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This thesis deals with the life and works of Sammy Gronemann, German Jewish Zionist lawyer and writer. It seeks to place him in the context of his times and investigate the contribution his various activities made to the diverse communities of which he was a member. He helped lead the nascent Zionist organisation in Germany and went on to play an important role in the World Zionist Organization as founder and president of its court. As a lawyer he had a long and successful career, which he continued in Palestine after 1936. As a writer, starting from Zionist humorous journalism, he produced works in several genres – a novel, essays and plays, some of which are notable for their wit and for the light they shed on the life and thinking of German Jews in the first half of the twentieth century. In the breadth of his activities one may see a reflection of the various elements that made up his identity. For he is not to be seen as a German, or a Jew, or a Zionist, or even as an author, but as a combination of all these elements. After an examination of his life and career, this work moves to an analysis of his most important literary works, beginning in each case with a summary and going on to an analysis of their context and function. The justification for this procedure is the relative unavailability of his works which, with a minor exception, have never been translated into English, and some of which have never been published. Throughout the work new light is thrown on questions pertaining to the history and literature of German Jews. The work aims to serve as a contribution to bringing Gronemann’s significance to the attention of students of German Jewish life.
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EDITORIAL NOTE

All references are done using the author-date system, with the exception of works by Gronemann, which are cited solely by their year or, if unpublished, by N. d. [No date] followed by a letter. All archival documents are cited according to the collection in which they are to be found, with the collections listed at the beginning of the Annotated Bibliography. German texts are transcribed exactly as in the original – which accounts for the use of variant spellings, i.e. ü/ue, ss/ß, sometimes in the same paragraph. All translations from the German are mine unless otherwise indicated. The transliteration of Hebrew words is based on the system set out in the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 1, 90. The following perhaps needing some clarification:

' alef    ' ayin    h    hey and het
k    kaf and kof    kh    khaf    s    samekh and sin
t    tet and tav    ts    tsade    v    bet and vav

The transliteration of Yiddish follows the YIVO norms. Numbers in brackets refer to pages in this work.
CONTENTS

Abstract 2
Acknowledgements 3
Declaration 4
Editorial Note 5
Contents 6
Abbreviations 9

Introduction 10

1 Life of Sammy Gronemann 14
   1.1 Childhood and Youth 1875-1894 14
   1.2 Higher Education 1894-1904 19
   1.3 Lawyer and Zionist 1904-1914 40
   1.4 Soldier 1914-1918 62
   1.5 Weimar Republic Years 1919-1933 78
   1.6 Emigration and War 1933-1945 88
   1.7 Last Years 1945-1952 101

2 Works of Sammy Gronemann 104
   2.1 Literary Background 104
   2.2 Tohuwabohu 110
      2.2.1 Plot 110
      2.2.2 A Zionist Novel 119
   2.3 Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich 127
      2.3.1 Summary 127
2.3.2 Themes

2.4 Schalet
2.4.1 Summary
2.4.2 Themes

2.5 Erinnerungen (Memoirs)
2.5.1 Summary
2.5.2 Themes

2.6 Plays
2.6.1 Mimik
2.6.2 Hamans Flucht
2.6.3 Jakob und Christian
2.6.4 Der Weise und der Narr: König Salomo und der Schuster
2.6.5 Der Prozess um des Esels Schatten

2.7 Minor Works
2.7.1 Sturmgeselle Vogelstein
2.7.2 Antonio, der Kaufmann von Venedig
2.7.3 Erste Begegnung
2.7.4 Eine ärgerliche Geschichte
2.7.5 Parve
2.7.6 Um ein Haar!
2.7.7 Träume
2.7.8 Sechstes Kapitel von ? ? ?
2.7.9 Der himmlische Lohn
2.7.10  Eine kleine Gefälligkeit  237
2.7.11  Eine kleine Überraschung  238
2.7.12  Ein Bluturteil  239
2.7.13  Megalophilen-Katalog 717  239
2.7.14  Wie alt ist Xenia?  241
2.7.15  Adam und Eva  247

3  Annotated Bibliography  250

3.1  Works by Sammy Gronemann  251
3.2  Secondary Sources  258
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZJ</td>
<td>Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZA</td>
<td>Central Zionist Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>Deutsches Literaturarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia Judaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
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</tr>
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INTRODUCTION

Up to 1997, very little had been written on either the life or the work of Sammy Gronemann exclusively.¹ His death in 1952 elicited little response in Germany and in Israel, outside the World Zionist Organization and the wide circle of his friends, he was quickly forgotten, to the point that few know that he is the author of the country’s first musical comedy. His fate was shared by many other like-minded writers of his generation, especially those committed to Zionism – they were too old to change languages and in most cases died outside the lands of their birth, unable to continue writing in a language none of their Jewish public wanted to read any more, while unwilling to continue writing for their former readers in Central Europe. Arnold Zweig constitutes one of the few exceptions.

In the case of Gronemann, this was compounded by the fact that his oeuvre was so much a part of the first third of the century and, since he had never aimed his work at the non-Jewish German public, his readership had literally vanished. Since he had never been a full-time writer in any case, having a busy career as a lawyer and a second activity as a Zionist activist and functionary, the interruption of his publishing, although it did not arrest his writing, does mean that from then until the end of his life his works would be published in other languages, mostly in Hebrew.

Although one of his pre-war books, Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich, was republished in Germany in 1984, it found no echo. Then in 1997, thanks to Joachim Schlör, Schalet was

¹ Until this date, after the article by Hanni Mittelmann in which Gronemann was one of the two authors whose novels were examined, the only works of any consequence on Sammy Gronemann were, to my knowledge, two MA theses, one on the novel Tohuwabohu, and the second one on his life and works (Mittelmann 1986; Kintscher 1989; Merchán Hamann 1996).
republished and in 2000 followed by Tohuwabohu, Gronemann's novel and his most important and successful work from before the war. This rebirth has drawn attention to the figure of Gronemann after so many years of comparative neglect. Not that he had not been the object of interest of several scholars working on the history of German Jews, and specifically on the relations between German Jews and Ostjuden, that is, East European Jews, on which subject his works have been quarried as a source, sometimes with, sometimes without due regard for their context (Richarz 1976, Richarz 1979, Gilman 1979, Aschheim 1982, Berkowitz 1993 and Brenner 1996). This was the result of Gronemann's position as one of those of the generation born in the 1870s who, disenchanted with assimilation, turned to Zionism. To this he brought a direct experience of Ostjuden due to family ties and an Orthodox upbringing, which led to a life-long respect and love for Ostjuden, quite uncommon in German Jews of his generation. Since he had not many Romantic ideas about Ostjuden, he could afford to take a more realistic view of their conditions, and in this he both typifies and yet differs from, his peers. But more than anything else, it is the wealth of contacts with all sectors of the German Jewish and Gentile world, as well as with the Ostjuden, that still draws people to his work – he ranges from Buber to Ludendorff and from antisemites to Hasidic rebes.

As a Zionist he belonged to that minority of German Jews whose identity was not based exclusively on their identification with German culture and the German people. Within the Zionist movement he was rare because he combined with his political labours a creative literary activity which gave artistic expression to his convictions. In the former sphere he came to be the first president of the Zionist Congress tribunal, while in the latter
he progressed from propaganda and humorous journalism to his three main works of the Weimar years, all of which have an avowed Zionist didactic purpose. Putting aside for the time being the quality of his work, he certainly is an exemplary figure and deserves more attention than has been paid him hitherto. This meant that from the start he had to think of what constituted Jewishness and consequently was able to cope with the shattering experiences of the twentieth century with a measure of balance. The details of his life have been reconstructed in the present work as far as possible from records or from extant papers. For the period before the end of the First World War this has been made easier by the existence of his unpublished memoirs and his published reminiscences of the war, *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*. As to the post-war events, there is a dearth of materials, but enough has been gathered for the first time here in order to present a fairly complete picture.

Concerning his literary output, the purpose here is firstly to provide as complete a listing as possible of the many articles, plays, and other works, so as to enable further research on the topic. This is done in the Annotated Bibliography, which lists more than a hundred items, with comments on many of them, especially those which have not been treated separately in the body of the work. There follows an extensive description of those of his works that are available and warrant such treatment. This takes the form of summaries of the works, which have not been translated into English with a single exception, and therefore are totally unknown outside the German-speaking world. The works are then put in context and a first attempt is made to provide a critical examination of some of them. In all but one case this is the first time this has been done to the present writer’s knowledge. This
procedure is necessitated by the fact that so much of Gronemann’s work is unpublished and not readily accessible to many students of German Jewish literature and history.

Throughout, Gronemann’s life and works are correlated with contemporary scholarship on the subject of German Jews, their history, identity and cultural productions and light is thrown on some of the questions, both theoretical and factual, raised in the recent and not so recent past. In the same way, misconceptions concerning Gronemann are dealt with at the appropriate point. Of particular help in addressing theoretical problems touching identity have been the works of Noah Isenberg and Keith Pickus, while for the historical background the list is so long that one is reduced to referring the reader to the secondary sources. On Gronemann himself the relevant works of Doris Kintscher and Hanni Mittelmann, are reevaluated within the context of the extensive body of material which the present work has brought to light and their contributions and insights have served as a starting point from which to proceed to a more detailed and nuanced analysis.

Thanks to the pioneering efforts of Joachim Schlör in rekindling interest in Gronemann, there is now no need to argue in favour of the value of his work, if only as rich testimonies to their time and place and it is hoped that this work will be of assistance to those interested in knowing more about the historical significance of this exceptional figure and his place in the complex world of early twentieth century German Jewry.
1. LIFE OF SAMMY GRONEMANN

1.1 CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH 1875-1894

G was born on Purim day, 21 March 1875 in Strasburg (Brodnica), then in the Second Reich province of West Prussia, fifty miles south of Danzig. His father was Rabbi Selig Gronemann, and his mother, Elena Hinde born Breslau, daughter of Solomon Breslau, belonged to the famous Pines family on her mother's side, and came from Georgenburg, a shtetl by the Niemen river in the Kovno Guberniya (TIDHAR 1952, 1383). His father had been born in 1843 and raised by his step-father, Raphael Karger, in Garz an der Oder. Rabbi Selig Gronemann had graduated in 1872 from the Breslau Jewish Theological Seminary, after having studied there between 1865 and 1871. The Breslau seminary was Orthodox in name but more liberal in outlook than its Berlin counterpart, and Selig Gronemann studied under Zechariah Fränkel and Heinrich Graetz. Shortly before his death in 1891 Graetz visited the Gronemanns in Hanover and G was deeply impressed by him. Strasburg was his father's first rabbinic post and in 1878 he became rabbi to the Weinberg community in Danzig. Here G attended Fräulein Nathan's elementary school, where most students were Jewish. He describes his childhood as very happy up to the age of eight, and he had no consciousness of being different until once at the age of six or seven when spending the summer holidays on the Westerplatte near Danzig, he was rejected and attacked on the beach.

2 On the seminary, see BRANN 1904. Its position in German Jewry was peculiar, since its rabbis were far more observant than the communities they served, but they would not as a rule be hired by Orthodox communities; in fact, Mordechai Breuer describes Selig Gronemann as 'moderately Orthodox' (BREUER 1992, 241).

3 The source for any unattributed information on G's life up to 1918 is the Ms. of his memoirs, Erinnerungen, which I was able to consult thanks to Leo Baeck Institute New York and the CZA. I will only cite verbatim quotations, as n.d. a. (See Annotated Bibliography for details).
by children he had helped build a sand boat, and he later selected this painful incident symbolise the Jewish situation: 'Erst darf man mitarbeiten und aufbauen, dann bewerfen sie einen mit Schmutz, und dann stossen sie den unappetitlichen schmutzigen Juden aus ihrer Gemeinschaft. – Das war meine erste Begegnung mit dem Antisemitismus in der fremden Welt' (At first you may participate in the work and help to set it up, then they will throw dirt at you, and finally they expel the unsavoury dirty Jew from their community. That was my first meeting with antisemitism in the outside world. Erinnerungen, n.d. a, 13). He also remembered witnessing in Danzig how a Jewish man stood up for a man who was being victimised by a group of bullies. His father and his friends often discussed the rise of the antisemitic movement led by Pastor Stoecker. He recalls being in Russia in the small town of Georgenburg by the river Niemen, visiting his maternal grandmother and great-grandmother when Alexander III was crowned. The coronation took place in May 1883 (Zaionchkovsky 1976, 42, 78).

Early in 1883 Selig Gronemann was appointed Landrabbiner in Hanover. The rest of the family did not move until after January 1883 since G's sister Elfride was born in Danzig on January 21, 1883 (Stern 1970, 85). The move to Hanover meant the end of a happy childhood for Gronemann and, although he lived there, except for the period 1894-1900, until the end of 1906 when he moved to Berlin, he never felt at home there: 'Ich empfinde nicht das mindeste Heimatgefühl gegenüber dieser Stadt, denke nur mit Bitterkeit an die dort verlebte Zeit' (I do not experience the least feeling of home for this city, and

---

4 On the struggles involving his appointment, see Jüdische Presse 1883, 14; 93, 334, 465, as cited by Breuer (Breuer 1992, 449).
think of the time I lived there only with bitterness. N.d. a, 18), and he goes on to compare its citizens to Wieland’s Abderites, renowned for their narrow-mindedness.

He started from the Sexta (First form) at the local Gymnasium Lyzeum II and was with some exceptions (Literature and Mathematics) a very poor student and was constantly bullied by his, mostly antisemitic, fellow students. Antisemitism was also widespread among his teachers. To top it all, for a full year student rabbi Hermann Bach lodged at the Gronemann’s house and tutored G, making his life at home a misery as well. He remembers only two outstanding teachers and that the principal was a fair man. Börries von Münchhausen, who was to be G’s friend up to the rise of Hitler, was also sympathetic, but he was one year ahead of G. Some respite was afforded by his holiday visits to old Karger in Garz an der Oder, where he lived in an old-fashioned religiously observant atmosphere, for the old man was not only a follower of Elijahu Gutmacher, the Grätzer rebbe – the only German Hassidic leader, but also ran a hostel for shnorers and vagrants – a hek desp, where a constant stream of road people stopped for a rest, to his wife’s chagrin. The old man’s constant expectation of a return to Zion, and his knowledge of Kabbalah made an impression on G, as did the envoys from the holy land.\(^5\)

It is to be noted that the ethos of his parents was completely against all they regarded as superstition, which included Kabbalah and amulets – both were present in Karger’s home. At Karger’s as well as in Georgenburg, G came into contact with East European Jews, those

\(^5\) G described the old man in his memoirs (N.d. a, 8-11), and in Schalet (1927, 255-266), as well as introducing the hostel and Karger under his real name in Tokuwabolu (1920, 65), as noted in my MA Diss., (MERCHAN HAMANN 1996, 5). For further details on the life of Raphael Karger (1820-1897), who traced his descent to Moses Isserles, see the memorial book edited by his step-son and G’s father, Selig Gronemann. (GRONEMANN 1898).
in Germany being forced by the authorities to be in constant movement to prevent them from settling down anywhere.

When he was in the Quarta (Third form) he wrote a letter to a newspaper posing as a father of one of the pupils and complaining about the state of things at the school. He had the satisfaction of seeing it published next to an answer from the principal. After this, his contributions were published regularly and anonymously in the local press. He also entered into correspondence with many people answering the personal advertisements sections. He had started attending Social-Democrat meetings, which was illegal for Gymnasium students, and from this went on to attend antisemitic meetings. Of the former he was impressed by Wilhelm Liebknecht, and of the latter he remembers the visit of Rector Ahlwardt, which G attended in disguise and having been spotted had to run for his life. These visits led G to busy himself with things Jewish. He entered into a correspondence with Wilhelm Herzberg, then living in Brussels, and author of a powerful early Zionist novel, *Jüdische Familienpapiere*, published in 1875, as well as one of the few German proto-Zionists, the *Hovevei Zion*, to actually go to live in Palestine. Herzberg had actually stayed at G’s father’s house on his return from the Holy Land in the early 1890s and so G had met him (n.d. a, 109). Selig Gronemann became involved in the struggle against antisemitism. Three people in Hanover had a great influence on G – Manuel Gottlieb, a Russian scholar who detested converts and hypocrites and who held the disappearance of the ghetto to be a great misfortune for the Jews. Gerson Lange, a handsome and charismatic religion teacher and

---

There is a letter written by Herzberg to Gronemann, dated 18 July 1892, as cited by Reuven Michael (Michael 1983, 82); for Herzberg’s fascinating career, see the article cited. For the influence of Herzberg’s novel on G’s thought see below.
man about town, under whose spell G fell although later he learned to recognise the type as common among German Jews. The third person was Consul Alexander Moritz Simon, founder of the Ahlem educational institution whose aim was to prepare Jews for manual labour. The consul was absolutely obsessive in his insistence on the institute.\textsuperscript{7}

The narrow-minded provincialism of the Christian citizens of Hanover was also reflected in the Jews, who were conventional, beset by quarrels that split the community into parties and the President of the community, after Julius Kaufmann, Senator Leopold Fischer, was vain, petty and probably the author of the many anonymous letters that saturated the community. Cultural activity was restricted to the \textit{Verein für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur}, which confined itself to apologetics, but where G had a chance to listen to Karpeles, Lazarus, and Franzos. Selig Gronemann was not suited to this community and his patriotic flock made his life miserable. The province of Hanover was unique in the German Reich in that its rabbis had extensive administrative authority over the communities they served (BREUER 1992, 236). As \textit{Landrabbiner} he was also in charge of the communities in three of the districts (\textit{Drosteien}) of the old Kingdom of Hanover as well as being their school inspector. G accompanied his father on many of his visits. These communities were moribund, but kept alive many of the customs described in the novellas of Aron Bernstein. The trouble they had in keeping their schools open and leading a Jewish life have been described in \textit{Schalet}. At the same time, antisemitism from Protestants and Catholics, as well as from the more recent racial antisemites, was growing and G thought that a life so full of ritual yet devoid of content made it easier for these people to become Zionists later, a fact

\textsuperscript{7} On Simon (1837-1905) see LOWENTHAL 1969.
borne out by Eloní’s statistics (Eloni 1987, 119-23). As a Primaner (Sixth-former), G went to Russia to pay his respects to Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Spektor in Kovno (N.d. a, 273).^8

1.2 HIGHER EDUCATION 1894-1904

G passed his Abitur in 1894 and decided to study Law after hearing Fritz Friedmann, a great case lawyer, arguing in the Spieler case, which incidentally helped the antisemitic press in its campaign. His father had insisted that he spend one year studying the Talmud and he decided to go to Halberstadt on the advice of Gerson Lange. The Halberstadt yeshiva, led by the Hildesheimers and the Barths and financed by the Hirsch family, was an orthodox institution which although socially segregated from the Gentile world, had a modern outlook. This peculiarly German Orthodox institution, with its combination of religion, philosophy, esthetics, and mathematics, was probably the only place where somebody like G would have fitted in, and fit in he did (Calvary 1947, 30). At Halberstadt in 1894-95 he not only studied hard and acquired the basis for a sound legal training but most important of all, he recovered his self-esteem and healed some of the damage caused by Hanover. He lived at the home of Rabbi Dr. Josef Nobel, and was taught by him as well as by Dr. Selig Auerbach, Salomon Cohn, and the sons of the first two, Drs. Isaak Auerbach and Nehemias Anton Nobel. He devoted himself more to the legal content than to the language of the Talmud, which he admits he never mastered to perfection; what he did master was the deep question,

^8 Spektor (1817-1896), a respected leader of Russian Jewry, was also a supporter of Hovevei Zion. G would later meet one of the judges in Spektor’s rabbinical court, Rabbi Nissan Karg, during World War I whilst stationed in Kovno.

^9 On the atmosphere at the Halberstadt yeshiva, see Calvary 1947, 30-5; for more general details, see the first part of Auerbach’s article (Auerbach 1967). On the Hirsch family, who contributed the necessary financial support, see Mosse 1990.
and was called by J. Nobel Rabbi Jirmijahu. His friends were his study partner, Josef Hirsch, later a gynecologist, Heyman Chone, later rabbi in Constance, Leo Isaac, later physician in Tel Aviv, and most of all Moses Calvary.\(^\text{10}\) G describes the latter as far from being a Zionist then, although later he would become an ardent cultural Zionist, whilst remaining ‘in europäischer Kultur wurzelnd wie kaum einer von uns, er [...] galt mir immer und gilt mir bis heute als einer der besten Vertreter jener Synthese europäischer und jüdischer Kultur’ (...rooted in European culture like none of us [...] he was and still is for me one of the best representatives of the synthesis of European and Jewish culture. N.d. a, 46). In addition to his social interaction with the Nobels, he also took part in the busy social life of the household of the merchant Benjamin Hirsch, father of Josef, to which he was often invited. Since his stay in Halberstadt coincided with the Dreyfus trial he attended meetings pro and contra antisemitism (N.d. a, 45-7). He witnessed how some of the Orthodox led double lives and broke many of the commandments they were supposed to uphold, and for a long time he could not understand it. He adds that later in life it was in their all too human faults that he found he could sympathise with strictly Orthodox Jews. At the end of his time at Halberstadt, he even entertained the desultory wish of becoming a rabbi, what he calls ‘eine vorübergehende “geistliche” Störung’ (a passing “mental” disorder. N.d. a, 41).\(^\text{11}\) He decided against it though, ‘und so sind die deutschen Juden wenigstens vor meinen Predigten bewahrt geblieben’ (and thus German Jews were at least spared my sermons. 1924, 108).

\(^{10}\) Notice the inconsistency, since Calvary in his memoirs mentions having received a letter from G when the latter was at the Berlin Rabbinerseminar, i.e. the year after, and says he only met G later (CALVARY 1946, 34).

\(^{11}\) In my MA Dissertation, I asserted he had started at the Hildersheimer Rabbinerseminar in Berlin with the intention of becoming a rabbi, and then changed his mind and transferred to the university, but from the Erinnerungen it is clear that he was only an auditor at the seminar and that he had decided against it before his arrival in Berlin (MERCHAN HAMANN 1996, 7).
After his year at Halberstadt, G had only two choices for a university city if he wanted to attend a rabbinic seminary simultaneously: Berlin and Breslau. Against the advice of Anton Nobel, who thought it would be better for him to be to the right of a left wing institution than the other way around, he chose Berlin, mostly because of his love of the theatre (N.d. a, 48). Whilst in the Prima (Sixth form) he had stayed in Berlin with his maternal uncle Moritz Breslau, who initiated him into the big city’s life, including flirting in the Zoologische Garten. He started studying Philosophy in 1895, but after one semester changed to Law. In his department he liked only two teachers: Professors Eck and Josef Kohler. It was due to Kohler's encouragement that he wrote an essay on the death penalty in Talmudic law, not knowing Kohler would have it published, much to G’s discomfiture, since he was keenly aware of its imperfections, but to make matters worse, Kohler quoted extensively from it in an article he published in Goldschmidt’s German translation of the Talmud (Goldschmidt and Kohler 1907, 1235-7). After his first year he stopped attending the Rabbinerseminar and concentrated on his university course (A135/27, 1). He attended the lectures of Erich Schmidt on the History of Literature, Hermann Grimm on Art History, and those of the greatest of all in G’s opinion, Willamowitz-Möllendorf on Ancient Greece. On the whole he missed many classes, preferring to rely on his legal intuition rather than on the accumulation of knowledge. Concerning this he tells the anecdote that circulated in Berlin concerning him many years later: three of his articled clerks (Referendare) came to him with a highly complex legal problem that was beyond them, and he solved it quickly and

12 Breslau’s Jüdisches Theologisches Seminar was the more liberal of the two Orthodox institutions, whilst the Berlin Rabbinerseminar did not allow the use of any of the then current methods of Bible criticism.
brilliantly, and seeing their enthusiasm, he is supposed to have answered: ‘Wirklich, ich haette eigentlich Jura studieren muessen’ (Really, I should have studied Law. N.d. a, 51).

Among the faculty at the seminary in Berlin, where G was an external student, were the founder, Rabbi Dr. Esriel Hildesheimer, who had had a stroke from which he never recovered; his son, Dr. Hirsch Hildesheimer, who according to G should have been a politician, and G’s two teachers: Dr. Josef Wohlgemuth, whom G calls a *davke* Orthodox, i.e. somebody who is intellectually convinced of the lack of validity of at least some of the religious commandments, and yet continues to observe them; and Jacob Barth, Calvary’s uncle, whom he admired for his deep yet entirely unaffected religiosity. This he had managed to transmit to his family, and it was to the fact that so many Jewish families were unlike Jacob Barth’s, that G ascribed the success of Zionism among the disaffected young. It provided otherwise empty formulae with a content, thus drawing back to Judaism those who had forsaken it, whilst making observant Jews non-observant, whence David Hofmann’s dictum: ‘Mit dem Zionismus verhält es sich wie mit der Asche der roten Kuh, sie reinigt die Unreinen und verunreinigt die Reinen’ (With Zionism it is like with the ashes of the red heifer, they clean the unclean and pollute the pure. N.d. a, 56). The centre of social life at the seminary was the student association *Dibbuk Haverim*, which was an attempt to combine Judaism with the German student *Burschenschaften*. None of the Ostjuden in the seminar was part of it, and this was only one symtom of the great split between the two groups. For the *Dibbuk Haverim* he wrote his *Tulpentaliade* à la Busch, illustrated by his friend Hermann Struck who was then studying at the Academy of Art (see 1897). He also wrote

---

13 See Numbers 19:1-10.
plays for the *Dibbuk Haverim* and for the family of Hirsch Hildesheimer, of which only *Hamans Flucht* has survived (1926). Moses Calvary remembers his productions of *The Merchant of Venice* and of Heinrich von Kleist’s *Prinz von Homburg* (Calvary 1947, 52). The students’ *Homiletischer Verein* gave him the opportunity to preach a paean to Jewish chutzpah. The Berlin seminary was then in crisis, with the founder incapacitated and many of the most brilliant students leaving as a protest against the inability of the faculty to introduce modern methods even if only in order to refute them. This must have made him abandon any ideas he may still have had about qualifying for the rabbinate. Nevertheless, he continued to attend classes for as long as he stayed in Berlin, but one suspects this was done more for social reasons than anything else.

During the first year, 1895-96, he shared a house in the Rosenthaler Straße with Chone and Calvary who at the time was desperately in love with Ulla Beradt. But in the second year he moved in with his cousin and future brother-in-law, Leo Gottesmann, and they shared lodgings at the Holdkempers, Brückenallee 27; he described the youngest of the three daughters and her friend in the first chapters of *Tohuwabohu*. Leo Gottesmann, his sister Sonia and his brother Moses, the children of Hayyim Isaiah, had been born and raised in Zhitomir, and they had already stayed with G and his family in Hanover. G had his meals at Peltesohns, the kosher restaurant at the Kassel Hotel in the Burgstraße, and his *Stammcafe* was the Monopol at the Friedrichstraße railway station, a predecessor of the Café des Westens and of the Romanisches Café. He had continued to keep to Orthodox observance,

---

14 G not only played innumerable pranks on Calvary, but also brought him up to date in dramatical matters. It is a pity Calvary did not live to write an article he had planned for G’s seventieth birthday in which he intended to describe this period in full (Calvary 1947, 52, 60).
unlike Calvary, who had not only dropped out of his rabbinic studies, but had also stopped observing some of the commandments. He also went to the Börsen Café to listen to Samuel Lublinski and Heinrich Löwe debate Zionism.

But his main activity was the theatre, not just writing plays, but attending all the premières at Otto Brahms’ Deutsches Theater, where most of the moderns had their plays produced, such as Gerhart Hauptmann, Hermann Sudermann, Ludwig Fulda, and Arthur Schnitzler.\textsuperscript{15} It was in the latter’s Freiwild, that he saw for the first time a Jew as a character on stage, the cashier Kohn, always on the side, and he immediately discerned in him a symbol of the Diaspora Jew; that this had been the author’s intention was confirmed to G by Schnitzler himself years later.\textsuperscript{16} He would later use this image in talks he gave to further the Zionist cause, such as the one reprinted in the Vienna paper Die Stimme (see 1935). He was particularly in awe of the acting talent Josef Kainz, whom he first saw in The Prince of Homburg and The Misanthrope. G developed his own theories about some of the plays, such as The Misanthrope, The Taming of the Shrew, but most of all, about The Merchant of Venice, his favourite play. His objective with the latter was to show that the play is not antisemitic, but that it glorifies the presence of the Jew on the world stage. He expounded his views in lectures to the Dibbuk Haverim, as Calvary remembers (Calvary 1947, 52). Many

\textsuperscript{15} Theatre life in Berlin at the time was split between second-rate chauvinists and moderns; the latter’s plays often gave rise to scandals and were censored and shut down. On this see Schütte and Sprengel 1987, 50-61.

\textsuperscript{16} On Otto Brahms’ productions of Schnitzler’s plays, see section 4, Schnitzler in Berlin, of Sprengel and Streim 1998, 457-86. According to them, the date of the Freiwild première was 3 November 1896 (466).
years later G wrote down his theories in “Antonio, Merchant of Venice” (see 1925), and read it as a public lecture many times, but more of this below (229-31).\(^\text{17}\)

G also visited the Reichstag, although more for the rhetoric, the How, as he puts it, than for the What, the politics. The greatest orator in his opinion, was the socialist August Bebel, whose clarity was unequaled, and who G compares favourably with any of the Zionist politicians in Palestine in the Twenties and the Thirties. In his lack of political consciousness, G saw himself very much as one of the members of his generation, who were on the whole politically illiterate, and who would not come of age in this respect until after the First World War and the 1919 Revolution.\(^\text{18}\) However, it is important to qualify this: G’s attendance at political meetings from such an early age is hardly evidence of his having been the innocent he makes himself out to have been; this might have had to do with his wish to stress the role Zionism had in his life, and to draw a line between the periods before and after he joined the movement. What is indisputable is that aside from any role his personality may have had in his inclination to politics, it was his Jewishness which thrust him willy-nilly into the middle of the political arena.

The part played by Zionist predecessors must not be ignored. G himself spoke about this in his memoirs (chapter 22 in the Erinnerungen; see corresponding section below, 176). He makes special mention of Max Bodenheimer, who he says had realised early that devoting oneself solely to apologetic work was useless, that to combat the symptoms and not the causes was not enough (… Max Bodenheimer, der als blutjunger Referendar ganz selbst

\(^{17}\) As stated in the Curriculum vitae he sent to the Keren Hayesod, dated 25.9.1935 (CZA 135/24).

\(^{18}\) Or, to use Thomas Mann’s term, apolitical. This would have serious consequences for Germany.
erstaendlich sich zur Erkenntnis durchgerungen hatte, dass all nur auf Apologetik abzielenden Arbeiten nutzlos bleiben mussten und etwas Positives gesagt werden musste, dass man sich nicht nur mit der Bekampfung der Symptome begnuegen durfte, sondern dass an die Quelle des Uebels zu gehen war. N.d. a, 109-10). Another influence that may have played a major role in making G into a Zionist is that of Wilhelm Herzberg, whom he had met in the early 1890s and with whom he had corresponded before Herzberg’s death in 1897 as has already been seen (n.d. a, 109).

All of this alleged political inactivity was to change with the start of the Zionist movement. Herzl’s *Judenstaat* had been published in February 1896, when G was in the first semester of his Law studies. The movement was opposed by the majority of the German Jews, with the exception of Max Bodenheimer, Heinrich Löwe, and David Wolffsohn, together with many of the *Ostjuden* then residing in Germany. G read Herzl’s book but was against its ideas: ‘Man muss sich vergegenwartigen, dass es für jeden deutschen Juden eine schwere geistige Operation war, vollkommen umzulemen’ (One must realise that for all German Jews it was a severe mental and spiritual operation to change their ideas entirely. N.d. a, 77). From 1896 until the spring of 1897, G attended many meetings for and against Zionism, and once, in Breslau, he almost spoke against it at a meeting. Then, after having attended a meeting in which Dr. Albert Goldberg defended the Zionist point of view, he was discussing the matters with an elderly gentleman, and heard himself saying: ‘Es ist doch eigentlich verflucht schwer, nicht Zionist zu sein’ (It is actually damned difficult not to be a

---

19 On Bodenheimer (1865-1942) and Wolffsohn (1856-1914), as well as on German Zionism, see LICHTHEIM 1954, POPPEL 1976, and ELONI 1987. On Löwe, who later edited the *Jüdische Rundschau*, see the article G wrote about him (1944).
There and then he decided to stop attending meetings and think things through; after a few weeks, he decided to join the movement and paid his first shekel to Rabbi Dr. Brody, later Chief Rabbi of Prague.  

G did not get involved in public meetings at first, but took part in many discussions at the seminary and the Monopol café. He and others read avidly the reports of the First Zionist Congress, which took place in August 1897. The Congress caused the opposition to the movement to intensify. In May 1898, G travelled to Brest-Litovsk to the wedding of Leo Gottesmann’s brother Moses. At that time, Tsarist embassies did not give tourist visas to Western European Jews, and so most Jews intending to visit family and friends in Russia had to acquire false papers to prove their visit had a business purpose. G had failed to provide himself with one and so he had to wait for a full day at the border town of Thorn (Toruń), plying the German Customs official with alcohol until the man arranged to have G smuggled across the border.

In Brest-Litovsk G got engaged to his cousin Sonia Zipporah “in secret”. On the way back to Berlin, G and Leo shared a carriage with a large contingent of Jews from Czemikau (Czerników) who were travelling with their rabbi to attend a wedding in Berlin. The rabbi, Dr. Freund, who heard G discussing Zionism, had a heated argument with G in the course of which he mentioned that the German Rabbinic Conference had condemned Zionism. This was the Protestrabbiner declaration, and at the meeting only Selig Gronemann voted against

---

20 As regards the payment of the shekel, G was always of the opinion that it was not simply a fund-raising device, as Wolffsohn held, but a matter of conviction, as Bodenheimer thought, and in 1899 G refused to take it from Dr. Lazarus Barth, whose beliefs he did not consider mature enough. (ELONI 1987, 141-4).

21 The rabbi, a brother of Dr. Ismar Freund the historian, was later to succeed Selig Gronemann to the Hanover rabbinate.
the declaration. Incidentally, G got the best of Freund and most of the Czernikau contingent subscribed to the Zionist organ, *Die Welt*.

On his return to Berlin G threw himself into Zionist activity. He went to an anti-Zionist meeting organised by Rabbi Heinemann Vogelstein of Stettin (Szczecin) at the Hôtel Imperial, and though they were in a minority, G and the other Zionists held their ground; two weeks later they held a meeting at the same place and in this meeting Dr. Hirsch Hildesheimer adroitly avoided committing himself to a definite position as regards Zionism. In these meetings G learnt to speak in public, usually in the face of hostile audiences, and he heard for the first time the great Zionist orators, Herzl and Nordau, as well as the then well known editor, M. A. Klausner, who often took the stand and spoke against Zionism.

After six semesters in Berlin, G was supposed to do his last two semesters at the University of the province where he was supposed to practice his profession, i.e. Göttingen, but he could not tear himself from Berlin and arrived in Göttingen only two months before his finals to cram for them. Again he lodged with the local rabbi, Dr. Jacob, with whom he had many discussions, and whose own wife later started the local Zionist group. Although he had not prepared well for it, G passed the written part of the finals, and afterwards went to Celle to sit the oral examination. Börries von Münchhausen had to sit his orals on the same day, and since it so happened that the exam took place on a Saturday, when it came to sign the register, Börries had to sign for G. Both passed.

Now an articled clerk (*Referendar*), G was destined to Nienburg an der Weser, where he started working as a secretary to the local judge, and so tasted for the first time the very
tangible advantages of being a part of the all-powerful Prussian bureaucracy. From this period, he tells of a Jewish witness who came up to the tribunal and gave his religion as Israelit, the Assessor, also a Jew, dictated mosaisch to G, who in turn wrote and said out loud Jude. Ironically, the man in question, who did not know G was Jewish, said later to his friends that the new clerk was an antisemite! G comments: ‘Die Juden damals wussten wirklich nicht, was sie waren und wie sie sich nennen sollten’ (Jews then really did not know what they were and what they should call themselves. N.d. a, 90).  

Since he was required to work on Saturdays and could not arrange not to do so, he had to transfer to Bassum, south of Bremen, where he stayed for five happy months. For all of this time, he had to be supported by his parents, since articled clerks were not paid; in fact, at the start of their practice a bond to the value of 6,000 Marks had to be paid to guarantee their maintenance during this period (see Max Kollenscher’s description of his clerkship in his memoirs, AK 619/1, 35). At the end of this period he received good references from all the judges under whom he had served, but they all added that his handwriting was atrocious; this continued to be the case the rest of his life, and he dictated to a secretary during his whole career.  

Bassum was a Guelph centre (followers of the old Hanover royal house, which had been ousted by the Prussians in 1866) and somewhat antisemitic. Life was very traditional and people’s political alliances were still not settled. The jail had a very good cook and the court had a job dealing with the many homeless vagrants who had themselves arrested in

\[22\] Assessor was the lowest rank of lawyers in the Prussian judicial administration. Jews were not allowed to progress beyond it.
order to spend some days recovering from the hardships of the road. G had no opportunity to engage in Zionist activities, but he visited Rabbi Rosenak in Bremen and managed to make himself unpopular for his views. He finished his *Amtsgerichtsstation* on Easter 1900 and returned to Hanover, where he would stay for three years.

In Hanover G found a Zionist group which had been formed after Heinrich Löwe’s visit, and which had promptly split in two: German Jews and *Ostjuden*. The latter, calling themselves *Dorshei shalom Zion*, were led by Zimak and Jacob Schnelling, whilst the former’s leader was Inspector Ivan Meyer, principal of the Jewish Free School. It was a sign of his (Meyer’s) courage that being an employee of the community, and knowing the bitter enmity most of the locals felt towards the movement, he still joined it; but he lacked tact and G had to be very diplomatic to try and make the two groups work together, which he managed with the help of his friend Lazarus Barth, with whom he set up an umbrella organisation. In May 1900 he took part in the Berlin *Delegiertentag*, the delegates’ convention, where he met for the first time David Wolffsohn, Arthur Hantke, Rabbi Wilhelm Levy, Egon Rosenberg, and Erich Rosenkranz; he also saw again Lina Tauber and Jacob Wagner, who married shortly after. The organ that was to become the *Jüdische Rundschau* was founded on this occasion, with Heinrich Löwe as editor. The situation became very hard for Selig Gronemann, who not only did not ask G to tone down his activities, but made a point of sitting on the stage at any Zionist meeting he attended, in order to show his support for the movement, although as a civil servant he was forbidden to join it. The community was so assimilationist that G and the others were socially and later professionally boycotted and their activities were constantly hampered. The leader of the
opposition to Zionism was Mendel Zuckermann, himself having come to Hanover from Posen (Poznań), contrary to what is implied by Herzog (HERZOG 1973, 62-3). After a shaky start they had many guest speakers, the best of them being Alfred Klee, who would later be G’s partner and a close friend. He also organised cultural soirées, to which he brought Börries von Münchhausen and York-Steiner.23

G took in hand the Zionist organisation in Northwest Germany as well. He started by appealing to the bureaucrat lurking inside every community leader by sending out long questionnaires to be filled in; the leaders responded enthusiastically. He then undertook tours of all the small towns where there were still no Zionist groups, with much success, particularly in Bielefeld, where he had a spirited debate with the rabbi, Dr. Coblenz. In Magdeburg he did not do so well, but years later Arthur Ruppin told him it was his lecture there that made him decide to join the movement. Whitsun 1901 he went to Mannheim to take part in the Delegiertentag.

The Orthodox organ Der Israelit, had published a personal attack on Herzl; so on his way back from Mannheim, G stopped in Mainz where he attacked the paper and its editor, Oscar Lehmann. The latter replied by publishing an article Sammy, der konservative Zionist, to which G responded by publishing a series of three articles in the Jüdische Rundschau (then the Israelitische Rundschau), under the title ‘Israelit, Orthodoxie und Zionismus’; he rejected the incompatibility of Orthodoxy with Zionism, assailing in turn the alleged contradictions between Zionism and certain principles of Judaism, the assertion that the

23 Heinrich York-Steiner (1859-1934), a Zionist since 1896, a close friend of G, left the WZO in 1911 when the Practical Zionists took control, but continued to be active in the movement and wrote many books.
Orthodox should not mix with the Reform Jews, and the accusation that Zionism leads to a decrease in religious interest (Lehmann 1902; 1902a). In Marburg he was heckled by patriotic Jews who started to sing the national anthem; G let them sing and when they reached the second strophe they had to stop since nobody knew the words to it – he made his point. His main fault when debating was his ruthless way of slaughtering his opponent. In 1901 Rabbi Rülf of Memel asked him always to remember that his antagonist also took himself seriously and not to rob him of his self-respect. One of the best propagandists of the movement was Fabius Schach, who unfortunately in G’s opinion, left the movement when thwarted in his ambition to achieve high office in it.

In Hanover the situation was getting worse for G: the opposition, led by Senator Fischer, was very strong, and he was constantly threatened with being reported to the authorities, which would have meant the end of his career, given that as a civil servant he was not supposed to engage in political activity. In his role as a Referendar, he had first to take turns at prosecuting cases and then do a stint as a defender. His last case as a prosecutor was against three Jewish businessmen, and he was embarrassed when an antisemitic newspaper congratulated him on his job, not knowing he was Jewish; to top it all, his first case as a defender was the defence of those very same businessmen. This was a lesson in objectivity. In August 1901, G and Sonia celebrated their official engagement in Bad Harzburg. In Berlin he had visited Ernst von Wolzogen’s recently opened literary cabaret, where he met Marcell Salzer and Robert Koppel (See Schutte 1987, 54-7). Inspired by this he organised a cabaret benefit for the Palestine colonies, against his principles, given that he

24 As announced by Sonia’s parents in the Israelitische Rundschau, 33, 23.8.1901.
was a Political, not a Practical Zionist, but as G put it: ‘Prinzipien muss der Mensch haben, er darf sich nur nicht immer nach ihnen richten’ (One must always have principles, but one may not always need to follow them. N.d. a, 114). During this period, G published little or nothing in the press, except for Zionist articles, and on one occasion in 1900 he organised the one-off Allgemeines Deutsches Käseblatt, to help publicise a cheese factory (Veth in Gandersheim); to this end he commissioned pieces from prominent writers, and not only was it very successful, but it raised considerable controversy, when the paper was accused of dragging poetry through the mud.

In December 1901 G was a delegate from Hanover, together with Ivan Meyer and Jacob Schnelling, to the Fifth Zionist Congress in Basle, the first one he attended, and from then on he never missed one up to the Twenty-Third in Jerusalem in 1951. The scenes he witnessed on the way there are the same that Hans Lehnsen observes in the last chapter of Tohuwabohu. He felt an unbounded admiration for Herzl, and he learnt to admire the undisciplined, but truly enthusiastic Russians, as well as Herzl’s ‘loyal’ opposition leader Leon Motzkin. It must be noted that G’s admiration for Herzl, like that of many of his contemporaries, was totally uncritical and bordered on hero-worship; his status as an icon was not put in doubt, and G speculates that one of the reasons for Herzl’s success may have been his very alienation from Judaism, since his outsider status made people respect him, but he goes on to compare him to Moses (!) and to other Messianic figures who were not brought up in a Jewish environment. That Herzl’s successor, David Wolffsohn, was not respected as much as Herzl had been, and that he had numerous problems due to this, is not in doubt, but the combination of Nietzschean superman with messianic figure may throw
light on the phenomenal success Herzl had. G’s German love of order was shaken when he witnessed the chaos which surrounded the deliberations, but most of all, by the way people had of leaving the plenary sessions to show their disagreement with a certain policy, but he quickly learnt this was not meant seriously. He was very busy, indeed he worked harder than he ever did afterwards, and yet he admits he was not as conscientious as Ussishkin. It is a sign of the generation-revolt aspect of Zionism that the train back from Basle was full of enthusiastic Zionists singing Yiddish songs and openly flaunting their Jewishness, this also entailed an idealisation of Ostjuden that stood in open contrast to their parents’ disdain for those they did not consider civilised. G stopped at Mannheim where he held a debate with Fabius Schach who by now had become an anti-Zionist.

On his return to Hanover, G gave his report on the Congress, and resumed his activities. He toured the northwest and managed to create two new groups in Varel (Oldenburg) and Hameln (ISRAELITISCHE RUNDSCHAU 1902). He also prepared a project for the development of the Zionist organisation as a federation of groups of shekel-payers (1902). His cousin the chess-player Ossip Bernstein, who after the Revolution settled in Berlin, came to Hanover to play in a tournament, and also present was Ernst Heilmann, whom G tried to convince of the rightness of Zionism, but Heilmann did not join the movement, and later became a Social-Democratic politician. In 1902 G and Sonia married in Breslau, to make it easier for his and her families to travel from the East. Whilst in the pulpit, seeing several Protestrabbiner present, G could not help but make a Zionist speech, which he considered but fair compensation for the many anti-Zionist sermons he had had to

25 For more on this subject, see Steven Aschheim’s Strangers and Brothers (ASCHHEIM 1972, passim).
hear from those present. Their wedding trip took them to Lucerne in Switzerland via Dresden and Munich. At that time Elfride Gronemann was living in Lucerne. On their return they stopped at Cologne where Sonia met Bodenheimer and Wolffsohn. By this time the social situation had become serious for G in Hanover, so it was fortunate that Sonia had now arrived since everybody was eager to meet such a curious creature and were astonished to find her so cultivated; this helped to lighten the boycott against G. Is is noteworthy that very few German Jews of G’s generation ever married Russian Jews, not even among the Orthodox (Breuer 1992, 51). The reasons for this were not only prejudice and separatism, but also the legal impediments put in the way of those wishing to do so (Wertheimer 1987, 83). Their first soirée almost ended in disaster when the gas lights failed and they had to turn it into a candle-lit piano concert. It is a sign of the way things improved socially for him that G was accepted as a member of the Zion lodge of B’nai B’rith in Hanover, subject to his not overtly canvassing for Zionism among the lodge’s members. This would mark the start of G’s long association with the benevolent organisation and it confirms the importance of B’nai B’rith as a neutral forum where Jews of all colours of the political and religious spectrum could meet, exchange opinions, and socialise. On December 1902 they both took the train to St. Petersburg for Leo Gottesmann’s wedding. On the way back G made speeches at Königsberg and Danzig, where G’s uncle Hermann Breslau lived. The last two months of his training period as an articled clerk should have been spent in Celle at the High Court, but the judge, Senatspräsident Ursel, did not require him to attend any sessions but those in which he had helped prepare the case. This meant G could stay in Hanover and commute to Celle.
At the end of August 1903 Sonia and G travelled to Basle to take part in the Sixth Congress. They witnessed Herzl and Nordau's meeting outside the hotel and G was struck by Herzl's handsome physique, which indeed was one of the movement's assets. Elfride came from Lucerne but she missed Herzl's sensational speech in which he announced the British government's offer of Uganda. Everybody was enthusiastic, including those who, like Heinrich Löwe and Weizmann, were later to oppose the plan. Alfred Nossig attacked Herzl and as the debate between Davis Trietsch and Herzl became personal, Herzl proposed that the matter be referred to an investigative commission headed by Nahum Solokov, so the dispute could be settled, and he chose G as his representative. The proceedings never came to a conclusion: G wrote to Herzl (Zl/353/2) explaining the difficulties he had meeting Davis Trietsch's representatives (Weizmann, Buber and Feiwel) and the commission's president, Sokolov, who were too busy or lived too far away to attend the sessions; G proposed that Hantke and Jungmann join him in representing Herzl and that Dr. Altschul replace Sokolov, to take advantage of the fact that Davis Trietsch' representatives are currently (11.1.1904) in Berlin. Herzl replied three days later agreeing with G's suggestions as long as it was clear that it was only a fact-finding commission, not a judicial tribunal; he instructed G to continue gathering material (Zl/353/2). G then wrote to Herzl on 24 January that he did not think anybody misunderstood the role of the commission and asking for permission to continue working. No answer has been kept (Zl/354). As both parties died with the case still open, G never had the papers published, and after Hitler came to power and G had to leave Germany, they were lost forever. One evening at the Spitz Café Herzl

26 Herzl's letter can be found in the edition of his diaries and letters currently being published (HERZL 1996, 512-3).
and the Marmorek brothers urged him to start a Zionist humour magazine, this would lead to
the creation of Schlemihl (1903) and in turn Schlemiel (1903-1905).

