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Abstract

Abandoning one’s mother tongue for another language is one of the most profound aspects of exile experience, often fraught with feelings of loss and alienation. Yet the linguistic switch can also be viewed as an advantage: the adopted language becomes a refuge, affording the writer creative distance and perspective. This thesis examines the effects of this switch as reflected in the works of two translingual Jewish authors, Stefan Heym (1913-2001) and Jakov Lind (1927-2007). Both were forced into exile after their lives in Germany and Austria were shattered by the rise of Nazism, and both chose English as a medium of artistic expression at certain periods of their lives.

Reading these authors’ works within their post-war historical context, the thesis argues that translingualism is associated with a psychic split as the self is divided between its languages. This schism manifests itself differently in the writing of each of these authors, according to their distinct perceptions of their identity and place in the world: in Lind’s work, it is experienced as a schizophrenic existence, and in Heym’s – as an advantageous doubling of perspective.

The first chapter focuses on autobiographical writing in a foreign language, exploring how self and language are bound together in Lind’s English-language autobiographies. The second chapter draws on Bakhtin’s notion of dialogism as it considers the relationship between narration, ideology and propaganda in Heym’s war novel The Crusaders. The third chapter examines Lind’s and Heym’s representations of the writer in their fiction, and how their translingualism defines their perception of their own identity and role as writers. The final chapter shows how the two authors reinterpret the figure of the Wandering Jew to construct different visions of a humanistic Jewish identity that correspond to their own diasporic existence.
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1. Introduction

‘My private tragedy, which cannot, indeed should not, be anybody’s concern, is that I had to abandon my natural language, my natural idiom, my rich, infinitely rich and docile Russian tongue, for a second-rate brand of English.’¹ – Vladimir Nabokov

‘Our identity is at once plural and partial. Sometimes we feel that we straddle two cultures; at other times, that we fall between two stools. But however ambiguous and shifting this ground may be, it is not an infertile territory for a writer to occupy.’² – Salman Rushdie

The decision to abandon one’s mother tongue for another language is one of the most profound aspects of exile experience, often fraught with feelings of loss and alienation: Vladimir Nabokov, for example, described his break with his native Russian as ‘exceedingly painful – like learning anew to handle things after losing seven or eight fingers in an explosion.’³ In is no coincidence, perhaps, that the native tongue is described in various languages as mother tongue - ‘Muttersprache, langue maternelle, mama loshen, sfat em, lengua materna, modersml, lingua maternsa, matesk jasyk.’⁴ Severing this primal connection, then, can be perceived as ‘tantamount to matricide.’⁵ Yet such a linguistic switch can also be viewed as an advantage: the adopted language becomes a refuge, affording the writer creative distance and a new sense of perspective. In this thesis, I contend that translingualism, which ruptures the perceived link between language and world as the writer chooses between two systems of representation, is associated with a psychic split that

---

³ Nabokov, p. 54.
⁵ Kellman, p. ix.
can be reflected in the translingual author’s work as a schizophrenic existence or as a productive doubling of perspective.

The twentieth century saw some of the most celebrated instances of literary translingualism – which Stephen Kellman defines as writing ‘in more than one language or at least in a language other than [one’s] primary one’ – in writers such as Joseph Conrad, Samuel Beckett and Nabokov. While these writers are often seen as exceptions to the rule that one can – and perhaps should – write only in one’s native tongue, translingualism, as Kellman shows in *The Translingual Imagination*, has a long tradition: from Seneca, Erasmus, and Dante to contemporary authors such as Milan Kundera, Chinua Achebe, Anita Desai and J. M. Coetzee, to name but a few.

The complex relationship between language, consciousness and experience, and by extension between language and identity, has occupied philosophers and linguists for centuries. Throughout history, attempts have been made to explain the diversity of languages: as George Steiner notes, a version of the myth of Babel – a tale of the fragmentation of one language into many – exists in various cultures. In the gnostic tradition Steiner describes, the original, single language, perceived as divine, had ‘a congruence with reality such as no tongue had had after Babel. […] Each name, each proposition was an equation, with uniquely and perfectly defined roots, between human perception and the facts of the case.’ The multiple languages that replaced the original one cannot achieve its clarity: whereas ‘the tongue of Eden was like flawless glass’, our speech ‘interposes itself between apprehension and truth like a dusty pane or warped mirror.’

