minority Culture in Germany, 1824–1955.

By Jonathan Skolnik. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2014. xv + 260 pages + 17 b/w illustrations. \$65.00.

The paradoxical fact that a society or social group often forges a new identity by reinventing its past has, in recent times, become commonplace. Still, the story of German Jewry must be an exemplary case in this regard. Beginning in the eighteenth century, Ashkenazi—Yiddish-speaking—Jews broke with their native heritage and transformed themselves into German Jews, and they did so to a large degree by adopting Spanish Jewish (Sephardic) culture and customs. Even before political emancipation was achieved, they turned increasingly to art, history, memory, and myth to consolidate their new status and identity. To be sure, the Jewish textual past had always provided a fertile source of characters, plots, and lessons available to rabbis