G was in favour of the Uganda proposal, and years later he regretted not having had the presence of mind to make the executive aware that phrasing its resolution in a more conciliatory fashion would avoid causing bad feelings, which in turn would have prevented at least some of the later strife. But he did not, and even if he had, it is doubtful whether all conflict could have been avoided. The attacks on the Uganda partisans which started then were intemperate. Back in Hanover, he was happy that his own group members asked him to speak less about Uganda and more about Zion; this confirmed him in his belief that they were now mature Zionists and may have played a part in his feeling confident enough to leave for Berlin. But first he had to spend two extra months at Celle, since a bureaucratic error had resulted in his not having served the full period he was allotted. It is not clear whether these are the two months he had already referred to, or whether he had to extend his practice, but, whatever the case, he did not have to actually reside in Celle continuously, and so could devote the time to consolidating the structure of the local Hanover group.

At the earliest in November 1903, G, together with Sonia and Elfride, moved to Berlin to prepare for his bar exam (Assessorsexam). They spent a few months in the Bellevue neighbourhood of Berlin in the NW area ("Nebichwesten"), halfway between the poor Jews of the Scheunenviertel and the prosperous high bourgeoisie of the West. Their home (Flensburgerstraße, 8. Berlin NW 23) became the centre of a Zionist and literary circle, and this busy life left him little time for cramming. A Hanover lawyer, Siegmund Meyer, had published an attack on Zionism entitled ‘Quo vadis?’ and G responded to it in a
series of three articles in the *Jüdische Rundschau* in which he touched on a series of questions which the Hanover community would probably have rather not discussed; he accused them of discriminating against the *Ostjuden* in the city and excluding them from the community, concluding with a powerful blast in which he states that these Jews are deeply ashamed of their Jewishness, and though they would not convert to Christianity themselves, would not mind if their children did, in G’s own words:

> Der Mann, der Quo vadis schrieb oder seinem Inhalte zustimmt, empfindet sein Judentum als Unglück. – Er ist ein Unglücklicher, der aus Charakter-Stolz, Trotz, vielleicht Pietät nicht zur Taufe schreitet, – der aber sehnlichst wünscht, dass seine Kinder, ohne sich vor sich schämen zu müssen, diesen Weg finden und nicht wagt, sich selbst diesen Wunsch einzugestehen!
> Es ist die Theorie des Benedictus Levita!!
> Wir können nicht, – unsere Kinder aber sollen es leicht haben!! (1903a, 514)

The articles were a good statement of his beliefs vis-à-vis those of the Liberal Jews, just as those against Oscar Lehmann he wrote in 1902 did the same with respect to the Orthodox side; they also foreshadow his *Der Sturmgeselle Sokrates*, published two years later; what is almost certain is that they contributed to make his position in that city a very difficult one.

On the question of *Schlemiel*, G knew he could not take over the editorship, but he and Klee found the perfect editor in Max Jungmann, and a publisher, Julius Moses. Apart from a short lived publication, there had been up to then only one humorous Jewish magazine, *Schlemihl*, which Leo Winz had edited in May 1903, but it had stopped after one issue. They decided to continue publishing it, but for legal reasons had to change the name to *Schlemiel* (Jungmann 1959, 61). Jungmann did the political poetry (*Zeitgedichte*), Emil

---

27 *Gut Woch*, published in 1889 by Siegfried Meyer in Berlin and which made fun of the then ridiculous idea of a Jewish state.
Simonsohn the weekly review, Zlocisti a few poems, G some political poems and most of
the parodies. The first number came out in November 1903. Herzl liked Schlemiel very
much, as he makes clear in some of his letters (HERZL 1996, 292, 284). One of the main
causes of the closure of the magazine in 1905 was Herzl’s death, since the pleasure he took
in it had been decisive in making them publish it. Later, in 1905, G, now a lawyer in
Hanover, would defend Moses and Jungmann, accused of defamation by the CV
(Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens, the Federation of German
Citizens of the Jewish Faith), and his version is that he managed to have them declared
innocent and then convinced the CV president not to appeal by making him see the absurdity
of the situation (N.d. a, 70). Things may have been outside the CV’s hands though, because
according to Jungmann the state prosecutor appealed and the case was heard in Berlin,
where another lawyer defended them and were found innocent by the skin of their teeth
(JÜDISCHE RUNDSCHAU 1905, JUNGMANN 1959, 63). The Schlemiel was an important though
short-lived instrument for the propagation of Zionist ideas, and it also focused on
controversial and divisive issues such as the Uganda controversy and the problems generated
by the undue emphasis on fund-raising (BERKOWITZ 1993, 180-3). Special Purim editions of
the Schlemiel were published in 1907 and 1908. In 1919, when the magazine was briefly
resurrected, G contributed the gallery of famous contemporaries. The magazine finally
succumbed to hyperinflation. A final attempt by Jungmann to publish it as a supplement to
the Vienna Jewish monthly Menorah also failed after just one issue, mostly due to the cool
reception of the brash and forward-looking Berlin satire at the hands of the nostalgic
Austrian public (ELONI 1991, 5). A month after its demise, the irrepressible magazine
When the Uganda question took centre stage, G tried to have the Herzl-Davis Trietsch case solved, but even though Altschul took over the chair of the commission from Sokolov, the matter was never solved, as mentioned above (36). G’s bar exam had two parts, the written paper (*wissenschaftliche Arbeit*), which he had six weeks to complete and on which he worked intensively at the Royal Library. Then came the second part, the case-study (*praktische Arbeit*) for which he had three weeks to look at the files of a real-life case, with the verdict omitted, but which one could get hold of through the offices of an enterprising individual who had set up an agency. All candidates availed themselves of this service, and so did G, but he could not square his legal opinion with that of the court and decided to run the risk of delivering a different verdict. He passed his bar exams, thanks to the written paper and to the spirited defense he put up at his Viva, ‘Ich muss sagen, dass die vielen Debatten in zionistischen Redekämpfen eigentlich ein gutes Training für das Examen waren, denn hier wie dort war ich oft genötigt, mich in eindrucksvoller Weise über Dinge auszulassen, von denen ich nichts wusste und verstand’ (I must say that the numerous debates on the side of Zionism were a really good preparation for the exams, as in both situations I was often forced to speak convincingly about things of which I had not the slightest idea. N.d. a, 144).

1.3 LAWYER AND ZIONIST 1904-1914

Early in 1904 G had given an organisational lecture at the Hamburg *Delegiertentag* and it was then that he found out from Wolffsohn about the seriousness of Herzl’s state of health.
After passing his bar exam, he then set about starting his private practice in Hanover, hiring as clerk, August Quante, who would later go with G to Berlin and work with him for 29 years. He also had to retire from the Prussian civil service, which took several months, but he could still use the title of Assessor. In June 1904 he and Sonia visited the Klees who were then taking the waters at Bad-Pyrmont; there they realised Herzl would soon die. Several weeks later, in Hanover, Elfride came into the dining-room and told Sonia of Herzl’s death. G was called to the bar and sworn in on the same day as Herzl’s funeral. Selig Gronemann eulogised Herzl from the pulpit and this made his congregation very angry; G then added to this by publishing an advertisement in the local press calling for a meeting to honour the leader of the Jewish people. This led to a complete boycott of his newly started practice and he built up a clientele exclusively composed of Ostjuden and Christians. The only relief from the narrow and asphyxiating atmosphere came from the visits of Alfred Klee. Of the cases he was involved in, the most noteworthy came about after the Prussian government suddenly and unofficially stopped issuing peddling permits to the thousands of Ostjuden engaged in this occupation, thereby threatening their livelihoods and threatening them with certain ruin. Two of them came to G and showed him documents which they had purchased previously by paying considerable amounts of money, and which the sellers claimed had been issued by a small local authority in the East which had yet to comply with the government regulations. It turned out the documents were forgeries. G took up the case and managed to track down and prosecute the culprits and return most of the money to his clients and to dozens of others who had also been taken in.
G was elected to the Central Committee of the German Zionist Organisation, the ZVfD, and so he had to travel regularly to Cologne, and was present when David Wolffsohn was unanimously proposed for the Presidency of the World Zionist Organisation. Wolffsohn refused at first and G remembered with regret how he had reproached him with his attitude and had urged him to take up the office which later hastened his death. Being an autodidact and a self-made millionaire – he made his money bringing wood from Lithuania and East Prussia to the Rhine river – Wolffsohn was never able to overcome the handicap of his ungrammatical German. He became Herzl’s confidante and initiated Herzl, who had had a secular upbringing, in Jewish matters. After Herzl’s death, he lacked a trusted aide such as he himself had been to Herzl; his worries about the safekeeping of the Zionist Bank and the Jewish National Fund antagonised Otto Warburg who was set at the head of their wing by Weizmann and the Practical Zionists and they gradually put pressure on Wolffsohn until he resigned in 1911 during the Tenth Congress.\textsuperscript{28} It was while undergoing medical treatment with Sonia in Scheveningen that G met Ernst Heilmann who was then attending the Social-Democrat Congress in Amsterdam, and then he realised Heilmann would never join the Zionists. G always had a deep admiration for this man, whom he compared to Nathan the Wise, who took care of a precious legacy, handed it over intact, and was never thanked for it.

G and Sonia spent Passover 1905 in Zhitomir with her family and G had the opportunity of witnessing the state of mind of the population before a pogrom, as described in \textit{Tohuwabohu}. They always slept next to a gun, but this did not affect the holiday spirit.

\textsuperscript{28} On Wolffsohn and his career see ELIAV 1977.
When the self-defence group spoke at the synagogue they had to have their weapons in their hands in order to provide the community with an alibi in case the police arrived, this because political meetings were banned, and given that this would have counted as a political meeting, the weapons would have allowed them to claim they were forced to listen to the speech. After the holidays, things seemed to return to normal, and G went back to Berlin whilst Sonia stayed, and that night he attended Max Reinhardt’s production of *Midsummer Night’s Dream*. The next morning he was shocked to read in the newspapers that the pogrom had broken out and for the three days it raged he was on tenterhooks. Finally he received a letter from Sonia who was well, describing the pogrom, and he had it published in the *Berliner Tageblatt* and in the *Neue Freie Presse*. Later in his memoirs (written in the Forties) he would remark ironically how Jews and Gentiles in Germany agreed that that kind of thing could only happen in Russia.

The Seventh Congress (Basle 27 July – 2 August 1905) had seemed destined to take place without any problems; after all, in his last appearance before the *Großes Aktionskomitee* in April 1904, Herzl had managed to allay the fears of the anti-Uganda wing, the Nay-sayers. However, just before the congress Ussischkin organised a meeting of the Nay-sayers in Freiburg, and in this meeting the Yea-sayers were accused of anti-Zionism and threatened with exclusion from the congress. G and other yea-sayers were angered by this, and saw in these proceedings a return to the *Hovevei Zion* tactics, which Herzl himself had helped render obsolete, and a rejection of Herzl’s political aspirations. To complicate things further, some of the Yea-sayers were indeed becoming further and further removed from the Zionist mainstream and into the Territorialist stand. For G and his fellow Yea-sayers things...
became clearer after Ussischkin made explicit his group's rejection of the *Hovevei Zion* tactics, and the Territorialists adopted obstructionist tactics. The uproar was such that the cantonal authorities forbade the continuation of the plenary congress sessions. It was after this that G delivered his lecture on agitation and propaganda which in those circumstances sank without trace although it throws much light on Zionist ideology in practice. G misunderstood the intentions of Zangwill and the Territorialists and could not bring himself to believe they wanted to leave the organisation. After the session that rejected the Uganda proposal, G and his friends, unhappy with the paragraph that rejected any colonisation attempts outside Palestine, even as means of attaining the ultimate Zionist goal, started the Union of Political Zionists and G was elected its president. As he later admitted: 'Das schaffte mir manche Verlegenheiten' (That caused me a good many embarrassments. N.d. a, 156). He had to argue with his opponents, the Ziyonei Zion, and held a debate with Judah Magnes, where the latter represented the ultra-nationalist point of view, ironically in view of his later pacifist activities in Palestine.

G found himself now face to face with the ideological rigidity of many of the *Ostjuden*, as well as with the passive resistance of the members of his own faction such as Alfred Klee, who went back home intending to stop all political activity. G on the other hand decided to follow the congress directives in spite of his personal resistance to parts of them. One of the Union Members, Dr. Kalmus, convinced G to cable Zangwill congratulating him on the meeting of his followers which Zangwill had convened in London. To G's embarrassment, at this meeting, which took place in August 1905, Zangwill announced the establishment of the International Territorial Organisation, and he read G's telegram to the
delegates. It was with great difficulty that G managed to convince David Wolffsohn that he had had no intention of supporting the ITO. Even though he managed to prevent most of his friends from joining the ITO, they still went on with the planned strike that winter. Wolffsohn understood G’s naïveté, and


that incident was soon settled as far as I personally was concerned. But I became convinced then that I could not rely much on my political acumen and decided henceforth to restrict my Zionist activities to the battle with external forces and to keep away from all internal squabbles as much as possible. I have remained faithful to this resolution. [...] This political neutrality was later very useful to me when I was chosen to head the [Zionist] Congress Court.

Back in Hanover G became involved in many different activities to further the development of the local organisation. When a local Jewish gymnastics group was started he had to become a member in order to turn this officially neutral group into a Zionist cell; the painful exercises he performed proved invaluable later in the war. But the best means of finding an appropriate task for the group came about when a young woman, Anne Berliner, came to tell G she had discovered that the trains taking immigrants from the Ukraine to America via Rotterdam stopped at Hanover. The German authorities allowed the trains

---

29 In May 1904, when the Jüdische Turnerschaft Hannover started, Leopold Fischer had urged that the club be dismantled, as one of the club’s statutes stated that every law-abiding Jew could become a member (EISEN 1983, 255).

30 A. Berliner, one of five children, later went to live in the USA, but her sister, Cora Berliner, became a big figure in the Jewish Youth Organisation, and later died in the Nazi extermination camps; two of her brothers managed to emigrate to the USA as well. (See HILDESHEIMER 1984).
through on condition they be sealed, and when they arrived in Hanover passengers had not
had a drink for hours. Änne bullied the station-master into giving her the keys so that people
could at least get off the (cattle!) wagons to go to the pumps and drink some water. Pretty
soon Änne and G had organised a relief effort which provided each train that arrived with
warm food and milk for the children. Each day three trains went by: at midnight, at 6 AM
and at 4PM, the first two stopped for only 12 minutes, the latter for two hours. An agent in
Myslowitz wired them the number of passengers in each train, and for the first two trains
they had to go quickly from wagon to wagon and choose a trustworthy passenger to
distribute the packages.

The operation became a success, with non-Zionists in the city clamouring to take part
in it. The Christian Railway-mission ladies tried to organise a similar effort for the
Ruthenian peasants; their well-intentioned efforts hindered more than they helped and G
decided to take over and feed everybody. But then they found themselves in need of outside
financial assistance, for which they turned to the Hilfsverein deutscher Juden; the result was
that the Hilfsverein tried to have them stop the operation, on the pretext that they could
spread epidemics, but the real reason was their fear of sponsoring what was actually an
illegal operation. They decided then to turn to the Konferenzgemeinschaft der Alliance
Israëlite, led by M. A. Klausner, mentioning the fact that the Hilfsverein had refused to help,
and Klausner sent them money, doubtlessly in order to steal a march on the competition.31
Subsequently G went back to the Hilfsverein and told them about the Konferenzgemein-

31 Already mentioned above as an anti-Zionist speaker of note in Berlin.
schaft’s gift, which resulted in a further contribution. The results of the project were threelfold – it welded the group together into a good working unit, it gave them some respect and raised their profile in the eyes of the rest of the community, and finally, it gave everybody involved in the project some direct experience of the East European masses.

In January 1906, David Wolffsohn had asked G to attend a conference of Jewish aid organisations in Brussels. He travelled with Alfred Klee, Professor Mandelstamm from Kharkov, and Jasimovski from Warsaw. Since the Zionists had convened the meeting, the Alliance and the IOA refused to attend, and only the Hilfsverein and Zangwill’s ITO came, the latter represented by Carmel Goldsmith. The results of the conference were disappointing, since nobody could find a way of stemming the flow of emigrants. G viewed the stately Palais de Justice with no inkling that later he would be working there (1924, 237).

Life in Hanover was getting worse for the Gronemanns. G quotes Georg Hermann’s character, old Jacobi in Jettchen Gebert, ‘Gott soll schützen vor der Provinz.’ (God protect us from provincial life N.d. a, 164). The stuffy provincial atmosphere, together with the oppressive Victorian social mores, the useless round of visits and the fact that all and sundry called on him to compose verses for every kind of social occasion, put him in danger of becoming a Bratenbarde, as he himself puts it (N.d. a, 166).

32 It is impossible to assess the actual amounts involved, given the semi-illegal nature of the operation, but the Berlin bureau spent the following amounts on Unterstützungen an russische Auswanderer: 12,478.94 Mk. in 1905 (BERICH 1905, 142), 25,876.65 Mk. in 1906 (BERICH 1906, 118), 24,994.41 Mk. in 1907 (BERICH 1907, 128), 26,522.77 Mk. in 1908 (BERICH 1908, 156), and then it decreased to 22,569.28 Mk. in 1909 (BERICH 1909, 123), and to 18,696.76 Mk. in 1910 (BERICH 1910, 138). I have not been able to find out if any other cities had aid programs of the same sort, but an idea of the magnitude of the effort can be gauged from the fact that the total expenditure of the Alliance Israelite Universelle in Germany for 1905 was 26,306.40 Mk. (BERICH 1905, 142). Klausner had only joined the Konferenzgemeinschaft in 1905 but by 1906 was already the manager (Geschäftsführer) of the organisation (BERICH 1905, 186; BERICH 1906, 198).
G attended the meetings of the many associations (Vereine), including those of the Verein für Förderung jüdischen Wissens, led by Mendel Zuckermann, already mentioned above (30). As a result of G's growing dissatisfaction with life in Hanover, coupled with the fact that he could rely on his group to continue its activities in his absence made it easy for him to take the decision of moving to Berlin. G had been commuting to the Prussian capital with a certain regularity, mostly to defend cases at the Palace of Justice (Moabit) where he had met Karl Liebknecht. G moved to Berlin in December 1906 and Sonia followed in January 1907. G and Alfred Klee had decided to start a law firm together, and they found an office at Königstraße 49, C2, where they remained until 1913. Most of their early cases were heard at the Grünerstraße Court (Landgericht I). In April 1907, Klee passed his Staatsexamen and was called to the bar, after which he performed most of the court appearances, since he was a superb courtroom advocate. Also part of the practice were the third partner – Fritz Simon and G's clerk August Quante, who as we have seen had moved with G from Hanover. Hermann Lelewer joined the partnership later.

Before the war, Zionist activity in Berlin centered around the Café Monopol at the Friedrichstraße railway station. G quickly became the president of the local Berlin Zionist group and had to moderate the meetings, which were regularly enlivened by the presence of the anti-Zionist M. A. Klausner, and even without him generated enough controversy to prevent G from being bored. After G's arrival in Berlin, the Jewish community forced its preacher, Emil Cohn, to resign due to his Zionist convictions and G and the Berlin Zionists made use of the opportunity to show the lack of tolerance the Liberal side had shown. Although the Schlemiel had by now closed down, G continued writing parodies with Lazarus
Barth, for which Salomon Hildesheimer wrote the music. As far as I know, they were never published, and the originals were not kept. As he still was a member of the Central Committee, G had to travel to Cologne to attend the meetings. G now joined the Montefiore lodge of B’nai B’rith in Berlin, of which he would remain a member until his departure from Germany.

The Eighth Congress, which took place at The Hague in August 1907, saw Wolffsohn and his champion Leo Motzkin, at the head of the Political Zionists, triumph over the Practical Zionists headed by Otto Warburg and his champion Chaim Weizmann. Women were integrated into Zionist activity through their own organisation, the Kultur-verband jüdischer Frauen für Palästina, led by Betty Leschinsky and Sonia, and from it developed WIZO. G sat on the commission for the reform of the organisation, led by Nordau, and he was able to witness Nordau’s thoroughness and devotion to duty, virtues usually overshadowed by his rhetorical talent. G gave the report, which should have been given by Arthur Hantke, on the new federation structure, with which he (G) disagreed. G became a member of the World Zionist Organization’s action committee (Großes Aktionskomitee), a post he would fill until 1911 (HEYMANN 1970, 110).

As in Hanover, G’s law practice brought him into contact with many Ostjuden, many of whom would be used later in his books. These included among many others the elderly Majer Reches, who was often mistakenly addressed as “Major” Reches, and who was an Orthodox old tar, having served as kashrut inspector on the Hamburg-New York lines for twenty years. He appears in sections 10 and 11 of Schalet, where this mistake is made to stand for the complicated relationship between Christians and Jews (1927, 74-6, 86-7). In
the Moabit court he once saw a Landgerichtsdirektor mercilessly mocking a Jewish lawyer, and on this he based the episode witnessed by Heinz Lehnsen in *Paradiesäpfel* (Eden’s apples) the fifth chapter of *Tohuwabohu*. He was also involved in explaining points of Jewish law to Gentile courts; in this field his greatest achievement was to make a court and the Prussian Interior Minister Wolfgang Heine uphold the annulment of Rabbenu Gershom’s ban through the signatures of 100 rabbis in three countries. He was also involved in the strange case of a woman who was legally married to two men at the same time, due to the contradictions between German and Russian law.

In the summer of 1909 G and Sonia went to stay at her parents’ dacha in the Ukraine near Korostyn (in the Zhitomir oblast). At first he enjoyed the closeness to nature but then, urban animal that he was, he fell victim to depression and returned to Berlin in September, with a long detour that took in Kiev, Odessa, Ungheni, Kishinev, Jasy, Bucharest, Orsova, and up the Danube on a steamer to Belgrade, Budapest, and Vienna (Z2/17). He stopped in many places and familiarised himself with life in these communities, especially Jewish life; this was to stand him in good stead in the Thirties when he went on propaganda tours for the *Keren Kayemet L’israel* and the *Keren Hayesod*. His depression lifted and he returned many times to Vienna and Budapest, cities that he loved.

That December the congress took place in Hamburg, the first to take place in Germany. G was deputy chairman of the *Permanenz* committee, whose chairman was Chaim Weizmann; the committee was in session almost permanently. The Practical Zionists had

---

33 The ban prevents a husband from taking a second wife whilst still married to his first wife, but makes an exception in the case of his receiving written approval from 100 rabbis.
prepared a violent attack on Wolffsohn and Dr. Pasmanik started by attacking him personally and repeatedly. But Wolffsohn scored a stunning success with his presidential address. After this, the Practicals concentrated on attacking the choice of Cologne, where Wolffsohn resided, as the seat of the Executive Committee, thinking that Wolffsohn would never consent to have it moved to Berlin; G thought that this was Wolffsohn’s plan all along and only the fact that he later had a heart attack prevented him from carrying it out. The congress ended in an anticlimatic final session for the first time ever. They could hold no elections, but had to retain everybody in their existing posts, and this satisfied no one. In 1910, a struggle that had been taking place in the German Zionist movement between the founding and the younger generations, culminated in the move of the ZVfD centre from Cologne to Berlin, and in the replacement of its President, Bodenheimer, by Arthur Hantke (Reinharz 1975, 153-60). There was also an attempt to revise the statutes of the organisation, that had been carefully prepared by G and Felix Rosenblüth in the months before September, in consultation with Mizrahi members, but this could not be finalised at the delegate convention and was not completed until the following year (Z2/38). At the Twelfth Delegate Convention of German Zionists, which took place in Frankfurt-am-Main in September 1910, Gronemann was elected first secretary of the ZVfD Executive Committee (Geschäftsführender Ausschuß) in Berlin and Richard Lichtheim, who was also elected to the committee, remembers that G was given the task of monitoring the attitude of the press to Zionism (Eloni 1987, 256; Lichtheim 1970, 126). It was at the Twelfth Convention that a resolution tabled by Kurt Blumenfeld was approved, emphasising the national character of Zionism; this would have grave consequences for the Zionist movement as well as for German Jewry.
G always loved detective stories, and in the course of his career had the opportunity to use his talents in this direction many times, as did his partner Alfred Klee. Especially the Konitz (Konic, Chojnice) murder case in 1900 of the dissolute student, Ernst Winter, which gave rise to accusations of ritual murder, stirred up by the antisemite Bruhn. Although long after the fact, G was able to examine the documents of the case again, thanks to Julius Moses who requested his help and was able to convince himself of the truth of Moses’ hypotheses; unfortunately, the presumed murderer had died by then and the matter was dropped. He was convinced that miscarriages of justice were relatively rare, but the notorious legal tool of issuing arrest warrants in civil litigation cases did lead to many abuses.

Whilst at the Berlin Rabbinerseminar, G’s friend Moses Calvary had fallen in love with Ulla Beradt, a great beauty, and it was through Ulla that G met her brother, Martin, who was part of the circle of writers and intellectuals that met at the Vienna Café.34 When G participated in the case of the blackmarketeer Romulo Echtermeyer, he was asked to write a feuilleton about it and published Du glaubst zu schieben und Du wirst geschoben in the Berliner Tageblatt. Beradt read it, and thought of G for the post of lawyer (Syndikus) to the Schutzverband deutscher Schriftsteller, which the Vienna group were in the process of setting up. The SdS had already had an informal meeting in the autumn of 1909, but they first met formally on January 11th 1910, with G attending, when they elected Georg Hermann, Theodor Heuss and others to the executive, as stated in the formal registration of the organisation with the authorities four days later (FISCHER 1980, 33-4). G kept this post for many years, until Hans Heinz Ewers, a former friend of his who became a Nazi, deprived

34 On Martin Beradt (1881-1949), who died in exile in New York, see BERADT 1965.
him of it under orders from Goebbels, a matter to which we will return below (88). The *Schutzverband* did much to protect the rights of authors, and G was for many years in charge of the commission dealing with these matters, 'eine personelle Kontinuität,' as Ernst Fischer puts it, 'die sich ohne Zweifel auf die Vertretung der rechtlichen Interessen der Schriftsteller durch den SdS günstig ausgewirkt hat' (A personal continuity which undoubtedly was very favourable to the SdS in representing the interests of writers. FISCHER 1980, 39-40)

The SdS was very successful, as seen from the increase in membership through the years: 400 (1911), 804 (1914), 1200 (1918), 2100 (1926), 2514 (1931) (FISCHER 1980, 126, 197, 246). Some of the most important activities were the fight against unauthorised reprints, exploitative and unreliable publishers, censorship, and plagiarism (FISCHER 1980, 74-90, 102-4, 111-7). In November 1912, G took publisher Curt Wigand to court for usurious exploitation of authors, and won (FISCHER 1980, 86-90). As part of his role as *Syndikus*, G gave free legal advice twice a week to needy authors, and was part of the drive to standardise contracts and clarify authors' and publishers' rights (FISCHER 1980, 95, 101-7). As G wrote in the SdS organ, *Der Schriftsteller:*


Law and justice only stand in very loose contact with each other. Often there is no worse enemy of justice than the law, which is always limping behind reality as is only to be expected since it can only cover with the net of its concepts those facts which are already fully developed.

35 Years later, an author published *Tohuwabohu* in the New York *Yidishe togblat* under his own name!
A grateful membership voted him a payment of 1000 Marks on April 15 1913. G continued to occupy the post of Syndikus until 1924, when Hans Erich Wolff took over the post (FISCHER 1980, 264).

As part of his legal practice, G was also involved in the struggle against Zuschußverleger, i.e., publishers who were paid not to publish pieces which could threaten people’s reputations; in a society such as Wilhelminian Germany, which put so much value on respectability and where nothing was worse than scandal, these blackmailers made more money from what they did not publish than from what they did. All of these activities put G in even closer contact with writers and playwrights, and it would eventually lead to his own literary career. He realised that the influence Jews wielded in German literature was totally out of proportion to their numbers. In this respect, he was in agreement with what Moritz Goldstein held in his famous 1912 article Deutsch-jüdischer Parnafi, that it was wrong for Jews to manage a cultural heritage that did not belong to them. Gronemann met Georg Hermann, one of his favourite German-Jewish authors, but in many respects his ideological opposite; Hermann was, up to the First World War, an assimilationist, and his famous novel Jettchen Gebert contains a stereotypical Ostjude who is a direct heir to Freytag’s and Raabe’s characters. G could not resist telling how when he went to a Schutzverband meeting in which he knew Hermann would be present and, having the impression from Hermann’s novels that he would look like a Prussian aristocrat, he mistook him for Theodor Heuss, and when he met the real Hermann, was astonished to see he looked like a typical Berlin Jewish

---

36 Ten of the thirteen founding members of the SdS were Jewish (FISCHER 1980, 44).
37 On this affair, see GOLDSTEIN 1912b, 1957, as well as Steven Aschheim’s article in GILMAN AND ZIPES 1997, 299-305.
merchant. After Hitler’s rise to power, Hermann fled to Holland, whence he was deported to and perished in Auschwitz; meanwhile in Palestine G tried in vain to procure visas for him and his family, as will be seen below (99).³⁸

The Tenth Congress took place in 1911 in Basle, during the hottest summer G could remember. Wolffsohn ordered Nordau to preside over the congress, which ended with Wolffsohn’s resignation and the triumph of Otto Warburg and the Practical Zionists. G as a member of the WZO’s action committee (Großes Aktionskomitee) was the only one to defend Wolffsohn, according to Eloni, but Reinhartz puts him on the side of Kurt Blumenfeld and the German Young Turks (Reinhartz 1975, 153-60; Heymann 1970, 110; Eloni 1987, 228). Whatever his political attitude, there is no doubt of G’s personal devotion to Wolffsohn and he says that he urged Wolffsohn to remain at the helm of the movement. There were also differences of opinion with Bodenheimer on the matter of organisation, statutes and constitution, which Bodenheimer wanted approved in toto, without a detailed discussion of its points (Z2/182). It was at this Congress that the WZO Ehrengericht (Court of Honour) was organised, and G, already known for his fairness and freedom from bias, was chosen to head it, which he did from 1911 to 1933.

The Court of Honour was created to solve problems between members such as the one between Herzl and Davis Trietsch in which G had already participated, and had the power to fine members up to 5,000 Marks and/or expel them from the organisation (Z2/33). His friend and successor at the head of the Kongressgericht (Congress Court), created in

1923, Aron Barth, credits G with actually creating the Court of Honour, the Congress Court, and the WZO Legal Institute (HEYMANN 1970, 110; ELIAV 1977, 427; BARTH 1950, n.p.). This was the culmination of the reorganisation process which G had undertaken with the help of Felix Rosenblüth in 1909 and Barth’s assertion can be confirmed by the presence of the two courts in G’s plan, which resulted in Adolf Friedemann’s formal statutes (Z2/33, 38). From 1911 on the Court of Honour had numerous cases referred to it and G was kept constantly busy (Z2/517). The statutes of the court, developed on the basis of the plans by G and Dr. Margulies of Leitmeritz (Litomerice), and edited by G, were approved on 3 June 1912 and published in *Die Welt* (1912a).

At the end of May 1912 there took place the Thirteenth Delegate Convention, in which, following the precedent already set by Blumenfeld and proposed by two of his followers, a resolution was taken which called on members of the ZVfD to settle in Palestine. The so called Posen Resolution caused a negative reaction from the rest of German Jewry, which included the establishment of an anti-Zionist Committee, and the exclusion by the Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens of all those members not sharing in the so called *deutsche Gesinnung*. As the Centralverein (CV) was the most important Liberal organisation in Germany, this caused most of the Jewish associations to sever their relationships with the ZVfD, and then to a split within the ZVfD itself, with most of the older members resigning their positions when the Fourteenth Delegate Convention held in 1914 reaffirmed its line (REINHARZ 1975, 157-69). When the

39 As I observed in my MA dissertation, translating this term as ‘German ethos’ leaves out a large part of the emotive charge with which this term was loaded by Wilhelminian non-Jews and Jews, the latter bent on assimilation or at least on integration into German society (MERCHÁN HAMANN 1996, 14).
Posen resolution was discussed, not only were older members against it, but others too who, though they agreed with its spirit, foresaw that it would alienate non-Zionist Jews; G himself judged it the greatest mistake the ZVFID ever made (as quoted by ELONI 1987, 277, who does not acknowledge his sources, however).

In the pre-war period G was involved in numerous cases, many of them involving blackmailers and others of all kinds, including one in which he acted on behalf of the heirs of the 18th century Russo-German Count von Münnich, whose properties in Prussia had been confiscated illegally by Frederick the Great; G managed to find out that Frederick had indeed stalled the heirs and wilfully prevented the return of the properties, but the First World War put a stop to the proceedings. Another important case in which G was involved at this time was that of Wilhelm Mertens, head of a colonial company, who refused to let himself be blackmailed by the journalist Graf, editor of the Graf'sche Finanz-Chronik and one of the type of Zuschuβverleger to which we referred above (54). The trial took place in the autumn of 1912 and it was hard going, for Graf had much to lose if his threats were shown to be baseless and he used all possible methods fight Mertens. In the course of this case G learnt much about colonisation matters, which proved to be of considerable utility later in his Zionist activities, and heard experts such as Admiral Thomsen and the Jewish colonisers Otto Warburg and Soskin. Admiral August von Thomsen –he was ennobled in 1913– had been Chief of the First Battle Squadron until 1900, when he became Chief of the Naval Station and, after retiring became involved in private industry; he was thus an important contact with the Prussian establishment (LAMBI 1984, 131, 192; HERWIG 1987, 119, 122).
G also took part in the case of Karl M[artha] Baer, a Jewish man born with stunted genitals who had been classified female and thus had been raised as a girl. (S)he trained as a social worker in Hamburg and became involved in the Zionist movement and in the struggle against white slavery in Eastern Europe initiated by the Hamburg lodge of B’nai B’rith and Bertha Pappenheim’s Jüdischer Frauenbund; (s)he was sent to Galicia as part of a group of three and was the only one to complete his/her mission successfully (Knappe 1994, 175. Bristow 1983, 323). In the second half of 1906 Baer decided to apply to the courts for a change of gender and become a man legally in order to marry a woman he had met in Czemowitz and went to G, already in Berlin, who Baer states had already being recommended to him in another case; G successfully managed to have the application approved (Body 1993, 152). In 1907 Baer wrote a book about his life and published it under the pen-name N. O. Body; in it, G is the only person to be mentioned by Baer under his real name (Body 1993). Hermann Simon has conjectured that Baer may have met G during Baer’s stay in Hamburg (1903-1904) or even earlier due to the fact that Baer is known to have attended the educational institution in Ahlem, of which G’s father was trustee and whose students attended religious services in Hanover (Body 1993, 224). This conjecture is made even more probable when we add to it the fact that G was indeed in Hamburg on Zionist business at least once during these years and also mentioned his closeness to the founder of the institute, Alexander Moritz Simon (see above, 18). Baer was later in charge of the welfare section of the Berlin lodges of B’nai B’rith (Brenner 1998, 32). The pioneer sexologist Magnus Hirschfeld, who for years had been involved in a campaign to legalise

---

40 For more on Baer, see the afterword by Hermann Simon to the reprint of Baer’s book, as well as David Brenner’s essay, to my knowledge the only material on Baer in English (Body 1993, Brenner 1998).
homosexuality and dispel prejudices about the varieties of behaviour in human sexuality, intervened in court in favour of Baer, and wrote an epilogue to Baer’s work. This case shows that G was not afraid to tackle issues at odds with the conventional views on morality of Wilhelminian society; however, it must be noted that he did not mention it in his memoirs. The law firm was doing well, and by August 1913 they had moved to new offices at Oranienburgerstraße 24, N24 (A142/59/3a). It is unfortunate that the case he considered the strangest of all those he had won, and which he described in chapter 44 of his memoirs, cannot be traced as he did not mention the names of any of those involved.

Like many other members of the bourgeoisie in the German Empire, G often travelled to resorts and spas and visited European capitals regularly. We have already spoken of his regular visits to Scheveningen in the Netherlands followed by visits to Ostende to recuperate from the boredom of Scheveningen; he used to make Fasching visits to Munich and thence to carnival in Nice as well. He also visited London and afterwards Paris to alleviate the London tedium. It took him some time to get to love Paris, which was not the case with Vienna, mostly due to its ravishing women and, as he said to Schnitzler, ‘Das Fleisch ist willig, aber der Geist ist schwach’ (The flesh is willing, but the spirit is weak. N.d. a, 216).

In Vienna G visited the respected Rector of the Rabbinical Seminary, Dr. Adolf Schwarz. The first thing he did there was to ascertain which cafés the feuding Zionist groups were frequenting, and which ones they were not, in case one wanted not to be disturbed. In

41 On Hirschfeld and his activities in Wilhelminian and later Weimar Germany, see the full account given by Charlotte Wolff (WOLFF 1986).
February 1913 G accompanied Sonia to Russia to visit her family. For carnival he went to Nice stopping as usual for Fasching in Munich; he liked the contrast between the two very different atmospheres in the two places. In all these places, as well as in Monte Carlo and Cologne, G had fun with bourgeois respectability and the double standards it produced. And yet at the same time he also had to deal with the sometimes terrible consequences of this system in his professional capacity.

In 1913 Die Welt, now edited by Kurt Blumenfeld, attacked Max Nordau, who decided not to attend the Eleventh Zionist Congress in Vienna in September of that year, and so did Nordau’s followers the brothers Alexander and Oscar Marmorek; only Jacobus Kann came, and this only to care for David Wolffsohn who was gravely ill and would die that year (POPPEL 1976, 48). Herzl’s daughter, Trude, attended the congress for Wolffsohn’s sake as well. G and Sonia spent the Sabbath before the congress at Adolf Schwarz’s family home in Ischl, and saw Emperor Franz Joseph walk to visit his mistress Katharina Schratt. The congress had much trouble deciding on whether to elect Wolffsohn to preside over the sessions, on how to deal with Nordau, about the official language of the sessions and the precise role of Hebrew, but the central debate was about the proposed Zionist bank and what lay behind this, i.e., whether the activities of the movement were to be mainly financial (as Kann held), or ideological (as proposed by Sirkin and Shemaryahu Levin).

After the Congress, G’s activities outside his law practice were concentrated on two fronts: the Schutzverband (SdS) and Zionism. The SdS was trying to fight against censorship, and, in connection with this, he would later remember U. Rauschner’s speech against antisemitism, warmly applauded by many writers, most of whom later became Nazis;
he also continued the legal activities already mentioned as part of his role as Syndikus of the SdS, as already mentioned (54). The Zionist agitation took place on many fronts. He took the opportunity offered by the Beilis blood-libel case in Russia to attack in an article published in the Jüdische Rundschau the tepid response of the judge Maximilian Horwitz, who had cautioned against too strong a response to what he deemed an ongoing judicial process in a civilised country (Kulturstaat), G ridiculed the use of the term to designate the Russian state, and attacked also the fact that Horwitz’s whole stance simply legitimised the blood libel (1913). The Berlin Neuer jüdischer Gemeindeverein (New Jewish community association), which was founded in 1905 as an ostensibly neutral organisation led by Lichtenstein, but in reality was a Zionist organisation controlled by Alfred Klee, offered G a forum for debate, as did the Liberal Jugendverein where he polemicised against Bruno Weyl and Rabbi Goldmann and the Lehreryereinshaus, where he debated Julius Bab. But the greatest struggle was inside the Zionist movement, against those who insisted on making German the language of instruction of the Haifa Technion, where G sided with Shemaryahu Levin in favour of Hebrew. In his memoirs he concludes by saying:


And it is only to my having led the struggle for Hebrew for so many years that I ascribe the fact that I never found the time to really learn a decent Hebrew. And so it happens that the Hebrew edition of this book appears in the good and unforced Hebrew of its translator and not in a stilted, imperfectly learnt language. This too is for the best! [The last sentence in Hebrew]
The whole period can possibly be summarised in a sentence which is part of the last article G published before the war, and which was aptly subtitled Epilogue; in it he manages to combine his generation’s view of the contrast between natural and artificial and between vital and degenerate attitudes and visions of the world, with an expression of the hope that the labours they have engaged in will result in a generation whose Zionism will be natural, not acquired:


1.4 SOLDIER 1914-1918

G and Sonia were sitting by the lake in the Tiergarten when they heard of the Archduke’s assassination in Sarajevo. G did not believe it would come to war, and so they did not cancel an English holiday they had already planned. They sailed from Hamburg on Wednesday and spent two carefree days on board; the rest of the second day they took to visit Southampton; on Friday morning they took the train to London, where they stayed at the York in Oxford Street. On Saturday they walked down to Westminster and on their return decided to go back to Germany, although G still wanted Sonia to stay until things had calmed down. On Sunday they took the train to Queensborough where they boarded the Queen Wilhelmina bound for Flushing in the Netherlands, where they were astonished to see the mobilised troops, and thence by train to Berlin. G had previously been involved in tracking down an international gang that had murdered a Russian twelve-year old prince, and he had forced them to return
the money they had stolen from a Hungarian client, and members of the gang had invited G to meet their chief in London, but this could not be managed due to the war breaking out.

The start of the war caused an outbreak of chauvinism and anti-foreign sentiment, with people seeing spies everywhere. Russian Jews who had been in German spas and sanatoria, as well as those who resided in Berlin were particularly exposed to persecution. The German Jewish organisations were not very good at dealing with them and the Zionists were slow to react. A. Klee and G worked to help them until most of them could sail to Sweden. Fritz Simon and Arthur Quante were mobilised, and Aron Barth replaced Simon and later G after the latter had to join the army as well. The first of G’s friends to die was Heinrich Barth and his mother had to keep the fact from her husband, who was dying of cancer at the time, and continued reading him the letters written from the front, which kept arriving after his death. Many rushed to volunteer in order to find cushy jobs for themselves, and G was thankful he resisted the temptation to do so. Many writers found themselves now in a difficult financial situation and so the SdS organised fund-raising activities, of which G remembers bringing the graphologist Raphael Schermann from Vienna. G continued to attend the Bohemian writers’ meetings at the Café des Westens. He was astonished at the chauvinist hysteria which gripped writers particularly.

Zionist activities were particularly affected. Davis Trietsch thought the war would not last long and England would be defeated; G had to fight hard to keep Zionists neutral, and in January 1915 went to Hamburg to speak with Albert Balin and Arthur Hantke

42 The same story is told by another close friend of the family, Moses Calvary, in his memoirs (CALVARY 1947, 41)
(A142/59/3b). Added to German nationalism on the part of the Zionists was the wish to fight the Tsar. Bodenheimer organised the *Komitee des Ostens* and G and took part in it until 14 March 1915. The KdO managed to help Jews east of the Vistula emigrate to America, and prevented potentially dangerous events; for example, the Emperor having read Heinrich Loewe’s brochure on Yiddish, which portrayed East European Jews as carriers of German culture into the East, he became so enthusiastic he wanted to free all the Jewish Russian POWs. In his memoirs, G relates how when the Zionists wanted to withdraw from the KdO, he managed to convince them not to, in what he considered a triumph of oratory, since he managed to convert Buber to his point of view. He later quoted Buber as saying in the café after the meeting:

Ich weiss nicht, was mir heute geschehen ist; ich kam mit der festen Absicht, aus dem Komitee auszutreten. Nun hat mich Gronemann vollkommen umgeworfen, und das Merkwuerdige ist, dass er das ohne jede Rhetorik getan hat. (N.d. a, 253)

I do not know what happened to me today. I came here with the firm intention of resigning from the committee and now Gronemann has turned me round and the odd thing is, that he did it without any rhetoric.

The main activists at the KdO were Adolf Friedemann with the help of the Zionists Franz Oppenheimer and Moritz Sobernheim, as well as the anti-Zionist Eugen Fuchs and the neutral Bertold Timmendorfer, head of the B’nai B’rith lodges and a friend of G.\(^4\) Hagit Lavsky in her authoritative study, states that the Zionists helped set up the KdO and collaborated in its labours (*LAVSKY 1996, 37-8*). However, G may not be telling the whole story in his memoirs, since at one point a resolution was taken that all Zionists resign from

\(^4\) Adolf Friedemann (1871-1933) Zionist lawyer and activist who also founded the *Neue jüdische Monatshefte*, his path crossed G’s numerous times. In 1905 G wrote to him arguing for a federation of Zionist national organisations rather than a single supranational entity (*A8/109*).
the KdO, and this was carried out as can be seen from Kurt Blumenfeld’s letter of 24 March 1915 to Richard Lichtheim in Constantinople: ‘Die Behrenstraße ist erledigt. Klee, Gronemann, Buber und Oskar Cohn sind aus dem Komitee [des Ostens] ausgetreten’ (The Behrenstrasse [referring to the Foreign Ministry where the KdO met] is finished. Klee, Gronemann, Buber, and Oskar Cohn have resigned from the KdO. BLUMENFELD 1976, 45).

Another version can be gathered from the KdO papers; on 10 March, G wrote to V. Jacobson of the Zionist Central Bureau asking for clarification of his and his friends’ roles, and demanding that Zionist affairs be discussed previously by Bodenheimer with the members; on 14 March, Jacobson wrote back expelling G [and by extension, his friends] from the committee (Z3/204). Whatever the true events were, this represented a personal defeat for Bodenheimer, whose brainchild the KdO was, and as such was symptomatic of the change of guard in the movement. Some Zionists still took part in the work of the KdO, but not as Zionists, but rather as officials of the German administration in the East, e.g. Struck, who tried to have the Soviet government guarantee the rights of the Jews (Z3/205).

At the end of June 1915 G’s call up papers arrived, ‘nachdem die Heeresleitung eingesehen hatte, dass sie ohne meine kraeftige Mitwirkung den Krieg nicht wuerde fortfuehren koennen. Ich wurde Soldat! - Armes Deutschland!’ (after the Army High Command had realised that it would not be able to continue the war without my powerful contribution. I became a soldier! - Poor Germany! N.d. a, 255). G enlisted on June 24 at the General Papestraße garrison and was sent to Rathenow where he slept in lodgings, so that Sonia and their maid Anna could join him. This lasted for fourteen days and then he was sent to do the *Einjährige-Kurs* in Brandenburg. Here he met true Prussian militarism, and from the captain...
down to the NCOs they all made the recruits' life hell; G was singled out by a lieutenant from Berlin for punishment, and although close to breaking down, managed to survive by dint of good humour and later accepted that the exercise did him some good. Since the unit was composed mainly of intellectuals and professionals, many of them Jewish, he met many people of his own class but it was only with the non-Jews that his views found echo at the start. After two months, he completed the course and was sent to Rathenow and managed to get leave for the first days and spend the New Year with Sonia and his parents in Hanover and also to organise things for the Jewish Russian POWs in Rathenow, just as his father had done in Hanover. Life in Rathenow was good: G's company commander, Captain von Mudra, was an eccentric, and the major in charge was a musical enthusiast who organised a production of *Rigoletto*, with singers from the Hamburg Opera and ballerinas from the Berlin Metropoltheater, and it was G's job to escort them.

In October G was sent to the front. The trip took almost a month, via Braunsberg (East Prussia, now Braniewo in Poland) where they stayed for one week, and Insterburg (East Prussia, now Cheryakhovsk in Russia) which had been retaken from the Russians three days before. G made friends especially with Strauß, a Bavarian Christian engineer who helped him enormously and later saved his life. In Braunsberg, a Catholic town with a tobacco factory, G met his maternal uncle Moritz Breslau, who was serving as a translator at the POW camp there, and he became acquainted with the Catholic milieu. From his uncle he got a copy of one of Mendele Moykher Sforim's books and read it to his comrades, to the interest of the Christians and the embarrassment of the Jews. G also became a friend of Captain Schwarz, his company commander; Aron Barth came to Insterburg to confer with G.
on business matters and suggested he report to the ambulatory care unit, since his health was not good. G followed his advice, which meant having to put up with the complaints of his irate commander when he almost missed the train that took them to Vilna via Eydtkunen and Kovno.

On his arrival in Vilna, G became his comrades' guide to the city's Jewish inhabitants. As many of his contemporaries noted, "Es war ueberhaupt [...] fuer die deutschen Soldaten eine unerwartete Ueberraschung und Freude, sich mit den Juden infolge ihres Dialektes ziemlich muehelos unterhalten zu koennen". (For the German soldiers it was on the whole a surprise and an unexpected pleasure to be able to converse with the Jews almost effortlessly thanks to their dialect. N.d. a, 271). The poverty was shocking, but G took his comrades to the synagogue on that first morning, a Sabbath, to listen to cantor Herschmann, to the (Jewish) Imperial Hotel, and then to a café chantant, everywhere eschewing Western imitations and demanding Jewish food and songs. He succeeded in all but one case in giving his comrades a favourable impression, becoming, to use his own words 'an impressario for Vilna Jewry' (N.d. a, 273). On this occasion he visited one of his distant relatives, who told him how the Germans had entered Vilna on Yom Kippur and who did not share the other Jews' enthusiasm for the German occupiers. After a few days they left Vilna and, his first success notwithstanding, G felt he had failed in his task of interpreting Jews and Germans to each other.

After staying up the whole night listening to gruesome stories and jokes, they arrived at the end of the line and then they marched for several days and spent the last night at the village of Antonov. The next day they stopped two km. from the front. That same night they
went up to the front-line. G was very lucky in his lieutenant, who made him unofficial librarian of the unit, in his sergeant, a Social-Democrat, and his friend Strauß, who kept him from getting killed. He earned a reputation for bravery, which he attributed to his own foolishness and this increased when he was ill but refused to go to the hospital for fear of being reassigned to a less tolerant unit. G and his comrades organised a cultural circle and read books aloud. At Christmas G and Strauß were promoted to lance corporal (Gefreite). After a relapse G was finally sent home and classified as 'dauernd Frontdienstunfähige' (permanently incapacitated for front service. N.d. a, 282).

During all this time G was able to experience how many hitherto perfectly assimilated Jews became Zionists and/or returned to their Jewishness, not on account of the antisemitism, which was not so bad, but simply due to the close contact with their Christian fellow-citizens, which allowed them for the first time to experience the enormous difference between the two groups:

Und da nun endlich man gleich und gleich verkehrte, als die Schranken weggefallen waren, als jeder sich so gab wie er war und nicht wie er scheinen wollte, begriff der Jude, dass er doch etwas ganz anderes sei als der arische Freund und Kamerad. Er stellte vielleicht nichts Besseres und nichts Schlechteres dar, aber etwas Anderes. [...] Jetzt gingen auch dem Juden die Augen, die er so lang krampfhaft geschlossen hatte, auf, und er sah mit offenen Blick, dass er ein Anderer war als die Kameraden um ihn. Er fand zu sich zurück (N.d. a, 283).

And when finally they could mix on an equal footing, when the barriers had fallen and when everybody showed themselves as they were and not as they wanted to appear, the Jew understood that he was indeed something completely different from his Aryan friend and comrade. He represented something maybe no better and no worse, but different. [...] Now the Jew’s eyes, which he had desperately kept closed for so long, opened, and he saw clearly, that he was different from the comrades around him. He found his way back to himself.
He would put this experience to use in Tohuwabohu and describe cases of the sort in Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich, but he chose not to mention his front experiences or make use of them until he wrote his memoirs in Palestine after the Second World War had already started.

He was taken on a sled from Antonov to a station and put on a train, and he started to miss his comrades. They stopped for delousing at the border in the town of Prostken, where G had met David Wolffsohn at the age of two. He was then taken to the military hospital in Strasburg, where he had been born, and which he had left at the age of two. Here he was visited by rabbis Pick and Neufeld, Dr. Salomon Hildesheimer, and Sonia. From Strasburg he was then transported to the Adass Jisroel hospital in Berlin, whose head nurse was Frau Geheimrat Barth, and where he started working from his bed, dictating to his secretary Frl. Tenz. Finally he was sent home, but had to present himself everyday at a post in Charlottenburg, where he was examined by the military phycisian Dr. Lehnsen (whose name G took for the lawyer in Tohuwabohu, and as he found out after the war from the doctor's son, the doctor had also changed his name). His status as incapacitated for front service was upheld, but he was declared fit for garrison duties (GV or Garnison-verwendungsfähig), and ordered to present himself to the reserve battalion in Fürstenwalde; but first he could take a convalescence holiday in Baden-Baden, so he and Sonia spent the 1916 Passover in the Black Forest and visited relatives and friends in Karlsruhe. In the course of this trip G had opportunity to experience the blood-thirsty atmosphere which reigned among the civilian population.
On his return to Berlin, G met Hermann Struck at the Lessingstraße synagogue. Struck had been a volunteer and told G that he was going to request that G be appointed his replacement in Kovno as Yiddish translator for the Press section of the north-east theatre of operations. Meanwhile, G was still in Fürstenwalde, where he was assigned to a company whose antisemitic captain was very kind to his Jewish soldiers for fear of committing an injustice. He also met an unnamed Jewish doctor who saved G when the captain sent all the Jewish soldiers to the front by ordering that G stay behind for “medical observation”, during which grace-period the order from Kovno arrived. At Fürstenwalde G met many writers from the SdS and Sonia could visit him, as well as Klee, who brought with him his latest protégé, Nachum Goldmann, who made a deep impression on him. On receipt of the transfer order, G was quickly equipped with modern weapons (useless in his case) and put on a train to the East.

G was stationed first in Kovno, where he took lodgings at the same inn where Struck was staying, as was Chaplain Rabbi Dr. Rosenack. After Struck had gone, they corresponded, and exchanged ideas on the kind of work they could still do (A124/25). Unlike Richard Dehmel, he liked the head of the Pressestelle, Captain Friedrich Bertkau, as well as his direct superior, Lieutenant von Wilpert, a theologian in civilian life. G states in his memoirs that he did not know Yiddish, but this has to be taken with a grain of salt, since he had travelled to Eastern Europe several times, had Yiddish speaking relatives on his mother’s side with whom he seems never to have had any trouble communicating, and could follow Yiddish plays.⁴⁴ Be that as it may, G hired a young man to do the job, according to

⁴⁴ See for example his visit as a Primaner, already mentioned, to Rabbi Elhanan Spektor in Kovno.
him due to his inadequate command of the language, but more probably because the salary meant the difference between starvation and survival for the man and his family. The other job with which G was involved was the compilation of a mammoth multilingual dictionary (German-Russian-Belorussian-Polish-Latvian-Yiddish-Lithuanian), which was meant to set down the official terminology to be used in the German-administered territories in the East, but more about this below (134). Closely related to the press office was the censorship section with which G was also concerned.

Due to their tactlessness and arrogance, the Germans had quickly alienated the goodwill of the Jewish population in Kovno and G, embarrassed for his compatriots, found it difficult to make contact with any of them at first. It was not until the careless lancing of a blister by a military doctor gave him a bad case of blood poisoning and he fell gravely ill, that he had the opportunity of meeting some of the girls' gymnasium teachers who came to take care of him in hospital. Through the teachers, Lise Wilenschuk, Sonia Warschafsky, and Fanny Ritewski, he later gained entry into Kovno Jewish society. It was whilst G was still in hospital that his first theatrical attempt had its première; this came about because several soldiers had decided to produce Gustav Räder's Robert und Bertram, a play popular at the time, whose third act was antisemitic: G then proposed to the company that he should re-write the act and they agreed. Although he was not able to attend the performance, Alfred Klee, who was then in Kovno to defend a client, managed to do so, although his reaction to

45 Incidentally, he was treated successfully by the military physician Dr. Klemperer, Victor Klemperer's brother, who will be dealt with in connexion with the impact of G's work on his own outlook as described in his recently published diaries. Victor Klemperer had also been stationed in Kovno and had been part of the Intellectuals' Club, but he was transferred just before G's arrival.
it is not known to me. G's closest friend during this period was Hermann Struck, who taught him to draw.\footnote{On Struck (1876-1944), who after the war left Germany and settled in Haifa, where he was one of the pioneers of modern art, see the exhaustive study by Jane Rusel (RUSEL 1997).} After coming out of the hospital G spent his leave with Sonia in Lübeck.

After his return, G became a good friend of the girls' gymnasium founded by Rabbi Rosenack and directed by J. Carlebach; he even taught there on a volunteer basis. He became a frequent visitor at Rav Nissan Karg's, a Habad hasid, and was a witness to the intense national life of the Jews there.\footnote{Karg (1858-1938), had been a judge at the rabbinical court of Rabbi Isaac Elhanan Spektor and after Spektor's death, of his son Zvi Hirsch. He supported, the first Zionist organisation, Hovevei Zion, and emigrated to Palestine in 1926.} This, he would claim later, was a decisive period for him

Ich lernte kennen, was Juden sind, die unbefangen und nicht nach Fremden schiehend ihr eigenes Volksleben führten, und begann damals erst recht so vieles von jüdischen Dingen zu verstehen, die ich zwar schon gelernt hatte, deren Wesen mir aber doch vielfach dunkel geblieben war. Das Herz ging mir auf. Was etwa an westlichem Hochmut in mir steckte, schwand nunmehr. (N.d. a, 303).

I met Jews that lived their own lives naturally and without constantly looking over their shoulders at foreign models, and began to understand for the first time many Jewish things that I had already learnt, but whose essence had remained obscure to me. My heart opened to them. Whatever remained in me of Western arrogance now disappeared.

G did not continue his Zionist activity among them, as he felt he had nothing to teach these Jews. In this he is typical of so many of the generation immediately after his and the phenomenon has been studied several times, with the previous and the following quotations from G having been cited frequently (see ASCHHEIM 1982). He saw how they made fun of the German Feldrabbiner. It was the unaffected quality of this life that impressed him most:
Ich sah dort zum ersten Mal die Juden wirklich ihr eigenes Leben führen, so natürlich, wie es ein Deutscher oder Franzose lebt. Sie brauchten sich nicht erst künstlich zu beweisen, dass sie Juden oder dass die Juden ein Volk sind. (N.d. a, 303).

There I saw for the first time Jews living their lives as naturally as a German or a Frenchman live theirs. They did not need to prove artificially that they were Jews or that the Jews are a people.

Here even assimilated, or rather assimilatory-minded, families were more Jewish than the most Jewish family in Germany:

Und da ging mir der grosse Unterschied zwischen dem oestlichen und westlichen Zionismus auf. Ich habe bereits gesagt, dass jeder west-europäische Jude eine schwere Operation geistiger Art durchmachen muss, wenn er der zionistischer Fahne folgen soll. [...] Der Ostjude hat es leichter, sein Weg liegt klar vor ihm [...] Es waere mir eine Anmassung erschienen, waere ich in jener juedischen Welt als eine Art Praeceptor aufgetreten. (N.d. a, 403-04)

And then the big difference between Eastern and Western Zionism became clear to me. I have already said, that all Western European Jews must undergo a severe mental operation in order to follow the Zionist banner. [...] For the East European Jew it is easier, his path lies clearly before him [...] It would have seemed presumtuous to me to present myself to that Jewish world as some sort of mentor.

This is a good formulation of the feeling that penetrated the hearts of so many of the German-Jewish intelligentsia, and which would characterise the spirit of the community in the Weimar period (see BRENNER 1996, ASCHHEIM 1982).

G restricted his Zionist activities to the circle of his compatriots, specifically to the "Intellectuals Club", which had been formed by those stationed in Kovno, and counted among its members Richard Dehmel, Frentz-Sudermann, Oskar Kühl, Arnold Zweig, Herbert Eulenberg, Smigelski, Baron von Wilpert, Rößler, Hans Goslar, Struck, Magnus Zeller, Gurlitt, and Schmidt-Rotluff. They all learnt to appreciate the local cultures, and G
quotes from a piece of work Dehmel dedicated to Struck: ‘Diese Randleiste hat ein litauischer Bauer gemalt, der weder lesen noch schreiben kann. Es ist anzunehmen, dass die deutsche Kultur dieser Barbarei ein Ende bereiten wird’ (This was painted by a Lithuanian peasant who can neither read nor write. It is to be assumed that German culture will soon put an end to this barbarity. N.d. a, 305.)

G notes how it was the Christian Germans that showed more interest in Jewish things than some of their Jewish compatriots. Also in Kovno was Professor Bergsträßer, who changed his view of the Jews from that of a religious community to that of a nation. Some of the club’s discussions centered on the topic of a “national” art; this went over G’s head and he only understood it later. The higher échelons were threatening to dissolve the club, but this was averted thanks to Doctor Klemperer’s intervention. Dehmel quarreled with Bertkau and had himself transferred, but G counted himself fortunate to have spent time with him.

It was in Kovno, surrounded by writers, that G caught the “poetic bug” as he described it, and started to write Tohuwabohu. He claims he never intended it to be anything but a serious work and that he was later surprised when it was found to be funny. In any case, in December 1916 he was already writing it and when he went on leave to Berlin, he read the first five sections of the work to friends at home and also gave parts of it to read to von Wilpert and Bistrum, both of whom liked it. (For the date, see the letter to his wife, quoted in the memoirs. N.d. a, 309). On his return from Berlin in January, he spent fourteen days in Vilna, where he met Olschwanger and Margolin, working in the Letste nayes, the

---

48 Underlined in the original.
49 I am not quite clear as to whether Bergsträßer was an Antisemite or not, but he was certainly the model for Tohuwabohu’s Sträßer. He was later a Reichstag deputy.
Yiddish newspaper, as well as those working in the Vilna Tageblatt, but the most important experience he had there was seeing the Vilna Art-Theater perform in a parody of Fuhrmann Henschel. He would later have a hand in bringing them to Berlin.

After his return to Kovno, the whole unit was transferred to Białystok, where they spent the following eight months. It was in Białystok that G wrote a version of Don Carlos in which Arnold Zweig played the part of the Queen! On Lag ba-Omer G got his NCO stripes. One of his jobs was to see to it that distinguished visitors’ schedules were so busy that they would not be able to see anything but what the Germans wanted them to see. The only exception was Judah Magnes who on his way back to Vilna had a car accident and had to spend the night in a civilian house nearby. In Białystok G saw for the first time in his life a Hebrew theatre company. Hans Goslar was the drama critic for the Białystok paper but he signed his reviews G., which led many to believe they were written by Gronemann. G actually wrote a review only once, and that for a very poorly produced play, in order to be able to sing the praises of the Vilna troupe, which had just visited Białystok just the week before, but whose performance could not be reviewed due to official disapproval. G., helped by von Wilpert and in conjunction with his friend Lazarus Barth, organised a visit to Warsaw by the troupe, which had never appeared in what was then one of the two Yiddish theatre capitals. In Warsaw, the Jewish section under Ludwig Haas was dominated by the Agudat Israel and could barely function, causing Lazarus Barth much trouble. Although G judged Haas harshly in Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich, he somewhat revised this in his memoirs. Still, there was a world of difference between Warsaw and Białystok, where the Jewish section was under the command of Hermann Struck, who had come back from the
front a Lieutenant and who managed to keep the Agudat Israel under control, maybe because of his own Orthodox background and connexions (A124/81). The Bialystok section managed to work miracles to alleviate the misery reigning in the region. There was one other source of entertainment in Bialystok, the cinema and G appreciated it, though not uncritically.

After eight months in Bialystok, in the autumn of 1917 the Press section was transferred back to Kovno, and since the dictionary was by then almost completed, G travelled to Leipzig to make arrangements for its printing and Sonia was able to join him there. Having found a publisher, Spamer, G returned to Kovno and started reading the proofs. Von Wilpert put him in charge of the front theatre company and he tried in vain to change the usual repertory (Charley's Aunt) for the better. Things now changed for the worse: the new Kovno paper editor Oswald and Bertkau's replacement were both antisemites and made life hard for everybody, starting with Catholic Smigelski, who was sent to the front. The doctor in charge, Dr. Wittkowski, whom G had already met at the Berlin Seminary, resisted their pressures to send or not to send certain people to the front. Eight days after Purim 1918 and after the peace of Brest Litovsk had been signed with the new Bolshevik government, Selig Gronemann died. On G's return to Kovno there was great jubilation at the cessation of the hostilities in the East and Passover was celebrated by 300 German Jews and as many Russian POWs. Bertkau had been transferred to Brussels and G had asked him for help, so he put in a request for G to be sent to Brussels, which came through and G was able to leave Kovno and stop in Hanover to see his mother. Two years to the day after he started in Kovno, the second day of Pentecost 1918, he arrived in Brussels.
where he was demobilised and became political officer of the civilian administration, with
the rank of Major, and a salary of 1,000 Mk. a month plus 300 Mk. for expenses.

In Brussels, G was head of the Nachdrucks-, Rechts-, und Vertragsabteilung and he
had plenty of time to make contact with several Zionists in the occupation government,
among them Hansel Traub; he also convinced Dr. Otto Ebstein, who was in charge of
censorship and whom he helped with Yiddish books, to join the movement. East European
Jews who had been expelled from Antwerp and moved to Brussels started a Zionist club,
Beth Zion, and G took part in their discussions.

Of all the people he met in Brussels, the most interesting one was the playwright Carl
Sternheim, self-exiled in Belgium since 1913 (STERNHEIM 1976, 1174), who, in G’s opinion,
was the greatest writer of satires and comedies of the age, and represented a decadent, very
Jewish type of genius.50 G also noted the man’s vanity and conceit, but still liked him, and in
the 1920’s acted on his behalf in a legal capacity. In the 1890s Sternheim had written to
Selig Gronemann in Hanover, asking him to enquire in the communities of Hameln and
Lüneburg whether he was related to Heine, to whom he felt a deep affinity; to the latter’s
surprise, Sternheim turned out to be related to him on Heine’s maternal side, the Van
Gelders. Due to a strike of Belgian judges and lawyers which took place that summer, G had
to work as a defender in the Palais de Justice, and met some interesting types from the
Brussels underworld (1924, 237-9).

50 Sternheim (1878-1942) was Jewish on his father’s side (STERNHEIM 1976, 1097).
The Germans had to evacuate Brussels in a hurry and G, following orders from his superiors, had to burn many books, including Ewers' *Alraune.*\(^5^1\) The High Holidays came and went, and on 10 November the Revolution broke out among the German troops stationed in Belgium, one day after it had started in Germany. G left Brussels on 13 November and took four days to travel by train to Düsseldorf, unmolested by the revolutionaries. The next day he travelled by train to Berlin and that night reached his home, Monbijouplatz 10.

1.5 WEIMAR REPUBLIC YEARS 1919-1933

On his return to Berlin, G attended the 15\(^{th}\) Delegate Convention, which took place between 25 and 27 December, rejoined his associates in the law firm, all of who had returned from the war more or less unscathed, and resumed his professional activity, whilst continuing to work on *Tohuwabohu*, which was published by the *Jüdischer Verlag* in 1920. The reception of *Tohuwabohu* was stormy and this made the book a minor success. Anti-Zionist Jews, specially those associated with the *Centralverein*, which represented the majority of German Jewry, attacked it sharply. This is not surprising, given the fact that the novel is an indictment of the positions represented precisely by those Jews.\(^5^2\)

---

\(^{5^1}\) Ewers would later play an infamous role in the SdS, forcing the whole board, G among them, to resign in March 1933, although he himself subsequently fell out of favour with the Nazis and his works were banned. Immediately after this happened, G left Germany (see below, 88).

\(^{5^2}\) This is not to discount the criticisms, but simply to note the fact. Typical of them is the review by Felix Goldmann, rabbi in Leipzig, and prominent in the *Centralverein* (GOLDMANN 1920). This will be dealt with more fully in the section on *Tohuwabohu.*
In 1919 the Jüdische Volkspartei was founded, as a coalition of Zionists, Ostjuden, and lower-middle class Jews, in order to participate in community politics; Alfred Klee was one of the founders, and G was sympathetic to its aims; Michael Brenner considers it crucial in understanding the redefinition of the modern Jewish community and, by extension, of Modern Judaism (BRENNER 1990, 221). On the issue of the founding of the Jüdische Volkspartei and the alleged right-wing orientation of its members, it is important to notice that Alfred Klee had come to the conviction that of all non-Jews, only the workers could be trusted to react against anti-Jewish acts (A142/87/40, cited also by Jacob Toury; TOURY 1992, 230). This led Klee to an ideological approach to the Social-Democrats which culminated in his defence of the Jewish businessmann Georg Sklarz, during which Klee was imprisoned for four days in August 1924. Although Georg Kareski can be suspected of bias, Jacob Toury considers Kareski’s later testimony during his trial in Jerusalem, that Klee ‘belonged to Social-Democracy’, reliable (TOURY 1992, 231). Whatever the truth of this assertion, it is beyond dispute that Klee was close to the Republican Reichsbanner through his son-in-law Hans Goslar, a member. In 1919 and 1920, G was very busy contributing the texts to the Galerie des Schlemiel, or as he himself called it, Galerie berühmter Zeitgenossen, (Gallery of famous contemporaries, n.d. a, 141), a section of profiles of prominent Zionists, illustrated by Menachem Birnbaum. As mentioned above, the magazine fell victim to hyperinflation (39).

The most important case that G was involved with in 1921 was the defence of Arthur Schnitzler’s play Reigen, accused of indecency under the statute on indecency and sexual

53 This in a report almost certainly by Klee, as Toury notes (TOURY 1992, 230).
offences (*Unsittlichkeit bzw. Unzucht*) of the Weimar republic’s legal code. The play, written in 1896-97, had been printed privately by Samuel Fischer in 1900 and finally published in Vienna by Benjamin Harz in 1903; but there was no question as to its being produced for the public until 1920, when the *Berliner Kleine Schauspielhaus* tried to do so, but was forbidden by the censor; nevertheless, the premiere took place on 23 December 1920, and the courts finally authorised the production on 3 January 1921 (Breuer 1982, 20-1). The actual book had been confiscated on 4 March 1920, and then again on 10 February 1921, despite the favourable judicial reaction to its theatrical production; on behalf of the SdS, G lodged a legal complaint (Schneider 1995, 155). G had visited Schnitzler in Vienna on 7 February 1921, who noted in his diary: ‘Sehr zionistisch angestellt; klug und guten Willens’ (Very Zionist in his sympathies, clever and full of good intentions. Schnitzler 1993, 139). The production ran into trouble again in the summer of 1921, when it was denounced for ‘obscene music’ (unzüchtige Musik); the play was produced privately for the court experts on 6 November 1921, the second trial running from 5 November to 18 November, and ending with both Schnitzler and the play being exonerated, but the trial gave occasion to antisemitic attacks against its author. The defence was in the hands of Wolfgang Heine. A third trial took place in Berlin in 1922, and Alfred Kerr gave the expert opinion which led to the dismissal of the charges against the accused (Breuer 1982, 221-2; Schneider 1995, 156). Throughout this period, the right-wing press made political capital out of the Jewishness of the writer, lawyers, and some of the civil servants involved (For full details, see Schneider 1995, 103-6, 153-8).
Since before the war G had been an active member of the B’nai B’rith organisation, as seen above (35, 49), and he came to be president of the Montefiore Lodge in Berlin. After he resigned the presidency, he continued to be a member of the Great Lodge of Germany. He tried to give his activities a Zionist slant, with some success, given the hostility of the movement to Zionism, shared by most of German Jewry (A135/27). He would later join the Bialik lodge in Tel Aviv, where his portrait hangs today. The portrait has been reproduced in Joachim Schlör’s edition of Tohuwabohu (2000, 356)

Meanwhile, G had participated in the 16th German Delegate Convention, which took place in Berlin in June 1920. In August of the same year, Max Kollenscher joined the law firm. Kollenscher (1875-1937) was a Posen (Poznań) lawyer and Zionist, who had already known G, Klee and Simon for a long time, and he soon became a good friend of Aron Barth who was an informal partner of the firm, as he put it in his memoirs:

Die neue Societät hat mir menschlich nur Freude gemacht. Drei meiner Sozien waren mir durch jahrzehntelange gemeinschaftliche und gleichgerichtete zionistische Wirksamkeit innig befreundet, mit dem braven, vornehmen, liebenswürdigen und tüchtigen vierten bin ich ebenfalls schnell auf freundschaftlichen Fuss gelangt. Es hat niemals zwischen uns eine Differenz gegeben (AK 619/1, 64).

The new firm afforded nothing but joy on a personal level. I was already a close friend of three of my partners due to our common and Zionist activities stretching over several decades, and I soon became firm friends with the upright, distinguished, charming and competent fourth partner. There were never any differences between us.

Kollenscher was a member of the Jüdische Volkspartei. Unfortunately, professional problems to do with first-instance lawyers, led to Kollenscher withdrawing from the

54 It was painted by Käthe Ephraim-Markus.
partnership on January 1st 1922, but the five remained tied by a close friendship (AK 619/1, 65). In June 1921 he sent to London a report on the activities of the Ehrengericht (Court of Honour) from 1914, emphasising the difficult conditions that obtained during the work, due to the mobilisation of all of its members, which led to a drastic drop in the number of cases dealt with, from 5 in 1914 to 1 in 1915 to none in the following three years (Z4/5564). Apparently this had provoked an attack on the tribunal, and led to G’s vigorous defense. G insisted that local Zionist groups set up their own tribunals, to which the Ehrengericht would serve as a court of appeal. The situation was clarified, and he attended the Twelfth Zionist Congress in Carlsbad (Karlový Vary) in the first half of September, as President of the Ehrengericht (Court of Honour), a status which had been in doubt following the previous annual conference in London, where the attacks had taken place.

From June 1922 Klee, acting for both the Zionists and the Jüdische Volkspartei, was involved in the creation of the Preußischer Landesverband jüdischer Gemeinden (PLV) (BIRNBAUM 1981, 59-96). As already mentioned, one of the persons associated with the party was Georg Kareski who also became involved with the PLV. G devoted 1922 and 1923 to writing Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich, which was published in 1924, and was better received than Tohuwabohu, although it did not sell as well. He also attended the 18th and 19th Delegate Conventions which took place in Kassel and Dresden, on September 1922 and June 1923 respectively. He was elected President of the Kongreßgericht, the Congress Court, a post which he would keep until his retirement in 1946. G then attended the

55 On Kareski’s later career as a tool of the Nazis in Germany from 1933 to 1937, see Herbert Levine’s article (LEVIN 1975).
56 With an interruption from September 1933 when Rufeisen took over, see below (90).
Thirteenth Zionist Congress in Carlsbad in August 1923. His work on both tribunals involved constant correspondence with Leo Lauterbach, the secretary of the World Zionist Organization in London, and from their periodic meetings at the sessions of the Actionscomité and the Zionist Congress a close friendship was born. They attempted to reform various aspects of the organisation in order to increase its efficiency and stop some of the abuses that took place, specially at local level. They first undertook to reform the Ehrengericht (Court of Honour) statutes, widening its powers, and were involved in this from April 1925 until October 1926 (L14/121, 137/2). The second task they were involved in was the revision of the statutes of the organisation, aimed at clarifying the position and powers of the local branches, as well as their relationship with the central offices and the individual shekel payers, and this was achieved partially between March and August 1926 (see L14/121).

After Graf Ernst zu Reventlow had published a statement attributing to the Zionist essayist and ideologist Ahad Ha-Am the authorship of the Protocols of the Sages of Zion, Ahad Ha-Am authorised the WZO to sue von Reventlow. The WZO designated G to represent Ahad Ha-Am, and the case was brought to a conclusion when the court found against von Reventlow and ordered him to pay damages albeit nominal to Ahad Ha-Am (SIMON 1960, 93). The count, a navy officer and an antisemite, became after 1924 a member of the Reichstag, and was one of the brothers of the Munich Bohemian writer Franziska Gräfin zu Reventlow (REVENTLOW 1975, 583). G admired the writer’s work, as he stated in his memoirs, and he thought he had met her at the Nibelungs’ Ball of the Munich writers in
In November 1923 Carl Sternheim had sued his publisher Kurt Wolff and G in his capacity as Syndikus of the SdS intervened in the matter representing the author, claiming that he had not been treated fairly in the matter of the publication of his comedy *Die Cassette* (Sternheim 1966, 302). In June 1924 G was one of the founder members of the Soncino Gesellschaft, a society dedicated to the publication of Jewish texts. The society managed to publish several valuable and rare volumes before 1933 (Berliner Tageblatt 1924; Homeyer 1966, 67-9). On the last week of December 1924 G attended the 20th Delegate Convention in Wiesbaden, in which Kurt Blumenfeld was elected President of the Zionistische Vereinigung für Deutschland. This was followed by Chaim Weizmann’s visit to Berlin during the second week of January, which constituted a major landmark for Zionism in Germany.

The first two months of 1925 were dominated by the elections for the Verbandstag (Assembly) of the Preußischer Landesverband jüdischer Gemeinden. It was considered the first Jewish parliament in a Diaspora country, and the Jüdische Volkspartei won a quarter of the seats. One of the ten delegates for Berlin was Alfred Klee, and G was his stand-in (Birnbaum 1981, 93-96). Klee was elected Vice-President of the Verbandstag of the PLV in June (Birnbaum 1981, 102). G then attended the 14th Zionist Congress, which took place in Vienna in the second half of August 1925. He stayed in Vienna from June until the end of August (A142/59/3b). In June 1926 G and his associates, Drs. Klee, Simon, and Lelewel,

---

57 In fact he had membership number 10 (Homeyer 1966, 130)
moved their office to Tauentzienstraße 13, W50, around the corner from the Kaiser Wilhelm Gedächtniskirche (A135/68). July 1926 he spent in London, working closely with Lauterbach on the above mentioned statute revision (83, L14/121, A142/59/3a). In August 1926 G was back in Germany for the 21st German Delegate Convention which took place in Erfurt from the 22nd to the 24th.

In March 1928 the practice ran into financial problems (A142/59/3b). G was then busy writing Schalet and involved in the Pick case, for which the firm earned 12,000 Marks, a comparatively small sum then. From 30 August to 11 September 1927 he took part in the Fifteenth Zionist Congress in Basle. He also participated in the 22nd German Delegate Convention in Breslau 27-29 May 1928. That autumn he wrote the unpublished short story ‘Träume’ (A135/52).

In February 1929 G managed to reach a private agreement with Carl Sternheim’s ex-wife Thea née Bauer on the matter of the division of their property; Sternheim had become seriously ill both mentally and physically and had been confined to a sanatorium since December (Sternheim 1976, 1260). By the spring 1929 the economic situation had not improved and G sold one of his short stories, ‘Um ein Haar’, to the evening paper Acht-Uhr Abendblatt (A135/53). At the same time he travelled with Sonia to Palestine during March and April on official Zionist business, and also on their first visit; they arrived in Port Said and from there travelled to Jerusalem and visited the Dead Sea, Jericho, Hebron, the settlements and Tel Aviv. They also visited Damascus and Baalbek before boarding the Adria in Haifa to return to Europe with a stop at Ithaca (A135/63). Between 28 July and 10 August he took part in the Sixteenth Zionist Congress in Zurich. In December he was in Jena
for the 23rd German Delegate Convention. Despite the gravity of the crisis and his Zionist activities, G continued to be involved with the community’s cultural activities; in November he became one of the founders of the Jüdischer Museumsverein, together with Arnold Zweig, Max Liebermann, and others, mainly through the initiative of Karl Schwarz (SIMON 1997, passim)

1930 was a very bad year financially and G was away in June. He and Lauterbach tried to use the powers of the courts to attenuate the party struggle that was weakening the Zionist movement precisely at this time when antisemitism was on the increase (L14/122/1). By now the functions of the Kongreßgericht (Congress Court) and the Ehrengericht (WZO Court of Honour) had become codified, with the former having a president and eight members and the latter having a president and six members, all elected by the WZO Congress, according to the Statut der Zionistischen Organisation of 1930 (A135/1). The Congress Court’s main role was to deal with election procedures and good conduct of the same (A135/1). In November the campaign for the elections of the Verbandstag of the PLV took up all of Klee’s time and energy and the results were not very encouraging in view of the seriousness of the situation – the JVP took a quarter of the seats again; one of them was held by G’s sister, Elfride Bergel-Gronemann, whilst Klee remained one of the Vice-Presidents (BIRNBAUM 1981, 212-216). A welcome distraction from the bleak situation was the establishment in Berlin of the Jüdisches Kabarett Kaftan by the Russian Maxim Sakaschansky and Prague actress Ruth Klinger, who had made her début the year before in Georg Hermann’s dramatisation of Jettchen Gebert. G visited the cabaret several times until its demise in 1933 (KLINGER 1992, 79-82, 96-8). The Kaftan performed in Yiddish and was
very successful, a measure of the change in the attitude of German Jews towards Ostjuden and their culture documented by Michael Brenner (BRENNER 1996).

By 1931 things had become so difficult that the firm was in serious financial difficulties and on the verge of collapse. In April Klee was in Locarno and G disclosed to Klee his plan to save the firm. G would work only part-time and only on his favourite type of cases, e.g. divorce; for the rest they would hire a Referendar or an Assessor whom G would pay out of his own pocket, later taking the money from the firm’s income. With the free time now at his disposal he would write the novel he had planned and for which Kiepenheuer had shown some interest. The book would earn them about 30,000 Marks by the end of 1932 if all went well (A142/59/3b). As a reason for this, G adduces the need he feels to give expression to the ideas still lying fallow in his mind whilst he has it in him to do so; in his own words:


The tact with which G makes it into a matter of personal need, whatever his actual situation may have been, thus sparing his partner and friend the feeling of indebtedness, points to the strength of their friendship. From 30 June to 15 July G was in Basle for the Seventeenth Zionist Congress. In July the Darmstädter und Nationalbank defaulted, leading to M. Kollenschler’s financial ruin (AK619/1). Ironically, the Nazis made use of the alleged Jewish
involvement in the unsavoury scandal for political propaganda. Klee was extremely busy in the *Jüdische Volkspartei*, and was active in this party’s activities in the Berlin Jewish community and in the *Preußische Landesverband jüdischer Gemeinden* (LOEWENSTEIN 1966, 398-402). Consequently, G had to deal with most of the firm’s affairs. This year saw the publication of the French translation of *Tohuwabohu*, done by Lucienne Astruc, who would later assist G in Paris (1931).

In January 1932 G was ill and Motzkin wrote him a letter to inquire about his state of health (L9/207). By September he was in Frankfurt am Main for the 24th German Delegate Convention. Although the financial situation of the firm was still shaky, things seemed to be improving slightly.

### 1.6 EMIGRATION AND WAR 1933-1945

On 5 January 1933 G signed the verdict of the *Ehrengericht* (WZO Court of Honour) against the Revisionists (Z4/5174, 5216). From February 12 to 15 he took part in a Berlin session of the *Ständige Kommission für Organisation und Propaganda* (A135/11,12). During the rest of January and February he was busy with the first steps of the *Aliyah* affair (A135/30). Starting in February and for the next six years G would be involved in a lengthy investigation of the *Aliyah* abuses together with Werner Senator, member of the Executive of the Jewish Agency; the abuses involved the widespread issue of false certificates for immigration to Palestine (*aliyah*) in Poland, specifically in Warsaw and Lwów (A135/30/1-4). On 6 March G was still in Berlin (Letter from M. Berchin, a collaborator of Jabotinsky). On 10 March, Hans Heinz Ewers and a group of writers interrupted a *Vorstandssitzung* of
the SdS, of which G was a member, and forced the members of the board to resign (FISCHER 1980, 616; BARBIA 1995, 92-3). By the end of the month he had left Germany, and in a curriculum vitae he wrote for the Keren Hayesod in Prague he says he arrived in Paris on 1 April. He explains there that, as a front-line veteran, he could have continued to practice law as well as discharge his duties as a notary (A135/27). The first thing G did in Paris was to resign the presidency of the Kongreßgericht (Congress Court). Leo Lauterbach wrote to him on 16 April refusing to accept his resignation and addressed his letter to the Hôtel Lafayette, 6, Rue Buffault. In practice, though, the difficulties involved made it imperative for somebody else to take care of the Kongreßgericht business for the time being and from September Joseph Rufeisen, a Czech Zionist, took over (A135/7).\footnote{Rufeisen (1887-1949), born in Ostrava, was a Weizmann supporter.} At the end of April G wrote to his friend Harry Friedenwald in Baltimore and described the terror in Germany, calling the regime the New Middle Ages. He also asked his friend to be cautious in the use he made of G's information since he still had family and property in Germany (A182/38). He then devoted himself to Zionist business; this was in disarray as the Nazis had stolen most of the files belonging to the Ehrengericht (WZO Court of Honour) of which he was still the president, and this resulted in long delays, as G explained in a letter to Leon Motzkin dated 14 June (A135/1). He also tried to help friends from Germany who were penniless in Paris, and thanked Harry Friedenwald for money the latter had sent to members of the B'nai B'rith lodge (A182/38). The day before G had moved to 26 Rue de Constantinople which would remain his Paris residence until 1935. By this time then Sonia must have managed to leave Germany. From 21 August to 4 September he took part in the Eighteenth Zionist Congress in Prague, chairing the tumultuous sessions of the Court of Honour from the 23rd to the 29th in
which so little could be resolved that the Executive decided that *Ehrengericht* matters should be dealt with after the Congress had concluded its sessions, as Lauterbach formally informs G in a letter dated 12 December (A135/1).

This year brought tremendous changes to G's life, just as it did to the lives of countless other German Jews. The Dutch translation of *Tohuwabohu* was published (1933). In Germany, the situation had deteriorated, but Klee refused to leave, and even took over Max Kollenscher's duties in the Berlin community when the latter emigrated to Palestine in June 1936 (Birnbaum 1981, 229); this in addition to his already onerous duties at the PLV, the JVP, and the ZVfD.

G became involved in the life of the rapidly increasing population of German refugees in Paris. In March 1934 he was head of the German Committee (*Comité Allemand*) set up in Paris by the *Keren Hayesod* (A135/27). The committee tried to assist German refugees in solving their legal and financial problems. In their report to the Joint Distribution Committee in New York, as cited by Vicki Caron, the German Committee stressed the desperate situation of the refugees and the despair that drove so many of them to suicide and made a poignant call for assistance (Caron 1999, 113-4). By March he had also resigned from the presidency of the *Ehrengericht*, and Rufeisen had taken over for a short while. He did, however, resume the presidency of the *Kongreßgericht* (Congress Court) (A135/7, 41/2). G helped a group of young German Zionist refugees in Paris, led by David Kahan, P. Getz, and Marianne Hohenberg to organise the group *Ost und West*, in whose activities he also participated (A135/25). After the loss of his legal fees from Germany, G supported himself and Sonia thanks to a monthly salary (300 Francs) paid to him by the WZO, as he
writes in a letter to the Organisation’s treasurer Avadio: ‘Von der deutschen Währung wie von so manchen anderen deutschen Dingen habe ich mich endgültig freigemacht’ (I have finally freed myself of German currency, as of so many German things. A135/2). They seem to have been spared the worst sufferings of so many other refugees, and in September they were in Nice, where they stayed at the Hôtel de Calais (A142/59/3b, A182/38).

In March 1935 G and Sonia travelled to Palestine where G, again performing his duties as President of the Congress Court, took part in the sessions of the Actionscomité in Jerusalem 28 March – 7 April, staying in Tel Aviv the rest of the month (A135/8, /17, A142/59/3a). The most important case to come up before the Kongreßgericht was that of Zekharyah Gluska and the Yemenite settlers (A135/2).^59

This year he also declined to preside over the Ehrengericht, as he stated in a letter to Franz Kahn, at the Zionist Kongreßbüro in Lucerne (A135/17). Whilst they were in Tel Aviv, G’s partner Fritz Simon died, almost certainly by his own hand, like so many German Jews during these years (A142/59/3a). After their return to Paris they moved to 5, Rue des Sablons. During these years his private secretary was Yvonne Guttmann and he would continue to employ her after his departure for Palestine when in Europe on Zionist business. In August 1935 G was in Lucerne helping to arrange for the transfer of Herzl’s remains to Palestine, on which matter he wrote a long memorandum and which he successfully accomplished; from the 15th he dealt with the case of Bulgaria and monitored the delegate elections. He then took part in the Actionscomité’s meetings during the Nineteenth Zionist

---

59 Z. Gluska (1895-1960) was the leader of the Yemenites in Palestine, chairman of the Hitahdut hateimanim (Yemenite Union) and their representative to the WZO congress.
Congress, 20 August – 4 September (N.d. x, A135/2, /17, /35). By 10 September he was back in Paris, from where he writes a letter of encouragement to Lauterbach. Lauterbach’s work for the WZO was not appreciated and, since there was little hope of this happening, G consoled him with the thought that to be thanked for performing a meritorious action robs it and its doer of any merit, as it might be thought he is doing it for the recognition he receives, but it is better to quote G’s words:

Ich persönlich kenne eigentlich nichts Besseres als mir gegenüber bewiesene Undankbarkeit. Für nichts bin ich so dankbar wie für Undankbarkeit, denn wo bliebe das Verdienst an irgendein Gutem, das man der Sache wegen tut, wenn man dafür noch belohnt wird und sei es auch nur durch Anerkennung. Jemand, der mir für etwas dankt, beleidigt mich doch eigentlich. (A135/2)

In October G and Sonia were in Nice, and from there they travelled to Prague for a lecture tour of Czechoslovakia and Austria on behalf of the Keren Hayesod, at the request of Arthur Hantke (A135/27). They did not intend to return to Paris and reside there, but to emigrate to Palestine permanently, as can be seen from the good wishes they received from many friends (A135/35). Whilst in Paris, G had continued his activities on behalf of the many German writers exiled in France and several of them made an album for him wishing him a good trip to Palestine at the end of October. Among those who signed was Joseph Roth (A135/62). In Prague G was elected again President of the Kongreßgericht, and spoke at the B’nai B’rith lodge on ‘Shylock and Antonio’ (A135/2, /27). They then visited their friend Fritz Eckstein, also a member of the Congress Court, in Teschen (Tešín). At the end of November G spoke in Olmütz (Olomouc) and Pressburg (Bratislava) in Slovakia on his way to Vienna, where he arrived on 26 November. G spoke in Vienna on the construction of Palestine and toured several Austrian cities – Linz, Salzburg, and Innsbruck. He was forced to prolong his stay
after his passport was stolen (Neues Wiener Abendblatt 1935, A135/27). A Vienna Jewish newspaper informed that G had used Schnitzler’s character in Freiwild, the cashier Cohn, as a symbol of the Jew in the Diaspora (Stimme 1935, 5). In a letter to Hantke written from Vienna on December 12, G informed him of the situation in Prague (very good) and Vienna (depressing) (A135/27).

The German authorities dragged their feet and G did not get his passport until January 1936. In February they visited Budapest where G spoke. They sailed for Palestine in February and arrived there on the 19th, intending at last to settle there. They stayed with one of Sonia’s brothers in Tel Aviv. Tragically, Sonia died as the result of a traffic accident on 25 March (A135/27; Tidhar 1952, 1383). G left for Europe on 1 May (A135/24). In May and June G did another lecture tour this time for the Keren Kayemet Lisrael (Jewish National Fund). He visited Poland and Romania, his itinerary included Lwow, Przemysl, Drohobycz, Tarnopol, Borislaw, Czernowitz (Cernăuți), Bucharest, Alba Iulia, Mediaș, Arad and Temesvár (Timișoara) (A135/24). He then stopped to speak in Budapest on his way to board a ship to Palestine at Trieste (KKL5/7583). The tour was a success; in Lwow, for example, he collected more than 300,000 zlotys, and in Czernowitz 200,000 lei; but in Transylvania he had trouble since the KH was running a fund-raising drive at the same time, as he wrote from Temesvár on 6 June (A135/24, KKL5/7583). In Czernowitz G gave a press conference on the recent troubles between Arabs and Jews and lectured to a large audience, as well as to the B’nai B’rith lodge on Shylock und Antonio. The Czernowitz and the Czernowitz-Bucharest newspapers wrote that Gronemann was at pains to distinguish the Arab uprising from pogroms (A135/24, Allgemeine Zeitung 1936, Czernowitz...
MORGENBLATT 1936). Theodore Weisselberger writing in the Ostjüdische Zeitung praised G’s impartiality and was the first to call G the Western (Jewish) Sholem Aleichem ([G] gehört zu den wenigen Persönlichkeiten in unserer Bewegung, die keine Gegner haben [...] Vielleicht wird einmal ein Literaturhistoriker Sammy Gronemann als den westjüdischen Schalom Alejchem nennen. WEISSELBERGER 1936, 1). G boarded the ship in Trieste on June 24 and was back in Tel Aviv by the beginning of July, where he set about trying to establish himself professionally, setting up a legal partnership, Arba Arbitrators (‘arba means four in Hebrew), with Hermann Lelewski, Moritz and Tuchler, as written by Elchanan Scheftelowitz to Joachim Schlör and cited by the latter in his afterword to Schalet (KKL5/7583, SCHLÖR 1997, 244); they collaborated in cases with Aron Barth in Haifa and I. Waldmann in Jerusalem and had their office at Rehov Nahalat Binyamin (A135/29, A182/38). G spent the summer in Tel Aviv, but in August sailed for Europe, where he attended the Actionscomité session in Zurich (A135/17). By November he was back in Tel Aviv (A135/34).

In Tel Aviv G finally settled down at Rehov Hamagid 10, where he was to be found in January 1937 ill with shingles and from there he wrote to Lauterbach in February to complain about not getting paid. He had continued to help his compatriots who had succeeded in migrating to Palestine to adapt to the new society of the yishuv. An important part of this adaptation was to convince the newcomers, most of whom were not Zionists, to contribute to the funds that financed the social services of the community, not just in order to guarantee the community’s solvency, but also to give them a feeling of belonging. In March he served as judge in a public tribunal organised by the Hitachdut Olej Germania, with the purpose of encouraging people to fulfill their civic duties (Mitteilungsblatt, as cited by
GELBER 1990, 302). At the end of April G together with his sister Elfride and Lauterbach sailed for Trieste, and G arrived in Basle on 4 May. Thence he travelled to Paris, where he arrived on the 11th and started working for the Keren Kayemet Lisrael, he did a lecture tour covering Strasbourg, Metz, Mulhouse and Colmar (KKL5/7583, A135/18, /25). There were problems in Alsace and the rest of France because of the rivalry between the KKL and the KH, as G informed the head office of the KKL in Tel Aviv (KKL5/7583). He left as his legal representative in Tel Aviv Dr. Max Strauss (A135/30/3). Although he had planned to return to Palestine after the tour, he remained in Paris where, with Yvonne Marcus-Guttmann again as his secretary, he worked on the Grand Duke Sergius case, involving the fate of land the Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich Romanov had purchased in Jerusalem for the Palestine [Christian] Orthodox Society (KKL5/7583, A135/25). G had inquired from the KKL director in Paris about the members of the German Zionist group Ost und West and on May 25 he gave a talk to the group on 'Der Jude auf der Weltbühne' (A135/25). He tried, in vain to get Yvonne Marcus-Gutmann a job in Zurich; he also met several assimilated French Jews at the home of his French translator and friend Lucienne Astruc in Paris (A135/25). At the end of July he travelled to Zurich where he presided over the sessions of the Congress Court on July 27, 29 and 30 and August 1 and 2. G then attended the Twentieth Zionist Congress (A135/18, /41/1). He could not preside over the Court of Honour sessions, although he took part in them (A135/41/1). His secretary then was Judith (Teicher-)Drimmer of Vienna. In September he was back in Tel Aviv and by the end of the year he was deeply involved in the Aliyah abuses case, which had come to a head thanks to the thorough and lengthy investigations undertaken by Werner Senator; unfortunately, the abuses could not be corrected due to the opposition within the Jewish Agency to anything resembling a civil
service which could not be controlled by the parties (A135/30/3). In December he sent some of his letters to Abraham Schwadron for his collection, including letters from Leopold Zunz, Heinrich Grätz, Carl Sternheim, Max Nordau, and Roda Roda; the letters are to be found in the Jewish National Library in Jerusalem (A135/30/3, A135/35).

From January 1938 G and Alex Bein became involved in a project to film the life of Herzl, and they tried to interest Paul Muni, the then well-known actor, to take the role of Herzl\textsuperscript{60}. It all came to nothing in July, when Muni wrote to G to say the time was not yet ripe for the film (A135/35). In February he was so busy that he had to drop all of his Ehrengericht work and concentrate on the Kongreßgericht business, as he wrote to Arthur Hantke (A135/3). That summer the Eckstein affair broke out and G was ill several weeks (A135/9, /34). The Czechoslovak Zionist Federation informed G that there had been accusations against Eckstein and asked G to make him resign from the Kongreßgericht (Congress Court), but G, who was a friend of Eckstein wrote to Aron Barth on 8 July saying he was not prepared to do it and would rather have Eckstein not sit in those cases still left for the court to deal with, and this is what he wrote to the federation on 14 July, Eckstein was also expelled from the B’nai B’rith lodge. The Zionists from Morava wrote to G on 27 July agreeing with his proposals and this seems to have been the end of the matter, which was ended in any case by the German takeover of Czechoslovakia (A135/3, /9).

In the autumn G wrote to Lauterbach that he was sick of politics and asked if he could do a propaganda tour of Romania (A135/3). G’s sister, Elfride, had come to Palestine

\textsuperscript{60} Bein (1903-1988), the German-born director of the Central Zionist Archives, was the biographer and editor of Herzl’s works in Hebrew.
in 1936 and was made a permanent resident in 1937 but her children Margarete and Bernd had stayed in Europe. After the death of her husband Dr. Salo Bergel in August 1937 the time had finally come for the rest of the family to join her and they finally arrived in January (STERN 1970, 84-85). They settled down in Kiryat Bialik (A135/7).

In January 1939 G was appointed one of the two representatives of the Herzl Archives in Palestine by Reichenfeld who was in charge of the archives in Vienna (A135/35). From April to July 1939, G together with Lauterbach and Aaron Barth dealt with *Keren Kayemet Lisrael* and *Keren Hayesod* matters, including the right of KH contributors to be elected to the Congress, as well as the participation of both the KKL and the KH in those elections, G and Barth prevailed over Lauterbach in both issues (A135/29). He was also part of a commission that revised the statutes of the WZO (A135/20). Fritz Eckstein had by then arrived in Palestine from Czechoslovakia and was working at the Central Zionist Archives in Jerusalem. He asked G to get his wife a job but G was unable to help. All through the month of June G tried without any success to find jobs for Eckstein and for Hans Marcus who was married to his secretary Yvonne Guttmann (A135/20, /21). G was very busy with *shekel* and organisational matters, to which he would devote a large part of his attention until 1945 (A135/16). In July G was planning a propaganda tour to the Netherlands, Yugoslavia and Romania after the congress but, of course, the war forced him to cancel them all. He then tried to get the WZO to pay for Eckstein’s trip to the congress and he succeeded at the cost of some personal abuse (A135/20). In preparation for the Congress, G and the Congress Court dealt with the elections in the second week of August (A135/5). G attended the Twenty-first Zionist Congress in Geneva 16-26 August but
afterwards he barely managed to return to Palestine. This year also saw the arrival from Greece of Stella Kadmon, who in 1931 had founded the Lieber Augustin cabaret in Vienna and successfully directed it for seven years; she had escaped to Yugoslavia in July 1938 whence she managed to reach Greece (Rösl 1991, 158; Stomp 1994, 394). The cabaret, originally far from political satire, had turned to contemporary problems after 1934. Kadmon, after her arrival, managed to start a cabaret in Tel Aviv, the Papillon (Rösl 1991, 159-61; Stomp 1994, 745)

In January 1940 G was appointed head of the KIV of the Ehrengericht (Court of Honour) (A135/38). In February he was collaborating with Martin Rost and Stella Kadmon in their production of Es war einmal, and he wrote to Max Jungmann, the former editor of the Schlemiel, asking him for material, and describing himself as ‘eine Art Hausfreund’ (a sort of friend of the house. A94/21-27). The Papillon did three productions in the war years: Es war einmal, Franz Werfel’s Jacobowski und der Oberst, and Brecht’s Furcht und Elend des Dritten Reiches (Stomp 1994, 745). For reasons which are understandable, the feeling in Palestine against the German language grew during the war, which added to the previous intolerance to the use of any language other than Hebrew in public life, meant that it was very difficult to publish or produce any plays in the language. Still, in 1941 the literary anthology Menora was published, which included an article by G; his sister Elfride also managed to have a book of short stories published by Peter Freund (See 1941. Ben-Chorin and Stern 1941. Berge-Gronemann 1943). G participated actively in the Hebrew-speaking society of Tel Aviv, presiding for years over the unofficial club of those born on the day of the festival of Purim, which for years met in the café ‘Atarah to hold a joke
Many of G’s jokes and witticisms can be found in the two collections edited by Dov Sadan (SADAN 1950b, 308-10; 1953, 189-90, 440.). In December G finished working on the Fischer and Unna case and from then until June 1941 he and Lauterbach were busy with Keren Kayemet Lisrael (A135/38, 26). G found the atmosphere stifling and he had biting words to say on the prudery prevalent in the yishuv, as he wrote to Max Jungmann about a novella the latter had sent him, praising it but adding that it might run into trouble for its frivolity since ‘es herrscht ja bei uns, wenn nicht in taten, so doch in Worten, eine ziemliche Pruderie’ (among us reigns such prudishness, in words if not in actions. A94/21-27). Another place where G could find a refuge from the boycott of German language activities was the literary salon initiated by Ernst and Nadja Taussig in Tel Aviv in 1941 (SCHWARZ-GARDOS 1992, 3). After 1940, due to the difficulties in communicating with the various Zionist branches, practically all Kongreßgericht activities ceased (A135/3).

During the war years G was constantly involved in trying to help friends trapped in Europe. These included his partner and friend Alfred Klee together with his wife, his daughters and their husbands, the writer Georg Hermann, Mrs. Margit Rodosi in Slovakia and many others. He was constantly submitting applications for visas, sending food parcels to occupied Europe and in January 1944 actually succeeded in getting a certificate for Georg Hermann and his family. Unfortunately, Hermann had been deported from the Netherlands to Auschwitz on 16 November 1943 (A135/31, HORCH 1987, 73). He also managed to get certificates for Arnold and Gertrud van Deuren, for Josef and Leah Schwartz and their four sons, for Julius and Irene Möller and their two sons, as well as for Josef Terkech (A135/31).

61 Taussig, who arrived in Palestine from Prague, was Max Brod’s brother-in-law.
G was ill in 1942 and went for a rest cure to the Ahuza sanatorium in Haifa in November (A135/36). Nevertheless, he had already started writing his memoirs, since he read from them at the Taussigs' literary salon twice in 1942 (SCHWARZ-GARDOS 1992, 3). The war put a stop to the growth of the arbitrators firm, and G ran into financial difficulties, as he wrote in English to Harry Friedenwald in 1944: 'I have various literary plans, but I fell [sic] somewhat handicapped by the trouble to make both ends meet' (A182/38). He continued to take part in the Taussigs' salon and in 1943 he was presiding judge at the mock-trial of the Central European aliyah for its attitude towards the language question (SCHWARZ-GARDOS 1992, 3). In October 1943 he tried a case that came up before the Kongreßgericht involving the Female section of the Mizrahi (Orthodox Zionists) and the General Zionists (A135/36). In February 1944 he was busy advising Georg Herlitz on the publication of Herzl's letters (A135/35). In 1944 he finished writing his memoirs which remain unpublished in the original, but the first half was translated into Hebrew by Dov Stock (Sadan) and published in 1947 under the title Zikhronot shel yeke (Memoirs of a Yeke. A182/38). By the last years of the war, theatre productions in German had to be performed in private and the Kreis der Kunstfreunde organised among others the production of Arnold Zweig's Bonaparte in Jaffa, which took place in Stella Kadmon's house in Tel Aviv (WENZEL 1978, 321). In January 1945, with the end of the war in sight, the Zionist movement began to prepare for the hard labour lying ahead and in that month G was chosen by the Va'ad le'umi (National Council) to be president of the supervisory committee for the Jerusalem Jewish municipal elections (A135/32). On G's seventieth birthday he received a letter from Ben-Gurion and planted five

62 (1885-1968) German-born founder and until 1935 director of the Central Zionist Archives.
63 Yeke is the Modern Hebrew word for a German Jew, and it is not complimentary.
trees in a *Keren Kayemet Lisrael* orchard (A135/58, /70). To Max Jungmann, who had been born on the same month, he expressed in his congratulatory letter his feelings on aging and the nearness of death, referring to a birthday as a crime one “commits”, since life is a crime and the penalty imposed by nature for it is death. He does add, that we all hope for a lengthy postponement ([Sie werden das] Verbrechen des 70. Geburtstages “begehen”. Der Ausdruck ist korrekt, denn das Leben ist bekanntlich ein Verbrechen, auf das die Natur die Todestrafe gesetzt hat. Wir hoffen aber auf geräumigen Strafaufschub. A94/21-27). In May Erwin Piscator directed a Pargod company production of *Shlomo hamelekh vesalmai hasandlar* (‘The King and the Cobbler’) in New York (A135/57). In June G went two weeks for a rest to Zikhron Ya’akov, where he was treated by his personal friend and physician, Dr. A. Fränkel (A135/16, 68).

**1.7 LAST YEARS 1945-1952**

The end of the war revealed the magnitude of the catastrophe wrought upon European Jewry. G tried to find out what had happened to those he had lost contact with (A135/310). As G wrote to his friend Harry Friedenwald in Baltimore, as he reminisced on a stay in Switzerland before the war, when they had scared their wives with the gruesome titles of their favourite crime novels: ‘Inzwischen sind nun freilich alle Schrecken dieser “thrillers” durch die Wirklichkeit überwunden’ (A182/38). The Twenty-second Zionist Congress in Basle, 2-24 December, was the last one in which G took an active part. He rendered an account of his activities as President of the *Kongreßgericht* (Congress Court) and retired from the position amidst general acclaim (A135/22). Two speakers bade G goodbye; David
Remez said that to be a Zionist you needed two things – the first one was to pay the shekel, and the second one was to know G. Leib Garfunkel praised G as a judicial pioneer who for 25 years had guided the congress legally (A135/22). He was succeeded by his friend and Arba partner Aron Barth. In April 1947, G sent Barth all the protocols of cases pending (A135/4). The rest of the year, he was still being consulted by Barth on Congress Court matters and he was actively concerned in the reform of the World Zionist Organization, which had interested him and Lauterbach for a long time; he also continued to oversee the delegates’ elections to the Congress (A135/4, /37, /15). In March 1947, he had sent a birthday poem to Josef Rufeisen on his sixtieth birthday

Was, die Zeitung, die erfrecht sich
Und behauptet, Du bist sechzig?
Lange Jugend, da die raecht sich,
Spuert man noch die Lenzgefuelle,
Zieht sich nicht zurueck vom Spiele,
Freilich ist man erstmal siebzig,
Ganz allmaelich denn es gibt sich.
Und man liest mit gutem Mute
Ciceros “De Senectute”
Wahre Du Dir noch die Jugend,
Huet’ Dich vor zu frueher Tugend!
Die noch stets von selber fand sich –
Weiter drum bis hundertzwanzig!

This year, Ruth Klinger the founder with Maxim Sakaschansky of the Jüdisches Kabarett Kaftan in Berlin, who had managed to get to Palestine from Europe, and who was by now back in Prague working for the World Zionist Congress, wrote to Margot Klausner, owner of the Theatre and Publishing company Moadim, asking her to request G to make changes in Jakob und Christian to make the German characters in the play more unsympathisch; the play was produced in Prague by Ota Ornest and the request was prompted by the producer
(Klinger 1992, 269). At this time many of G’s non-Zionist friends whose work had been in the German language returned to Europe: Stella Kadmon to Vienna in 1947, where she established the Theater der Courage and Arnold Zweig to the Soviet-controlled sector of Berlin via Prague in July 1948, where he would become one of the main writers of the GDR (Stompor 1994, 745. Wenzel 1978, 336) In April 1948 G was still attending sessions of the Zionist General Council (A135/23). After the War of Independence, G produced a plan which he sent to the Foreign Minister Moshe Shertok, which aimed to regularise the political situation, the plan involved a partition of Palestine according to the UN limits, and for other regions with a substantial Jewish population – West Galilee and the Negev – to be administered by a trust; nothing came of it (A135/37).

G spent his seventy-fifth birthday in Switzerland, receiving congratulatory messages from all over the world; these included a letter from David Ben Gurion (A135/61, /70). Several articles in the Israeli press praised his activities and personality (Nehoshtan 1950, Neuman 1950, Chusch 1950, Karo’ 1950, Hador 1950, Mitteilungsblatt 1950, Yedio’t Hayom 1950). In August 1951 G attended his last Zionist Congress, held in Jerusalem. He died in Tel Aviv on 6 March 1952.
2. WORKS OF SAMMY GRONEMANN

2.1 LITERARY BACKGROUND

It is crucial to elucidate not only the historical circumstances of Wilhelminian German Jewry, but also Gronemann’s literary background, if only so as to understand many of the jokes in Tohuwabohu. This primarily entails a review of German-Jewish authors, as well as of those German Gentile writers that concerned themselves with the so called Jewish Question, and the uncanny way they all, Jews as well as Christians, had, of concentrating their attention on East European Jews. This will in turn cast light on the historical aspects since most of the writers in question were deeply committed to the specific political views and programmes which permeated all of their work.

From the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, German Jewish writers concerned themselves with the ghetto, i.e. Heinrich Heine and his cousin Heinrich Schiff, the latter dealing mostly with Christian and Jewish prejudice and with the internal conflicts in the ghetto. After 1848, coinciding with the lessening of the troubles between religious and free-thinking Jews, the ghetto was idealised, to a greater or lesser extent, by writers such as Leopold Kompert, Aaron Bernstein, and Leo Herzberg-Fränkela (SCHÜTZ 1992). The latter was thoroughly anti-religious (maybe as a native of Galicia) and is a predecessor of Franzos, of whom more later. G considered the novellas of Aron Bernstein masterworks (N.d. a, 37).

64 I do not mean to reduce the Protean figure of Heine to a fighter against prejudice; as has been observed, Heine was a Jew to the Germans, and a frenchified one at that, a German to the French, immoral to the Anglo-Saxon world, and worst of all for the Victorians: he was not serious! (See Introduction to HOHENDAHL AND GILMAN 1991, 1-18).
The decades immediately preceding and following the 1848 Revolution saw the crystallisation of a powerful antisemitic myth in the contemporary German mind, so that even a relatively sympathetic Liberal writer, Karl Gutzkow, could propose in 1838 a plan for the destruction of Judaism, although not of the Jews (cited in Rose 1991). Two works of considerable literary quality still in print contributed to fix the vivid and durable image of the Jew as a negative figure, in both cases opposed to a positive, virtuous German figure: Gustav Freytag’s *Soll und Haben* (1855) and Wilhelm Raabe’s *Der Hungerpastor* (1863). In the first one we have Veitel Itzig, the evil Jew, whose libidinous character is opposed to Anton Wohlfart, the virtuous and self-denying hero. In all fairness it must be added that the Poles fare almost as badly as the Jews, and there are some good Jews, among them Schmeie Tinkeles. In Raabe’s novel the anti-hero is Moses Freudenstein (aka Theophile Stein), and standing against him is Hans Unwirrsch, a good German boy. Raabe, today considered one of the greatest Post-Romantic Nineteenth Century German writers, later deplored this early work, but never went as far as to disavow it. It must be noted that he did have sympathetic portraits of Jews in several of his early as well as in his late works. Both books were extremely popular: by 1960, *Soll und Haben* had sold one million copies, half of them after 1925. Freytag even had a Jewish successor, Conrad Alberti, who wrote a continuation of *Soll und Haben, Schröter & Co* (Alberti 1893). A contemporary German scholar denies Freudenstein was a representative Jew or that Raabe was in any way antisemitic and defends Freytag against the same charge (Horch 1985, 146-50, 165). Mark Gelber’s investigation into the use of Judeo-German (i.e. what is technically known as Western Yiddish) in German novels does clear Freytag of antisemitism and finds that while he used grossly antisemitic works as sources for the language used by his characters, it is clear that his intentions were Liberal, but its comparative mildness
gave his book respectability and thus *entée* into middle class drawing-rooms, and whatever his intentions may have been, it was certainly read in a very different way by an audience ready to have its prejudices reinforced, and the same is also true of Raabe’s work (Gelber 1986, 166-70). Russell Berman finds Freytag’s rhetoric “ultimately congruent” with Nazi antisemitism, although this ignores the historical chasm between the two (Berman 1986, 97). Notwithstanding the presence of several works sympathetic to the Jews by writers such as Johann Peter Hebel, Annette von Droste-Hülshoff, Franz Grillparzer and Theodor Fontane, it was the other, hostile works, which imprinted themselves on the minds of the middle-class German public in Wilhelminian Germany.

Another important influence was that of the works of Karl Emil Franzos, born in Czortków (Galicia) in 1848, the son of a doctor who brought him up to consider himself a German of the Jewish faith, and who after his father’s early death was taken by his mother to Czernowitz where he was educated at the Gymnasium. He went on to study Law in Vienna and Graz, and became a journalist. He grew up alienated from both the Jews and Gentiles of his town as a consequence of his not belonging to either one in the eyes of both communities. His *Kulturbilder* (travel vignettes) about the Eastern provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire became a success, and were collected under the title of *Aus Halb-Asien*, this already being a clear indication of the way in which he regarded his native region. His books, which were a paean to the excellencies of German culture, helped in some instances to perpetuate the image of the backward and superstitious Ostjuden among German Jews, and both his *Kulturbilder* as well as his book of stories *Die Juden von Barnow* were in print until the Twenties; the latter contained the famous story ‘Schiller in Barnow’, about young Jews trying to break out of the
claustrophobic ghetto and acquire German Bildung (FRANZOS 1877, 1-53). G heard him speak in the Hanover Verein für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur (Jewish Literary and Historical Society. N.d. a, 36). Sander Gilman finds that the stereotypical Ostjude of German-Jewish fiction and the Jew of antisemitic novels are one and the same, and Aschheim observes that even antisemitic politicians made use of Franzos's writings in the course of political debates in the German Parliament about the immigration of East European Jews (GILMAN 1979, 342; ASCHHEIM 1982, 31; for a more balanced view of Franzos and a bibliography see BICKEL 1986).

The negative image of the Eastern European Jew in German Jewish literature culminated in Jettchen Geberts Geschichte, the novel in two parts, Jettchen Gebert and Henriette Jacoby, which Georg Hermann (pseud. of Georg Hermann Borchardt) wrote in the first decade of the century and in which the antinomy German/Jew was replaced by a new antithesis: German Jev/Ostjude, just like the ones present in Freytag's and Raabe's novels; admittedly the action takes place in the Biedermeier period, and Jettchen's hopeless love for her uncle's Christian friend Kössling makes her passionate dislike of her Polish cousin and intended fiancé Jacoby understandable, but the distancing does not prevent the underlying message from coming through clearly: Eastern European Jews are dirty, loud, and uncivilised.65 Steven Aschheim points out how this contributed to the perception of East European Jews as aliens by their German correglisionists, as well as being used by antisemites later (ASCHHEIM 1982, 53-4, 216). The impact of the novel was considerable: by the time both Hermann's and Thomas Mann's books had been banned by the Nazis (1936), The Magic

65 On Jettchen as a schöne Jüdin, and her de-Judaized image which makes reader identification easier, see Florian Krobb's thorough study (KROBB 1993, 217-9).
Mountain had half as many copies in print as Jetten Gebert and Henriette Jacoby put together (RICHARDS 1968, 62, 64, 66). After the Great War, Hermann revised his opinions about Jews and Germans, wrote a sequence of autobiographical novels, and moved to Holland in 1934 from where he was transported to Auschwitz-Birkenau in 1943, where he perished, as has been related above (99). But Jetten Gebert was still in print in Germany in the Seventies (HELMANN 1906, reprinted 1977, 303-7). Hermann’s works are currently being republished.

Godela Weiss-Sussex, in her dissertation on Hermann’s pre-First World novels, concentrates on the motif of the big city and concedes that the Ostjuden are depicted as ‘rather two-dimensional types’ (WEISS-SUSSEX 1998, 111). She comes to the conclusion that the conflict between Jason and the Ostjuden ‘constitutes a theme that pervades all of Hermann’s work’ (WEISS-SUSSEX 1998,115).

It was against this tradition that G reacted with the weapons he had forged writing for the Schlemiel in the pre-War period: humour and satire. His finest achievement would be his novel, Tohuwabohu. Of course a reaction against the negative stereotyping of Ostjuden had already set in long before the War, and it resulted in the works of Buber and others; however, these works, although far above the level of what had been written before them, idealised Eastern European Jews to the point of making them totally unrecognisable, and ordinary German Jews meeting poor Ostjuden who had had to immigrate to Germany or were in transit for the New World would be hard put to find in them the wise and mystical Hasidim of Buber’s tales (for Buber’s conscious reworking and bowdlerising of Hasidic tales, see GILMAN 1979, 344-52).
A far more relevant predecessor for G is Wilhelm Herzberg, author of the early Zionist novel, *Jüdische Familienpapiere*, first published in 1868 in Hamburg under the pen-name Gustav Meinhardt, and then reprinted several times starting in 1871 under his own name (MICHAEL 1983, 54). This epistolary novel tells of the painful return to Judaism of an orphan raised in the Christian faith by a Protestant adoptive father, who goes back to Germany to try to convert his uncle and his family to Christianity, but in the process discovers the inadequacies of his new religion. The powerful attack on Christianity necessitated the pseudonymous publication. Herzberg, whose early Zionist convictions led him to settle in Palestine until his return to Europe for health reasons, knew G’s father and corresponded with G in the 1890s. One of the themes of the novel that recurs in later Zionist works and in G’s œuvre in particular, is that of the fact that the Jews are not known by their neighbours, and that the day this impediment ceases, a large part of the problems between them will vanish (HERZBERG 1893, 104-5).

66 For more on Herzberg’s life and works, see Reuven Michael’s article (MICHAEL 1983).
2.2 **TOHUWABOHU**

2.2.1 **Plot.** *Tohuwabohu* was published in 1920, and it set out to paint Jews warts-and-all, not simply to shock its audience, but with a pedagogical purpose: to show that the solution to the German-Jewish dilemma lay in Zionism; its shock value has been partly lost today because the values he set out to mock or the platitudes he deflates are no longer understood, so probably the best way to approach the novel is to summarise its plot while at the same time explicating the points today's reader may miss. Although it has been mentioned by many scholars, there is as yet no English translation. The title is the Biblical Hebrew expression for 'without form and void' (*wüst und wirr* in the German translation) used in Genesis 1:2 to describe the earth on the first day of creation. The word, used in Judeo-German or Western Yiddish, has passed into modern German usage to mean chaos. The novel has twelve chapters, and I will discuss them in turn.

1. **Goethe in Borytschew.** The title alludes to Franzos's famous story 'Schiller in Barnow' (in *FRANZOS 1877*). Berl Weinstein, a Jew living in the small Russian town of Borytschew, has no money and four daughters to marry off, and so has himself baptised every time he needs a dowry: the last one, Chane, is to marry Jossel Schlenker, an *ilui* (Talmudic genius), and so he travels to Whitechapel and after his conversion, earns the dowry money by translating into Hebrew Christian writings, while the priest who has asked him to do the translation takes credit for it. Then comes a flashback showing how Jossel and Chane meet when he found her
on a Sabbath reading *Faust* outside the *eruv*. This transgression of the Sabbath should have driven them apart, but instead Jossel falls in love with Chane and she gives him the book to read; Jossel does not simply read *Faust*, but *learns* it, as he would the Talmud, and finds he does not know enough to understand it.

They continue meeting secretly until found out by Pastor Bode, newly arrived from Germany, and school teacher Strößer, another member of the ethnic German community in Borytschew. The latter, an antisemite, is arguing with the former, who wants to convert the Jews, and claims to love them, having surmounted his former instinctive antipathy to them, Strößer then unmasks his friend’s real feelings and expounds the antisemitic argument with such clarity that it must be quoted at length:


There are all sorts of antisemites. You wish to take the Jews’ Judaism away from them - if only that were possible! You want, so to speak, to kill off the Semitism in the Semite. Is that not true antisemitism? [...] They [young Jews] are the least respectful and most anti-authority community there is. [...] They want to know everything and they believe in nothing! At most, they believe in themselves! That is their only faith! [...] The Jews may have a better culture, [...] all the worse for them, because it is all the more dangerous! One must throttle them, before it is too late! That is self-defence!

---

67 Boundary marking the limits of the area within which one can carry objects otherwise not carried on the Sabbath.
When the Pastor interjects that that is not Christianity, Strößer responds: “Das ist praktisches Christentum!” (On the contrary, that is practical Christianity!). Pastor Bode then devises a plan to explain Faust to Jossel, and through this to win him over to Christianity. When he puts it in practice, however, and explains to Jossel that the book typifies the development of humanity, starting from Old Testament justice and culminating in Love, i.e. Christianity, Jossel convinces Bode that he (Bode) has misunderstood Faust: the important thing is not love, but justice! The chapter ends with Jossel and Chane’s engagement, and their decision to leave for Germany after the wedding, because Jossel has heard how good things are there from his former teacher Wolf Klatzke, who now lives there; both expect to free themselves from the constraints of Orthodoxy and to gain access to German culture.

2. *Ein literarisches Unternehmen* (A literary enterprise). Wolf Klatzke, who now writes begging letters in Berlin for a living, grew up in Borytschew and after saving money and teaching himself German, went to Berlin, but thanks to the German-Jewish system of shuttling Jewish paupers from community to community so they should not settle down anywhere, he was forced to do it via Thorn (Toruń), Schneidemühl (Grudziądz), Dirschau (Tczew), Danzig (Gdańsk), Königsberg (Kaliningrad), Kolberg (Kolobrzeg), Stettin (Szczecin), Eberswalde, Frankfurt an der Oder, Posen (Poznań), Breslau (Wrocław), Kattowitz (Katowice), Dresden, Leipzig, Halle, Halberstadt, Magdeburg, Braunschweig, and Hanover! When the couple arrive in Berlin, it turns out that Berl Weinstein, Chane’s father, has asked Klatzke to write letters begging for money from rich German Jews, who will believe anything, except in the Torah (‘Es gibt Juden in Deutschland’, sagte Berl, ‘die glauben an alles, was du willst, außer an die Thora’, 1920, 65). In the course of the discussion that arises when Jossel protests at this
undignified trickery, the narrator mentions his (i.e. G’s) step-grandfather’s *shnorer* (beggar) hostel. One of the begging letters is addressed to a rich relative of Jossel’s *Landgerichtsrat* Levysohn, who has now become *Landgerichtsdirektor* Lehnsen. The promotion and the shedding of Jewish identity are thus neatly conjoined.

3. *Eine fromme Stiftung* (A pious foundation). Introducing the Lehnsens: father, mother, Heinz, and Else. Else is engaged to a Christian Junker, Joseph von Sandersleben, whose sister in turn is engaged to a Christian divinity student, Gustav Ostermann. Mrs. Lehnsen’s father has left a fund for the purpose of helping impecunious yeshiva students, and Mrs. Lehnsen wants her husband, one of the fund’s trustees, to award a grant to the said Ostermann, in order to ingratiate herself with Joseph’s mother, the Baroness. The two other trustees of the fund, the Reform rabbi Dr. Magnus and the Orthodox lecturer Professor Hirsch, refuse to agree to such a perversion of the founder’s intentions, and favour a rabbinical student, Jakob Kaiser. G later returned to this story in *Schalet*.

4. *Seelsorge* (Pastoral work). Both Jossel and Chane have occasion to see Jewish Berlin. Jossel goes to Rabbi Magnus for advice but the latter throws him out thinking he is a *shnorer*; there he meets Kaiser, who takes him to a wedding, but it is only after they go out and Kaiser tells Jossel it was a *Jewish* wedding that Jossel realises he has been inside a synagogue! Meanwhile, Chane has gone to see an Orthodox rabbi, Dr. Rosenbacher, who promises to help, and then meets a group of students who meet to learn with Kaiser’s teacher, Joelsohn. Kaiser’s place was inspired by G’s domicile in Berlin during his student time, located in the Brückenallee (N.d. a, 72).
5. *Paradiesäpfel* (Eden's apples). After being exposed to antisemitic ragging at court, Heinz, who is an articulated clerk, muses bitterly: ‘Welch ein Unsinn der Weltgeschichte, wenn Jahrtausende hindurch mit unendlicher Zähigkeit etwas festgehalten und conserviert wurde, das im selben Moment, da es gefahrlos gezeigt werden darf, als wertlos verworfen wird’ (What a nonsense on the part of History, if after millennia of tenaciously hanging on to, and defending something, at the very moment when it is possible to show it without danger, it is thrown as worthless away. 1920, 170). When he gets home, he finds Jossel talking to the concièrge who is explaining to him that no Lewysohns live there, he has come to return the ten Marks that were sent to him in response to the begging letter sent by Klatzke. Jossel then tells Heinz the whole story. Meanwhile, upstairs, the Lehnsens have distinguished visitors: the Baroness together with her uncle, Baron von Stülp-Sandersleben, who had refused to come while the Lehnsens were still the Levysohns. As he is taking his leave, Heinz comes in and introduces a caftaned Jossel as his mother’s cousin!

6. *Ostergeläute* (Easter pealing). Back in Borytschew, Dr. Strößer, who is now coaching little Jakob Schlenker, Jossel’s brother, advises Pastor Bode to stay away from the Jews and avoid helping them now that a blood libel agitation is taking place. Mrs. Schlenker finds among her daughter’s underwear a revolver: Riwke Lade has joined a Zionist self-defence group. Pastor Bode preaches to his disapproving and fearful congregation a sermon condemning the blood libel, and is summoned by Kujaroff, the Governor, who accuses Germans of true antisemitism and of having knowledge but no culture, and when Bode says Jews in Germany have equal rights, he retorts that German Jews are spineless, and pay too high a price for their rights. Finally after remarking that the pastor’s daughter plays with his, the Governor’s, daughters, he
pointedly advises him to preach about the government's good intentions in the week to come. The model for this episode, as well as its conclusion in chapter 11, was the pogrom in Zhitomir in 1905, witnessed by the author's wife, but not by G, although he was in the city up to a few days before the attack took place. G told the original story in chapter 28 of his memoirs.

7. *Posaurentöne* (Trumpet blares). Ostermann, despairing of getting the grant, takes an article to an antisemitic publisher, and the editors skilfully make him tell them about the scene that took place at the Lehnsen's. Dr. Lehnsen has managed in the meantime to convince vacillating Dr. Magnus to abstain in the matter of the grant, which means that he has his way since his is the deciding vote. Heinz has been sent to Russia by his father, and while waiting for a visa, visits for the first time the East European quarter of Berlin, looking for Jossel. The musical connotations of both this and the previous chapter are linked to antisemitism; the first one obviously -Easter time was traditionally the season for anti-Jewish disturbances throughout the Christian world- whilst the second one comes devoid of the religious undertone, and with its military associations brings in the modern concept of nationalism. Music thus characterises both religious and political antisemitism. The model for this chapter is the case of the blackmailing publisher Graf, mentioned above, and cited by G in chapter 43 of his memoirs (57).

8. *Der Minjan-Mann* (The minyan man). Heinz, looking for Jossel, finds him with a group of young Zionists of East European origin, and when the atheist chemist Dr. Pinkus arrives looking for a *minyan* (the prescribed number of ten male adults) to say kaddish, being one short, they include the bewildered Heinz. Chane says she has heard more talk about religion and Judaism since she arrived in Germany than in the rest of her life; she thinks the problem
lies in the idea that to be a Jew one must believe in something – in the East, a Jew is a Jew, and that is that. They invite Heinz to stop over at Borytschew and visit Jossel’s parents. The chapter ends with Heinz attending a Zionist meeting for the first time.

9. *Die Erstgeborenen* (The first-born). Heinz arrives at the house of study as Moische Schlenker and little Jakob celebrate the customary meal eaten at the end of studying a Talmud section, so that the first-born will not have to fast. Everybody wants to have him as a guest for the first night seder, and he decides to go to the Schlenkers’. Jakob shows him the city and tells him Pristav Kujaroff has organised a pogrom, and Riwke walks him to his hotel on her way to patrol duty and discusses Zionism with him. He then attends his first seder and while saying goodbye, he slips a ring on to Riwke’s finger.

10. *Abwehr* (Defence). The title of this chapter constitutes an ironic reference to the fact that *Abwehr* was one of the avowed aims of the Liberal organisation, the *Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens* (*Reinharz 1975, 47, 49, 182*). The *Posaune* (Trumpet) has printed Ostermann’s article, preceded by a scurrilous prologue alluding to what occurred at the Lehnsens’ luncheon-party, and at the insistence of his wife and daughter, Lehnsen goes to pay the editors money so they will hush the scandal up. Rabbi Dr. Magnus for his part has decided to institute proceedings against the *Posaune* and when Lehnsen arrives, he finds they have already confiscated the first edition and must pay 5,000 Marks to have them suppress the next issue; as he leaves the building, he runs into Ostermann and realises he was responsible for the article; Ostermann has come to ask them not to print the article, since in the meantime he has

---

68 On the day preceding the Passover holiday, it is a custom for the first-born to fast to show gratitude for the fact that the first-born of the Israelites were not slain by the last plague (see Exodus 12: 23, 29). However, it is permitted to break the fast in order to eat a meal at a religious ceremony.
found out he received the grant, but in the end he has to pay them the 500 Mark grant to compensate them for the loss of the edition. It all ends with Dr. Magnus informing a meeting that he has agreed to pay out of his own pocket the 500 Mark fine imposed on the *Posaune* and in exchange they have given him a sealed envelope containing the name of the article’s author. When he reads the name, it means nothing to anybody but Magnus, who by abstaining, had given him the grant. Dr. Magnus does not speak of the total amount he has had to pay the blackmailers, i.e. 5,000 Marks.

11. *Pogrom*. Pastor Bode’s daughter has disappeared, and Mrs. Bode gets hysterical when Governor Kujaroff tells her he saw an old Jew take her away. A mob appears, brandishing clubs and cudgels, and Bode runs after them, looking for his daughter. As Heinz returns to the hotel, the manager, a German Balt, receives him with relief, and tells him he is getting his best rooms ready for the committee of rich Jews that is sure to come after the pogrom. Heinz is thinking about the apparent *tohuvabohu*, the chaos he has just seen in the synagogue, when the pogrom starts and he rushes out while the horrified manager calls after him: “Aber man wird Sie für einen Juden halten [...] Nehmen Sie doch wenigstens ein Brecheisen mit oder eine Hacke, damit man sieht, daß Sie ein Christ sind.” (“But they will take you for a Jew [...] At least take a crowbar or a pick-axe with you, so that people can see that you are a Christian!” 1920, 376). The soldiers have surrounded the ghetto, in order to give the looters a free hand, and to prevent the self-defence group from going in. The latter are detained and beaten up, but Heinz is allowed through and witnesses how Berl Weinstein is also beaten up. Berl, who had hidden waiting for Pastor Bode so he could show him his baptismal certificate and get out of the ghetto, cannot bring himself to do it when the time comes, and when he realises Heinz is a
Christian, shouts at him ‘Meschummed’ (apostate). Heinz goes to the Schlenkers and when they ask him to leave so his life will not be in danger, he tells them he is their relative. When he leaves, he is shot by the pogromists, and at the end the Governor takes Pastor Bode’s daughter home to her parents, while in the city the rumour goes that the Governor saved the child from certain death. The indignity of the German Jewish attempts at self-defense in the previous chapter has been neatly contrasted with the dignified if equally unsuccessful attempts by the Zionists in the East.

12. *Die große Woche* (The great week). In a letter written to Heinz by Else from Northern Norway, where she and Joseph are spending their honeymoon, we find out that Ostermann and Joseph’s sister are to go to Borytschew where he is to replace Pastor Bode who has suffered a nervous breakdown, and the Lehnsens have gone to Karlsbad to take the waters. Heinz himself is at the Anhalter Bahnhof ready to leave for Baden-Baden, when he sees Jossel and Chane in the middle of a large group of Jews: they are all on their way to the Zionist Congress in Basle. In the morning Dr. Pinkus, the chemist, recognises him and says he is going to a temperance meeting league and then talks about the importance of keeping up the strength of the Germanic race. The other passenger in the compartment announces he is also Jewish and says there is no need to talk in an undertone. Pinkus has reasons to be nervous: his former assistant has sued him and the antisemitic press has labelled him an exploiter of Aryan workers, while a professional journal calls him a great German scientist! After he hurriedly leaves, the gentleman talks to Heinz about the foolishness of trying to hide what you are and the harm it does to you and to your people; and how the Jews for centuries have been ready to return to
their land at a moment’s notice and have kept their law without any outer compulsion. Heinz gets off at Oos and takes the local train for Baden-Baden.

2.2.2 A Zionist Novel. At the time Tohuwabohu appeared it caused a minor scandal and was deplored by a Liberal German-Jewish reviewer, but received little or no attention from the mainstream German literary journals (GOLDMANN 1920). In 1912, Moritz Goldstein and others had called on German Jews not just to create Jewish works and withdraw from German literature, but to go further and create a new type of Jewish character, authentic and true (GOLDESTein 1912a and 1912b; KAUFMANN 1912).\textsuperscript{69} Tohuwabohu can be seen as a response to this call, very much in tune with Gronemann’s own opinions and it has been described as a Zionist Zeitroman (MITTELMANN 1986, 226). The Zeitroman, a novelistic genre developed in Germany in the nineteenth century seeks ‘to portray a society, the manners and mores of that society, its political crosscurrents, and [...] the interrelationship between classes’, unlike the Bildungsroman, which focuses on an individual (HILLMAN 1983, 24). The fact that Tohuwabohu deals with German as well as East European Jews and switches its location from Germany to Russia is not in conflict with its belonging to this genre, and neither does the fact that it deals with Gentiles only in so far as they have to do with the Jews, since its object is to portray the situation of the latter. Its geographic breadth precludes it from being classed as a narrower Gesellschaftsroman, which otherwise it would be. Its apparent narrowness of focus vanishes if we compare it to Fontane’s novels or to Heinrich Mann’s Im Schlaraffenland, also classed as Zeitromane by Hillman (HILLMAN 1983, 87-141).

\textsuperscript{69} For an overview of the controversy that ensued, see GOLDESTein 1957, BRENNER 1996, 129-31, and Steven Aschheim’s article in GILMAN AND ZIVES 1997, 299-305.
Moving to the second element of Mittelmann’s definition, it is true that there had been several Zionist novels before the war, but they had all been written by Jews who had had little or no contact with Jewish tradition and thus knew little of Judaism, with the result that most of them concentrated on the feelings of deracination and alienation of modern Western Jews (Mittelmann 1986, 228-30). Mittelmann chooses as prototype of the pre-War novels, from a very meager inventory, Fritz Mauthner’s *Der neue Ahasver* (Mauthner 1882). G, because of his religious background and his contacts with Eastern European Jews, had a different view of the matter, and although he recognised and depicted the alienation, he thought he knew the remedy, and set out to teach the solution to the problem. However, in order to do so he first had to show the problem, and this he did with humour, satirising German-Jewish everyday life. His purpose was to teach through laughter and help German Jews in the painful process of overcoming their problems and re-making themselves. Although I think the novel has a few structural problems deriving from its episodic character and is not as seamlessly structured as Hanni Mittelmann holds, it is on the whole a success and can still be read with pleasure (Mittelmann 1986, 233). This is due to its surprising lightness of touch, and the way in which it does not allow the reader to dwell on the absurdities and the sadness of its characters’ situation for long, but propels him to new scenes, reflecting the chaos, the *tohuwabohu* of Jewish life not only in Germany, but also in Russia. Its apparent lack of depth is more than offset by a clearness of purpose and the underlying structure necessary to achieve it.

Doris Kintscher has written the only work devoted wholly to *Tohuwabohu*, and I acknowledge her thorough analysis of the novel. Many of the points she makes are of

---

70 The new German edition was chosen as a book of the week by the German *Cosmopolitan* magazine.
assistance in understanding the book’s structure. Kintscher draws attention to the fact that the novel has a puzzle-like structure, with parallel development of subjects that at first do not seem to be connected, but finally do (KINTSCHER 1989, 100). At the same time the omniscient narrator heightens the tension with comments indirectly (addressed to the reader) anticipating the course of the action; these comments can be detected by the shift from the past tense to the present (KINTSCHER 1989, 100-1). Another device used to enliven the narration is to start and finish many chapters with the use of reported speech (KINTSCHER 1989, 107). The action shifts from Borytschew to Berlin and back and Jossel and Heinz do not meet until chapter 5. The language used by the Jewish characters is always grammatically correct standard German; this is not surprising in the case of the Westjuden, all of whom are educated, but when it comes to the East European Jews, this represents a conscious reaction against the tradition of reporting their speech as corrupt and primitive German, both at the hands of German Gentile and Jewish writers, as has been observed above (106; BAYERDÖRFER 1985; HORCH 1985). As Kintscher has observed, Hebrew and Yiddish terms are carefully explained within the text (KINTSCHER 1989, 106). Another feature remarked upon by Kintscher is the copious use of the dash, in order to report interior monologue, to serve as parentheses, but mostly to preserve the clarity of the text ((KINTSCHER 1989, 108-9). Kintscher finds that G reflects antisemitic prejudices uncritically and cites as support for this Oberlehrer Strößer’s speech to Pastor Bode, and the final scene on the train full of Zionists on their way to the Congress (1920, 28-9, 407-8). Although the first episode is easy to discard since, after all, an antisemite like Strößer would not sound plausible if he spoke differently, the second one rests in the present writer’s opinion, on a misconception of the Zionist purpose of presenting Jews honestly; thus the Zionists on the
train are presented as noisy and unruly because that is how the narrator perceives them to be and he feels no need to apologise for the fact. One must of course allow for the fact that this is a post-Holocaust reading of the work. There is an echo of Herzberg’s view in the description of the effect the Zionists have on the Gentile passengers:

Juden, welche nicht scheu ihr Judentum zu verstecken suchten, – sondern die unbekümmert und sorglos über ihre jüdischen Angelegenheiten redeten, waren ihnen in Deutschland noch nicht vorgekommen. – (1920, 408)

In Germany they had not yet come across Jews who did not try bashfully to hide their Jewishness, but rather spoke readily and casually about their Jewish affairs in a carefree manner.

*Tohuwabohu* certainly surpasses the efforts in the genre made in Wilhelminian Germany, and can be likened more to *Berlin Alexanderplatz* by Alfred Döblin – whose meeting with East European Jews has been compared to Gronemann’s – rather than to other examples of the genre (BRENNER 1996, 143-4). Another work that can be compared to it is the much less well-known *Die Straße der kleinen Ewigkeit*, by Martin Beradt, with its loving description of the life of Polish Jews in Berlin’s Grenadierstraße; Beradt himself was born in a strict Orthodox family and grew up in Berlin in the sort of neighbourhood he describes. Beradt’s work takes place within the confines of Berlin’s Scheunenviertel, in contrast with *Tohuwabohu*’s wide-ranging setting, and avoids dealing with other German Jews as far as possible. Another comparison can be made with I. J. Singer’s Yiddish novel *The Family Carnovsky*, with its stark look at German Jewry (GILMAN 1986, 363-369). A writer who lived in Germany for a time and looked at German Jewry from the outside but with deep empathy is

71 Beradt’s novel was recently republished in Germany and reviewed together with Tohuwabohu’s new edition (LANGNER 2001).
S. Y. Agnon, particularly in several of his novellas, such as *Ad hennah* (Thus far), and in his posthumous published novel *Behanuto shel mar lublin* (At Mr. Lublin’s shop).

The book can be seen as part of the construction of the new Zionist culture which Michael Berkowitz has described (Berkowitz 1993). Few German Jews would have been capable of such an achievement, and the fact that parts of it are still painful to read demonstrates that the problems of Jews in the Diaspora are still very much what they were then. The novel inverts the antithetical pair we saw in Chapter 3, and instead of the evil Jew vis-à-vis the good German, we have a pair of Jews, one German and one from the East, counterposed with a pair of Christian Germans, Ostermann and Strößer, and their moral characters are more subtly delineated. This is by no means the only way of arranging the characters as polar opposites, and would warrant further investigation. Gronemann's literary activities in following the publication of the book can be seen as a continuation of it: a didactic literature reminiscent of the activities of his ideological adversaries – the Enlightenment Jewish writers.

A particularly dramatic reading of the book was the one made by the philologist Victor Klemperer during the Second World War in Dresden and recorded in his diary in May and June 1942. He immediately links the novel with his struggle to escape the racial persecution, if only in mind:

Klemperer had already read and reacted angrily against *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich* in the summer of 1941 as will be seen below (149). It may be that the worsening of his personal situation in the intervening period had the effect of tempering his response, but in any case he likes the novel although for the second time he makes a point of reaffirming his determination to remain German; and yet, he observes that he no longer considers the German people to be a chosen people:


(14th May) Surprisingly good and enthralling is Sammy Gronemann, *Tohuwabohu*. (18th May) [...] I read out the last hundred pages of *Tohuwabohu* in one go. I must make notes on it. A surprisingly good book. But it cannot convert me. I cannot escape my Germanness. But I am quite beyond nationalism. And I no longer take the Germans to be a chosen people. (KLEMPERER 1999, 49, 52)

Two items must be noted in connection with this matter. Klemperer clearly loved Georg Hermann’s *Jettchen Gebert* and in that same year quotes from it twice (KLEMPERER 1996b, 31, 133). He was much harsher on Herzl, although conceding that Herzl had foreseen what was to come, he concludes that Zionism has a deep affinity with Hitlerism (KLEMPERER 1996b, 144, 146). Thus his reading of G as well as of Herzl can be seen as part of the desperate struggle he
was undergoing to keep hold of his German identity, separating it from both the racist National Socialist reality he lived in, and the Zionist vision of a new nation being created.

The novel was forgotten after 1933, possibly because the majority of its intended audience – German Jews, were not responsive to its message, and the initial choice of publisher did not allow it a wide diffusion among the rest of the German reading public. Nevertheless, it was reprinted 16 times until 1925 and it could still have reached a wider public, since in 1930 it was published by Kiepenheuer Verlag in Berlin, but by the end of 1932 it was too late. It is useful to compare its reception by both the Jewish and the wider public with the heated controversy which Raphael Seligmann’s works have caused in Germany, with Schalom Ben-Chorin calling Seligmann’s writing ‘nest-dirying’, in a curious echo of a previous generation’s reaction to Gronemann’s work (as cited in GILMAN 1995, 47-58).

Although never translated into English, it has been described as ‘hilarious’ by Steven Aschheim and as an ‘excellent and unjustly forgotten novel’ by Ritchie Robertson, who incidentally translates the title as *Topsy-Turvydom*, which apart from losing the biblical connotations of the original, transmits the original’s whimsy (ASCHHEIM 1982, 29; ROBERTSON 1988, 216). The novel was translated into French in 1931 by Lucienne Astruc and into Dutch by M. van Bueren in 1933 (1931; 1933). The pogrom scenes were dramatised by Jan Fabricius in 1923, and later this was retranslated back into German using the original text (FABRICIUS 1971; AND FABRICIUS n. d.).

The last few years have seen a rebirth of the interest in G’s work, thanks mostly to Joachim Schlör, and in 2000 *Tohuwabohu* was re-published with an afterword by Schlör (2000). The new edition has met with some measure of success, as already mentioned, and of
the reviewers, some have chosen to deal with its literary qualities – the chaotic structure mirroring the state of German Jewry – or its value as testimony to a world that no longer exists and to the fact that ‘Zionism was a valid solution for some German Jews to their identity crisis, before the rise of National-Socialism; certain episodes are highlighted – the opening scene, the pogrom in Borytschew, Jossel’s entrance into the Lehnsen’s flat when Baron von Stülp-Sandersleben is visiting (SAUERWEIN 2000; KRAMBERG 2000; WERGIN 2000; LANGNER 2001). But only two reviewers, to my knowledge, have made explicit the circumstances in which this new reading is taking place; namely the loss of innocence and the enjoyment of the humour despite the intervening events; Clemens Wergin notes


Even though on account of the antisemitism the laughter sticks in one’s throat time after time – one knows now what this led to – one is transported to a time when the relations between Western and Eastern Jews were dealt with great naturalness.

Although it may be argued that the supposed naturalness in question may be more a reflection of the writer’s post-Holocaust perception. After all, the book was widely criticised at the time of its publication; but the fact remains that there can be no question of an innocent reading of the book. As Andreas Tretner puts it ‘Die Unschuld des Lesens is nicht wiederherstellbar, die Faszination gleichwohl’ (The innocence of reading cannot be regained, but the charm stays. TRETNER 2000).
2.3 HAWDOLOH UND ZAPFENSTREICH

2.3.1 Summary *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich* has forty-eight chapters, some of them very short. The narrator at times adopts the same conversational style that was to be used throughout in *Schalet*. A brief summary of each section follows. The title already makes evident a polarity, contrasting the Jewish concept of *havdalah*, with the non-Jewish and military tattoo, both of which, in their very different ways, mark a boundary between times allotted to different purposes. This contrast of concepts both analogous and contrary recurs throughout the book.

1. Warnung! (Warning!) After a disclaimer of any pedagogical intentions, almost certainly meant ironically, since one of the effects of the book, whether intended or unintended, was to make Germans, both Jews and non-Jews, aware of the life and conditions of Jews in the East, as witnessed by its author, and to dispel the many prejudices against them held in the West, the narrator follows with an attack on those German Jews who write about the East with scant knowledge of the subject. He presents his qualifications and states that the book was written at the urging of his friends.

2. Vorspiel (Prelude). The narrator describes his second birth, i.e. his return at the age of forty, wounded, from the Eastern Front to a military hospital in Strasburg (Brodnica), the city of his birth, where he starts his convalescence. Transferred to a hospital in Berlin, he meets Hermann

---

72 Havdalah is the ceremony and also the prayer performed at the end of the Sabbath and holidays to mark the division between the sacred and profane times.
Struck and through him finds a Yiddish translator’s post in Kovno, persuaded by Struck that he will not need a thorough knowledge of the language, which of course he lacks, as he will only be required to check the censors’ corrections.

3. *Dienstantritt* (Assumption of duties). Travel and arrival in Kovno. Meeting with Hans Goslar, already mentioned in the first part, who was editor of the Lithuanian newspaper *Dabartis* (The present). His first impressions of the city are illustrated by a drawing of a street scene with soldiers and civilians going past Jewish shops and businesses. The illustrations are particularly important for the comprehension of the text since they were drawn by Magnus Zeller at the time he was stationed in the Eastern Front, and thus provide an independent eyewitness testimony rather than being added to the book after it was written.

4. *Quecken* (Couch grasses). The author’s first day in the translators’ office. He finds on his desk a folder marked Very Urgent, and in it the text to be translated: ‘Ordinances on effective measures against *Quecke*’. To his horror, he does not even know the meaning of the German word, and in his despair, starts to write the text out in Hebrew letters, whilst everybody else in the office looks at him. The scene is brimming with humour, and it all comes to a head when he discovers his companions were horrified when they saw him work so hard; as G had already found out in the judicial bureaucracy, nobody ever does anything marked urgent at once.

5. *Perfekt Jiddisch* (Perfect Yiddish). This chapter follows the only illustration not drawn by Zeller: a reproduction of a leaflet published by the commander of the German forces in the East, containing on one side a poem in Yiddish mocking the Tsar’s message to “My dear Jews”, accompanied by a cartoon of the Tsar in a prayer-shawl among the tombs of the
Kishinev cemetery; and on the other side a proclamation addressed to the Jews of Russia by the German commander in both Hebrew and Yiddish. This was supposed to remind Jews of the antisemitism of the Russian regime and win them over to the German side. Although the brochure was published in October 1914, i.e. more than a year before G came to Kovno, this was precisely the sort of thing that he had opposed during his activities in the KfO as seen above, i.e. the use of the civilian Jewish population to further the German war aims (64-5).

The chapter itself takes a look at the Yiddish language, its complexity and richness, and at the contemptuous attitude towards it on the part of German philologists and the general public, followed by a marvelously mordant examination of the sudden reversal of attitudes after the start of the war, when Jews and Yiddish were found to be the keepers of the German spirit mostly by those who could not bear them inside Germany. After this he returns to Struck’s many activities in favour of the Jewish communities in the area under German occupation, as well as his own success in finding somebody to do his work for him.

6. Staatsgefährliche Andachtsbücher (Prayerbooks threatening the security of the state). On the absurdity of the censor’s activity which consisted mainly in a continuous search for uses of the Russian calendar, banned by the occupiers, and the examination of thousands of prayerbooks to expunge from them the prayer for the Tsar and his family. This had to be done as well for those Jews trying to emigrate to America. The author remarks on the possible correlation of the suppression of the prayer with the subsequent fall of the Tsarist regime.

7. Der Bademeister (Sauna attendant). The attendant was the man G found to do his job. The fact that this man was well educated and later changed his name prompts a disquisition on the high level of culture in the East, and in the countless devices to which Jews were forced in
order to prove they had a right to the surnames they bore, or to change the ones imposed on them by the authorities, often opprobrious.

8. Der Klub ehemaliger Intellektueller (The Former Intellectuals Club). The club, mentioned above, and its members are introduced, with the suspicions its name gave rise to among the Prussian officer caste (73). There are drawings by Zeller of himself, G, Herold, Friedrichsen, Smigielski, Bergsträsser, Eulenberg, Struck, Kühl, Schmidt-Rottluff, and Dehmel.

9. Ein jüdisches Restaurant (A Jewish restaurant). The Schloßberg restaurant, where the club met and where G had his meals when in Kovno, prompts a reflection on what Jewish restaurants East and West have in common (beggars) and where they differ (no rabbinical supervision or supervisors in the East). The narrator also remembers how he introduced Dehmel to the culture of the Jews in Eastern Europe and the profound impression it made on him.

10. Die Synagoge des Ostens (The synagogue of the East). The comparison between East and West continues with what the author considers to be the a focal point of Jewish life – the synagogue. In a powerful tone the author depicts what he perceives as the intensity, honesty, artlessness, and joy of the Eastern synagogue with the stiffness, military discipline, and grimness of the temples in the West. The causes for this are in his opinion the imitation of the Christian traditions, visible in the very architecture and physical arrangement of the temple, and in the surrender of any claims to be considered a nation. It is in this last element that lies the strength of the Eastern Jews according to the author and hence the cohesion and solidarity of the Kovno community are dwelt upon admiringly. The chapter is illustrated by a drawing of a group of Jews in a synagogue surrounding a man who stands on the platform holding the
scrolls and leads them in prayer. This represents one of the few examples of what has been termed by Steven Aschheim ‘The cult of the Ostjuden’ (ASCHHEIM 1982, 185-214).

Another detail that he seeks to clarify is that of the purpose of the building, which may also be destined to community activities of a profane character, a fact which might shock many Western non-Jews and even some Jews, but this is because they associate the synagogue with the church, a misunderstanding to which Western Jews have contributed through the changes they introduced in architecture and function. Thus the author once more makes Ostjuden the repository of a perceived authentic Jewishness. The actual details of the differences between the West and East as seen by the author may not have been quite right, and the illustration may also be faulty in its details, but what is really interesting is the reproach that was directed towards the whole of German Jewry, but particularly on the Orthodox, a fact that was noticed by one of their foremost representatives, Josef Wohlgemuth, editor of the monthly Jeschurun, in his review of the work (WOHLGEMUTH 1924). This chapter was included in a recent German anthology of Jewish journalism in German between 1901 and 1928 (see 1996).

11. Besuch in Wilna (Visit to Vilna). Describes his brief visit in January 1917, the contrast is made between the beauty of the city, and the misery and starvation that reigned. He also compares the German theatre with the Yiddish Vilna troupe to the latter’s advantage. He mentions his visits to an institution training young Jews in various trades as well as those visits he paid, with an anonymous friend, to some of the numerous brothels in the city, making clear the basic honesty of those working in them and the dire need that had driven them there. A striking drawing by Zeller, entitled ‘Der Tod in Wilna’ (Death in Vilna), shows a coffin
bearing the corpse of a victim of one of the epidemics that ravaged the city being carried out of
the house whilst a woman looks out of the upstairs window.

12. *Sabbat*. The author turns to the subject of how the Jews in the East have maintained the
ture spirit of the Sabbath. To explain the meaning of the Sabbath he quotes Heinrich Heine’s
poem ‘Prinzessin Sabbat’, as well as a Yiddish play by Yitskhok Leyb Perets; this permits him
to inscribe himself doubly in Jewish and German-Jewish tradition.⁷³ He considers the essence
of the Sabbath to lie in the fact that on that day Jews deal only with spiritual matters, and
considers that this is not the case among German Jews. The misunderstandings between Jews
and the occupying army, as well as the absolute refusal of the former to violate the laws
governing that day, culminate in the inability of the Germans to understand the concept of the
*eruv* (the boundary marking the area where things can be carried during the Sabbath). This
concept is crucial to the action of the first chapter of *Tohuwabohu*, as seen above, and its
recurrence here marks the importance of boundaries for the author (110).

13. *Eruv und andere Kuriositäten* (*Eruv* and other curiosities). The *eruv* gives rise to a series
of anecdotes, not all of them having taken place in the East, which touch on the difficulty for
non-Jews of understanding the fact that different kinds of Jews have varying degrees of
adhesion to the precepts of religious law. He characterises negatively the lack of tact in the
Western Jews and of tolerance in those Eastern Jews who openly flaunt their defiance of the
rules, causing thereby untold confusion in the non-Jewish observers, who see no reason to
make allowances for the Orthodox if the non-Orthodox can ignore religious law. He adds an

⁷³ The reference occurs in the first act of *Di goldene keyt* (The golden chain), a title that alludes to the Jewish
religious tradition.
anecdote about the strong reaction of the community which impeded the execution of a post-mortem on a deceased Jewish patient, despite the intervention of the Chief of Medical Services, Dr. Klemperer, brother of the philologist and diarist.

14. *Vom Lehrhaus* (Of the rabbinic study house). The light interlude of the past section is succeeded by a more serious tone in the discussion of the study house, which the author represents as being, together with the Sabbath, the pillars of Jewish identity. The intensity of the study is conveyed, as well as the religious significance attached to it, and in a lofty tone the study house is described as giving expression to the feelings of eternity and freedom. The chapter is accompanied by a drawing of four bearded Jews, three sitting and one standing around a table, immersed in the study of a sacred text. The drawing has a much less angular and modern feeling than the ones showing scenes of the city, and together with the one depicting the prayer at the synagogue, has a cosy air, using in its title the Hebrew name for the study house: *‘Im Bethamidrasch’* (In the study house).

15. *Die zehn Nichtstuer* (The ten idlers). Communities in the East supported ten ‘idlers’ who thus relieved of the need to earn a living, were supposed to devote themselves to the study of Torah and when required, to pray for those of the community who were in need. The author explains the concept, using the Hebrew name for the ten idlers, Assoroh Batlonim (Ashkenazi pronunciation of the Hebrew *‘asarah batlanim’*), of which the title of this chapter is the translation. He praises their inactivity and compares them with ascetics of other religions, except for the fact that they strive for collective rather than individual salvation. The section finishes with a humorous anecdote about G’s step-grandfather Raphael Karger who, infuriated by a prayerbook published by the Stettin (Szczecin) Reform rabbi Heinemann Vogelstein,
wanted to curse him in his prayers, but for this needed the man's Hebrew name, and so had to send a friend to ask the rabbi his full Hebrew name. Vogelstein had attacked G and Zionism and G responded in *Sturmgeselle Vogelstein*, which is examined below (section 2.7.1).

16. *Mein Hauptwerk* (My masterpiece). In this chapter the author states how he was involved in writing *Tohuwabohu* at the same time he was compiling a multilingual dictionary in which all terms of any use to the occupation administrative bureaucracy were given in German, Polish, Russian, Belorussian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and Yiddish (See *SIEBEN* 1918). This work, which was supposed to put an end to the multiple linguistic misunderstandings in the occupied zone, was rendered useless by the end of the hostilities with Russia. Probably ironically, it is the dictionary and not *Tohuwabohu* which the author considers his masterpiece.

17. *Innendienst* (Office duty). The narrator then busies himself with the absurdities of the censorship Hebrew section, which was supposed to find subversive material in the books to be printed, most of which were biblical books or talmudic commentaries. Since the section could never find a book to ban and was therefore far behind the other sections, they were forced to ban a book published in 1846 and so fulfill their quota.

18. *Krankheit* (Illness). A description of how, having fallen dangerously ill with blood-poisoning, following a doctor's blunder, G was treated by Dr. Klemperer and his assistant Dr. Felix Rosenthal, and nursed back to health by two teachers of the girls' gymnasium, thanks to whom he later gained entry into Kovno Jewish society, as was mentioned above (71). He also describes the German soldiers' amateur theatre company, which was the occasion for one of his theatrical efforts, as has been remarked above (71).
19. *Nach Bialystok* (To Białystok). The narration continues with the transfer of the whole unit to Białystok, to the chagrin of many, in particular Hans Goslar. The author, however, came armed with introductions from his Kovno friends and soon became integrated into the city's society and found a translator to do his job, a tireless Hebrew writer whom he holds up as example of the respect Eastern European Jews had for German culture.

20. *Besucher aus Deutschland* (Visitors from Germany). The author describes his feeling of humility before the Jews of the East which led him to refuse to take part in any Zionist activities, as he felt he could contribute nothing and wanted to learn not to teach. This leads him to the numerous visitors from the West, full of goodwill and ideas on how to help, which most of the times did not work. Since G's job was to act as their guide and make sure they saw only what they were supposed to see as already mentioned, he had first hand experience of the matter. There were also occasions in which the arrogance of the West caused damage to eastern Jews; this was mostly the case with German officers, especially those of middle rank. The author is careful to dissociate the High Command, and Ludendorff personally from any such attitudes, remarking on the fact that during this time, far from showing the antisemitic stance adopted after the war, he went out of his way to show his favour to the Jews, giving examples of his behaviour.

21. *Leben und Sterben in Bialystock* [sic] (Life and death in Białystok). Following a heart-rending drawing of a group of beggars, clearly starving, follows an attack on the senselessness of the bureaucratic measures imposed on the population by the German authorities, and the immense amount of energy devoted to their enforcement. This resulted in numerous indignities being inflicted on civilians, whilst the soldiers were forced to watch and were prevented from
intervening by fear of a court-martial, as the author bitterly puts it: ‘Die Erziehung zur Feigheit ist die Grundlage jeder militärischen Disziplin’ (The education in cowardliness is the basis of all military discipline. 1924, 150). This mighty machine was powerless to prevent the starvation of the civilian population, and the narrator describes the horrible scenes which he witnessed, accompanied by the efforts made by many of the soldiers to save some lives, including his and Goslar’s on behalf of an orphanage. The effect is reinforced in the next section by a drawing of three undernourished and barefoot children.

22. Abstecher nach Warschau (Detour to Warsaw). This chapter marks a break with the bleak content of the previous section, probably the grimmest in the whole book. Promising to avoid such painful issues, and insisting that he has glossed over the worst incidents, the narrator detours literally with an account of his bodily side trip to Warsaw, where his German friend Lazarus Barth introduces him to the city and the German administration, and his Polish friend Hirsch Zabludowski tells him stories of the city under Tsarist rule. He aims a few barbs at the attitude of the German Jewish representative of the religious Orthodox party, the Agudat Israel. This is a continuation of his attack on the Orthodox German establishment.

23. Schulvisiten (School visits). Still in Warsaw, the author tells of a visit he paid with a travelling commission from Germany to several schools, first making clear the immense thirst for knowledge to be found in the East. The first school, of the Mizrahi movement, is a model and its students far more advanced than their German peers. The second school is an old-fashioned heder, and the visitors are appalled by the dirt and overcrowding. Still, the narrator has demurs from a total abolition of such schools, he feels that more good would be lost by
such a move than the ensuing result would produce. This again is typical of the above-mentioned cult of the Eastern Jews (108).

24. Der entfesselte Schulrat (The raging schools inspector). The subject is still education but the narrator moves the action to Kovno, where the Prussian official in charge of education, aghast at the total lack of method he saw in the Jewish schools, was determined to reform the system. His two attempts fail – he tries to have the knowledge of Hebrew of the teachers of the famous yeshiva (Talmudic academy) of Slobodka tested, but the indignant rabbis refuse to read a line. He then organises a teachers’ course for the primary school teachers of the area, to be taught by Leo Deutschländer, but almost all those attending the course turn out to be merchants who availed themselves of the opportunity to travel to Kovno, since the Germans had banned the civilian population from travelling in the area. This section can be seen as an illustration of the author’s assertion about the uselessness of many of the reforms based on Western models. He clearly makes it understood that the average educational establishment in the East is superior to its Western counterpart.

25. Modelljagd (Model hunt). A humorous description of the author’s efforts to lure suitable models, including beggars, into Struck’s studio to have them pose for Struck, who had returned from the front and was now an officer in charge of Jewish affairs in the region. Most of the drawings in Das ostjüdische Antlitz were executed during this period.

26. Bialystoker Dienst (Service in Bialystok). More comedy in the form of a depiction of G’s quarters and those of his neighbour Arnold Zweig. When made part of a group that was to take charge of organising the production of theatre plays for the entertainment of the troops, the author proposes Lessing’s classic comedy Minna von Barnhelm, but is overruled by the
officer in charge, a theologian, who chooses *Charley’s Aunt*. He concludes sardonically that at least it was one of the Kaiser’s favourite pieces.

27. *Soldatenbühne* (Military theatre). The author remembers how he participated in a production of Verdi’s *Rigoletto* whilst in the barracks in Rathenow shortly before being sent to the front. In Białystok he adapted Schiller’s *Don Carlos* putting in references to make it topical.

28. *Blumentage* (Flower days). A short section describing how the young Zionists in Białystok organised collection days for welfare organisations in which they would sell flowers with the star of David and the national colours; the military band would play the Zionist anthem *Hatikvah*. This, so the author argues, led for most German non-Jews to the first meeting with nationally-conscious Jews. There is a description, which today makes for peculiar reading, of the band in the German theatre playing *Hatikvah* whilst the German officers all stood up in silence as a mark of respect. The point is assisted by a drawing of the volunteers with military and civilian passersby in the city’s park.

29. *Das Märchen vom sittlichen Tiefstand* (The tale of moral debasement). The title points out to the ambiguity of the response to the situation in the East, since depth could be understood as well as debasement. This section is purely apologetic. It responds to the numerous reports of German soldiers who were shocked by the numbers of Jewish prostitutes. His argument is threefold. First he admits that the awful conditions did drive many women to this expedient, but when conditions became easier, they reverted to other occupations, citing as an example the success in Białystok of a centre to retrain and find employment for Jewish prostitutes. He argues that many soldiers preferred Jewish women because of the easier communication and
the lack of hostility. Referring to Vilna, and supporting it with personal experience, he states that many of the girls that took soldiers to the cafes and tea-houses were intent only in getting a good meal, and would later leave the establishments and the soldiers in them. Interestingly, he refers to the relative minority of Jewish women in the tea-houses, and the drawing by Zeller depicts a Polish tea-house.

30. *Ein literarisches Gericht* (A literary tribunal). Continuing the apologetic theme, a contrast to the preceding chapter is provided by the description of the animated meeting of a Jewish literary society in which a group of young people set a mock-trial of a character from a modern literary work. The author points out their seriousness and the high level of their discussion.

31. *Vereinsleben* (Life of the societies). On the many literary and theatrical societies in Bialystok. The author speaks of the complete lack of familiarity among Russian Jews with the rules of debate, which caused the speeches to last long and often be interrupted with no attempt at orderly procedure. The societies are riven by partisan attitudes, and the various groups are constantly clashing; only what the author terms assimilation is wholly unrepresented. The passion for culture makes theatre societies a very different affair from their Western equivalents.

32. *Theater*. After the episode of the theatre criticism of Hans Goslar which was wrongly attributed to G, as mentioned already, the author gives an account of the artistic poverty of Yiddish theatre, with the uneducated public as the perfect foil for the inferior pieces by Goldfaden and the outrageous plagiarisms and adaptations of Gordin. The latter gives rise to a mention of the wholesale plagiarism of *Tohuwabohu* by the editor of the New York Yiddish newspaper *Yidish togblat*. 
33. Die Wilnaer Truppe (The Vilna troupe). After dealing with how the Yiddish theatre troupe was formed in 1916 and with its discovery by members of the Kovno group, G included, the author proceeds to tell of the tours he helped organise, which brought the company successively to Białystok, Kovno, and finally to Warsaw. He tells of how they achieved a resonant success, and as has already been noted, of how he helped bring them to Germany after the war. He adds anecdotes concerning some of the temperamental and artistically honest artists.

34. Białystoker Kino (Białystok cinema). The author relates how movies were shown at benefits for Jewish charities, including a missionary film with a convert Jew who finds salvation in the church, after which a Jewish choir sings a psalm, heightening the absurdity.

35. Zurück nach Kowno (Back to Kovno). The narration moves back to Kovno following the transfer of the unit in October 1917. At the instigation of the antisemitic Lieutenant O., the author and Zeller participated in the redaction of a humorous supplement to the Kownoer Zeitung, which is shut down after one issue.74

36. Café Steinbach. A description of the meeting point of the intellectuals after their return from Białystok, and its brave owner.

37. Das Kownoer Gymnasium (The Kovno gymnasium). This section is devoted to the Jewish gymnasium, which was a focal point of the intellectuals – G and many of his friends

74 Hermann Struck did manage to publish at least four issues of another periodical entitled Kownoer Bilderbogen, illustrated by him and with contributions by several of the members of the circle, including a poem by Arnold Zweig, 'Der Bettler', but nothing by G as far as I am aware (A124/131).
gave talks to staff and students. The author’s point is to show how the students, although the institution had been founded and was led by two anti-Zionist German Jews—army chaplain Dr. Rosenack and Dr. Josef Carlebach—were resolutely Zionist and forced the administration to dedicate a high proportion of the classes to the Hebrew language, and to sing Hatikvah in the school functions.

38. Nachbarinnen (Female neighbours). The author tells of how life imitated art: in his room, near the gymnasium, he overheard his two female neighbours studying Heine’s poem Atta Troll with an intensity that matched Jossel and Chane’s in the first chapter of Tohuwabohu.

39. Das jüdische Dezernat (The Jewish section). An encomium of Struck’s activity, mixed with a denunciation of the almost forced removal of Jewish men to work in Germany, and the irony of the persecution against East European Jewish immigrants in Germany after the war. This section and the following have now acquired a new resonance and can only be read, in the light of later abuses.

40. Beschlagnahme und Requisitionen (Confiscation and commandeering). This section continues a detailed description of the abuses of the occupiers and the trickery to which the population resorted in response. Once more, with guile people manage to neutralise the worst efforts of the bureaucracy.

41. Abschied von Kowno (Goodbye to Kovno). With the arrival of a new commander having complicated the narrator’s life; the peace of Brest Litovsk, signed between Germany and the Soviet government makes his transfer possible. The narrator then describes his last days and
departure from Kovno. The chapter has an illustration of a Jewish family, mother with a baby in arms, a young boy and girl and a toddler, barefoot on the threshold of their wooden hut.

42. Einszug in Brüssel (Arrival in Brussels). The narrator tells of his return to civilian life, and finds one Zionist in Brussels, Hansel Traub.

43. Allerhand jüdische Treffpunkte (Various Jewish rendezvous places). Somewhat unjustly, this chapter highlights the contrast between the Jewish community of Kovno, self-assured and not afraid to enter into contact with German Jewish soldiers, and the Belgian Jews, who the author feels, were even more reluctant than non-Jews to establish relationships with the occupiers. He gives an account of the acquaintances he made with those Eastern European Jews from Galicia, who because of their Austro-Hungarian nationality were expelled from Antwerp by the Belgians. The German Jewish community is portrayed as indifferent and boring.

44. Ein Feind der Religion (An enemy of religion). An amusing anecdote about Eastern radicalism – the socialist Zionist who in a debate on religion and Zionism swears eternal enmity to religion, only to be found by the narrator in the synagogue dancing with the scrolls of the Torah on the day of the Rejoicing of the Law. This attitude characterises in his opinion Jewish extremism.
45. *Allerhand Begegnungen* (Diverse encounters). The author tells of meetings with several people, including the already noted one with Carl Sternheim, and relates his activity as a criminal lawyer in Brussels for a brief period.

46. *Der Zusammenbruch* (The collapse). Short account of the start of the revolution, and the hurried destruction of all the occupying administration’s records.

47. *Heimkehr* (The return home). The last trip of the war, in a brief account.

48. *Nachwort* (Epilogue). The author disavows any claims for the work as a proper book, and considers it as a collection of materials for a book, which he hopes to complete one day in Haifa. Only there, the author thinks, will the solution to the Jewish enigma present itself to him, as it may one day present itself to Western Jews; but not to Eastern Jews, since they already know the solution. The author refers to the shaky basis of Western religion and morals, as made evident during the war, and to the fragility that it revealed. He expresses a hope for the discovery of what lies in Eastern European Jewry, finishing with the words of the havdalah prayer already cited. These paragraphs constitute one of the most powerfully worded statements for a renewal of Western Jewry, and is fully in line with Ashheim’s *Cult of the Ostjuden*, as already remarked (*ASCHHEIM* 1982, 185-214).
2.3.2 Themes 

*Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich* (*Havdalah* and military tattoo) was published in 1924 by the *Jüdischer Verlag*. Magnus Zeller provided it with a cover illustration and twenty illustrations for the text. Zeller had been with G in Kovno, as has been seen, and his illustrations are drawn in a modern style and so have a more contemporary air than the more traditional drawings in Arnold Zweig’s *Das ostjüdische Antlitz* by G’s friend Hermann Struck, who had also been posted to the Eastern Front (73; ZWEIG 1920). This, together with Zweig’s highly idealised portrait of East European Jews, produces a completely different impression, and although both books are part of the turn to the East mentioned above, and have been linked, they are far from being alike (108; BRENNER 1996, 142-8). More about the four men and their relationship follows. As for the book, it recounts G’s experiences as a translator in the East from Whitsun 1916 to Whitsun 1918. As already seen in the first part, he was attached to the Press Section (*Presse Abteilung*) of the General Staff Headquarters for the Eastern Front (*Stab Ober-Ost*) which was located at Kovno except for eight months from January 1917, when it was transferred to Bialystok. His duties included translating German documents and proclamations into Yiddish and censoring the Vilna newspaper *Letste Nayes* (*Latest News*). On arrival in Kovno, he soon realised he was expected not to work very hard and so decided to hire a local to do his job, reckoning rightly that the income might mean the difference between starvation and survival to this man’s family.

On Monday evenings he attended the meetings of the Intellectual’s Club (*Intellektuellenklub*), which counted among its members Arnold Zweig, Richard Dehmel, Hermann

---

75 Zeller (1888-1972) was later declared mentally ill by the Nazis and ostracised. He survived thanks to a patron and later became a respected artist in the GDR; Arnold Zweig contributed a preface to one of the books about him (See ZELLER 1993, ZELLER AND LUDWIG 1988, and ZELLER, ZWEIG AND LANG 1960).
Struck, Magnus Zeller, Hans Goslar, Herbert Eulenberg, an ex-Jesuit – Smigelski, Karl Schmidt-Rottluff, and G’s immediate superior Lieutenant Baron von Wilpert. For all the members of the club, the war involved coming in contact with East European Jewry, and this revealed to them unexpected treasures (DEHMEL 1919, 448-67). For Arnold Zweig, this was also a crucial period, it meant meeting Russian Jews with their Zionism and Socialism face to face, and resulted in his writing a text to accompany 50 drawings by fellow Intellektuell and Orthodox artist Hermann Struck; this was published in 1920, under the title Das ostjüdische Antlitz (The Eastern Jewish Countenance); although Zweig later changed his views, the experience had great personal significance (ZWEIG 1920; WENZEL 1978, 76-8, 105-8; MIDLGEY 1987, 8-12). Magnus Zeller, like Struck an artist, would later supply the illustrations to Hau Doloh und Zapfenstreich. The club was an important part of what Aschheim has called the “strange encounter”, and it continued to meet after the war in Berlin, as the Former Intellectuals Club (Klub ehemaliger Intellektueller) (ASCHHEIM 1982, 139-84; 1924, 45-55).

Although he does not omit the hunger and the degradation caused by the war, G is more interested in contrasting the fervour and sincerity of the services in the Eastern synagogues with the artificiality and stiffness to be found in their German counterparts, even in the Orthodox ones, although at first all one can see is the complete chaos that reigns in the former. On a visit to Vilna, G, like Kafka, discovers the beauty of Yiddish through the Yiddish theatre: ‘Aber dort, vielleicht zum ersten Male, ist mir das Schöne und Innige der jiddischen Sprache aufgegangen. Sie ist wirklich adäquat den Gefühlen...’ (But there, maybe

75 Dehmel (1863-1920), as a Christian writer who belonged to the Symbolist circle, is particularly valuable as a witness to this: he saw the depth and the commitment of Jews in the East and became a Zionist. After his death, G wrote an article about him (1920i).
for the first time, I realised the beauty and warmth of the Yiddish language: it perfectly matches feelings [...] 1924, 80). He also has a description of a study-house, with reflections on the place of study in Judaism. Before the transfer to Białystok, he fell ill with blood-poisoning, and experienced personally the care and generosity of the local Jewish families.

In October 1917 Gronemann returned to Kovno together with the Press Section. He was involved in teaching German Literature to the teachers of the Kovno Gymnasium, an institution created for the Jewish community by Feldrabiner Rosenack, which quickly became Zionist in spirit. The establishment of a Jewish Section (jüdisches Dezernat) led by Struck, took the load of caring for the local Jewish communities off the shoulders of the Feldrabiner, whose responsibility it had been until then. Although their behaviour was not exceptionally cruel, the Germans, through their inflexibility and their insensitive treatment of the population, together with the many unjust requisitions, managed to alienate many of the locals. Gronemann saw this, but he was also impressed by what he saw as Ludendorff’s friendly attitude to the Jews, in total contrast to his post-war antisemitism. Pace Sander Gilman, it does not appear that Gronemann realised, even in the Twenties, how wrong he had been about Ludendorff’s motivations. Another facet of his basically pragmatic attitude can be seen in the report by Bernhard Kahn, Secretary of the Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden, that after having had a difference of opinion with Ludendorff in 1916, the latter had him put under surveillance by Military Intelligence (Gilman 1979, 355; Kahn in Richarz 1979, 462-73). After Brest-Litovsk, Ludendorff was transferred to Brussels, and Gronemann, not liking the officer who was left in charge of his section, succeeded in also getting transferred to Brussels, where he arrived on Whitsun 1918. There he continued as a Yiddish translator with a
community of Galician Jews, expelled from Antwerp by the Belgians as enemy nationals; he finally returned to Germany in November 1918.

_Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich_ has been wrongly described as a novel (GEIS 1971, 930). The book was characterised by the Orthodox editor of _Jescurum_, Josef Wohlgemuth, as a not wholly successful _Mussarbuch_ or ethical book, but singled out for praise the chapter on 'The ten idlers' and the Epilogue. Incidentally, Wohlgemuth had been G’s teacher at the Hildesheimer rabbinical seminary in Berlin in 1897, as seen above (22; WOHLGEMUTH 1924, 891). More recently, the work has been deemed, on the one hand, to glorify Eastern European Jewish spirituality, while on the other hand, its author is said not to be either attracted or repelled by Eastern Jewish culture but to have a purely political interest in Eastern Jews, as possible recruits for Zionism (BRENNER 1996, 146; GILMAN 1979, 354). The truth of the matter, however, is that the situation is more complex: while the book is certainly part of what Aschheim has called the cult of the _Ostjuden_, even Brenner, who classes it as an idealisation, qualifies this by noting its humour and by emphasising in comparison the pathos and sentimentality of Zweig’s _Das ostjüdische Antlitz_, which is also a result of the Eastern Front experience (ASCHHEIM 1982, 185; BRENNER 1996, 142-6). Gilman’s description, on the other hand, ignores G’s repeatedly expressed sympathy for Eastern Jews, and reduces his attempt to distance himself from the tragic situation, the better to deal with it, to cold political calculation. G’s disclaimer of any paedagogical intentions, made both at the onset and in the last chapter, is nevertheless in contradiction with his own use of the _havdalah_ both for the title and at the end of the book:

Wenn wir erkannt haben werden, was die Stärke jener Menschen im Osten ist –

wenn wir erkannt haben werden, was im alten Judentum ruht: der ewige Geist,

verkörpert in jener heiligen Rolle, in der Thora, dann werden wir wissen gleich
When we have recognised what is the strength of those people of the East – when we have recognised what lies in old Judaism: the eternal spirit, embodied in those holy scrolls, the Torah, then we will know how to differentiate the eternal from the transitory, the essential from the inessential. In the words of the havdalah:

“To make a distinction between holy and profane, between light and darkness...
Lehawdil
bein kaudesch lechaul,
bein aur lechauschecch.”

At the time of its publication, the book was praised as a humorous yet deep work by Georg Hermann, Max Brod, Herbert Eulenberg, and Alfred Döblin (1927, 297). The Orthodox editor of Jeschurun also praised it despite what he termed the subjective views of its author, discounting the latter’s attacks on Western Orthodoxy (WOHLGEMUTH 1924, 392) The book was reprinted in Germany in 1984. This edition was the only reprint of any of G’s works after the Second World War that lacked a foreword or epilogue that would put the work in a historical context. This glossed over the destruction of the world described in the book, hit in close succession by the First World War, the Russian Revolution and the civil war following it, and finally dealt the final blow by the Holocaust, not to mention the murder and exile of many of its German protagonists. It also fails to give many relevant facts in G’s life. It is hard to know what the German reading-public must have made of it; as it is, the book provoked little response and was promptly remaindered. The circumstances of this publication have been
criticised by Schalom Ben-Chorin, the Israeli writer in German, in an article remembering G (Ben-Chorin 1986).

For Victor Klemperer, reading *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich* in the summer of 1941 was a decisive event, and he devoted considerable space to it in his memoirs (Klemperer 1996, 478-82). Klemperer had been stationed in Kovno and was transferred only a few days before the arrival of G, and so he knew many of the members of the club. Klemperer tries to determine why he dislikes the book so much, given that he does not find it aesthetically objectionable:

> Alles in Gronemanns Buch ist mir interessant, nichts finde ich in ästetischer Hinsicht zu beanstanden, keiner seiner anekdotischen Berichte scheint mir die Wahrheit allzu karikaturistisch zu verzerren. Warum ist mir das Werkchen dennoch verhaßt, so verhaßt, daß ich es nur mit Widerwillen zu Ende las? (Klemperer 1996, 480)

I find everything in Gronemann’s book interesting, there is nothing to which I would object from the aesthetic point of view and none of his anecdotes seems to me to be all too caricatural as to distort the truth. So why do I still find the work so hateful? So hateful that it was only by overcoming my aversion that I could finish it.

He stresses his rejection of G’s Zionist position, accusing him of idealising backward and fanatical Ostjuden, whilst denigrating the enlightened views of his brother: ‘Und mit derselben Glorie umstrahlt er ihre Talmudschulen und jedes Merkmal ihrer Erstartheit in dem, was tausend Jahre zurückliegt und sinnlos und lebensfeindlich geworden ist.’ (Klemperer 1996, 481) But the matter seems more than personal, and his conception of the Ostjuden typical of his kind and time. His rejection of the book’s view-point is complete, and he goes as far as to accuse Zionism of facilitating the rise of National socialism and even of putting the two on the same level:
Immer ist mir die Gesinnung verhaßt gewesen, die aus Gronemanns Buch spricht, und heute ist sie mir verhaßter als je, denn sie gibt Hitler recht und hat ihm vorgearbeitet, und manchmal ist es mir wahrhaftig zweifelhaft, ob ein wesentlicher Unterschied besteht zwischen einem Nationalsozialisten und einem Zionist... (KLEMPERER 1996, 481)

I have always hated the way of thinking that speaks in Gronemann’s book, and today I hate more than ever, since it agrees with Hitler and laid the groundwork for him; and sometimes it is truly doubtful to me whether there is a fundamental difference between a Nationalsocialist and a Zionist...

The circumstances in which the memoirs were written explain the extremity and bitterness of Klemperer’s comments, but nevertheless the fact that it was G’s book, and later Tohuwabohu, that served him as a touchstone to clarify his position vis-à-vis his identity as a German, serves to underline the importance of the work and the need for it to be republished.

2.4 Schalelt

2.4.1 Summary Gronemann’s last book to be published in Germany, and his last work of any length to be published in German anywhere, had a noteworthy title: Schalelt. Beitrage zur Philosophie des “Wenn schon!” (Schalelt. Contributions to the Philosophy of “So what!”). Schalelt is the Judeo-German word for tsholent, the traditional dish kept warm over the Sabbath, and the work’s epigraph is Heine’s poem to schalelt; the subtitle alludes to Vaihinger’s sceptical philosophical system, popular at the time: Die Philosophie des “Als ob” (The Philosophy of “As If”) (VAIHINGER 1911). To this he adds a new variant: “Als ob nicht” (As if not) and makes it into a guiding principle of Jews at all times and in all places.
Schalet is a collection of loosely tied anecdotes and essays very much in the German feuilleton tradition, witty chapters about acquaintances and professional experiences interspersed with reflections on Judaism and Zionism and a few personal and autobiographical details; a short summary of each section is provided below.

1. Philosophie des Unbewussten (Philosophy of the unconscious). The narrator argues the need for books not written by specialists on their recondite areas. He goes on to explain the difficulty he had in finding a title for the book, and to discuss some of the possible choices he had.

2. Chammer sag Li! The section is devoted to explaining the meaning of the untranslatable title as well as the reason he did not choose it. The words Chammer (Hebrew hamor, a he-ass), and li (Hebrew, to me, used by the groom in the wedding ceremony to state that he takes the bride as a wife for himself), give rise to the story of the hesitating bridegroom to whom the words were hissed by an irate bride, accompanied by a painful elbow jab. This leads to an anecdote about a younger man who for a bet dashed to a young girl and said the ritual formula whilst slipping a ring round her finger. According to Jewish law, the couple were married, so the local rabbi summoned the young man, gave him a good dressing-down, and advised him that he would have to give the lady a divorce. He responded that he had never said li, but rather nie (German, never). But when the young woman arrived, she and her companions asserted he had actually said li, and refused to accept the divorce. It was with some difficulty that he extricated himself from the escapade.
3. *Moschel* (Parable). The narrator proceeds to explain the last word of the previous chapter, and paradoxically, he does it by means of a parable. The parable ascribed to the Maggid of Dubno, a Hasidic preacher, makes the point that behind a good story always lies a deeper interpretation. This may be taken as a statement of justification on the author’s part.

4. *Kuriosa – nicht Lozelach* (Curiosities – not Jewish jokes). The narrator states he will strive to avoid stale Jewish jokes and announces his intention to relate only true events, adding that everything in his two previous books is true, as mentioned above.

5. *Wenn schon!* (So what!) He starts by stating his first principle: ‘Grundsätze muß der Mensch haben – aber er darf sich nicht nach ihnen richten!’ (A person should have principles, but need not follow them!) (1927, 37). This to introduce the paradox of the Jewish people, simultaneously bound by centuries-old traditions, and at the same time driven by curiosity to explore all sorts of new ideas.

6. *Rabulistik* (Sophistry). An explanation of the Talmud and the Talmudic method of case law and legal reasoning. The narrator states that the ability to find the way in the maze is something innate, and it also explains why so many Jews are sceptical and resistant to take things on the authority of experts.

---

77 From the Hebrew *mashal,* in Ashkenazi pronunciation *moshel,* used both in West- and East-Yiddish.
78 From the Hebrew *lets,* meaning clown, prankster; also used in West- and East-Yiddish.
79 By which he means *Tohuwabohu* and *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich.*
7. *Risches* (Calumny). The narrator attacks, via the expression ‘machen Risches’, the exaggerated fear of most German Jews, who in their effort to avoid giving antisemites weapons, refuse to discuss topics that might seem to show Jews in a bad light. He insists that antisemites will hate Jews regardless of the attitudes of the latter, as mentioned above, and states that Jews are hated for their virtues and tolerated for their weaknesses. He follows the Zionist opinion that it is lacking in dignity to sweep under the carpet things that other peoples do not suppress, and that Jews also have the right to their share of criminals and bad persons.

8. *Versteckspiel* (Hide-and-seek). Anecdotes on Jews or converted Jews trying to hide their Jewishness, together with the strange cases of converts to Christianity who still keep some of the Jewish customs. This culminates with the case of the Viennese convert who left all of his money to the Benedictines on condition that a monk say kaddish for him every year on the anniversary of his death.

9. *Wechsel auf die Ewigkeit* (Bill of exchange on eternity). From the fact that the Viennese convert just mentioned insured his life with two different companies the narrator speculates on the preoccupation in both religions with the afterlife, although personally convinced that Judaism had initially not concerned itself with it. Still, for many Jews a good deed, or *Mizwoh* (Modern Hebrew *mitsvah*), is taken into account in their favour for the afterlife. He proceeds to list good deeds, amongst them one done by his friend and inspiration in

---

80 From the Hebrew *rish 'ut*, in Ashkenazi pronunciation; its meaning in Hebrew is evil, calumny; the expression *machen Risches*, used originally in Yiddish, but common in German among Jews, means (usually but not necessarily, for a Jew) to do things that may give rise to antisemitism.
Hanover, the Ahlem educational philanthropist, Alexander Moritz Simon, already mentioned. From good deeds he manages a smooth transition to the following section.

10. *Mifiverstandnisse* (Misunderstandings). The misunderstandings are those between Jews and Christians, which according to the narrator underlie not only the enmity between the two religions, but also their mutual esteem. Examples are given of linguistic misunderstandings between German and Yidish speakers, using an East European Jew, Majer Barches, who when he appeared before the court was at first taken for a Major Barches, with the preposterous situation of an East European Jew being accorded the respect usually reserved for a Prussian officer.

11. *Vor Gericht* (Before the court). The gap separating those administering justice from those appearing before it is so great that the two groups can hardly understand each other. All the more so, the narrator argues, when Jews appear before the court, and illustrates this with several examples from his own practice, including a clever trick his client Majer Barches played on the other side’s counsel and the time a Russian Jewess accused G of being a Zionist, a term she understood referred to someone who wanted to assassinate the Tsar and have him replaced by a Jew.

12. *Jomkippur vor Gericht* (The Day of Atonement before the court). The narrator relates a curious case told to him by another lawyer. A cantor hired to lead the prayers and blow the *shofar* (ram’s horn) in a synagogue during Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement), sues the community for having paid only half of the previously agreed fee. The case comes up before a judge, a Prussian junker, who asks whether he did not do what he was supposed to, or was it the quality of his performance that caused the community’s action. When the defendants
explain it was neither, but rather that he ate and drank on that day. The judge, indignant, rules against the defendants, stating that to deprive a worker of his food is a violation of his rights. They appeal and the appeals court, after hearing the testimonies of both a Reform and an Orthodox rabbi, finds against the cantor for not having atoned for the community as he was supposed to. However, the amount of the damage is so small that the community is forced to pay most of the withheld fees. The narrator emphasises the fact that the lawyer acting for the cantor is Jewish and knows very well his client is in the wrong; it is only when the case for the community is taken over by a dynamic Christian lawyer that they get to explain their position in court.

13. *Ein tüchtiger Kantor* (A capable cantor). The story, told to the narrator by a Dutch lawyer, tells the case of an East European Jew who was thoroughly unsuccessful in all his business ventures and had to be rescued by the said lawyer on numerous occasions. Finally the lawyer received a request from a community in another city in the Netherlands for a cantor to lead the services. The man declared himself capable and so the lawyer sent him to the community. To his surprise the community sent a letter stating that the man was totally incompetent and that they had been forced to put him in a boat to England. Two years later the advocate receives a visit from a prosperous looking man who turns out to be the same East European Jew, who announces to the lawyer’s amazement, that he now works as a cantor in Leeds, and explains that the community in question is so small that they have not had a minyan, the necessary minimum number of adult males, in all this time and consequently, he has not been called upon to perform his job.
14. **Khille-Sorgen** (Community troubles). Plays on the opposition of the two words for community available to the German Jew: the bureaucratic and cold sounding German *Gemeinde* vis-à-vis the comfortable and homely Yiddish *Khille* (Hebrew *kehillah*). This seems on the face of it a prime example of the process of idealisation of the East European Jew that has already been touched upon. Yet the narrator proceeds to demolish the ideal image and show that even the most modern German community in a big city has a lot in common with those communities in the East; the shared features include the propensity to engage in long and pointless domestic disputes. The narrator then cites examples drawn from the relatively large community of Hanover to small communities both West and East. The sharpness of these feuds is explained using a commonplace Zionist argument: the lack of political rights has forced Jews to turn inwards, driving all the suppressed energies into the political microcosm – the Khille.

15. **Der Kampf ums Barett** (The struggle over the skullcap). The word used to describe this episode – Fröschmäusekrieg (War between frogs and mice), points to the influence on G of Greek literature.\(^{81}\) In fact, the whole episode is the kernel for the play *Der Prozeß um des Esels Schatten*, which is discussed below (section 2.6.5).

The story, told to the narrator by one of the participants, is that of a cantor in a medium-sized community who decides to add a touch of solemnity to the prayer marking the end of the Sabbath by wearing his Sabbath skullcap rather than the ordinary hat. The move causes a split between the conservative and the liberal elements of the community; parties

---

81 The *Batrachomyomachia* is an ancient poem parodying the *Iliad*, and was attributed in Antiquity to Homer. Incidentally, the poem provided C. M. Wieland and thus G with the name for one of the characters in *Der Prozeß um des Esels Schatten*, Physignatus (Puff-cheek).
are established and soon the argument has intensified to such an extent that the community is still involved in it. The narrator muses on how a Romeo and Juliet element could be added to it, and this is precisely what G did in the play.

16. Überzeugungssport und Gebetrekorde (Conviction-sport and praying-records). To the traditional Jewish antipathy to sport, the narrator juxtaposes the cases of Jews whose approach to prayer and good works could be said to resemble that of athletes to sport.

17. Chasanowitsch. An anecdote about Dr. Josef Chasanowitsch (1844-1919) from Bialystok, founder of the Jewish National Library. Chasanowitsch was so obsessed by his project that once in the middle of a discussion about obtaining a charter of colonisation for the Zionist movement, when somebody asked a reason to get such a document, he answered: “You fool! The charter is needed so that I can have a copy for my library!” (“Du Narr! – Die Urkunde ist nötig, damit ich für meine Bibliothek ein Duplikat haben kann” 1927, 133).

18. Vom Palästinasport (On the Palestine sport). A satirical look at the fashion for tourism in the Holy Land, from where the visitor who stayed for a few days returns an expert who gives talks and even writes books.

19. Steckenpferd- und Prinzipienreiter (Faddists and sticklers for principle). More witticisms at the expense of the (not exclusively German-) Jewish obsession with matters of principle, leading to fanaticism.

20. Der orthodoxe Bubikopf (The Orthodox bob haircut). An amused glance at the Orthodox custom of women wearing wigs so as not to show their hair leads to the absurd consequences of Orthodox adaptation to modernity and thence to an attack on the Orthodox groups that in
Germany seceded from the mainstream communities to form *Austrittsgemeinde* (separate congregations).

21. *Das Arbekanfeß*. The narrator explains the meaning of the word, used to name the tasselled prayer-shawl worn as a piece of underwear by Orthodox males to cover the chest and the upper part of the back. The term, used in Yiddish and by German Jews, corresponds to the Hebrew *arba' kenafoth*, meaning four fringes. The narrator calls it the uniform of God’s shock troops. There follows a series of tales having to do with this and other Jewish customs, both from the Jews’ and the Gentiles’ point of view.

22. *Wie man sich trifft* (How people meet). Stories told by G’s uncle, Joachim Fink, and David Wolffsohn, about meetings in foreign countries, with Jews who were invariably kind and generous. Once again the narrator compares the kindesses shown to German Jewish soldiers in the East front during the First World War by Russian Jews with the shabby treatment those same Russian Jews suffered at the hands of some of their German brethren after the war. This idealisation of the circumstances lacks the subtle handling shown in chapter 14. It also marks the start of a series of chapters in which Zionist points are made with little regard for other viewpoints, albeit wittily.

23. *Treuhänder der Kultur* (The trustees of culture). An exposition of the Zionist stand on how the double-life of Jews in the Diaspora makes it impossible for them to have a natural disposition to their lives as Jews. This is caused by the strain of having to function as the trustees of other people’s cultures.
24. *Konfusion*. The confusion that life in the Diaspora causes to those Jewish children growing up in it is exacerbated by their parents’ assimilatory attempts, ranging from Christmas trees in Jewish homes to outright conversion, with many intermediate stages; the narrator delights in pointing out some of the inconsistencies and involuntary absurdities that arise from this situation.

25. *Ein Haus im Tiergarten* (A house in the Tiergarten). The story of an eccentric Orthodox Jew from Berlin, who contrived to get Gentile guests out of the dining-room when he had to perform the table blessings, and whose household ran concurrently two kitchens – one kosher and one non-kosher. He is introduced again in chapter fourteen of the memoirs.

26. *Unübersetzbares* (Untranslatable). Following on the previous section, the author comments on how difficult it is to make non-Jews understand certain Jewish customs, and on how these difficulties are multiplied by the attempts of Jews not to draw attention to themselves.

27. *Ignoranz*. There follows an attack on Western Jews for their ignorance of Jewish ritual and customs. This is illustrated by a variety of comical examples. The narrator states that these Jews have much Bildung, if by it one understands what is left after one forgets all that one ever learnt, and this because although they learnt very little, they forgot it thoroughly (Sie haben zwar nicht viel gelernt, das wenige aber haben sie gründlich vergessen. 1927, 198).

28. *Wie man sich nicht trifft* (How people do not meet). The assault on German Jewry shifts to the unawareness of the Jewish political and economic situation, particularly in Eastern
Europe, and how this has given rise to stereotypes and paradoxes. The subject-matter then changes to Eastern Jews and their lack of knowledge of Western Europe, particularly among the young who have an idealised perception of Western culture.

29. In fremder Welt (In a foreign world). The narrator continues with tales of Eastern European Jews who have come to the West and in their desperate battle for subsistence are forced sometimes to resort to measures which are not wholly sanctioned in their new home.

30. Gefühls-Paradoxe (Paradoxes of feeling). The flow is interrupted for a light-hearted causerie about the numerous oddities the narrator has experienced.

31. Im Dilemma (In a quandary). The narrator has two more anecdotes; one about a man who was alive but legally dead, the other one about a woman who was legally married to two men at the same time.

32. Man akkordiert (One accommodates oneself). On the deceptions to which East European Jews are forced by the petty rules so ruthlessly enforced by the Prussian bureaucracy and police. Barbs are aimed at Reform and Orthodox accommodations, but also at the intolerance and lack of consideration for other people’s feelings to be found in the East.

33. Ein völkischer Dichter (A ‘Volk-ish’ author). The story of a poor Jewish peddler from the East who composed a nationalist German poem and when the piece was set to music and became the anthem of one of the right-wing groups sued them for unauthorised reproduction and use of his product. The focal point lies in the irony of the antisemites being forced to print under the title of their song, which extols the manly Germanic virtues, the name of its
author – Leib Krotoschin. The story becomes the occasion for observations on antisemites, their credulousness, and their preference for Jewish advocates.

34. Völkische Verlegenheiten ('Volk-ish' embarrassments). Continues on the subject of Jews and lawyers, with antisemitic counsel defending Jewish clients, and the antisemitic lawyer who falls in love with a Jewish girl.

35. Der unbekannte Jude (The unknown Jew). This chapter develops the Zionist idea that at the root of antisemitism lies the fact that Jews are not known, in many cases because they do not let themselves be known. To illustrate this the case of a village in Bavaria is presented, where a young woman preparing herself to go to Palestine came to learn how to be a farmer, and with her willingness to work hard turned the whole village into Zionists who later agreed to receive more young pioneers. In hindsight it is hard to avoid asking oneself how this village fared under the Nazis.


37. Homiletik (Homiletics). The narrator remembers preachers who bored him and those who, not always intentionally, entertained him with their ideas and the way in which they expressed them.

38. Gottes Gendarmerie (God’s constabulary). Turning away from preaching, to which the narrator assigns a relatively minor role in Judaism, he discusses those Jews who try to be guardians that make sure their fellow Jews keep the commandments. The dismissal of preaching, which had attained an important role in Reform services and in German Jewry in
general, is another call to return to an earlier Judaism that he clearly considers better than the varieties present in his own day. He contends that those self-appointed watchdogs undertook their labour not out of a prurient desire to intrude in the lives of others, but rather out of concern for their welfare and that of the whole community. As an example he cites the already mentioned Raphael Karger, his step-grandfather, who constituted himself into the guardian of all those Jews he came in contact with. This section and the next are devoted to Karger, who lived in Garz an der Oder and with whom G spent much time as a child. As has been remarked below, G also allotted the second chapter of his memoirs to Karger and even introduced him by name in Tohuwabohu (171-2; n.d. a, 6-12; 1920, 65).

39. **Beim alten Karger** (At old Karger’s). A description of the Karger household, of Karger’s veneration for Elijahu Gutmacher, the Hasidic master from Grätz, and of his devoted care of all the vagrants and beggars that came to stay with him, since he had organised a hostel for them.

40. **Schnorrer** (Beggars). This and the next chapters constitute a lament on the passing of the traditional Jewish beggar (in Yiddish *shnorer*) with his conviction that he was doing the donor a favour by allowing him to fulfill the commandment of giving alms to the poor, and in consequence felt himself the equal of the latter.

41. **Schnurrige Wohltäter** (Amusing benefactors). About the *shnorers*’ sense of worth, which leads one of them to endow a trust in his testament, to be financed by the perpetuation of the alms he regularly received from a firm. This is contrasted with the stinginess shown by a miser.
42. *Aus meiner Schnorrersammlung* (Of my collection of beggars). Recollections of beggars the author met through his father and later on his own. Including descriptions of their tricks, for example the propensity to pass for scholars.

43. *Ist's vorbei?* (Is it over?) The reason for the disappearance of the beggars of the old school, i.e. the *shnorers*, is tentatively ascribed by the narrator to the bureaucratisation of charity, which has robbed beggars of their self-respect. However, there remains still the feeling among many Jews that any other Jew should be ready to assist them no matter how inconvenient or onerous that assistance may be to the giver. One of the anecdotes shows Eastern European Jews as honest to a remarkable degree. The point being to dispel the prevalent image of the *Ostjude* as shifty and unreliable. This brings to a close the subject of beggars.

44. *Ein Philosoph* (A philosopher). The narrator introduces now a person who he argues was a perfect devotee of the philosophy of "Wenn schon" (So what) and "als ob nicht" (as if not). This was an elderly man he knew since the 1890s in Hanover. This man read his prayerbook and his newspaper so slowly yet so thoroughly that he was hopelessly behind, in fact, years behind. Still he did not let this faze him but continued reading yesterday's news as if nothing had happened in the intervening period.

45. *Im Wandel* (Changing). In the author's opinion, the old man of Hanover differs from most people in that he actually knew that he was not in step with time, whereas the rest of humankind pretend to be alive when in reality they are long dead. He then adds a typical paradox to explain how the modern struggle between fathers and sons differs from that of the past; in the past they fought because they had different ideals, now they fight because
their ideals are the same – with the difference that the young want to actually bring them about. As support for the thesis the examples of Socialism and Zionism are brought forward for Jews and non-Jews respectively.

46. Entartung (Degeneration). The narrator states that the culmination of his philosophy is the “Auch das ist zum Guten” (That also is for the best. 1927, 291). Whereupon he warns the reader not to confuse the authentic philosophy of “Wenn schon” (So what) with the pseudo-philosophy of “Nu schön” (so there, all right) which is so prevalent, but which in truth is but a degeneration (Entartung) of the real thing. The true philosophy has little to do with indifference or apathy, with that mindless transit from cradle to grave that characterises so many. This brings him to remark that the book has to come to an end as well.

47. Materialsammelstelle (Collection point for material). Having come to the end, the author tries to predict what the reaction of his readers will be. There will be letters sending him further anecdotes, and others accusing him of bringing Jews into disrepute (machen Risches). He tries to preempt the latter by explaining that he has spoken only about things extraordinary and curious, so their very peculiarity should make it clear that not everybody behaves in such a way. He intends to continue writing about the Jews, to make them better known, until such time as they can be known for what they are in their own country.

2.4.2 Themes It is in the central years of the Weimar republic that the work is written. The uncertainties of the new era had given rise to a veritable flood of books of essays, some trying to dissect the contemporary situation for the benefit of a public often at a loss in the new
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82 This is a literal translation of the Hebrew expression Gam zo letovah, common among German Jews.
system; others attempting to offer a comprehensive philosophy by means of which to cope with the new and unfathomable world. The former type, which also included novels, often compared the present to the pre-war period, whilst the latter, in Peter Sloterdijk’s words, full of yearning for the missing wholeness, offered a bewildering variety of systems with which to regain the lost paradise, and constituted a market-place of syntheses (SLOTERDIJK 1995, 322-4). Sloterdijk has drawn attention, among others, to three traits that characterised these works; the first one is the insistence on organic ways, as opposed to the artificial character of the modern; another is the emphasis on irrational intuition together with the distrust of reason as a tool of analysis, for it was seen as a corroding instrument; the third feature is the turn to the East as a reservoir of wisdom and to an alleged Oriental Universalism as a remedy for Western Individualism (SLOTERDIJK 1995, 327-30, 332-7). It must be remarked that these traits had their parallels in the Jewish community. A prime example of the stress on the organic is the opposition between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, which was current in the Jewish world of Weimar, just as it was in the surrounding society (ISENBERG 1995, 1-17; BRENNER 1996, 36-42). In the same manner, a turn to the irrational was effected among the Jews of the Weimar republic, most strikingly within the Liberal sector of the community (BRENNER 1996, 42-6).

Schalet can be seen as part of the stream of works just described, with a very specific slant – the situation it seeks to scrutinise is that of the German Jews, and the remedy it claims to offer is that of Zionism. Nevertheless, this is not done in the solemn manner characteristic of the literature of the time, but with much humour and a lightness of touch not present in other productions. Starting with the deliberate confusion of the reader as to the actual purpose of the
book, playing on the then recent psychoanalytic meaning of the word unconscious. Actually the word was also a favourite of those arguing for a turn to the irrational and an abandonment of reason. The first five chapters continue to ponder over the issue of subject and title of the work, making it clear that the work will be one of Jewish interest, if only because most of the four chapters have Jewish words for titles and the fifth one parodies the title of one of the numerous philosophical works of the time, as seen above (164). Finally, the title is chosen precisely because it denotes the genuine national Jewish dish (das eigentliche jüdische Nationalgericht. 1927, 13) but at the same time he avoids choosing a word of Eastern Jewish usage, preferring the West Yiddish version already present in and inscribed by Heine in German Jewish literary tradition.\(^4\) At the end of the book, with a mock-philosophical tone that parodies the solemnity favoured by so many essayists of his time, the author returns to a subversion of the ideas current at the time, from the very choice of title for chapter forty-six, *Entartung* (degeneration). The German word had by the Twenties turned into a cliché; it had become common currency since the fin-de-siècle, when it was introduced and associated with thinkers such as Max Nordau; through Oswald Spengler it would then be adopted by the Nazis who would then use it to designate the kind of art they objected to.\(^5\) Its use by G is another way of ridiculing the contemporary fad for prefabricated ideology.

In chapter fourteen, as mentioned above, G turns the opposition between the organic community (Gemeinschaft) and the artificial society (Gesellschaft) on its head by making the German Jewish community, the *Gemeinschaft*, play the role of the *Gesellschaft*, and assigning

\(^3\) At the time the word would have commonly been understood to mean unknown or unbeknownst.

\(^4\) The East Yiddish word for *Schalet* is *tsholnt*.

\(^5\) On the origins of the word, see Steven Aschheim's essay on Nietzsche, Nordau and Degeneration (ASCHHEIM 2001, 3-12).
the former's place to the Khille (Yiddish for the community), and as has already been seen, he remarks that the two have much in common and that the distinction is, to a certain extent, artificial. This marks a turn from the view expressed in *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich* that the Eastern Jewish communities were somehow more natural and deeply rooted than their Western counterparts (See 1925 passim, especially chapters 10-15). This is noteworthy: the battle to rehabilitate the image of the *Ostjude* had already been partially won – after all, figures from the Liberal community such as Rabbi Leo Baeck had expressed their preoccupation with the issue, as seen above – and G was careful to try and avoid too far a swing of the pendulum in that direction (See also MEYER 1998, 19-20; as well as CRESTI 1998, 261). Still, some of the best parts of the book are devoted to the improvement of the image of the *Ostjude* (cf. chapters 11 and 43). Another internal community issue dealt with is that of the Orthodox separatist communities in chapter twenty. This whole section, though light in tone, constitutes an attack on one of the basic principles of modern German Orthodoxy, and shows G as continuing a struggle that dated to the Vogelstein controversy referred to above (134). Although G does not mention them by name, he agrees with those Orthodox rabbis who opposed separatism, chiefly his friend Nehemias Anton Nobel and Isak Unna (On their position see ELLENSON 1998).

Chapters 23-29 and 35-36 make up a detailed examination of the weaknesses of Jewish life in the Diaspora seen from the Zionist point of view and the remedy Zionism offers. To begin with, there is the attack on the position of Jews as administrators of an alien culture. This is another echo of the pre-War call by Moritz Goldstein, a Zionist journalist, in his article ‘German-Jewish Parnasus’, for German Jews to abandon their positions in
German culture and deal exclusively in Jewish subjects, cited above (See GOLDSTEIN 1912a, GOLDSTEIN 1957, BRENNER 1996, 129-31, and Steven Aschheim’s article in GILMAN AND ZIPES 1997, 299-305). There follows a theme which recurs in G’s fiction – the confusion that the attempts of parents to assimilate sow in the minds of their offspring. He follows this with an attack on the false sense of shame that makes relations with Gentiles harder, another Zionist objection to life in the Diaspora. The most important of these sections is the attack on the lack of Jewish knowledge of German Jews, inasmuch as it involves an attack on the idea of Bildung, that is, on what is generally seen as one of the basic principles of the German-Jewish subculture, if not the fundamental axis around which German-Jewish self-definition revolved. Although the current scholarly opinions on the role of Bildung in German-Jewish identity are divided – from the centrality allotted to it by George Mosse, through the reservations expressed by Shulamit Volkov, to the emphasis on its rejection by important sectors of the Jewish intelligentsia expressed by Steven Aschheim – G clearly assigns to it a central role and ignores the fact that the Zionist all shared in the Bildung ideal (MOSSE 1985, VOLKOV 1996, ASCHHEIM 1996, 134-5. MOSSE 1985, 75-7, for the case of the German Zionists). This culminates with his indictment of the ideals of the old generation, whose motto –another paradox– is said to be: “Ideale sind doch nicht dazu da, daß man sie verwirklicht, sonst sind es keine Ideale mehr!” (Ideals are not there to be realised, or else they stop being ideals! 1927, 289). This echoes G’s indictment of the old generation’s ideals twenty years previously in his attack on the Reform rabbi Heinemann Vogelstein which will be examined below (section 2.7.1; cf. 1906).

86 See below 2.7.4 and 2.7.5.
Part of this critique is the Zionist idea that at the root of antisemitism lies the fact that Jews are not known, in many cases because they do not let themselves be known, developed in chapter thirty-five, Der unbekannte Jude (The unknown Jew); this concept was already present in Wilhelm Herzberg's Jüdische Familienpapiere, not to speak of its role in the programme of the Wissenschaft des Judentums (Herzberg 1893, 104-5; Gilman and Zipes 1997, 199-204). Another theme that runs through the book, although only comparatively few chapters are totally devoted to it, is that of the law and the legal apparatus, as it does in many of G's works, unsurprisingly due not only to his profession, but to its prevalence during the Weimar period (Lethen 1995, 424-7).

One of the work's main interests lies in the light it sheds on G's other books and his understanding of Zionism. He claims that everything in his two main books actually happened:

Es ist richtig: nicht nur alle die Dinge, die ich in meinem „Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich“ berichte sind geschehen – das ist bei Erinnerungen ja wohl selbstverständlich, so weit es sich nicht nun gerade um Erinnerungen höherer Militärs oder Diplomaten handelt –, sondern auch alle die in „Tohuwabohu“ erzählten Kuriositäten sind wahr. (1927, 31)

It is right: not only did everything that I reported in my Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich happen – that is of course only to be expected of memoirs, as long as they are not the memoirs of high-ranking soldiers or diplomats – but so did all the curious events related in Tohuwabohu.

It also shows him as perfectly aware of the didactic effect of his books, and he gives his own theories in this respect: ‘Mein These ist, daß an Stelle lehrhafter Deduktionen und Schilderungen viel besser die kleine Anekdote tritt, daß wesenhafter als die Geschichte die Geschichten sind’ (My contention is, that the small anecdote is much better than erudite deductions and descriptions – stories are better than History. 1927, 41).
He calls on Jews to be more authentic, to stop glossing over painful or embarrassing
details, since antisemites, and he mentions Hitler and Dinter, will make use of anything in any
case, and their views are grounded more on the virtues than on the vices of the Jews. G also
comments on the paradoxical fact that it is the Jews’ capacity for assimilation, the source of so
many of their misfortunes, which has also been responsible for their survival (1927, 51, 178).

At the conclusion of the book he sums up the Zionist purpose:

Richtig ist’s: da bin ich zum Beispiel, der wie unzählige andere Juden für das
Ziel in Palästina arbeitet. [...] 
Und wofür arbeiten wir?
Wir wollen jene Zeit heranarbeiten, in der wir alle, dieselben Leute die für den
Idealstaat heute zusammenscharen, was sie können – in der wir uns ergrimmt
im wiedergewonnenen Lande an den Schreibtisch setzen und Steuer-
reklamationen schreiben werden.
Wenn schon! So werden neue Ziele erstehen und eine neue Sehnsucht! (1927,
290)

It is true: here I am, working, like countless other Jews, towards our goal in
Palestina. [...] 
And what are we working for?
We want to bring closer that time, in which all of us, the very same people who
today scrape their pennies together for the ideal state, will sit down, incensed, to
our desks, in our reclaimed land, and write tax complaint letters.
So what! New goals and a new yearning will arise!

This is a clear indication of G’s Zionism, which is not of the idealistic and Messianically
charged type so current among those intellectuals who had been awakened to their Jewishness
by the First World War, and yet partook of the objectivity and matter-of-factness of the decade
(REICHMANN 1971, 537-50; BRENNER 1996, passim). From the perspective of the present, the
book can be appreciated for what it must have meant at the time of its publication, as well as
for the complexity of the positions it represented, as noted by Joachim Schlör in his afterword
to the new edition of the work (SCHLÖR 1997, 230-1).
2.5 ERINNERUNGEN (MEMOIRS)

2.5.1 Summary The memoirs were written during the Second World War, and two excerpts from it have been printed by the German historian Monika Richarz to illustrate the social history of German Jewry; the complete typescript is to be found at the Leo Baeck Institute New York with a copy in the Central Zionist Archives (RICHARZ 1976, 431-435, and RICHARZ 1979, 391-419). Dr. Hanni Mittelmann of the Hebrew University Jerusalem intends to publish them in the original. The first part was partially translated into Hebrew by Dov Sadan (Stock) and published under the title Zikaronot shel yeke (Memoirs of a yeke) (1947). The second half has never been published.

The work incorporates a few portions previously used by G, reworks others, and is divided into forty-nine chapters. It has been used in the first part of this work as one of the main sources for the period in question. Therefore, only brief summaries of the chapters will be provided, with mention of motifs, parallels, and sources where necessary.

1. The work starts with G remembering the first time he tasted wine from Palestine, at the Palestine Jewish Colonies stand in the 1896 Berlin International Exhibition, where he met Dr. Heinrich Loewe, wearing a red fez that gave him a thoroughly Oriental appearance. He then remarks he is writing in a café in Tel Aviv, and cannot believe it is all true. He likens Zionists to a certain extent to those refugees from Central Europe that arrive in Palestine, having been life-long anti-Zionists, and when they learn Hebrew they suddenly realise that all their lives they have been praying for the establishment of the country. After some witty
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87 As to the date of composition of the memoirs, Gronemann writes to Harry Friedenwald in November 1944 that he is currently writing them (CZA A182/38).
88 Personal communication.
comments on how people write memoirs in order to have certain facts forgotten, he offers his personal reason for setting his experiences down – he wants to understand how it all happened. He then offers a justification and a reason to read him – he is an unimportant observer and thus has nothing to hide, and at the same time he was a witness to many important events.

2. A description of the ambience in Garz in Pomerania, and of his step-grandfather Raphael Karger, already mentioned in chapters thirty-eight and thirty-nine of *Schalet*, with the reaction of the child G who experienced it taken into account.

3. His first memories of life in Danzig, including the traumatic beach episode mentioned above (15). The omnipresence of antisemitism is remarkable, also because except for this episode it seems to have had no effect on G.

4. The move to Hanover is presented as the end of an idyll. In this context it may be connected with the digression into a detailed picture of German Jewish religious life at the time, presenting the efforts of both Reform and Orthodoxy as paradoxically leading to a secularisation of God (N.d. a, 17). This excursus is meant to show the difficulty of the mental and spiritual operation necessary for those Jews who later became Zionist.

5. A bleak picture of life in Hanover, seen as narrow-minded and provincial, and of the gymnasium, where bullying and antisemitism make the narrator’s life impossible. There follows an account of his start in literature, and his surreptitious attendance of Socialist and antisemitic meetings. The section concludes with portraits of Manuel Gottlieb and Gerson Lange.
6. The whole section is devoted to Count Alexander Moritz Simon, the philanthropist, and Börries von Münchhausen, the writer and friend of G’s. The narrator tries to understand what caused the latter to become a member of the National Socialist Party and an antisemite.

7. Devoted to the Jews of Hanover, who were just as provincial as their neighbours, and whose bigotry and exaggerated patriotism is shown to have made G’s father life very difficult. The term he uses to describe the attitudes of both Christian and Jewish Hanoverians is Abderites, taken from C. M. Wieland’s *Geschichte der Abderiten* (N.d. a, 18, 33).

8. A short description of the life in the small dying communities of the region. An explanation for their turn to Zionism is provided by the steady growth of anti-Jewish hostility, both of the old- and the new-fashioned style.

9. The chapter is devoted to his year in Halberstadt. Apart from acute descriptions of his fellow students and teachers, he gains an insight into the lives of the Orthodox and tries to make sense of the double lives they sometimes led.

10. G’s move to Berlin, as well as the fascination he felt for the city are vividly described. He adds portraits of some of his teachers at the university, and adds that he left his studies unattended because of his interest in the theatre and the life of the city.

11. A chapter crammed with descriptions of personalities in the cultural world of Berlin, at the Hildesheimer rabbinical seminary, and of the theatre. Together with this, he talks of his own activities, and of the impressions that were imprinted during this time. His own interpretations of Shakespeare’s plays give rise to the next chapter.
12. *Literarisches Zwischenspiel: Antonio, der Kaufmann von Venedig* ('Literary Interlude: Antonio, the Merchant of Venice') This work, already published before, is dealt with in more detail below (section 2.7.2).


14. G's first years in Berlin, with anecdotes of people he met, e.g. Ferdinand M., the man who did all things Jewish in concealment, a character that appears already in the eighth chapter of *Schalet*, 'Hide and seek'. At the end of the chapter he describes the dispiriting effect the Dreyfus trial had on him and his friends.

15. Devoted to what G called, as already cited, 'the severe mental operation' (die schwere geistige Operation, n.d. a, 77), i.e. his becoming a Zionist. He goes into a discussion of his views on the shekel, and tells how he at first avoided debates.

16. The start of his Zionist activity, coinciding with his return from Russia, right after the declaration of the *Protestrabbiner*.

17. Anecdotes on M. A. Klausner and his relationship with Chancellor Bismarck, and then in a brief but intense section, his first view of Herzl. The impression appears to have been deep, as is also the case with other young Zionists (RICHARZ 1979, passim).

18. The author then proceeds to an entertaining account of his preparation for the final examination in Göttingen, the examination itself, and then his time as an articled clerk in Nienburg and Bassum.
19. Continuation of last section: old fashioned life in Bassum, and visits to Bremen.

20. His period of service over, the narrator returns to Hanover for the last years of his clerkship, describing the Jewish community, and his efforts to set up a Zionist organisation in Hanover and Northwest Germany.

21. The narration continues with the Zionist propaganda trips G undertook during his time in Hanover. He tells of the malapropisms of Mr. Apfelbaum in Leipzig, to which he returned in chapter thirty-six of *Schalet*. The passionate attachment of the young Zionists to their cause and its founder are underscored: ‘Man muss sich vorstellen, von welcher Begeisterung wir jungen Zionisten erfüllt waren’. (One has to imagine how full of enthusiasm we young Zionists were N.d. a, 107). There follows an account of G’s controversy with the Orthodox newspaper *Der Israelit* and its editor.

22. On the precursors of Zionism in Germany, both literary and practical; among the former, Wilhelm Herzberg, and of the latter, Max Bodenheimer, David Wolffsohn, and Fabius Schach, who later left the movement and campaigned against it. Next there are several anecdotes from his time as an articled clerk, including one about the lawyer Freudenstein, who is the narrator of the unpublished story ‘Ein Bluturteil’ (See below, section 2.7.12). His engagement and the cabaret revue he organised to collect money for the Palestine colonies are then mentioned, together with his first journalistic works.

23. A long section covering G’s trip to and participation in the Fifth Zionist Congress, the first one he had attended. What he witnessed on the train to Basle he latter used in the last chapter of *Tohuwabohu*. There are detailed descriptions of the sessions and the personalities
who attended. The work shows an awareness of the idealised image G and his generation had of East European Jews. The rest of the section narrates the author’s marriage and the end of his clerkship.

24. This section, again very long, is devoted to the Sixth Zionist Congress, the Uganda proposal, and Herzl’s relations with the main Zionist activists.

25. The move to Berlin to prepare for the bar examination, and G’s participation in Schlemiel are covered.

26. G passes his examination, is called to the bar, and they return to Hanover, where he starts his practice but dislikes the city, especially its Jewish residents. A moving description of the effect the death of Herzl had on Zionist activists.

27. A short portrait of David Wolffsohn, the forgotten second leader of the WZO.

28. A description of G’s visit with Sonia to Zhitomir, her city, of the tense atmosphere that reigned, and of the pogrom that broke out after G had returned to Berlin but that was witnessed by Sonia. The whole episode gave rise to chapters 6 and 11 of Tohuwabohu; it is presented here in a concise and factual manner.

29. An account of the Seventh Congress, its tumultuous sessions, and the secession of the Uganda plan partisans, the territorialists, with wry comments on G’s loss of innocence and on the political education he acquired. The section ends with his return to Hanover and G’s renewed activism.
30. Devoted to the relief campaign G and Änne Berliner organised to feed the passing East European emigrants on their way to America.

31. The conference of Jewish aid organisations in Brussels in January 1906, memorable for the author for having been the last Jewish meeting he travelled to attend whilst residing in Hanover. The move is seen as a milestone in his life, marking the beginning of a new chapter (Mit der Uebersiedlung nach Berlin begann fuer mich tatsaechlich ein neuer Lebensabschnitt. N.d. a, 163).

32. A parting shot at Hanover, the narrowness of its horizons and the prejudices of its citizens, using the language of Wieland, as he did in section 7. The section ends with the naïve reaction of G’s clerk, August Quante, who moved with him to Berlin, to the great city and especially to the enormous retail store Wertheim, which the narrator sees as a symbol of the city, and whose building in the Potsdamer Platz he considers the most beautiful modern structure in the city.

33. A description of the author’s and Arthur Klee’s first years of professional practice in Berlin, beginning with a consideration of the physical setting — their office in the Königstraße and the courthouse, with its façade containing an image of the building, which in turn contains a second image and so on ad infinitum — and ending with a restrained but moving elegy to the memory of Klee, of whose death the author was probably not certain at the time of writing, but which he seems to have sensed intuitively. Characteristically, it is on Klee’s Zionist activities and his astonishing oratorial gifts that he dwells.
34. The Zionist activity in Berlin, again moving from the physical environment, the cafes where most of the discussions took place, to the personalities of those involved.

35. The Eighth Congress in The Hague, with special attention devoted to Max Nordau, and to the casinos of Scheveningen, these last due to the author’s fondness for roulette. Mention of his wife’s part in the establishment of the *Kulturverband jüdischer Frauen für Palästina*.

36. This section narrates some of the author’s experiences in the law, starting with a declaration of love for his profession, expressing his preference for the mental processes involved in it, his attachment to the pursuit of justice, and the manifold experiences with people of all kinds that it has afforded him. The said attachment induces him to reflect on the difference between the German words for a defense and a prosecuting attorney (*Rechtsanwalt* and *Staatsanwalt*, literally the justice-attorney and the state-attorney). He remarks how ‘Justice and the state, i.e. Justice and the Law are to a certain extent opposed’ (*Recht und Staat, d. h. Recht und Gesetz stehen wirklich in einem gewissen Gegensatz. N.d. a, 184*). He then repeats the analogy quoted above of the law limping behind justice and never been able to catch up with it, which he had used in addressing the SdS members (53; FISCHER 1980, 102). The author then proceeds to recount several cases he had already mentioned, some of which may be listed for cross-reference purposes. The legal entanglements to which the lack of surnames in Eastern European Jewry gave rise (chapter 7 of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*). The case of the man who wanted to divorce his wife after 60 years of marriage (chapter 30 of *Schalet*). The various legal entanglements of ‘Major’ Reches (called Barches in chapters 10 and 11 of *Schalet*). A case of tax evasion through adultery briefly mentioned in chapter 6 of *Schalet*, is expanded. The families who on conversion to
Christianity change their names, an occurrence which led G to introduce the Lewysohn-Lehnsen theme which runs through Tohuwabohu causing misunderstandings and comic situations, whilst simultaneously standing for the deep identity problems of Heinz and through him of the whole German Jewish community. The case of the cantor who ate on the Day of Atonement (chapter 12 of Schalet). The woman who was legally married to two men at the same time (chapter 31 of Schalet).

37. The narrator tells of the depression that gripped him during his stay in his wife’s family’s dacha in the Ukraine, and of the trip he undertook to return to Berlin, visiting Romania and Hungary on the way.

38. The Ninth Zionist Congress in Hamburg, with its many conflicts and its unsatisfactory conclusion.

39. This chapter starts with a reference to detective stories and proceeds to tell of several miscarriages of justice and of the sometimes desperate expedients to which the narrator was sometimes driven in order to obtain justice for his clients.

40. An account of the author’s involvement in the literary world and his activities in the SdS. Discussing the subject of the alleged Judaization of German literature, already mentioned above, his opinion is that it was not so much a question of Jewish preponderance among the writers, but among the readers of what he designates as good literature (54).

41. The Tenth Zionist Congress and the case of the Graf von Münich.
42. The narrator's experiences travelling or staying abroad – in Scheveningen, Ostend, Paris, and Vienna.

43. The author returns to some of the legal cases in which he was involved. The above mentioned case of Wilhelm Mertens, head of a colonial company, versus the journalist Graf, editor of the *Graf'sche Finanz-Chronik*, was the model for the *Posaune*, the antisemitic journal in *Posauntöne* (Trumpet blares), chapter 7 of *Tohuwabohu* (57).

44. An account of two cases. The first one has to do with the wife of a Russian general resident in Berlin, born Jewish but who converted in order to marry him, and stayed married to him despite his atrocious behaviour and his wanting a divorce, all in order to punish herself. After the war, the author tells us, she obtained a divorce and returned to Judaism, and so G could have a joke at the expense of the august Dr. Josef Wohlgemuth, lecturer at the Orthodox rabbinical seminary and editor of *Jeschurun*, namely, to watch him in his office whilst he (G) is on the telephone, advising Her Excellence where to buy matzos, the Passover bread. The second case, which the narrator considers the strangest in which he was ever involved, is that of an important politician who refused to pay a small sum to the carpenter who made his mother's coffin; the latter sued him and there followed prolonged litigation which ended when the narrator asserted that the man had simultaneously been and not been in Hamburg on the same day. The court accepted his opinion and G won the case for the politician.

45. A report on the Eleventh Zionist Congress in Vienna. The report dwells on the city, on the language question, i.e. the use of Hebrew in the Zionist movement, and on some of the personalities in this congress.
46. An account of the author’s activities on behalf of the SdS and the Zionist movement up to the start of the war.

47. The author speaks of three cases from his practice in the year preceding the war. The first case involves the cleptomaniac but otherwise admirable nurse Sister Lisa, who confessed to all her thefts and had to be helped to avoid the stiff jail sentences the prosecution requested. The second case was that of a very sensitive woman who had an insensitive husband and wanted a divorce but could not get it since a divorce by mutual consent did not exist in Wilhelminian Germany; G’s solution was to have her write such a brutal letter to her husband, that the court gave him the divorce. The last case concerns a young Jewish debutante who is made pregnant by a rich heir and reserve officer, a Protestant. The author realises the girl has deliberately set out to entrap his client, and convinces him to deny paternity.

48. The last trips of the author and his wife in 1913 took them to Russia, France, and England, although he disclaims any responsibility for the Triple Entente against Germany (wenn ich auch nicht damit sagen will, dass diese unsre Besuche den Zusammenschluss der Entente gegen Deutschland herbeifuehrten. N.d. a, 234). There follows a long description of the leisurely life of the pre-War bourgeoisie and of its amusements and hypocrisies, whose details have been used above (59-60).

49. A report on the reckless trip the author and his wife made to England on the week before the war broke out and their precipitate return to Germany via the Netherlands.

50. After the return to Berlin, the author describes how the war fever grips the population, former pacifists turn into rabid warmongers, people see spies everywhere, and the
chauvinism turns against East European Jews who had been either taking the waters at the resorts, where G later set the start of his unpublished story ‘Megalophilen-Katalog 717’, or had settled in Germany (see below, section 2.7.13). There follows an account of the efforts made by the author and Klee to relieve their plight, and of the experiences their partner Fritz Simon had of antisemitism among the officers.

51. Witty portrait of the way writers gave in to chauvinism, giving credence to the wildest rumours, and the author cites the case of the mild-mannered Ernst Lissauer (1882-1937), who wrote the *Haßgesang gegen England* (Song of hate against England). He also relates the efforts of the SdS to alleviate the penury afflicting many writers, and singles out the generosity of Hans Heinz Ewers.89

52. This chapter deals with the difficult situation Zionists were in. On the one hand, they could not help wanting to do as much as they could for their homeland Germany, and it was tempting to identify Germany with the Zionist cause, particularly since the enemy was the hated Tsarist regime. An account is given of the activities of the KdO, already described above (64-5). The difficult middle-of-the-road position is described, although the author is not completely open about all the conflicts that ensued, as seen above (64-5).

53. The narrator is conscripted, sent to Rathenow, and he tells of the contrasts between civilian and military life, and of the advantages and disadvantages of the latter.

54. The rigours of the two-month course in Brandenburg are recounted in detail.

---

89 In 1933 Ewers, who had become a Nazi, forced G and other Jews to resign from the SdS.
55. After the end of the course, the author gives an account of his return to Rathenow, and of the pleasant weeks spent there.

56. The first part of the narrative of the long trip to the front, comprising the sojourns in West and East Prussia.

57. The second part continues with the stay of the narrator in Vilna and his efforts to show his comrades the city.

58. This chapter deals with the experiences of the author on the front. Events and opinions are relayed in an unemotional and prosaic manner, and comments on the paradox of the military mind’s aversion to the actual conditions of war at the front, which overturn all the discipline, hierarchies and drill. Finally he falls seriously ill, is sent to the field hospital, and from there to a military hospital; this last one happens to have been in Strasburg, the town where he was born, and so the return after forty years of absence is felt by the narrator as a rebirth, an image remarked upon by Joachim Schlöer, and also used in Vorspiel (Prelude), the second chapter of Hau doloh und Zapfenstreich (SCHLÖR 1997, 229).

59. After considerations of a general nature on the frequent phenomenon of the change in heart of many Jewish soldiers, a theme already touched upon in some of the preceding chapters, and which have been quoted extensively in the first part, the author examines his personal reactions to the experience of the front; he finds that these deeper consequences only became apparent much later, and that his immediate feelings were of relief to escape the rigours of life outdoors in the Russian winter together with a longing for the company of his unit. He has an ironic remark—this was the only time in his life he did not eat kosher, and
instead of the mouth-watering dishes of non-Jewish cuisine, what he got was the army diet. On the subject of ritually fit food, he comments that he has often been asked why he adheres to the rules so strictly, to which he always answers that he is not in the habit of changing his diet every couple of millennia (Ich pflege zu antworten, dass ich nicht gewohnt bin, meine Diaet alle paar tausend Jahre zu aendern. N.d. a, 285).

60. He turns to the convalescence in Strasburg, and then at the Jewish hospital in Berlin, organised by the Adass Jissroel community. The experiences there, as well as his first-hand experience of the war-like spirit of the civilians are the subjects of this chapter.

61. A description of the author's stay at the reserve battalion, the meeting with Hermann Struck which leads to his being appointed Struck's replacement as Yiddish translator at the Headquarters of the Eastern front. The meeting had already been mentioned in chapter 2 of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*.

62. The author apologises to the readers of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich* for the fact that much of the following material repeats what was already written in that book. Indeed, practically all of the text paraphrases selected parts of chapters 3-7, 16 and 17 of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*.

63. This section joins parts of chapter 13 with chapter 18 of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*.

64. Again, a combination of parts of chapters 10, 12, and 13 of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*. 
65. Expands chapter 8 of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*, giving an account of the life and activities of the Intellectuals' Club, and adding the fact that member Bergsträsser was the model for the character Strässer in *Tohuwabohu*.

66. An account of the writing of *Tohuwabohu* and the author's trip to Vilna. The chapter finishes with the transfer of the *Presse-Abteilung* to Bialystok. With the exception of the report on his authorial activities, which is greatly expanded, most of the material had already appeared in chapters 11, 18, and 19 of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*.

67. This section is a condensed version of chapters 19-22, 25, and 32-34 of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*. It covers the author's stay in Bialystok.

68. A brief account of the second and last period in Kovno, ending with the narrator's transfer to and arrival in Brussels; it is made up mostly of parts of chapters 35, 36, 39, 41, and 42 of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*.

69. The last chapter is devoted to the author's stay in Brussels and his return to Germany; again, it uses parts of chapters 42-47 of *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*.

2.5.2 Themes It is necessary to begin by trying to place the *Erinnerungen* in their time as well as to determine what type of genre they belong to. It is no coincidence that they were written during the years of the Second World War; many German Jews who managed to reach places of refuge in the years before the war put their recollections in writing, and hundreds of them can be consulted at the Leo Baeck Institute in New York. Their motives are various but in the main can be said to constitute an attempt to invoke and record a world by then already vanished as well as to try to establish the reasons for the way events
developed in Germany (RICHARZ 1976, RICHARZ 1979). That the second of these reasons is part of G’s personal motivation we know because he states as much in the first chapter, as remarked in the plot section above (171). But this is not to say that this and many other autobiographies and memoirs would not have been written without the spur of the Nazi catastrophe; already in the Weimar period, there was a deluge of autobiographies, and together with the disastrous experience of the First World War, the main impulse behind them has been established as the feelings of alienation of those outsiders stigmatised and discriminated for whatever reason (SCHÜTZ 1995, 553-4).

In her study of the autobiographies in German of Ostjuden who emigrated to Central Europe, Maria Kłańska has noted how hard it is to distinguish between autobiographies and memoirs when dealing with European Jews of this century; the critical distinction between the autobiography, mostly concerned with the individual’s actions and experiences, as opposed to the memoirs’ concentration on the events the author witnessed and the persons he or she met, is very hard to maintain for those individuals whose lives were bound up with the establishment of the Jewish state or with any other political causes they may have been involved with; this is particularly true of the work under consideration (KŁAŃSKA 1991, 21-7). In the same way, Jürgen Lehmann’s classification of autobiographies in a threefold schema of confession-narration-report, as reported by Kłańska, reveals itself inadequate to categorise G’s Erinnerungen, which present instances of the three types, without it being possible to assign it to a single one (KŁAŃSKA 1994, 29-31).90

---

90 Without entering into the details of the typology, suffice it to say that examples of each of the three types would be Jean Jacques Rousseau's Confessions, Maxim Gorki's Childhood, and Goethe's Dichtung und Wahrheit (KŁAŃSKA 1994, 29-30).
It must be noted that G omits to mention important facts in the *Erinnerungen*, as well as deciding to end his text with his return home from Brussels at the cessation of hostilities. This decision could be ascribed to the fact that most of those persons referred to would still be alive and might not only be embarrassed but even endangered by any mention of them since many of them were in what was at the time of the redaction of the work Nazi-occupied Europe. This reason could also extend to the omission of his many friendships with prominent Gentile intellectuals, mostly through his professional activities and his voluntary work at the SdS. No such reason however, can be found for his failure to stress his close family and friendship ties with East European Jews, although he does declare them and in one place even tells of his wife’s distinguished Ukrainian-Jewish family. On the other hand, the process of his political maturation and joining the Zionist movement concentrates exclusively on his own person, without bringing into play what must have been the strongly marked Zionist character of his household and the friendship of his father with many of the first Zionists, including Wilhelm Herzberg. In connection with this process, it is interesting to compare chapters fifteen and sixteen with the description by Kurt Blumenfeld, the leader of the next generation, of his road to Zionism (*Blumenfeld* 1962, 36-48). The process was marginally less painful for Blumenfeld, and it has to be noted that G does not get involved in Zionist agitation until after his father has publicly declared his position.

At the same time, the work continues his dissection of German-Jewish life. From specific instances of Jewish behaviour, as his conclusion in chapter nine, drawn from the contradictory and sometimes hypocritical lives of some of the Orthodox: "Mir wollte das damals nicht in den Kopf, und auch noch lange Zeit hindurch begriff ich nicht, was nur erst
viel spaeter einging, dass, sowie Eros oder Sexus in Betracht kommt, ueberhaupt keine Frage nach Wieso und Warum gestellt werden kann. Hier endet jede Logik und Konsequenz’ (At that time I could not grasp and for a long time I could not understand, what I came to perceive much later: that as long as Eros or sex are involved, nobody asks any questions as to How or Why. This is the end of any logic or consistency. N.d. a, 47); to an analysis of the way the mentality of the Prussian citizen was reflected in its Jewish citizens, marginal though they may have been. This can be shown by his observations on the mindset of the community officials, stating that they showed the general Prussian respect for bureaucracy: ‘Bei der Verehrung, welche in Preussen die Beamtenhierarchie genoss und angesichts des Umstandes, dass Juden im allgemeinen zu dieser Kaste keinen Zugang hatten, war man gluecklich ein Surrogat zu finden’ (Given the admiration accorded to the bureaucracy in Prussia, and in view of the fact that Jews on the whole had no access to this caste, they were happy to find a surrogate. N.d. a, 103).

He also engages in general reflexions on the role of the Jews in Western European societies, as expressed by some of the plays he watched. Of particular interest for his later development is his reading of the character of the cashier Kohn in Schnitzler’s Freiwild, which agrees with that of the author (see above p. 24), as the quintessencial Jew in the Diaspora, separated from everything around him, yet interested, excluded from all that goes on, alone in the crowd, kept apart in his booth (Abgesondert sitzt er mitten im Getriebe der Welt, rechnet, hat Mitleid, interessiert sich fuer alles, was um ihn vorgeht, aber er ist doch ausgeschlossen von dem Getriebe um ihn, bleibt mitten im Getuemmel einsam, ist durch einen Verschlag von all dem flutenden Leben getrennt. N.d. a, 64). This image, already
touched upon in the first part, is a recurring motif in the work of G. So is that of the *Reigen*, the round dance, as mentioned below, and it is to be noted that both are derived from Schnitzler (see above, p. 24).

One can also detect a change of position in regard to the *Ostjuden*, with a realisation that the Western Jews of his generation had idealised them, and an account of the extremes to which this led the youngsters, all of which is not present in *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*:

Es herrschte damals bei den jungen deutschen Zionisten eine Art sentimentale Verhimmlung alles Ostjuedischen. Wir hatten ja auch alle das Gefuehl, hier einmal mit Menschen zusammenzukommen, die Volljuden waren und jedenfalls nicht, wie so oft manche im Westen es taten, ihr Judentum verstecken. Man fiel damals in das entgegengesetzt [sic] Extrem und suchte ueberall, beinahe provozierend, sein Judentum zu zeigen. Wir alle trugen das Magen-David-Abzeichen auf der Brust. (N.d. a, 123)

At that time a kind of sentimental exaltation of everything East European ruled among the young German Zionists. All of us had the feeling that for once we had met people who were full Jews and in any case would not hide their Jewishness, as so many in the West often do. Then one went to the opposite extreme and tried to show one’s Jewishness everywhere, almost to the point of provocation. We all wore stars of David on our chests.

He returns to this in chapter fifty-seven, in connection with the failure of communication between the two communities: German soldiers and *Ostjuden*. The theme of interpreting and being an intermediary dominates the chapter from the start, when Russian prisoners try to communicate with the Germans in broken German. Although the Jews in the city do manage to make contact with the German soldiers, the narrator faces his failure to interpret the two groups to each other, as mentioned above, and feels obligated to do so in his double identity as Jew and German soldier; he attributes this failure to his superficial and idealised image of the East European Jews (Ich war damais noch viel zu wenig in die ostjuedische Psyche eingedrungen. N.d. a, 275).
This does not exclude but rather entails the concurrent theme of the discovery of one’s true self through war, added to the discovery of oneself in others, i.e. East European Jews, which runs constantly through the memoirs, just as it does through *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*, as has been noted above. In chapters fifty-three and fifty-four especially, where he draws a balance of his military service and concludes that on the whole, he does not feel his war-years were a waste of time, since he got to know many people, including himself. (Ich muss sagen, dass diese Jahre bis zum Kriegsende mir keine verlorenen scheinen. [...] Zu den Bekanntschaften, die ich in jener Zeit gemacht habe, kann ich in gewissem Umfange auch die naheere Bekanntschaft mit mir selbst rechnen, soweit man sich ueberhaupt selbst kennen lemen kann, will man nicht dazu kommen, jede Beziehung mit sich abzubrechen. N.d. a, 255). He then goes on to define the theme of self-discovery as the discovery of the individual’s membership of his community (Man lemte sich kennen und man begriff, wohin man gehoerte. Ich kenne viele, die ohne den Krieg und ohne ihre Kriegserlebnisse nie den Weg zu ihrem Volke zurueckgefunden hatten. N.d. a, 260). In this as in many other respects G was typical of the change that took place in many German Jews during the First World War, as has been noted by Eva Reichmann (REICHMANN 1971, 514-5, 539-40).

The *Erinnerungen* can also be of use in trying to elucidate the problem of G’s identity as well as throwing light on the identities of other German Jews. Until quite recently, as Keith Pickus has observed, scholars studying German Jewry had little or no method for dealing with the particular issue of identity, and tended to concentrate on
organisation membership. In the last two decades however, students of German Jewish history have made use of techniques from social science to refine the concept, especially in relation to the concept of ethnicity (Pickus 1995, 74-5). For the purposes of this work it will be useful to consider identity as a synthesis by which a person integrates his/her roles and experiences to construct a coherent self; identity is always fluid and negotiable (Pickus 1995, 76). Pickus combines this concept with David Sorkin’s idea of German Jews as a subculture and uses it to interpret the place of individuals of Jewish origin who were not affiliated to any community organisation. By the same token, one could examine the case of G, as seen in his memoirs, to try to place him within the German Jewish community. It is of particular relevance that G downplays his multiple contacts with non-Jewish associations, although this may have been caused by his reluctance to compromise many of his friends still in Germany. Still, it is undeniable that, although he did not make a secret of them, neither did he go out of his way to stress the close family ties that bound him to Eastern Europe. This is evidence of the strong attraction German Jewish life exerted on him and of the need he felt to make himself belong to its community unambiguously.

91 Examples are Schorsch 1972 and Reinharz 1975.
92 The example here is Berghahn 1988.
2.6 PLAYS

Of G's extensive activity as a writer of cabaret and theatre plays, (details of which can be ascertained from the bibliography), only those that are currently accessible have been examined. This includes most of his productions for the theatre but for three plays, one of which, *Heinrich Heine und sein Onkel*, seems to have been important in so far as it provoked a hostile reception from the Hebrew press. It was translated into Hebrew and produced in 1947 under the title *Mishpahat hayne* (N.d. b, GEIS 1947, GEIS 1950, LEVY 1979, 297; 1947, SHEFFI 1998, 201). Up to this date G's plays had been successful in Palestine, but apparently the mood of the Hebrew-speaking public had changed and to my knowledge no copies of the play have survived. The extant plays thus represent only that part of G's dramatic work that found a favourable reception from the public in the Palestinian *yishuv*. All his cabaret productions have also vanished without a trace. Nevertheless, one can still form a reasonably accurate conception of his dramatic work and of the motifs present in it.

2.6.1 MIMIK

Written to celebrate his sister Elfride's marriage in 1905 to Dr. Salo Bergel, *Mimik* is G's first extant work of consequence for the theatre. The play has dances and songs and takes place entirely in Inowrazlaw (Inowroclaw), a small town near the Vistula river in the then province of West Prussia (today in Poland), where Dr. Bergel was employed at that time as physician to the health resort. Many of the songs revolve around the bride and groom and their personalities and from them we can see that Elfride was already then a passionate

---

93 As the subtitle advises: 'zur Hochzeitsfeier von Fräulein Elfride Salone [sic] Gronemann mit Herrn Dr. Salo Bergel von Sammy'.
Zionist whilst Salo was what he would remain to the end of his life – a convinced German nationalist.

The plot involves the frantic efforts of the spa’s director to attract more clients and make his establishment into a world-renowned health retreat. In order to do this he has ordered the locals to curb all hints of conflict between the German and the Polish sections of the population; he has also hired actors to play the roles of rich foreign visitors, and the employees are supposed to make welcoming speeches. All these efforts are sabotaged by circumstances – one of the actresses, a Jewess, cannot speak French properly and peppers every sentence with Yiddish terms; one of the employees, a rabid German nationalist, is driven to absurd efforts in order to purge her speech of every offensive French expression, a good example is her use of ‘Gastwirtschaftsvaterstädtischer Gesinnung’ for ‘Lokalpatriotismus’ (n.d. h, 14); on top of it all, the spa’s physician is away in Hanover, as he has become engaged to a woman from that city. The director asks his brother to take his place, brushing aside his protests that he is not a doctor, and asserts that his brother’s contract forbids him becoming engaged to or marrying anybody, since the nationality of the bride would upset the precarious balance between Poles and Germans in the city. A gullible visitor arrives with his daughter – a Jew from a town even smaller than Inowrazlaw, who is taken in by all the show put up by the director. The conflict is resolved and the play ends when Chancellor von Bülow\(^94\) arrives in town, and although at first nobody recognises him and fun is poked at his passion for quoting Classical German writers, he finally reveals his

\(^{94}\) Prince Bernhard von Bülow, Reich chancellor 1900-1909.
identity and states that there is no obstacle to prevent the doctor’s wedding since the bride sees herself not as Pole or German, but as a member of the Israelite nation.

In this, one of his first dramatic efforts, one can discern a clear understanding of the importance that ethnic identity held for the Wilhelminian Germans, and of the precarious role the Jews played, particularly in the East, where they were placed between the two struggling communities, Germans and Poles. Given that his father’s family came from this area and G himself had spent a large portion of his life there, he could speak with authority on such matters, without glossing over the fact that the Jewish community itself was divided on the issue of Zionism. And yet the fact that the wedding between members of the two opposing camps can take place reaffirms the ethnic and national solidarity among the Jews, a cardinal principle of Zionism. This solidarity lies far from threatening Gentile society, and it is actually the Gentile Chancellor who states the ethnic separateness of the Jews.

2.6.2 Hamans Flucht

*Hamans Flucht* (Haman’s escape) was written in the last years of the nineteenth century for the *Dibbuk Chaverim*, an association of Orthodox students in Berlin already mentioned above (22; n.d. a, 59). It is a *Purimspiel*, a comedy traditionally performed during the festival of Purim, which commemorates the deliverance of the Jewish people from the murderous scheme of the archetypal evil Jew-hater Haman, as related in the biblical book of Esther. Among other reasons, since the date of Purim (14 Adar) usually coincides roughly with the Christian Lent, the celebration has become tinged with carnival motifs, and Purim plays are riotous affairs. The play’s structure is quite simple – consisting of five scenes (or rather
tableaux, since the curtain never comes down, and only the background décor changes from scene to scene). Two of the characters, Heinz and Atlas, travel though time, and in each epoch play different roles. When in the present and when speaking to each other they do it in prose; but all historical characters speak verse.

The first scene has the boy Heinz punished by his tutor and his uncle Baruch, for his refusal to learn the history of Purim. Against the protests of the boy’s French tutor, Baruch locks him up in his study so that he will apply himself to his books. Heinz, tired and terrified at the sight of the mice that infest the room, falls asleep and then Atlas, who has been holding an orb containing a clock, comes to life and riding a coach pulled by four mice, they travel in time.

Their first stop is Susa at the time of King Ahasveros and Queen Esther; Atlas and Heinz are dressed as courtiers and they arrive to see Mordecai vindicated and Haman arrested. Heinz is entrusted with keeping Haman in custody but the latter escapes and Atlas and Heinz must chase after him through time so that Haman can be hanged and the biblical text come true.

They arrive next in Jerusalem during Vespasian’s siege in the year 70 C.E. Vespasian (played by the same actor who plays Haman, reinforcing then the former’s image as the eternal Jew-hater) receives in his camp the visit of Rabbi Johanan (Atlas), who has been smuggled out of Jerusalem pretending to be a corpse and now asks Vespasian for permission to set up an academy in Yavneh and foretells that he will become emperor. The escape of Johanan and his meeting with the emperor is a Rabbinic legend (Avot de-Rabbi Nathan, chapter 6)
grants him his wish and prepares to depart for Rome but his boots will not fit so he flies into a rage and asks for the cobbler (Heinz) to be brought and executed. Johanan asks for him to be spared and the two of them leave in the mouse-drawn coach.

Their next port of call is Granada in 1492. King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella, attended by the Inquisitor Torquemada (played once again by the actor in the roles of Haman and Vespasian), receive Columbus (Atlas) and Fernando (Heinz), who are about to sail on their voyage of discovery. Before they can leave, Torquemada notices that Fernando is wearing tzitzit, the ritual fringes, and the two are detained and taken away, under the care of two monks, to await execution. They wait until their captors fall asleep and make their escape once again.

They travel to a village in Bohemia, then (1770) part of the Austro-Hungarian empire. The village judge Huber (Haman / Vespasian / Torquemada) and farmer Stüber are faced with a problem. Stüber was given the guardianship of an orphan girl, and as a consequence of his constant beatings, she has run away. The farmer comes to his friend to seek for help, and Huber obliges – he proposes to wait for the first Jew to be brought into custody, so he can be forced to confess to the abduction and murder of the girl by the community. Stüber looks forward to settling scores with a village Jew he hates. Then Friemel, the drunken court-clerk brings in Heinz. As Huber is trying to coerce Heinz into a false confession, Emperor Joseph II and an aide (Atlas) make an entry, wearing long coats that make it impossible for them to be recognised. Huber orders Friemel to give Heinz twenty-five slashes, and Stüber says he deserves it since he is sure Heinz and the other Jews murdered his girl. Then the Emperor opens the door and brings in the girl, who he has found
lying on the road-side. Undisturbed, Huber orders Friemel to give the Jew a good thrashing, and when the Joseph asks whether the emperor allows that sort of behaviour, Huber informs him that the emperor is far away and it is they, Huber and Stüber that rule the village. The emperor then takes his coat off, revealing his identity, and has the two men taken away. A relieved Heinz tells Atlas that their chase is over and they have finally captured Haman. Atlas explains that they will never be able to capture Haman, that he will escape again and again to take the shape of government ministers and court chaplains. Heinz himself comes up with a solution: to forget Haman and concern himself with working on his own development. Atlas agrees, adding that when the Jews return to their country, Haman will end up by hanging himself. The scene ends to the strains of the Zionist anthem, later to become the anthem of the state of Israel, Hatikvah. A short epilogue has uncle Baruch and the French tutor come into the study to find Heinz asleep. They wake him up and he runs out of the room, glad that it was all a dream. Baruch then encapsulates, in a speech in verse, the message of the play for Jewish children.

Clearly a work of Zionist propaganda aimed at the young, the work is at pains to transmit to the presumably assimilated audience the permanence of anti-Jewish feeling regardless of its mutations, and the solution to it, although not explicitly Zionist, does entail the rejection of the ethos of the German-Jewish community, insofar as it asks for a new look at the very possibility of acceptance by and integration with the host community, thus putting in question one of the cardinal axioms of the assimilatory creed. G returns to this again and again in the course of his oeuvre. The play can therefore be seen as part of the continuous didactic activity of the author, an activity aimed in this case at those members of the

96 An allusion to Kaiser William's antisemitic court preacher Adolf Stoecker.
community who would not have considered themselves to be Zionists. An additional advantage would have been derived from the fact that children have always been an integral part of the audience and of the players in Purim comedies. The play, having a boy for its protagonist, is clearly aimed at the youthful audience.

2.6.3 Jakob und Christian

Written in 1937, this comedy was first performed in Vienna in October 1937 by Oscar Teller’s Jüdisches Kulturtheater (TELLER 1982, 291; DALINGER 1998, 117). It was translated into Hebrew and produced by Mataté under the title Ya‘akov ve’esav (Jacob and Esau) (GEIS 1950). The play has three acts and it takes place in a German village before the First World War.

In the first act, Christian Stockebrand’s mother’s funeral is taking place, and from the conversation in the village inn, the audience finds out that she was single when she gave birth to Christian, and could only find shelter with the Jewish shopkeeper, who then found her a job as wet-nurse to the just-born baby of a Romanian merchant who was then staying in the village and whose wife had died in labour. The merchant had found a place where Christian’s mother could leave her son and she had left with him for Bucharest where she stayed for three years. The local nobleman Landrat von Hahnenklee, tells his sister Aurora he is no longer against her engagement with Christian, because despite Christian’s lowly birth, as a company director he is going to be a very rich man and is already a powerful

97 Head of the administrative district.
figure in his political party, not least because of his antisemitism. Aurora then tells Christian of her brother’s decision, and subsequently they both inform Riegel, who is the redactor of the party paper, of their engagement. Riegel has come to try to convince Christian to announce in a meeting that evening that he will run for office in the coming elections. Christian speaks with the village priest who informs him that before her death his mother had confessed that she had switched the two boys so that her own child would have a better future. Christian understands why she was never very affectionate towards him, although he had always been a good son and had given her part of the riches he had accumulated. As Christian is trying to come to terms with the news, the mourners come into the inn and declare him candidate. The notary public Ennezerus invites all parties interested in the Stockebrand legacy to meet the next day in the afternoon, and announces the forthcoming arrival of Jakob Jacubowitz from Bucharest.

The villagers have been inflamed by Christian’s antisemitic speech of the previous eve, and they proceed to berate the inn-keeper for having reserved a room for the Jew who is due to arrive from Bucharest. A policeman brings in a poor Jew who says he is Jakob, and who tells them he lost all his inheritance due to his poor business talents; he has only survived thanks to the money his wet-nurse (at this point in the play the audience knows that she is Jakob’s mother) used to send him. Christian arranges for him to stay in the inn and then reveals to Aurora the situation and asks her to decide whether she will marry him or not. At the meeting the notary Ennezerus announces the existence of a sealed document which should prevent them from taking rash steps. He then reads the testament, which appoints Paradies, the Jewish shopkeeper, executor, and Jakob Jacubowitz is named sole
heir. It also leaves the alcoholic village doctor, Wendel, a monthly income of 100 Marks, and leaves it to the sole legatee’s discretion to do the same for Christian Stockebrand. Christian declares he will contest the testament, and Ennezerus’s response is that he is legally bound to hand the sealed document over to the courts in case the testament is contested. Christian then renounces any legal challenge and demands that the estate be handed over to him, as he is the legitimate issue of the Jacubowitzes.\footnote{I have not had access to the full text of the play and for the first two acts have relied on the plot outline provided by Oscar Teller (TELLER 1982, 295-7).}

In the last act, Landrat von Hahnenklee and Paradies are waiting for the exhausted Jacubowitz and the drunken Dr. Wendel to wake up. The Landrat’s comments show him to be a typical German antisemite, whilst Paradies says the story reminds him of King Solomon, to whom two women came fighting over a child, whilst here two children are fighting over a mother. Paradies then goes home and the Landrat reads the announcement of the engagement in the paper and as he reads Christian’s name, Jakob wakes up and answers to it. The Landrat comments sourly on his quick powers of assimilation. Jakob goes back to sleep and Aurora arrives telling her brother she and Christian are thinking of leaving the country so they can start again.

The inn-keeper and the maid come in to congratulate the siblings on Aurora’s engagement but they leave. The maid is left alone and when the policeman comes in they speculate on why the Landrat has been so irritable with everybody and so kind to the vagrant Jew. The policeman’s guess is that years ago a rich foreign Jew seduced the deceased (and remarks on the well-known moral failures of the Jews), which means Company Director
Stockebrand has a Jewish father. He states that the Landrat has brought the vagrant Jew because it is common knowledge that an antisemitic action is coming up, and nobody in the village would want to do anything against Paradies, whom everybody respects.

Christian, Aurora and the Landrat come down and find Jakob awake. Christian demands, as a prize for awarding Jakob a pension, that the latter leave the region forever. Jakob is angry at this treatment, calls it a Jewish insolence (a term much used by German antisemites), and threatens to contest the testament, observing he has nothing to lose from a lengthy process. Paradies arrives bringing with him Dr. Wendel, who has finally slept off his drinking excess. At first he does not want to oblige the Landrat and tell them what happened at the time of the children’s birth; pretty soon it becomes apparent that Wendel is thinking of something else that occurred at the time, namely, that he himself also intended to switch the children, and had no idea the mother had done the same. They all realise that in that case no change really occurred – Jakob is the true heir, and Christian has renounced all claims. However, Wendel interjects that he does not remember whether he really effected the switch or not. He reveals he was the illegitimate child’s father, and then remembers that after their birth, he examined the babies and one of them had a birthmark. When he looks up his diary, Paradies asks him not to read it yet, and proposes that before they know the truth about the matter, they come to an accommodation, since once they know, each side will feel they have truth and justice on their side, and they will spend years in litigation that will only bring them ruin and scandal. The Landrat tells Paradies that although he is a Jew, he is right and King Solomon himself could not have done it better (!). He then asks Wendel to reveal the truth, but Aurora sensibly remarks that there is no reason why they should know; after all,
they now are what life has made them and nothing can change that. But the Landrat then proposes that Jakob and Christian leave and that Wendel tells the other three the truth, on condition that they never tell anybody. The curtain falls as Wendel is about to reveal the secret.

The play, written before 1936, was produced in several countries, including a Hebrew version produced in Palestine by Mataté, as well as a Yiddish version (GEIS 1950). The play may be seen as a response to the racial antisemitism of the National-Socialists; whilst setting up a situation in which the audience thinks it can compare the effects of inherited traits vis-à-vis nurture, it cleverly plays on the audience’s prejudices by leading it to believe that Christian is the Jewish boy and Jakob is the Gentile—after all, it is Christian who is a successful businessman—only to turn the tables to reveal that Wendel may have switched the babies again; but then a final turn is added when it is revealed that the second switch may after all not have taken place which together with the refusal to reveal the truth, leaves the audience to draw their own conclusions. The play takes a look at the psychological fears which underlie the antisemitic mentality, in the specific environment of a German-speaking country in which political antisemitism is rampant, but it does not deal in any detail with the National-Socialist persecution in its full horror even as it was in the mid-thirties.

The play also engages with some of G’s recurring themes — that of the differences between Gentiles and Jews, and of what makes an individual feel a Jew, or to express it in a different way, what constitutes a Jewish identity in the German world. The response at this stage is a lot more ambiguous than it had been in Tohuwabohu — it does not seem to be the culture in which the individual is raised, or at least not with certainty, and neither does it
seem to reside in any inherent traits which only need the right set of circumstances to trigger an appropriate response, as happens to Hans Lehnsen in *Tohuwabohu*. What seems to be clear is that whatever the case may be, the question affects the Gentile as much as the Jew, and in that sense the play constitutes a call to the antisemites to return to their senses – futile as that may seem with the benefit of hindsight – together with a reminder to the Jewish audience of the multiple ties that bind them to their host culture; the latter had not been part of G’s repertory up to this time and may have been due to his stay in France where the differences between German and French Jews were highlighted by the desperate situation of the former and the reluctance of the latter to organise assistance. It may also be as a consequence of the intractability of the problem facing German Jews that the play offers no solution.

2.6.4 DER WEISE UND DER NARR: KÖNIG SALOMO UND DER SCHUSTER

*The King and the Cobbler*, as it was translated, or more precisely *The king and the fool*, written after his arrival in Palestine and published in 1942, was translated into Hebrew by Nathan Alterman and had three hundred performances by the Ohel Theatre in Tel Aviv; it was revived again in 1955, and later, in 1965, it was made into a musical by Alexander Argov for the Cameri Theatre (see Halevi 1950, Geis 1943, *Mitteilungsblatt* 1943, Geis 1955, Geis 1971, Almagor 1996). The Hebrew version was also produced in New York by the Hebrew theatre company Pargod in May 1945 under the direction of Erwin Piscator and achieved very good reviews (Zahavi 1945, Ribalow 1945, Yardeni 1945, Frank 1945). The original German edition had a preface by Margot Klausner. It was also translated into
English by Moshe Lowenstein and published in 1952, as well as into Yiddish by Joseph Weinstein, and performed at the Royal Opera House, Cairo, as part of a Victory gala; the author of these lines has seen a programme, where the play is referred to as *Le sage et le fou*, but has not been able to find the translation. The work has six scenes.

The first scene has Bathsheba, King Solomon’s mother, in the palace listening to Yoram, the scribe, reading from a scroll containing Solomon’s ongoing composition. Enter Hanon, the Royal Chamberlain, and Nofrith, the Egyptian princess. Hanon is telling her that in the marketplace he saw a man who looked exactly like the king. Solomon arrives, and they tell him about the man, Nofrith saying that she wants the man executed as would customarily be done in Egypt, but Solomon orders that the man be brought before him. He then attends to the case of the two women who both claim to be the mother of the same baby. Nofrith explains that in Egypt they leave it all to the goddess Isis, and if the goddess makes a mistake, then there is nothing to be done. She then asks Solomon to retire with her to her chambers and stop bothering with justice, which she considers a nuisance.

The second scene takes place outside the temple, where three workers, Lamech, Asher, and Beruria, and a Phoenician merchant, Mago are discussing the case of the two mothers. Mago says in Phoenicia they would have sacrificed the child to Moloch, but he is sure the wise king will find another solution. Enter Salmai the cobbler, drunk and singing. Lemech, Asher, and Beruria pretend they are bringing the case before the real king. Salmai’s verdict is to split the “child” –a piece of bread– in two and give each one half a piece. Salmai’s wife Naama enters complaining about her poverty and his indolence. Then the worker Reuben arrives bringing the news of the king’s verdict. When Salmai says that was
precisely his ruling everybody laughs, whilst Lemech observes: 'Denn was ein Narr und was
ein Weiser spricht, / scheint auch dasselbe, ist’s dasselbe nicht' (1942a, 17) (For what a fool
and a wise man say / may seem the same but it is certainly not). The Royal Chamberlain
Hanon comes to summon Salmai to appear before the king, and the two leave, accompanied
by the cobbler’s wife.

The third scene takes place in the palace, where Nofrith and her slaves dance the
sphinx dance for Solomon and his wife; Nofrith cannot tell the king what the meaning of the
dance is. Hanon brings the couple in. Unbeknownst to them, the king is watching them, and
is struck by Naama’s beauty. He has them brought before him, although his mother warns
him not to do so. The first one to come in is Naama; Solomon asks her if she likes him, and
she, confused, answers that he drinks too much and it all comes of writing poetry. She then
says that she likes his (the king’s) Song of Songs. Solomon decides to have her join his
harem, although she wants to remain with her husband. He orders Hanon to give the cobbler
money to compensate him for the loss of his wife, but then, at the instigation of his mother
Bathsheba, quickly trades places with Salmai. When the king’s mother approaches him, the
terrified cobbler throws himself at her feet but she convinces him to stay calm and play his
role. Nofrith comes in to complain that the king does not love her any more, as he has taken
a new wife, and Hanon asks what he should do with the cobbler. Bathsheba intervenes to ask
that the cobbler be sent away. The false king says he has to attend the council, and when
Hanon returns to announce he threw the man out, Salmai assents royally.

99 My translation, Lowenstein omits the couplet. (1952, 12).
Outside the palace, people try to catch a glimpse of the party that is taking place. A worker says the party goers are having fun at the people’s expense, but a burgher observes that they are all excited because the Queen of Sheba has sent the king three riddles; if he can solve them, the two countries will become allies. Hanon comes out and throws the leftovers and some coins to the crowd, whilst Salmai watches the crowd fight over them from the balcony. Solomon tries to make his way into the palace unobserved and when Hanon drives him back, he claims to be the real king, so Hanon threatens to have him whipped. The worker then offers to share with Solomon some of the cake that was thrown at the crowd, but the latter says he has always given and never received. Then Yoram comes out three times and reads the riddles. Each time Solomon offers a solution, but gets it wrong, and is told the king guessed all of them correctly. It turns out that Salmai never guessed the solutions, he was too drunk and tired and trying to be rude, but Bathsheba explains to him that people mistake simple-mindedness for wisdom. In the meantime, Solomon has found out what the poor people’s lives are really like and how Hanon and his officials have deceived him, thwarted his orders, and stolen money that was destined for the common good. Nofrith then comes out to the battlements and laments her rejection by the king, and when she notices Solomon, she proposes that he supplants the king and take revenge with him, but then she changes her mind, saying she meant it as a joke and goes back into the palace.

For the fifth scene, the action shifts back into the palace, where the king is judging the case of a man who was entrusted with a ring and who, when its owner returned to claim it, denied ever having received it. Salmai has the man swear he does not have it on his
person, and then discovers it in the man's cane and returns it to its rightful owner. Everybody is amazed but Bathsheba comments on how a wise man would not have found the ring. Nofrith, in order to get rid of her new rival, offers to show Naama a way of escaping from the palace so she can rejoin her husband, but Naama refuses any aid and is very confused – she thinks something about the king is very familiar. Salmai adds to her confusion by asking her whether she recognises him and asking her to kiss him. Finally, Naama runs away, and Salmai secludes himself in his chambers whilst Bathsheba goes out to look for Solomon.

In the sixth scene, Solomon is with his – that is, Salmai’s – friends, who are very worried at his obstinate insistence on being the king. They leave and Solomon embarks on a monologue that shows how much he has learnt from his experience. Naama then comes fleeing from the palace and asks him to get ready so they can run away to a foreign land, but she starts to find his behaviour strange, and feels oddly that she finds the king more familiar than her own husband. She finally realises this is the king when he cannot be bothered to go home and fetch his tools saying he will buy another set elsewhere. Finally, Bathsheba and Hanon arrive; she is ready to be punished by her son but insists her only purpose was to have him learn a lesson.

Back in the palace the last scene opens with a bored Salmai who, without his boon companions, takes his bag out and starts resoling shoes. When Bathsheba, Naama and Solomon come in, Salmai declares himself ready to go back to his home. Bathsheba tells Solomon he will now feel closer to his people, and Naama advices him to send Nofrith back to Egypt, as women are dangerous even to the best man. Nofrith also is anxious to return to
her country where Pharao is god and his subjects as dirt, unlike Israel, where in every king there is a bit of a cobbler and vice versa. She declares herself incapable of solving the riddle Jew, which she equates with the riddle woman. Solomon then calls Yoram, dictates the end of the biblical book Ecclesiastes, and announces he is done with women. At this very moment the trumpets blow and the Queen of Sheba arrives. As Salomon and his mother go out to receive her, Naama, Nofrith, Yoram, Hanon, and Salmai start a Reigentanz or round dance, which brings the play to a close.

The play’s origins lie in Midrashic legends, the most immediate instance being a narrative found in the Pesikta, a collection of homilies for the festivals, in which an angel takes Solomon’s shape and sits on his throne, whilst the king is forced to wander around the study houses of Jerusalem saying: “I, Koheleth, was king over Jerusalem” (Ecclesiastes 1:2); to which the response of his hearers is to declare him insane and after that they try to calm him, to which his response is: “Vanity of vanities” (Ecclesiastes 1:2) (See Pesikta 1975, 394). The first can be placed aside Solomon’s monologue in the sixth scene:

Noch gestem angebetet auf dem Thron,  
Der große Fürst, der Denker und der Dichter,  
Auf dessen Wort die Welt voll Ehrfürcht lauscht,  
Heut’ auf der Gasse und des Poebels Hohn,  
Ein Nichts, ein Wurm, im Staube mühsam kriecht er  
Ein böser Zauber hat mich ausgetauscht.  
Was dort ich sprach, schien jedem Offenbarung  
Selbst wenn ich irrte, schien es höchste Wahrheit.  
Hier gäb’ selbst Weisheit nur dem Spotte Nahrung  
Und höchstes Wissen schie ne hier nur Narrheit.  
Der Fürst, der Bettler auch, der Narr, der Weise,  
Sie hängen all’ an unsichtbaren Schnüren  
Und zupft der Puppenspieler dran nur leise,  
Kann er sie hierhin oder dorthin führen.  
Und dunkel bleibt das Ziel der Lebensreise. (1942a, 47)

It was but yesterday. They worshipped me,
The mighty king, the thinker, and the poet,
Whose every word was heard in reverence.
Today the mob derides me in the street,
Nobody, a worm, who wriggles in the dust.
Some evil witchcraft has procured this change.
Have I not taught them much? And though I blundered
And made mistakes, my words were still received
As revelations and profoundest truth.
Here, real knowledge is a provocation
And wisdom only calls for ridicule.
Be prince, be beggar, fool or sage, you dangle
From strings invisible to human eyes.
The puppet player with a gentle flick
Will lead you here and there and everywhere.
Your journey's end however is wrapped in darkness. (1952, 37)

To this can be added the widespread motif of the king wandering incognito among his people, present in the folklore of many peoples.

Some of the themes that resonate throughout the play may be seen as an echo of the plight of the German Jewish exiles confronting and expelled from their countries by Nazism — to begin with, one may look at the way the fundamental differences between Gentiles and Jews are confronted. This theme is brought into the play by means of Nofrith, who constitutes the main Gentile character, as well as a touchstone for the actions undertaken by the Jewish king, and culminates in her speech in the seventh scene:

Es scheint, daß wir nicht zueinander passen.
Der Pharao ist Gott in seinem Lande,
Das niedr'e Volk kriecht elend nur im Sande.
Er kann es töten, kann es niedermetzeln,
Er bleibt doch, was er ist, der Sohn der Sonne,
Ihn anzubeten bleibt die höchste Wonne.
Euch Juden aber kann ich nicht enträteln,
In jedem Schuster steckt ein Stückchen König,
In jedem König steckt ein Stückchen Schuster,
Geschaffen seid Ihr nach mir fremden Muster,
Nach Einfachkeit und Klarheit doch mich seh'n' ich. (1942a, 53)
Methinks that somehow we don't seem to match,
With us at home, a king is like a god.
The people kiss the dust beneath his feet,
Yet he can have them butchered at his will,
And still remains Ra's son, and glorious heir,
Admired, worshipped, praised by all the world.
But as for you and for your Jews. You are
A mistery which I cannot unravel.
In every cobbler is something of a king.
In every king is something of a cobbler.
I cannot grasp this strange and crazy pattern.
I yearn for clearness and simplicity. (1952, 42)

The differences are just too deep, they range from religion and politics down to personality traits; it is worthy of attention that she goes on to compare the riddle-Jew to the riddle-woman, concluding that both are unsolvable, thus setting differences of race on a par with those of gender, and making the equation of Jews with women, cf. Otto Weininger, as has been noted by Sander Gilman (GILMAN 1991).

Another theme is that of the knowledge which a subject who has lost his social status can attain, a knowledge both of himself and of the world, a world which up to the time of the fall had been like a closed book to the said subject, and I use the image advisedly, since in the first scene we find out that Solomon has been writing Ecclesiastes, a book of wisdom, although the attitude of the scribe Joram makes it clear that he sets little store by his master's wisdom; in fact, the king himself is dissatisfied with the book, he cannot decide how to end it, and at the same time is conscious both of the relative uselessness of knowledge from mere books, and of the little value attached to wisdom when it is not accompanied by power. Here a brief expansion is made to the actual text of Ecclesiastes 9: 14-15, in which mention is made of the poor wise man living in a city under siege by a powerful king, who could have saved the city and yet nobody thought of consulting him due to his poverty. The expansion,
supposedly part of king Solomon’s composition, changes the sense of the biblical text; the poor man manages to save the city, and yet his name has been forgotten, whilst that of the king of the city is praised, concluding that wisdom itself is powerless,

Da war ein Mann, ein unbekannter Weiser,
Der redete am Markt und schrie sich heiser
Man lacht’ ihn aus – und doch, er hat’s vollbracht,
Das Land gerettet aus des Feindes Macht.
Doch kündet uns kein Lied von diesem Weisen,
Sein Name ist vergessen und verloren.
Den König, der nichts tat, die Sänger preisen
Sein Ruhm ertönt in aller Hörer Ohren.
Wer mehr nach Weisheit als nach Stärke trachtet,
Der hat den bessern Teil für sich erwählet,
Doch bleibt er deshalb in der Welt verachtet,
Die nur vom Glanz und Reichtum gern erzählt,
Die Welt besteht zum größten Teil aus Toren
Hat stets auf Fürsten, noch so dumm, geschworen.
Wer arm und dürftig ist, der bleibt verloren. (1942a, 10)

Now there was found in it a man poor and wise,
And he by his wisdom delivered the city;
Yet no man remembered that same poor man,
Then said I: ‘Wisdom is better than strength;
Nevertheless, the poor man’s wisdom is despised,
And his words are not heard.’
The words of the wise spoken in quiet
Are more acceptable than the cry of a ruler among fools.
Wisdom is better than weapons of war... (1952, 5)

In the acerbity of the preceding text, which Joram states contains in his opinion the kernel of the work, the king himself has unconsciously arrived at the wisdom which he will procure through personal experience by the end of the play, and which is distilled in the – fictitiously expanded – ending of the book, which asks for resignation in the face of events whose outcome is not known and cannot be affected by human intervention

100 The translator has omitted G’s more cynical lines and remains closer to the text of Ecclesiastes 9: 15-18.
Oh, Menschensohn, Du sollst bescheiden bleiben,  
Du wirst ja stets nur Gottes Werkzeug sein,  
Du weißt es nicht, was eitel ist, was wichtig,  
Manch’ Blödes scheint Dir gut, manch’ Ernstes nichtig,  
Was böse scheint, kann gut, was gut scheint, böse enden,  
Den Ausgang kennst Du nicht, er liegt in Gottes Händen. (1942a, 47)

O son of man, you should remain modest,  
For you will always be God’s tool,  
You do not know what is vain and what is important,  
Many a stupid thing seems good to you, many a serious thing seems trivial,  
What seems evil could end well, what seems good could come to a bad end,  
You do not know the outcome – it lies in God’s hands.

There is only a weak rationale for this in the play, since after all the king’s fall was arranged by his mother precisely in order to have him learn at first hand the realities that have remained outside his ken. It is not difficult to see in this a reflection of the situation of so many German and Central European Jewish refugees, and the resignation and despair which so many of them felt at the constantly worsening situation. Again, the translator has omitted G’s witty treatment and substituted for it a slight rephrasing of the closing verses of the biblical book (Ecclesiastes 12: 13-14):

The end of matter,  
All having been heard:  
Fear God, and keep His commandments;  
For this is the whole man.  
For God shall bring every word into the judgment  
Concerning every hidden thing,  
Whether it be good or whether it be evil. (1952, 43)

And yet there is another theme running through the play. It is also Salmai who has much to learn about himself and his wife. But the careless and free attitude of Salmai, the comradeship of the poor and their good humour, as seen in Salmai’s drunken song at the start of the second scene
Es lebt der König Salomo
Vergnügt in seinem Schloße
In seinem Harem schläft er froh,
Ich schlafe in der Gosse

Er ist der große Salomo,
Ich bin ein Salomochen,
Thront er im Schloße irgendwo,
Thron’ich auch auf dem Popochen (1942a, 15) I sit – on my behind. (1952, 10)

King Solomon lives without no qualms
In cotton wool and butter.
He sleeps well in his harem’s arms
And I – sleep in the gutter.
The great King Solomon is a drone
I too am of his kind.
Sits he in state upon his throne,

are in stark contrast to the solemn and rigid mores of the royal entourage, and if Salmai
solves the riddles serendipitously, he nonetheless acquits himself well. The play’s finale, a
round dance, with its joyous call to seize the day and forget the calamities of daily life may
have struck a chord with its audience and might explain the success of the Hebrew version as
well as of the musical which followed the latter.

2.6.5 DER PROZESS UM DES ESELS SCHATTEN

The longest of G’s dramatic works is The Lawsuit over the Donkey’s Shadow. The play,
written during the last years of the war and published in Tel Aviv in 1945 by a group of his
friends, is a dramatisation of an episode in Christoph Martin Wieland’s novel Geschichte der
Abderiten (History of the Abderites), published in 1774. Wieland (1733-1813) placed the
action in ancient Greece to satirise the narrow-minded mores of the German Bürgertum.

Wieland’s satire was modelled on that of the Greek author Lucian, and it is of some import
that his translation of Lucian’s satires was widely read by the writers of the Galician
Haskalah at the beginning of the Nineteenth century and widely imitated (WERSES 1990,
225-6). Wieland set the story in the Greek city of Abdera, renowned for the stupidity,
bigotry, and contentiousness of its inhabitants. The city has deep divisions – along class
lines, with rich and poor in constant conflict along religious lines, with the priest of the local
goddess Latona constantly at odds with the party of the skeptics headed by the archon – the chief magistrate and city leader. The only things that unite the citizens are their detestation of everything foreign and their cheerful contempt for the philosopher Democritos, the only Abderite who is admired outside the city, but who is considered by most of them a fool. G changed some of the details and we will examine the adaptation after sketching the plot. The play has a prologue and four acts.

The prologue takes place in the countryside, where Chloe, daughter of the ass-driver Anthrax, and Damon, son of the dentist Struthion, have met to discuss how to break to their respective fathers the news that they are in love and want to get married. They are forced to hide by the sudden apparition of the two fathers; Struthion has hired Anthrax’s donkey to take him to the neighbouring city of Gerania. The two men get into an argument over the relationship between their offspring. Anthrax thinks the boy wants his daughter for a plaything and does not intend to marry her. Struthion dismisses both their friendship as a youthful trifle and the idea that they could ever get married as an impossibility. The driver is so upset that when the dentist stops to rest and sits in the shadow of the donkey to take shelter from the sun, Anthrax tells him that he has only paid to hire the animal, not its shadow and demands an extra payment of three drachmas. Struthion responds that the shadow goes with the animal and they decide to go straight to the city magistrate to resolve the dispute. The young couple, having witnessed the argument from their hiding place, realise the folly of their fathers’ quarrel, but then each one starts defending their own father’s position and soon they are also arguing.
The first act, set before the city gates of Abdera, has two scenes. In the first scene the city notables arrive at the entrance of the philosopher Democritos' house. They have been invited to admire the collection of curious objects he has brought back from his trips abroad. The arrival of the two litigants forces the city magistrate Philippides, an amateur poet, to return to the city gates to dispense justice. He listens to the arguments of the two sides, and repeating the old Jewish joke, declares himself in agreement with both of them, and when someone else points this out, he agrees with the third person too. The magistrate then proposes that Struthion pay Anthrax a smaller sum than the one the latter had demanded, and settle their differences. Both Chloe and Damon have by now arrived and advice their fathers to be reasonable, but they both insist they want to have justice done. Philippides, impatient to return to the party, summons the two to appear before him in half an hour to hear his verdict. However, his venal clerk Thrystogenes avails himself of the delay in order to take money from both sides and counsel them on how to take advantage of each other's weak spots. The driver's wife sells frog legs surreptitiously, since frogs are consecrated to the goddess Latona and not supposed to be eaten. So Thrystogenes advises Struthion to go to the priest Agathyrsos. On the other hand, the dentist has been spreading the rumour that the actress Thryallis's teeth are false. Since the lady in question happens to be the lover of the city archon Onolaos, Anthrax need only go to him to find support for his claim. Damon and Chloe try to become reconciled but fail to do so. Chloe is left alone when a foreigner arrives asking for directions to the house of Democritos; they enter into conversation and she tells him about the lawsuit.
The second scene shows the party in the garden of Democritos’s house. The guests are discussing the works of art the philosopher brought back from abroad. Their judgment shows their provincial, strait-laced ways of thinking and the narrow-mindedness of their views. When they come to discuss the case of the donkey’s shadow, everybody, the judge included, is seen to be partisan and superficial. When Chloe arrives escorting the foreign visitor, she explains to him that all the guests secretly despise the philosopher and have only come to take advantage of his hospitality. She also tells him that in Abdera the rulers are chosen for their poetic talents rather than for their fitness for office. Before he can speak to Democritos, the visitor is accosted by the guests, who saw him the day before attending the performance of Euripides’s tragedy *Andromeda*, and noticed he did not share the public’s enthusiasm for it. They cross-examine him and find out he did not like the production. When the archon Onolaos suggests they write to the author to let him resolve the dispute, the visitor reveals himself to be Euripides. The archon and others accuse him of being an impostor, but the rest believe him and the actress Thryallis asks him to direct a comedy. His identity is finally confirmed by Salabanda, a wealthy Athenian lady now living in Abdera. Euripides, mindful of his reputation as a misogynist, proposes Aristophanes’s comedy *Lysistrata*. The two disputants arrive to hear the magistrate’s verdict. Philippides finds them both liable and orders them to pay the judicial costs. They are both dissatisfied and each one lodges an appeal. Euripides and Democritos are left to discuss the divorce between reason and justice.

The second act takes place in the city square, where Strepsiades’s barber’s shop, Salabanda’s drawing-room, and Krobyle’s stall can be seen. Chloe is telling her mother
Krobyle, her sister Gorgo and Gorgo’s suitor Phanias about the events that have taken place.

Struthion arrives looking for the lawyer Physignatus and refuses to buy fruit from Krobyle. They watch the court clerk Thrystogenes take their donkey, which has now been impounded, to the city stalls. Democritos now enters taking Euripides to the barber’s, and they witness how Anthrax, despite his wife’s protests, chases after the busy prosecuting attorney Polyphonos; the term used for the latter’s profession is the negatively charged Sykophant, although with the original meaning of false adviser or accuser. Salabanda invites Democritos in to discuss how to mend things. Struthion explains his case to the lawyer Physignatus, protesting all the time that it is not a matter of money but of principle. The lawyer agrees to take on the case, following the payment of a 300 drachma retainer; when Struthion protests at the cost, Physignatus responds that that they are dealing with a matter of principle. Chloe comes to ask Euripides if she could have a role in the play to be produced, and rouses Damon’s jealousy. The priest Agathyrsos, prompted by Salabanda, tries to convince Struthion to drop the suit, but the dentist tells him about Krobyle’s sale of frog legs; the priest, indignant at the sacrilege, joins Struthion’s party. The prosecutor Polyphonos now comes to have his hair done by Strepsiades for the play, whilst he tells Anthrax he has decided to take on his case, as he has seen that justice lies on the driver’s side, and behind the dentist’s arguments lies a conspiracy of the rich against the poor. He promises to do his best for the poor Anthrax but does not forego his retainer – 100 drachmas, soothing the donkey driver with the argument that his guild will pay the money. At the theatre, the priest Agathyrsos addresses the audience warning them about the insolence of the proletariat and the unbelievers, who are threatening a revolution. Polyphonos and Strepsiades respond, arguing that the rich and the clergy are themselves plotting against the poor; finally, they
organise themselves into a party, calling themselves “The Donkeys”, whilst dubbing their rivals “The Shadows”. The response of Agathyrsos and Physignatos is to rejoice in the name. Soon the whole audience is divided into Donkeys and Shadows.

For the third act the action moves to Salabanda’s drawing-room, where Euripides is writing a new play and Democritos asks him how the writing of his new, misogynist tragedy on Medea is going. Euripides answers he has abandoned the play in favour of something less hostile to women. Salabanda and Chloe enter; the former relates that all the men will be going to the stadium to celebrate Latona’s festival of peace, and explains that Lysistrata, Euripides’s play, has given her an idea for a plan that will end the civic strife; she takes Democritos with her to see the archon.101 Chloe stays behind to speak with Euripides. She tells him she is in love and needs his advice. He thinks she is in love with him and tells her he has stayed in the city for her sake. But when it becomes clear to him that she is speaking about Damon, he understands his mistake and goes back to writing his play about Medea. They are interrupted by the arrival of a group and the belligerent cries of the members of the two parties which are going to the peace festivities. Onolaos, the archon, is very worried and wants peace to return, but his lover Thryallis wants Struthion to be taught a lesson for having spread the rumour that her smile was due wholly to his art. On the other hand, the magistrate Philippides has composed a hymn to peace, which he hopes will help the factions become reconciled. After the men have left, Salabanda assembles all the women and proposes a way of solving the problem – to adopt the example set by Lysistrata, e. g. to go on a strike until their men have stopped the strife. After some discussion they all agree to do it. Phanias then

---

101 Lysistrata was actually written by Aristophanes.
arrives from the stadium to tell them that the archon is coming to the city square with the leaders of the two parties; at the stadium, the men all started by singing the hymn of peace enthusiastically, but afterwards they started fighting each other with the same brio. When the men arrive, the women turn away and refuse to serve them food or drink. Even the young women, Gorgo and Chloe, unwillingly reject their suitors. Onolaos turns to the leaders of the Shadows and the Donkeys, the priest Agathyrsos and the barber Strepsiades, pleading with them to calm down their followers, but their attempt fails when each one abuses the other, their followers turn on each other and a riot starts.

The last act goes back to the city square, where the trial is about to start, with the archon Onolaos presiding. The men are hungry, their clothes in tatters, and their mood foul. The women, meanwhile, sit and watch the proceedings from Salabanda’s drawing-room. After Onolaos declares the High Court in session, Physignatos presents Struthion’s case in a long speech, basing it on the argument that the shadow does not belong to the donkey. The magistrate Philippides calls for the beast itself to be brought before the court. Then follows Polyphonos’ equally long oration contending that the shadow goes together with the donkey; he is interrupted by the archon when he starts presenting the case as one of the poor being oppressed by the rich. Court clerk Thrystogenes comes back with the news that the donkey has disappeared. Following Greek judicial mores, Onolaos then asks the citizens to take a vote to decide on a verdict. He is then reminded that before a vote is taken, anybody that wants to should be allowed to have their say. Salabanda asks to be allowed to speak, as was a woman’s right. She says that it is madness to be on the brink of civil war when the Persian enemy is ready to invade and obliterate Greece; she pledges to bring the women’s strike to
an end if the men stop the party strife. The men all express their vociferous agreement, but when Onolaos invites the two men to bury their differences and drop the suit, they, supported by their lawyers, refuse to become reconciled. Democritos then whispers a solution to the archon, who fines each man one thousand drachma, and promises to revoke the fine only if the men will be friends. They grudgingly do so, insulting each other as they embrace. Onolaos then declares an end to civil strife, threatening those who try to resurrect it with severe penalties. Salabanda announces the end of the women’s strike, and Krobyle tells Anthrax how the young have given their elders an example — Damon and Chloe have contracted matrimony, and so the women have taken the donkey from the stalls and presently the newly-marrieds appear riding the beast on their way to the honeymoon. The fathers then genuinely make peace. Salabanda asks the two wise men whether men live in discord all over the world. Euripides responds that such controversies are good when their objects are important, but become injurious when they turn on inconsequential matters. Democritos affirms that men have been made in the image of the gods, and just as the latter are always quarreling, humans cannot help but do the same. Euripides says he has heard of a people, the children of Jacob, that only recognise one god, to which Democritos responds that they should all become like this nation. The play ends on a happy note as Damon plays a melody on his flute, and he and Chloe ride the donkey across the square while singing.

The fourth book of Wieland’s novel took its idea from a Greek fable which was in common currency, being mentioned in Aristophanes’ *The Wasps*, and in turn it has been adapted several times for the theatre; Max Dufner has counted eight adaptations, including G’s (*DUFNER 1993, 32-3*). This is due to the satirical potential of the plot, which can be
adapted to fit all sorts of circumstances. Ludwig Fulda wrote a verse adaptation in three acts, very much in the style of a bourgeois comedy of errors (FULDA 1921). As a further example can be aduced Friedrich Dürrenmatt’s radio play, Der Prozeß um des Esels Schatten, where the theme of the neutral city Abdera, placed between the two great powers of Athens and Sparta at the time waging the Peloponnesian war, is clearly meant to reflect the situation of Switzerland in the early stages of the Cold War, with the weapons manufacturers anxious to make the most of the opportunity to arm both parties in what they see as the coming civil war in the Greek city (DÜRRENMATT 1988, passim). In G’s play however, it is the foolishness of the quarrel and the disunity it causes that is emphasised, with the looming threat of a Persian invasion in the background; it is not hard to see here a commentary on the political situation at the time the play was written, with the internal divisions of the Jewish community in Palestine coinciding with the catastrophe of European Jewry and taking place at a time when Rommel was less than one hundred miles from Alexandria.

G’s adaptation of Wieland takes the following form. First of all, the story of the lawsuit over the donkey’s shadow is the fourth of five books that constitute Wieland’s Geschichte der Abderiten (History of the Abderites). The plot follows almost the same line, with a few exceptions, but the characters have been changed, the main differences being as follows; the two priests in the original version – the aristocratic archpriest of Jason’s temple Agathyrsus, protector of Anthrax, and his mortal enemy, the priest of Latona’s temple and champion of Struthion – have been conflated into a single character, Agathyrsus, priest of Latona; consequently, their enmity, which Wieland intended to satirise the rivalry between Catholics and Lutherans, is replaced by that between the priest and the freethinkers, for
which his audience in Palestine would immediately have read religious and secular Jews. On the other hand, the lovers Damon and Chloe are absent from the novel, thus adding a Romeo and Juliet motif to the struggle in the play. Another new character is the court attendant Thristogenes, who is probably the result of G’s long legal experience. Euripides and Democritos, although present in the *Geschichte der Abderiten* (*History of the Abderites*), do not make an appearance in the fourth book, although the story of the production of the former’s play is also a part of the third book of the novel; they represent the neutral and rational party (Wieland 1966, 242-304). The guild-master Pfriem, head of the Shadows in the novel and, incidentally, the only character with a Germanic rather than a Greek name, is replaced in the play by the barber Strepsiades. The lady Salabanda, who in the novel is a partisan Shadow, has in the play become an Athenian and a member of the neutral party.

It is Salabanda who introduces one of the main changes in the play – the women’s strike, originally in Aristophanes’ play *Lysistrata*, but in the play attributed to Euripides, possibly in order to take advantage of the presence of the latter in the play; it is this which leads to the peaceful resolution of the conflict, unlike Wieland’s novel, where the end comes when the crowd turns on the donkey and tears it to pieces, thus obliterating the cause of the lawsuit, and with it, the conflict itself. This cathartic side of the novel is absent from the play, which after all does not aim to emulate the ending of the novel, i.e. the destruction of Abdera.

---

102 It is interesting to note that most of the characters’ names had meanings, and they were all kept by G. Struthion: soap-wort; Anthrax: carbuncle; Onolaos: people’s donkey; Krobyle: hair-knot; Strobilos: twisted up; Gorgos: grim; Physignathos: puff-cheek; Polyphonos: many-voiced/murderous; Thryallis: wick. Also interesting is the consistent use of the term sycophant, a false adviser, for the advocates in the novel, although it is only used occasionally in the play.
Several of G’s constant themes are present in the play. Foremost is the struggle against fanatism and intolerance, which G had in common with Wieland as well as with the Jewish Enlightenment thinkers, a fact which explains the warm reception of Wieland’s works in Eastern Europe, as well as his continued popularity and imitation. A running commentary on the Abderites’ attitudes is provided by Democritos and Euripides; typical of this is Democritos’ speech at the close of the third act, an observation very much in the spirit of Wieland, who was an enemy of Schwärnerei (sensibility), and often used by G elsewhere:

Was niemand täte wohl aus Egoismus,
Tut unbesorgt man für ein Ideal.
Und daraus folgt, daß der Idealismus
Oft sehr gefährlich ist für die Moral. (1945, 49)

What nobody would do for egoism,
They do nonchalantly for an ideal.
From which it follows that idealism
Is often very dangerous for morality.

Another theme which in this case the play has in common with Der Weise und der Narr, is the joyous ending and the song sung by Chloe to the accompaniment of Damon’s flute

Das Leben ist so schön und leicht,
Der Mensch nur macht es schwer
Will immer mehr als er erreicht,
Will immer mehr und mehr.
Im Sonnenschein rings alles lacht,
Der Mensch nur mit Gebrumm
Sich müht und quält und Sorgen macht,
Der Mensch ist doch zu dumm. (1945, 60)

Life is so nice and easy,
Only man makes it hard
Always wanting more than he can reach,
Wanting always more and more.
All around in the sunshine everything laughs,
Only man with his grumping
Strives, struggles and worries,
Man is just too foolish.

As in the case of the previous play, it is clear that the intention of the play was to boost the morale of the Jewish community in Palestine, and to provide some relief from the gloom reigning due to the danger of a German invasion before the battle of El Alamein, and later with the horrific news that filtered from occupied Europe.

The isolated and desperate condition of the Jews in Palestine, coupled with the similarly placed sub-group of Central European, German-speaking Jews, whose problems of adaptation to the mostly East European and Yiddish-speaking host community have been well documented and studied by Yoav Gelber (Gelber 1990a), may also have injected a note of self-assertion and pride in the achievements of the Jewish people and its culture, otherwise a target of G’s satire in the years of the Weimar republic. Its role here would be that of reinforcing the ethnic identity of those Central European Jews who mainly identified themselves with German culture and felt alienated from the culture then developing in the yishuv. This is achieved by the addition of the dialogue between Euripides and Democritos at the end of the play, absent from the novel, in which they speak about the people who worship one god and thus avoid the quarrels deriving from polytheism, and Democritos concludes by saying that it would be worthwhile to go and live among such a peaceful people, who never indulge in useless strife

So müßt' man denn zu diesem Volke wandern,  
Die halten Frieden, ihrem Gott zu Dank,  
Anders geartet also als die andern  
Gibt's nie bei Ihnen wertlos bösen Zank. (1945, 60)

One should thus go to this people  
Who keep the peace, thanks to their god,
And so have a different nature from the others
There are no nasty paltry squabbles among them.

Still it is impossible to ignore the ambiguity of the last line, whose irony would not have been missed by many of those aware of the conflicts tearing apart the yishuv. The play, after an Enlightenment writer not much in fashion during the period of the Second World War, constitutes an appeal to the forces of reason in the face of the barbarism of the period and at the same time an homage to the Jewish ideal of Bildung.

2.7 MINOR WORKS

2.7.1 STURMGESELLER VOGELSTEIN (Choleric veteran Vogelstein) A response to the attack on Zionism by the Stettin (Szczecin) Reform rabbi, Heinemann Vogelstein (1841-1911) (Vogelstein 1906).103 The title derives from that of one of Hermann Sudermann’s satirical comedies Der Sturmgeselle Sokrates, which has as its butt the older generation, its refusal to face the failure of their youthful ideals, and its futile resistance to inevitable change and its agent, youth (Sudermann 1903).104 It constitutes a classical statement of Zionist purposes but mostly it is a forceful and coherent attack on the basic tenets of Judaism as formulated in the nineteenth century by both the Reform and modern Orthodox movements.

---

103 As seen above, Vogelstein’s Reform prayerbook made him the bête noire of G’s step-grandfather, Raphael Karger (134).
104 Sudermann (1857-1928), a now forgotten Naturalistic dramatist and novelist, was very popular at the turn of the century. The play, which concerns a secret society of veterans of the 1848 revolution still pretending to plot a popular uprising in the mid-1870’s, provoked an attack on Sudermann by Maximilian Harden, with a subsequent response by Sudermann (see Harden 1903 and Sudermann 1903a). In fact, the old conspirators are risible figures, and their sons refuse to continue their self-imposed task. Of the two main characters of the older generation, one is Jewish, Rabbi Markuse. He is presented in a highly favourable light but is still out of step with his son’s feelings.
The work begins by attacking the bankruptcy of the ideals which the Reform rabbis allegedly purport to represent, i.e. the Jewish mission to keep an ethical legacy alive for humanity. The attack is in the plural since Vogelstein is explicitly associated with Rabbi Markuse, one of the characters in Sudermann’s play. They are charged with going against the facts of history; since the beginning of the movement, they (presumably Reform rabbis) have prophesied the imminent demise of Zionism – unsuccessfully. Vogelstein has, the author alleges, falsely stated that he has been persecuted by the Zionists, and this has led him to press for a boycott of Zionist rabbis. Vogelstein’s action is compared with Ludwig Geiger’s earlier proposal to deprive Zionists of their German nationality. The Reform movement (in Germany Liberalismus) is accused of leading often to religious apathy (Indifferentismus) (1906, 8), and of hypocrisy for claiming to defend a tradition they themselves have attacked. Very good use is made of a crucial scene in the play in which the rabbi and his son have a decisive confrontation, and after the son, embittered, tells his father of the new antisemitism, the father reacts by reminding him that the Jews must keep the ideal of humanity alive for others to which the son replies, and G quotes him: ‘That is all very well, but we still have to believe in it’ (Was du sagtest, Vater, war ja alles sehr schön. Nu [sic] brauchen wir bloß noch dran zu glauben. 1906, 3. SUDERMANN 1903, 109).

The denial of the existence of the Jewish people is in G’s eyes the worst fault of the anti-Zionists, and he spells out the task of the movement as being the emphasis on the national aspect, the exit of Judaism from the synagogue, and the replacement of ghetto fears by pride. These tasks are stated to be a historical necessity. That Vogelstein adduces Orthodox opposition to Zionism is seen as risible, since in all other respects he would be
completely opposed to their views, whilst he ignores the fact that many observant Jews are Zionists. The attack is then shifted to an examination of the claim that the Zionists have relinquished the mission of Israel. He concentrates on the use of the word Israel, and finds it a useful substitute for those who are incapable of using the words ‘Jewish people’ or ‘Jew’. The idea of mission is found to be ridiculous when adopted consciously, reference being made to Wieland’s Abderites as a people with a mission. The members of Vogelstein’s community of Stettin are said to be like Jews everywhere – they disseminate Jewish jokes, not Jewish ideals (‘Wenn sie etwas Jüdisches verbreiten, sind es jüdische Witze, nicht jüdische Ideale’ 1906, 13).

After a critique of Vogelstein’s concept of the Land of Israel as ‘an old man’s memories of youth’ (Jugenderinnerungen eines alten Mannes. 1906, 14), the article is devoted to a refutation of Vogelstein’s accusation of divided loyalty. Zionists are said to be able to combine national Jewish (national-jüdisch) with patriotic German (vaterländisch-deutsch) interests, and if a conflict should arise they would be willing to adjust their attitudes. The opposite would be the case with Vogelstein’s side, which could be accused of wanting to hide its Jewishness, and whose loyalty would always be open to the suspicion of harbouring ulterior motives. Reference is made to the matter of the birthday telegrams sent to the Kaiser by both Zionists and Reform Jews, and the embarrassing fact that the Kaiser had always responded to the first but never to the second. It is asked how liberal (i.e. in German Liberal = Reform) a man can be who is asking for the boycott of his own colleagues on account of their personal opinions. G ends by quoting one of the characters in the play, one of the old veterans who had absented himself from their meetings for a long time and
returns to make them see the fruitlessness of their labours and asks them to make way for the new generation; G observes that Markuse, the rabbi in the play, made his peace with the new conditions and asks whether Vogelstein really wants to do the same.

Incidentally, G met Vogelstein in a Berlin hotel shortly after the publication of his attack, and Vogelstein, discomfited for an instant, recovered quickly and though somewhat grimly at the start, chatted with the author for a while, and they took leave of each other cheerfully. The author, almost forty years later, would relate the incident adding the comment that Vogelstein never let differences of opinion influence his personal behaviour (Er gehoerte zu jenen Männern, die sachliche Differenzen nicht ins persoenliche Verhältnis übertragen. N.d. a, 166).

2.7.2 ANTONIO, DER KAUFMANN VON VENEDIG (Antonio, the Merchant of Venice) This essay, first published in 1925, was later included as chapter 12 in G’s memoirs under the title ‘Literary Interlude’ (Literarisches Zwischenspiel), and was one of his favourite talks, delivered in the tours he undertook in the 1930s to raise funds for the KKL and the KH (1925, n.d. a, 65-71). It represents the one substantial sample of his interest in theatre criticism that has been preserved, an interest that was born when he first came to live in Berlin, as has been discussed above (24). The work makes its Zionist points in an unstudied but convincing way. One can see why G chose it for his lecture tours, as it fits the type of serious cultural amusement so beloved of the Jewish Central European bourgeoisie; especially one that gives the classic – and Shakespeare’s work was certainly part of the canon in German and German-Jewish culture – a Jewish interpretation. G’s exegesis of the
play can be considered, as in the case of Heine’s essay, as a defence of Shylock (Gross 1992, 235-40). ¹⁰⁵

G begins by reminding his readers that the merchant of Venice is in reality Antonio, but that most people, including theatrical directors, have come to believe that the title refers to Shylock. This is attributed to the fact that when a Jew comes into the foreground of a work of art, it provokes such animated discussion, that the other characters fade into the background. It also may have to do with the fact that Shylock poses such an enigma – why does he enter into such a hopeless bargain? The answer provided is that he is counting on a miracle. The fact that the miracle does occur is interpreted as showing where the sympathies of the author lay in the case.

To justify this, an interpretation of Shylock’s antagonist is needed, and the author provides one. Antonio, like many Shakespeare heroes, is melancholy and self-absorbed, full of his own importance and that of his social position. Graziano tells him as much but he and his friends dismiss this. As the essay’s author puts it: ‘He is the very image of self-righteousness’ (Er ist die Selbstgerechtigkeit selber. N.d. a, 68). What Shakespeare does to test Antonio is to supply Shylock, and Antonio’s downfall comes when he accepts the famous clause. Shylock depends on divine justice, more than that, he absolutely needs a miracle.

¹⁰⁵ For more on the subjects of Jewish and non-English interpretations of Shylock, see the chapters ‘An Extended Family’ and ‘Other Voices, Other Cultures’ which John Gross devotes to it (Gross 1992, 234-60, 211-33). Also of use are the works by Sinsheimer and Williams, both cited by Gross (Sinsheimer 1947, Williams 1990).
At this point, Shakespeare is seen to have achieved a pinnacle in showing the opposition between divine and earthly justice. As G puts it: ‘It is absolutely not enough to be right in order to attain justice from the table of terrestrial justice’ (Es genügt durchaus nicht, Recht zu haben, um auch an der Tafel der irdischen Justiz Recht zu erlangen. N.d. a, 70). It is here that the author feels the play has gone awry, and tragedy turns into grotesque. He ends with the oft repeated motif of the Jew, in this case Shylock, as the only one outside the Reigen, or round dance, in which all members of Venetian society participate. The use of the rootlessness motif, so common in Zionist critiques of assimilationist sectors of the Jewish community, as well as the vocabulary of justice can also be identified as part of the techniques characteristic of the Neue Sachlichkeit (LETHEN 1995).

2.7.3 ERSTE BEGEGNUNG (First encounter) A reelaboration in fictional form of the traumatic childhood episode in the Westerplatte resort near Danzig, which G related in his memoirs and which has already been cited above (14-5; n.d. a, 13). In the story one element is added, the Christian children’s parents are watching their offspring play and when the Jewish child goes home for lunch the Geheimrat (Privy councillor), the most prominent person socially in the whole group, tacitly encourages his child, Fritz, to set upon his Jewish friend Harold Adler, by responding in the following form to Fritz’s tale of their ship-building game on the beach:

“Harold Adler ist auch dabei? – So, so – mit dem Judenjungen spielt Ihr auch?”
Die Bemerkung hatte genügt (N.d. t, 3)

“Is Harold Adler also there? Oh, so you also play with the Jew-boy?”
The remark was enough.
It is the Geheimrat that starts laughing when the children, led by his son, throw sand on the Jewish boy who comes back to play, and the rest of the parents follow suit. The same situation repeats itself in the new generation, and the children reproduce the roles their parents play in adult society, but this is not something random – the children would not have turned on their Jewish playmate without Fritz taking the lead, and the latter in turn was just counting on his father's unspoken approval. This is made explicit by the Geheimrat's comment at the end of the story, with all the bitter recognition it would evoke in its German Jewish audience: 'There is no greater happiness than to see that the new generation is the spitting image of the old one!' (Es gibt doch keine grössere Freude, als zu sehen, wie die neue Generation ein genaues Abbild der alten ist! N.d. t, 4). The story exposes the deep roots of antisemitism in German bourgeois society by showing the transmission process of the attitudes involved but without entering the consciousness of any of the participants and avoiding any direct treatment of the Jewish child's psychological trauma.

2.7.4 EINE ÄRGERLICHE GESCHICHTE (An Annoying Story) A group of rowdy Gymnasium pupils on their way back home start jeering and shouting at a Jewish pedlar. One of them, dressed as a sailor, starts singing: 'Jude Itzig! Jude Itzig! Mach Dich nicht so witzig!'. Then he stumbles and falls upon the peddler, upsetting his box and scattering all his merchandise. One of the Gymnasium teachers, witnessing the incident, takes the group, together with the man, back to the school, and asks their form tutor to punish them for their lack of 'religiöse Duldsamkeit' (religious tolerance); the term, with its German connotations of sufferance, was a particular target for G, just as it was the object of Zionist abhorrence. Their tutor laughs and explains that the boy in the sailor suit is actually Jewish, and decides to send him,
Harold Adler, home under the tutelage of a senior student, Fritz Keller, who is to explain to Harold’s parents what their son has done and compensate the man. There follows a scene embarrassing for the parents, who treat Fritz obsequiously and the hawker curtly. Then, having realised that Harold has acted in this way because he is not clear about his Jewish identity, they decide to do something. The result, however, confuses the boy completely. They do not reprimand him for his action, thus tacitly condoning it; and they withdraw him from the (Christian) religious education class but do not enroll him in the Jewish section. The ironies of the situation of assimilated families – which include Harold wearing a sailor’s cap inscribed S.M.S. Germania – culminate in Harold’s concept of Judaism as a religion and his conclusion that ‘Religion is when you can sleep one hour more on Mondays and Thursdays and go to school late’ (Religion ist, wenn man Montag und Donnerstag eine Stunde länger schlafen und später zur Schule kommen kann. N.d. s, 8) In this case the story deals with the pervasive antisemitism of German society by showing how the teacher singles out the Jewish student for punishment as a way of putting him in his place, but then shifts to the assimilated Jewish family and in order to show the complete confusion surrounding the issues of Jewishness and of the family’s identity, looks at them from the point of view of Harold.

2.7.5 PARVE The child was originally called Adolph Adler (the manuscript can be found in A135/48), but in the typescript, written in 1934, his name has been changed to Harold, the same as in the previous two stories, and the Adler family is clearly meant to be the same

---

106 Both children appeared already in ‘Erste Begegnung’.
107 The Hebrew term refers to food which is considered to be neither milk nor meat and thus is exempted from the prohibition to mix milk with meat; therefore it can be eaten with foods belonging to either of the two groups.
assimilationist family which in this case has possibly converted to Christianity (see typescript in A135/47). The story has Mrs. Adler explaining to an unnamed Assessor (solicitor in the Civil Service), that she and her husband have decided to give in to Harold’s desire and give him a menorah (seven-branched candlestick) for a Christmas present. When the Assessor argues that this will confuse the boy, Mrs. Adler responds that she and her husband see no contradiction in this; after all, they have taught their children to show no preference for either one of the two religions. She goes on to say that they have raised their daughter Anne Marie parve. The Assessor does not know the term, or the related Western-Yiddish word minnig, and she explains it to him in detail, making it clear that she herself was brought up in an Orthodox family, as was her husband. She finishes with the observation that, although they would like to see her married to ‘a young Christian of a good Jewish family’ (einen christlichen jungen Mann aus einer guten jüdischen Familie), they really would not mind about her future husband’s religious persuasion, as long as he does not believe in either the Jewish or the Christian god! The Assessor then observes that Miss Anne Marie must then be an atheist, and the mother replies: “Like all of us! Thank God!” (“Wie wir alle! Gott sei Dank!”) (n.d. l, 6).

This story completes the previous two in their attack on the assimilationist view of many of the families of the Jewish cultivated middle class; this time it concentrates on the syncretic mixture of elements from both Christianity and Judaism with the attendant confusion on the part not just of those involved, but also of the presumably Gentile interlocutor.
2.7.6 UM EIN HAAR! (By a hair's breadth) Published in the evening newspaper *Berliner Abendblatt*, a typescript is preserved in the Central Zionist Archives (see 1929, n.d. r). A mystery story in which an unidentified detective or lawyer solves the case of a blonde woman who was seen crying for help from a car driven by a man who with one hand was trying to restrain her, whilst driving through brightly lit streets near the Tiergarten at night on Easter Sunday. Nothing more is heard of the victim, but the investigator identifies the victim, an aspiring actress by the name of Lulu Petri, and tells the story of what should have happened and never did. The false kidnapping was planned and executed by a Dagobert Wagenseil, a friend of the victim, and it was intended to provoke an antisemitic outcry, with the abduction of a Christian girl by a Jewish-looking driver right before Passover used to resurrect a blood-libel. Why then did the plan fail and nothing of the sort occur? It turns out that the young actress was really called Sara Paradies, and was the daughter of a Jewish cantor. Wagenseil has to abandon the scheme and the actress, who had been lured into a ship bound for Argentina under the impression that she had succeeded so well in playing her part in the abduction scene, that she had obtained a leading role in an Argentinian film. She is now, concludes the investigator, in a house of ill-repute in Buenos Aires.

The story manages to combine some of the favourite ingredients of antisemitic propaganda – the blood libel, the heavy involvement of some Jews in the white slavery trade – with the elements of the detective story so popular at the time, inverting the usual propaganda components to produce an effect opposite to the usual one and producing an entertaining piece of fiction with an avowed apologetic purpose (LETHEN 1995).
2.7.7 TRÄUME (Dreams) Written in the autumn of 1929 whilst G was feverish, as stated in the typescript (n.d., q, 1). The narrator sees a crowd of well-dressed men, and when he asks them to go away they all disappear but for a man who, in Berlin dialect, refuses to do so. The narrator dies and goes to a large reception hall where there are five doors: one for the remarkable, one for the good, one for the obedient, one for the bad, and the last one for the ordinary. The narrator chooses the one for the bad and is told to go in and do good; he walks into a room with a bird in a cage and a cat sitting and watching the bird. The room has a window and the narrator thinks if he releases the bird the cat will not be able to kill it; but a bird of prey catches the bird he has just released and a girl with a man in a wheelchair walk in and she says the bird was what she loved most. He walks out and says he failed and could he be given another task, whereupon he is sent to Rembrandt’s room to scrub the floor.

The dream-like atmosphere of the story, as well as the fact that it cannot be assigned to one of the two types G concentrated on – Zionist critiques of German Jewish society or entertainment literature meant for the newspapers, or even to a combination of the two, makes it probable that the author was experimenting with a new type of narration. There is nothing new to this type of story, already popular in the fin de siècle, although the use of the oneiric elements and the obvious symbolism of the bird are characteristic of prose dating from late in the first decade of the century (WINKO 2000, 340-3; ANZ 2000, 494-501). In any case it is an uncharacteristic experiment which, as far as is known, G never attempted to repeat.

2.7.8 SECHSTES KAPITEL VON ??? [sic] (Sixth chapter of ????) This is the sixth chapter of a planned novel, Der ewige Israelit (The Wandering Israelite). To my knowledge there are no
other chapters extant and it is not even known whether he ever wrote any more. The chapter is divided into two parts. In the first part Herr Engländere, a widower and the father of at least three sons and a daughter, is in a working class dance-hall in a Berlin suburb where he has an encounter with a mysterious Jewish dwarf who warns him in a cryptic manner of dangers to come. He is then taken to a Mietskaserne (tenement building) where he witnesses the morning prayers of a group of Sefardi Jews. The action then shifts to a group of survivors from a shipwreck who have managed to reach a Pacific island; among the survivors are all the members of the Engländere family. The style of the narration is that of the sensational low-brow serials of the time. This is interlaced with observations on the social status of Jews in Weimar Germany.

The title of the projected novel is introduced into the narration by one of the hostesses at the dance-hall who explains to a customer that the man sitting by himself (Herr Engländere) is Der ewige Jude (The Wandering Jew), and when her companion seems embarrassed, she corrects herself and calls him Der ewige Israelit (The Wandering Israelite) (n.d. u, 6-7). This reflects the negative connotations the word Jude (Jew) had acquired among most cultivated German Jews, who preferred to call themselves Israeliten (Israelites). The work belongs to the fantasy genre, one of whose favourite tools was the use of Jewish protagonists with their presumed closeness to the occult and access to Oriental wisdom.

2.7.9 **DER HIMMLISCHE LOHN** (The heavenly reward). The story of Chaim, an elderly orthodox Jew, gravely ill, who receives a visit from a rabbi, who tries to allay the patient’s worries about the afterlife by telling him that even if he has sinned, he can always expect God’s grace, if he repents. Chaim is so upset by the thought that he could be thought to have done good all his life only because of the reward to be had, that he sins by transgressing the dietary laws and then, after having instructed his niece to get rid of the now impure butter dish, dies (For bibliographic details see n.d. m). The story portrays the Orthodox Jew sympathetically, without any overt sentimentality and its apologetic intent as well as the comparison with Christianity are only implied. It can be linked to the work of the already mentioned Wilhelm Herzberg, and specifically to the seventeenth letter of his epistolary novel *Jüdische Familienpapiere*, but without the explicitness of the latter (HERZBERG 1893, 172-217).

2.7.10 **EINE KLEINE GEFÄLLIGKEIT** (A small favour) A businessman about to board an aeroplane for a trip is asked by a young and attractive lady to take a small package for her sister. Before he can ask the woman’s name he has to get on board, and during the flight he starts getting suspicious; on the same flight is a famous and much hated statesman, and he notices that the package is ticking. He becomes convinced that the package contains a bomb but does not see how to get rid of it without incriminating himself. Fortunately, the plane makes an unannounced stop for some repairs (this was in the Thirties), and he throws the package into a well. When he arrives at his destination, he is led by a man to a little girl who is anxiously expecting the watch her sister sent her for her birthday (Bibliographic details in n.d. n). The modernity of the story, specifically its use of air-travel, is unique in G’s work.
2.7.11 Eine kleine Überraschung (A little surprise) A recently married man who is in a train on his way to Cologne tries to strike up an acquaintance with a beautiful woman in his compartment. She sees through his attempts and tells him so, but then proceeds to tell him she must spend the night in Cologne and wait for a train departing the next morning. He proposes that she drive with him to his hotel where she can get a room, and she accepts. When they arrive at the hotel, the hotelier mistakes her for his wife, and compliments him on his choice of bride. He is too embarrassed to rectify the misunderstanding and they spend the night together. The next morning he wakes up to find the lady together with all his money and valuables gone, including the gold watch his wife gave him. There is a mocking note from her saying that this is one affair he will never forget, and that if he wants her photograph, he can always get it from the police files, although she doubts that he will. He explains the situation to the hotelier, borrows from him an amount to tide him over, and goes to transact the business that brought him to Cologne. When he returns to the hotel, the overjoyed hotelier receives him with the news that the thief was arrested at the railway-station; she had called the hotel from there and asked for him, so the hotelier managed to ascertain where she was phoning from and notified the police of her whereabouts. When the man arrives at the police station to recover his goods, he finds himself confronted by his real wife, who had hoped to give him a pleasant surprise (For bibliographic details see n.d. o).

This story is almost certainly inspired by some of G’s professional experiences, or at the very least uses his knowledge of the techniques of confidence tricksters. In its unexpected denouement and its admiration for the skill of the criminal, it resembles other examples of the crime fiction genre (Lethen 1995, 421-4).
2.7.12 **EIN BLUTURTEIL (A blood sentence)** A story about an old judge in Hanover, as told by
the lawyer Freudenstein to the narrator. The judge was a very stubborn and eccentric man,
and he has exasperated the narrator, a young lawyer; the narrator then walks into
Freudenstein's chambers and tells him what has happened. Freudenstein proceeds to tell him
how a long time ago when the old man was a judge in a court with a jury, he disregarded the
opinions and advise of the jurors to such an extent that they made an official complaint and
he was reprimanded, whereupon he proceeded to exact his revenge in the following manner.
A man was brought to trial accused of having stolen kindling from somebody's woods. The
jury retired to deliberate with the judge, in the continental manner, and two of the jurors
being proprietors of woods and indignant concerning the defendant's actions, said such
people should be sentenced to death by fire. The judge silently wrote the sentence down and
passed it to the clerk. Freudenstein does not know how the affair ended, but he has shown
the narrator that the judge has been known to behave much worse than he has with him (For
bibliographic details see n.d. k). Its legal theme, with its comment on the functioning of
justice in the Kaiserreich, is characteristic of Weimar literature, although here the tone is
more one of affectionate retrospective contemplation, in keeping with the narrator's mood
(LETHEN 1995, 424-7).

2.7.13 **MEGALOPHILEN-KATALOG 717 (Megalophile Catalogue 717)** A novella about Egon
Berg, a young doctor from Berlin staying in Karlsbad (Karlovy Vary) during the first weeks
of the First World War. Most of the guests have left the spa but Berg, too bewildered by the

---

110 Probably Justizrat Freudenthal of Berlin, mentioned by G in his Memoirs; the character is given a similar
Jewish-sounding name, and the point is made that he is not Jewish, as was the case with Freudenthal (n.d. a,
171).
situation, cannot decide what to do and has time to observe a Hasidic zaddik, his entourage and family. One Saturday morning whilst sitting on a bench in the gardens he picks up a locket the rabbi’s daughter has dropped, and finds inside it two small pieces of parchment, both with a magic square with Hebrew letters on it. He does not know enough Hebrew to understand what is written on them and with the return of the party looking for the lost ornament he hurriedly puts a parchment back inside the medallion and arranges for its return. Inadvertently he has kept one of the parchment pieces. Before he has time to return it, a telegram arrives calling for his return to Germany, and he leaves. The narrator says he has no time to tell more about the fate of Berg during the war, apart from alluding to the magic powers the parchment conferred on its temporary proprietor, which translated themselves into a reputation for miraculous cures among the Jewish and Gentile population during his term as an assistant doctor on the Eastern front; they also allowed him to win considerable sums when he visited a casino, and more. The narrator insists his only purpose is to help Dr. Berg who now sits perplexed in a Paris café. After the war, Berg is doing a locum for a colleague at a theatre and attends a show given by a certain Katra, billed as ‘the oriental wonder-girl’ (das orientalische Wundermädchen); she is supposed to be able to guess the identity of objects proposed by the audience and when he volunteers an envelope with the parchment piece inside, the girl says the envelope contains a parchment with numbers on it, and on seeing Berg, collapses (n.d. j, 9-11). Berg is called to examine her and finds on her the same medallion he had once picked up in Karlsbad. She seems scared and only has time to whisper the words ‘Megalophilen-Katalog 717’ before her impresario walks in. That same day they leave town and Berg receives a message containing only the mysterious three words. Weeks later, a telegram arrives with the same words and also saying he is expected in
the London Savoy at eight p.m. He waits in London three days until he catches a glimpse of her and her impresario entering a lift; later he receives a message saying it is not possible to see him and to go to the Grand Hotel in Paris. Berg does just that and there is a telegram waiting for him that summons him to the opera-ball. In the opera, a masked lady takes him to a small hotel where he receives a call from a woman who tells him they have been discovered, the call is interrupted by the crash of furniture and the angry voice of a man. Dr. Berg never hears from the woman again and a year later he is called to Naples to attend a patient who turns out to be Katra. When she is about to reveal to him the secret of the medallion and of Megalophilen-Katalog 717, she dies. The narrator explains that after this occurrence, Egon Berg fell into a depression and constantly sits in a Parisian café trying to understand what happened. He further explains that if the numerical values of the Hebrew letters on the magic square are added up, the resulting figure in all possible ways is fifteen, which is not only the number value of the letters of the tetragrammaton, but also the sum of the digits in the number 717. The narrator then implicitly reveals himself to be a painter and friend of the doctor, and asks for any information on the daughter of a Hasidic wonder-rabbi who ended her life in Naples, adding that he can always be found in Berlin in the Romanisches Kaffeehaus. Like the extant sixth chapter of the novel Der ewige Israelit mentioned above, this story belongs to the fantasy genre, and once again it utilises the supposed familiarity of the Hasidic sages with mystical secrets (235; WUNSCH 2000, 183-5).

2.7.14 WIE ALT IST XENIA? (How old is Xenia?) A long novella, or rather a short novel in which G incorporates several episodes from legal life, all of which could perfectly well have come out of G’s personal experience, since divorce cases were one of his specialties. It may
have been part of a larger work, as references are made to events and characters which do not occur in the extant text (see for example the fourth section, where mention is made of Frau Doktor Liebow’s idea, of which we hear nothing more). The novella has seven parts.

The first section sets the scene – a civil court *(Landgericht III)* in Berlin, presided over by three judges – and comments on the public, some of who are there out of interest in the cases, while others have attended in order to take shelter from the bad weather and sometimes to get some sleep. The case being transacted is the divorce of Baron Dagobert von Wüstenried, accused of infidelity by his wife; a woman is called up to the witness box and cited as correspondent, she acknowledges the fact, and although one of the judges whispers something in the ear of the president, the divorce is granted; the whole thing has taken five minutes.

The second section takes place in the judges’ chambers where the president, Bierbach is speaking about the case with his two other colleagues, Roberts and Koppe. They realise from previous cases in which the Baron has been involved, that he makes a living out of marrying women who after the divorce can keep his name and title, with the consequent social advantages accruing from it. Koppe objects to the whole business, but the other two see nothing to censure in the Baron's behaviour. The president then asks Roberts about the woman accompanying Mansfelder, the lawyer for one of the two sides involved in one of the cases they are supposed to try on that day, and Roberts explains to him that Frau Dr. Liebow is a legal assistant to Mansfelder, and if she were not a foreigner she could be a practicing lawyer herself. They then proceed to dispatch the legal question they were supposed to be resolving in an instant and return to the courtroom.
In the next section Mansfelder and Liebow leave the courtroom to escape the interminable address of Lindner, a lawyer in the case being tried then, although their case is due to be tried next, and the lawyer for the other party, Grotefeld becomes annoyed and threatens to start speaking if they are not present when their case is heard. Once on their own, Mansfelder tells Liebow he is slightly uneasy about the trick they are playing on Grotefeld, but Liebow sets his mind at rest, explaining that as long as the rules are respected, any ruse that can be used to achieve a desirable end is justified. They are representing a woman whose husband had abandoned her three years before. On his return she had presented him with a one year old child; the husband had asked for a divorce and the woman was happy to grant it to him, since in the meantime a South African farmer had proposed marriage to her and she wanted to go with him, but without the child. Liebow then goes into a courtroom and Mansfelder remembers how he had given Frau Liebow a job, originally just to help her financially whilst she completed her studies, but as her legal expertise grew, she had become more and more indispensable to him, and now he, a bachelor, is more than partly in love with her. His thoughts are interrupted by Judge Alpers, who asks him to accompany him to his office to discuss the Roswitha case. When Liebow returns, she seems uneasy, and when Mansfelder introduces them, she says they have already met in not very pleasant circumstances. Then a laughing Mansfelder explains to an embarrassed Alpers that several years before he, Alpers, then a police judge, had tried the case of a young girl who had smuggled herself across the border and was accused of not having a valid visa. Mansfelder helped Alpers understand what the girl was saying.
Mansfelder and Liebow decide not to go into the courtroom just yet, as Lindner is still speaking, although the two assistant judges have long ceased paying any attention. They then proceed to discuss Frau Doktor Liebow’s circumstances. She left Poland after having been forced to marry a man, and now the man refuses to give her a divorce. But then she cannot become naturalised in Germany, and this bars her from pursuing a proper legal career. They witness how the new Baroness’s lawyer pays her ex-husband’s lawyer a considerable sum of money, and their reactions to the scene are different – Mansfelder disapproves and Liebow is very pragmatic about it, and whilst explaining her position she says she has found a way of getting a divorce and becoming a German citizen, but will not elaborate, saying only: ‘Der Kampf der Recht gegen das Gesetz. Das ist doch die Aufgabe des Anwalts, nicht wahr?’ (The clash between justice and law. Isn’t that a lawyer’s task?) (n.d. p, 20). All she says is that she will become a Catholic, but before she can continue, the witness in the divorce case approaches them and asks for an appointment to have her signature attested to by a notary.\(^{111}\) They then have to go into the court-room because their case is due to be heard.

The fifth section finally sees the start of the Liesegang case, with the husband suing for divorce on the grounds of infidelity, made plain by the presence in the court of the child born two years after the plaintiff had abandoned the defendant. As the latter’s attorney, Mansfelder does not contest the allegations. The judge is surprised, since in his written brief, Mansfelder had argued that the husband had being grossly remiss in his marital duties. Grotefeld then intervenes to draw attention to the child present in the court-room in its mother’s arms, but the judge insists that the fact has already been established and that he

\(^{111}\) In Germany most lawyers were also notaries, as was the case with G.
only wants to give the defendant’s legal counsel the opportunity to make a counterclaim that would make the plaintiff jointly accountable. Grotefeld remonstrates that the judge is unfairly helping the defendant, to which the judge responds that it is not clear which side will benefit. Mansfelder again forgoes any counter-claims, and, for a moment, Grotefeld begins to grow suspicious; but when he asks the judge to clarify things, the latter quotes the former’s remark that he should not help one side to the detriment of the other. The judge then sums up the case and delivers his verdict. Liebow then quickly leads the defendant out of the court-room and when the husband, grinning scornfully at his wife, comes out with Grotefeld, Liebow delivers the baby into his arms and explains to the dumbfounded Grotefeld that since he has failed to file a petition to declare the child illegitimate, its custody is now in the hands of the innocent party.

For the sixth section the scene shifts to Mansfelder’s chambers. Adalbert Riedl is disagreeably surprised at the news that his case has been won. Niedlitz, the clerk, is astonished at his reaction, but cannot find out what is the reason because at that instant Mansfelder has come in accompanied by Mrs. Schleedom, the correspondent in Baron von Wüstenried’s divorce case. The lady needs her signature certified by the notary and at the same time the Roswitha gentlemen need to speak to Mansfelder. Riedl insists on having a word with Mansfelder, saying that he is ruined now that he won his case, and then sits to wait for Mansfelder. Mansfelder is busy seeing the partners in the firm Roswitha: Rosenthal, Wittenberg, and Halpern. Mrs. Schleedom turns out to run a lonely hearts bureau, the

112 The irony deriving from the fact that Roswitha was a medieval nun and poet.
Hymen agency, and she offers Riedl a solution to his problems but Riedl impatiently waves her away.

The last section turns to Riedl’s recollection of how he came to find himself in the situation in which he is at present. He has always tried to avoid work and has developed a system to obtain unlimited credit without ever having to repay the sums he owes. He gets a job for a few months, arranges to fake an accident at the premises of a reputable business, and then proceeds to sue them for the injuries sustained as well as for the income lost. Once involved in litigation he goes to shops and businesses, and is given credit and loans with the prospective damage award standing in surety; meanwhile he delays the case for as long as possible until, partly as a consequence of the trickery he is involved in to prolong the legal proceedings, he loses the case. He has done this on several occasions and it has always worked, but now Mansfelder’s unexpected success threatens his whole way of life. Mrs. Schleedorn returns to the hall and once again tells Riedl that she can solve his problems but once again Riedl rebuffs her brusquely. Here ends the unfinished typescript.

This story has its legal theme in common with ‘Ein Bluturteil’, dealt with above (239); but in this case with the actual functioning of the Weimar judiciary as the object under consideration, rather than taking a nostalgic backward look at the by then vanished Kaiserreich, and in its attempt to demythologise the workings of the system and expose the dicothomy between justice and right, the story is very much a part of the Neue Sachlichkeit (LETHEN 1995, 424-7).
2.7.15 **Adam und Eva** (Adam and Eve) Biblical poem in twenty-five long stanzas with numerous references to contemporary Jewry and to the state of Israel, whence it can be inferred that it was written sometime between 1948 and 1952. Thus, it is the last work by G of any considerable length that will be examined here. It is to be found in the papers of Eduard Berend (1883-1972), born in Hanover, and exiled in Switzerland during the Second World War and through the Fifties. G must have met him there in the course of one of his visits to the country on WZO business. From the light-hearted start, where the author poses an ancient question already dealt with by midrashic exegetes: Why was Adam created first? (Warum schuf Gott den Adam erst? / Es heißt doch sonst stets: Ladies first. N.d. y, 1), the work retells parts of the biblical story from the creation of Adam to the death of Moses. As in many midrashic texts, there is considerable use of contemporary themes, but unlike the former, their purpose here is purely humorous, although the references are sometimes grim. The tower of Babel marks the beginning of a partisan spirit that subsists up to the present, when Jews can still not put aside party allegiances. Lot, expelled from his city, turns into a D. P. who, to avoid paying the extortionate exit duty on salt, claims the salt he is carrying out is his wife (n.d. y, 4). Hagar is described as an Osereth (Modern Hebrew 'özeret, the help) and Jacob as a black market dealer, who uses Darwin and Haeckel to take Laban’s sheep (n.d. y, 4-5).

A recurring motif is that of the interpretation of dreams, just as it is in the biblical text, except that here it is an ancestor of Sigmund Freud that interprets Jacob’s dream (n.d. y, 5). Joseph’s brothers use psychoanalysis to analyse his dreams (Die Brüder prüften freudvoll-kritisch / Die Träume psychoanalytisch. N.d. y, 8). When Joseph is summoned by
Pharao from jail to interpret his dream, his advisors have already offered a political
interpretation of the seven thin cows, as the hungry proletariat threatening the seven fat cows,
i.e. the bourgeoisie, and thus endangering the state:

Die Sachverständigen sagten kritisch:
Der Traum erscheint uns hochpolitisch.
Bedrohlich wächst in unserem Staat
Die Macht vom Proletariat
Das sich am Ende gar empört,
Den fetten Bürgerstand verzehrt. (N.d. y, 9)

The experts said critically
The dream seems to us very political
In our state grows alarmingly
The power of the proletariat
Who at the end quite rebellious
Will devour the fat bourgeoisie.

Joseph, the wise minister, is compared to Walter Rathenau. The use of modern technology is
also remarked on. The news that Joseph is still alive comes to Jacob via wireless telegramme
(n.d. y, 11). The song of Miriam, sister of Moses, is compared to Radio Israel, punning on
the Modern Hebrew name of the station, the Voice of Israel, and the simultaneous death of
Pharao's soldiers by drowning under the waves is the occasion for a play on the two uses of
the word wave for the sea and the radio:

Es klang schön, und es klang hell,
War es doch Kol Israel.
Leider aber, ich bemerke,
Kenn’ ich nicht die Wellenstärke.
Doch die Hörer, ganz versunken,
In den Wellen sind ertrunken. (N.d. y, 15).

It sounded lovely and it sounded high
It was after all Kol Israel
Unfortunately, I notice,
I don’t know the frequency
Yet the listeners, totally absorbed,
Drowned in the waves
When Moses and the Israelites reach the Promised Land, an expert commission is appointed to study the conditions for settlement, and the commission presents a negative report, approved by the majority over the objections of Caleb and Joshua, and democracy is said to be already functioning (n.d. y, 17-8). Korah, who together with his followers constitutes the opposition, accuses Moses of wanting to emancipate women and of being an adherent of the Reform party bent on destroying religion (n.d. y, 19). Before his death, Moses dictates that for those Jews residing in the Diaspora, it is mandatory to remember the Land of Israel, and this is labelled by the author double loyalty (n.d. y, 21). The poem thus ends on a Zionist note, with a condemnation and at the same time a tacit recognition of the legitimacy or at least the inevitability of the Diaspora.
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1902a ‘Israelit, Orthodoxie und Zionismus’, Israelitische Rundschau 7: 22, 24, 26, 28. (G responds to an attack by Oscar Lehmann, redaktor of the Israelit).


1903a ‘Die Meyeriaide (Quo vadis?)’, Jüdische Rundschau 8: 46-48, 491-493, 501-503, 513-514. (Response in three parts to ‘Quo vadis?’, article by Dr. Siegmund Meyer, Hanover lawyer; G attacks the discriminatory measures against Ostjuden taken in Hanover and the exclusion of the latter from the community).

1904 ‘Der Schekel. Referat von Assessor Dr. S. Gronemann’, Jüdische Rundschau 8: 21, 225-228. (Arguing for accepting payment of the shekel only from convinced Zionists)

1904a ‘Welchronik des Schlemiel’, Schlemiel 2:1, 4; 2: 16. (Long poem in two parts, signed S. G.114) On the Eternal antisemite as either Amalek, openly hostile, or Moab, apparently friendly)


114 This, unless otherwise indicated, is how Gronemann signed his contributions to the Schlemiel before the First World War.

253
‘Ein Mordskerl. Kriminal-Geschichte aus einer künftigen “rechtlich gesicherten Heimstätte”’, *Schlemiel* 2: 6, 52-53. (Short-story about how a legal system following Talmudic law would work when the Jews have returned to the land of Israel; signed S. Gronemann. Reprinted in *Mitteilungsblatt* 10: 6,1950).


‘Theodor Herzls Heimkehr’, *Schlemiel* 2: 8, 75-76. (Description of the arrival of the Imperial yacht bearing Herzl’s body; signed Sammy Gronemann).


[Untitled poem], *Schlemiel* 3: 6, 51.


‘Zionismus und Deutschum, eine Antwort an Herrn Professor Geiger’, *Jüdische Rundschau* 10: 12, 127-130; 10: 13, 139-143. (Response to Geiger 1905, in two parts; originally a talk given to the *Berliner Zionistische Vereinigung*).


‘Zu den Wahlen’, *Jüdische Rundschau* 10: 25, 301. (Responds to an article by J. Becker in Nr. 24).


‘Protestrabbiner Redivivus’, *Die Welt* 10: 40, 11-13; (continued as) ‘Sturmgeselle Vogelstein’, 41, 6-10. (Attacking Rabbi Heinemann Vogelstein. The two parts were reprinted as a separate book, see 1906).


‘Was ist ein Prozeß?’, *Der Schriftsteller* 2: 4/5, 42. (Part of G’s legal advice activity as lawyer to the *Schutzverband deutscher Schriftsteller*, cited by Fischer 1980, 138)

‘Statut des Zionistischen Ehrengerichts’, *Die Welt* 15: 31, 695-97. (Elaborated from G’s and Leitmeritz resident Dr. Margulies’s proposals).

‘Rußland ein Kulturstaat!! Der Beilis-Prozeß ein schwebendes Verfahren’, *Jüdische Rundschau* 18: 45, 480-81. (Attack on Justizrat Dr. Maximilian Horwitz of the CV, for not attacking antisemitism).

‘Zentralverein und Zionisten’, *Jüdische Rundschau* 18: 50, 537.


‘Aus der Praxis’, *Schlemiel* 1, 8. (Anecdote about East European Jews, clients of his, who have to change their names. Signed Gr.115).

‘Kindermund’, *Schlemiel* 1, 8. (Joke).


---

115 This, unless otherwise indicated, is how Gronemann signed his contributions to *Schlemiel* after the First World War.
1919e 'Aus dem Vereinsleben (Anmerkungen von Eduard Chaim Tippisch)', *Schlemiel* 2, 22.

1919f 'Gastronomisches', *Schlemiel* 2, 35. (Joke).

1919g 'Aus der Okkupationszeit', *Schlemiel* 3, 42-43. (Two anecdotes: 'Sprachkunde' and 'Die Beschlagnahme').

1919h 'Aus der Praxis', *Schlemiel* 5, 67. (Anecdote about a shnorer).

1919i 'Aus der Okkupationszeit: Das Kaisergebet', *Schlemiel* 6, 84. (Anecdote about the prayer for the Tsar, used later in *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*, see 1924, 38-41).

1919j 'Aus dem Vereinsleben', *Schlemiel* 6, 91. (Unsigned, possibly but not certainly G's).

1919k 'Sylvester-Gebräuche', *Schlemiel* 6, 94. (Anecdote about the Hamburg Zionist Congress. Used in *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich*).

1919l 'Aus der Praxis', *Schlemiel* 7, 107. (Short anecdote).

1919m 'Aus der liberalen Wahl-Hagadah', *Schlemiel* 8, 115. (Short satire on Liberal reluctance to allow universal suffrage in community elections, while asking for it in national elections; parodies the Passover song *mah nishtanah*).

1919n 'Dajenu', *Schlemiel* 9, 128. (Short reworking of the Passover song).

1919o 'Galerie des Schlemiel. Hermann Struck', *Schlemiel* 10, 141. (Profile of the artist and Mizrahi Zionist, who was stationed with G on the Eastern front).

1919p 'Aus der Okkupationszeit', *Schlemiel* 10, 142. (Two untitled anecdotes, one about Mr. Grünstein of the Poale Zion and his anti-religious stance, used in *Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich* (1927, 233-5), the other one about a Jew who comes to the Maggid to complain about his son being involved in Zionist activities).

1919q 'Galerie des Schlemiel. Israel Zangwill', *Schlemiel* 11, 153.

1919r 'Galerie des Schlemiel. Nachum Sokolow', *Schlemiel* 13, 177.

1919s 'Palästina Frauenarbeit', *Jüdische Rundschau* 186, 321.

1920a 'Galerie des Schlemiel. Dr. Nathan Birnbaum (Mathias Acher)', *Schlemiel* 14, 189.

1920b 'Galerie des Schlemiel. Chaim Weitmann', *Schlemiel* 16, 217.

1920c 'Galerie des Schlemiel. Homon ho Roscho', *Schlemiel* 17, 228. (Characterisation of one that claims to be a friend of the Jews but does not want them to be truly independent).


1920e 'Galerie des Schlemiel. Mendel Ussischkin', *Schlemiel* 19/20, 257. (Shorter than the other portraits).

1920f 'Chad Gadjo. Ein Lämmchen', *Schlemiel* 19/20, 263. (Parody of the Aramaic poem sung at the Passover *seder*).

1920g 'Galerie des Schlemiel. Albert Einstein', *Schlemiel* 21, 271. (Short piece strangely forecasting the "Jewish Physics" accusations of the Nazis).


1924a 'Hawdoloh und Zapfenstreich', *Jüdische Rundschau, Beilage* 29: 27. (Extracts).

1925 'Antonio, der Kaufmann von Venedig', *Jahrbuch für Jüdische Geschichte und Literatur*. (A typescript can be found with A. Klee's papers, CZA A142/59/3c, it was later included in the *Erinnerungen* as chapter 12, and also published in 1925 in *Die Drei*, 5: 534-545. I will cite the typescript version).
1929  ‘Um ein Haar’, Acht-Uhr Abendblatt, 2 April.
1930-1934  ‘Berlin on yidn’, serialised in Folksblat, Kovno. (Translated into Yiddish by Yudel Mark, who was editor-in-chief).
1935  ‘Eine Kundgebung für den Keren Hajessod in Wien’, Die Stimme, 505. (G’s lecture, given as part of his lecture tour).
1936a  ‘Eine stolze Erinnerung’, Mitteilungsblatt, March I and II, 4-5. (G remembers the early Zionist activity of Arthur Ruppin, his friend, on the occasion of Ruppin’s sixtieth birthday).
1936b  ‘Ke’anavim bamidbar’, Mitteilungsblatt (YedVot), March I and n, 35-34. (Hebrew version of 1936a, first published in Ha’arets).
1939  ‘Heinrich Loewe siebzig Jahre’, Mitteilungsblatt, July, I, 14. (On Loewe’s role as bridge between East and West).
1939a  ‘Hoda’at av bet-din hakongres, mar sami groneman’, Iton hakongres, 7, 1.
1940  ‘Gerüchtemacher’, Mitteilungsblatt, 6 September. (Against the spreading of rumours).
1941  ‘Etwas von Nordau’, 76-78 in BEN-CHORIN AND STERN 1941.
1946  ‘Vom jüdischen Theater’, Mitteilungen 11, 7. (G connects here Habimah with the Yiddish Vilna troupe).
N.d. g  ‘Galerie des Schlemiel: Davis Trietsch’, Schlemiel, 1919 or 1920 (reprinted in Mitteilungsblatt 1950, 9).

PUBLISHED AND UNPUBLISHED TYPESCRIPTS AT THE CZA\textsuperscript{116} AND THE DLA

N.d. h  Mimik zur Hochzeitsfeier von Fräulein Elfride Salone [sic] Gronemann mit Herrn Dr. Salo Bergel von Sammy. (28 p. kept with Alfred Klee’s papers, A142/59/3c).
N.d. i  ‘Der Zionismus’, A142/59/3c (16 p.).
N.d. j  ‘Megalophilen-Katalog 717’, A135/45. (Short story, 17p.).
N.d. k  ‘Ein Bluturteil’, A135/46. (Short story, 8p.).
N.d. l  ‘Parve’, A135/47. (Short story, 7p. One copy has Sonia’s handwritten notes in Russian and the handwritten subtitle ‘Ein Bild aus versunkenem Milieu’. Another version entitled ‘Frau Adler erzählt’).
N.d. m  ‘Der himmlische Lohn’, A135/48. (Short story, 10p.).

\textsuperscript{116} This includes also the typescript of the Erinnerungen, to be found at the LBI New York as well, and listed in the section on Books and Unpublished Plays above.
N.d. n 'Eine kleine Gefälligkeit', A135/49. (Short story, 4-7 p.).
N.d. o 'Eine kleine Überraschung', A135/50. (Short story, 5p.).
N.d. p 'Wie alt ist Xenia?', A135/51. (Novella, 38 p.).
N.d. q 'Träume', A135/52. (Short story, 3p.).
N.d. r 'Um ein Haar', A135/53. (Short story, 3,10,11 p.) (This was published, see 1929).
N.d. s 'Eine ärgerliche Geschichte', A135/54. (Short story, 9 p.).
N.d. t 'Erste Begegnung', A135/55. (Short story, 5 p.).
N.d. u 'Sechstes Kapitel von ???', A135/56. (Chapter of a novel which was to have been entitled Der ewige Israelit, 28p.).
N.d. v 'Doktor Hoffmanns Erzählungen', A135/28. (Script for a KH propaganda film).
N.d. w 'Du glaubst zu schieben, und Du wirst geschoben', Berliner Tageblatt, (Feuilleton about the Echtermeyer blackmarket case, appeared between 1907 and 1909).
N.d. x 'Die Frage der Überführung der Gebeine Herzl’s [sic] nach Erez-Israel’, A135/35. (Memorandum written probably in 1935, when G was in charge of the said transfer, 15 p.).
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