In the European tradition of the philosophy of language, the view that all languages have a common underlying structure – a ‘universalist position,’ Steiner calls it – competes with a ‘monadist’ position,’ which ‘holds that universal deep structures are either fathomless to logical and psychological investigation or of an order so abstract, so generalized, as to be well-nigh trivial.’ This position has its roots in Leibnitz’s late seventeenth-century work on

---

6 Kellman, p. ix.
7 Kellman, pp. 117-118.
9 Steiner, pp. 58-59.
10 Steiner, p. 59.
11 Steiner, p. 73.
12 Steiner, p. 74.
monads: the “perpetual living mirrors of the universe” which reflect ‘experience according to [their] own particular sightlines and habits of cognition.’ In the monadist view of language, language and thought are inextricably linked, and each language both reflects the world – like a monad – in a specific way and at the same time structures the perception of the world: ‘[thought] is language internalized, and we think and feel as our particular language impels and allows us to do.’

The legacy of the ‘monadist’ position is apparent in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in the works of Wilhelm von Humboldt and Benjamin Lee Whorf respectively. Humboldt believed that, despite certain general tendencies that can be discerned in all languages, ‘there resides in every language a characteristic world-view. As the individual sound stands between man and the object, so the entire language steps in between him and the nature that operates, both inwardly and outwardly, upon him.’ Whorf, working with Edward Sapir, developed this argument further: thought occurs only in language and is determined by it: ‘every language is a vast pattern-system, different from others, in which are culturally ordained the forms and categories by which the personality not only communicates, but also analyzes nature, notices or neglects types of relationships and phenomena, channels his reasoning, and builds the house of his consciousness.’ Linguistic determinism leads to linguistic relativity: Whorf asserts that ‘all observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe, unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar, or can in some way be calibrated.’

This type of linguistic determinism has been criticized as tautological and circular. ‘Civilization is uniquely and specifically informed by its language; the language is the unique and specific matrix of its civilization,’ Steiner summarizes Humboldt’s view. ‘The one proposition is used to demonstrate the other and vice versa.’ Humboldt’s conviction ‘remains fundamentally intuitive,’ Steiner adds, as he has not been able to ‘use it to enforce

---

13 Steiner, pp. 74-75.
14 Steiner, p. 75.
17 Whorf, p. 214.
18 Steiner, p. 84.
demonstrable proof.’\(^{19}\) Whorf’s theses rely on a comparative analysis of a variety of languages, yet his observations on language structure lead to tautological conclusions, Steiner argues: Whorf observes, for instance, that an Apache speaker would use a different formulation from an English speaker to describe a dripping spring, and infers a difference of cognition from the difference in speech.\(^{20}\) Moreover, when such assumptions of difference of cognition are taken to their extreme, they render translation and even communication between speakers of different languages nearly impossible.

Despite the flaws of the monadist or deterministic approach, the strong connections between language and perception cannot be disregarded, especially when discussing the transition from one language to another and the implications it might have in terms of the individual’s consciousness and sense of identity. In this context, the following observation by Humboldt is particularly evocative:

> By the same act whereby [the individual] spins language out of himself, he spins himself into it, and every language draws about the people that possesses it a circle whence it is possible to exit only by stepping over at once into the circle of another one. To learn a foreign language should therefore be to acquire a new standpoint in the world-view hitherto possessed, and in fact to a certain extent is so, since every language contains the whole conceptual fabric and mode of presentation of a portion of mankind.\(^{21}\)

Language, it would seem, constructs not only individual consciousness but also national consciousness or identity. This model of nation-formation appears to privilege language over other aspects of national identity, such as a shared history. Thus the mere act of learning another language alters an individual’s world-view and allows him or her to access the entire ‘conceptual fabric’ of another ‘portion of mankind’; crossing a linguistic border amounts to crossing a national one.

The crossing of national and linguistic borders has been increasingly common since the Second World War, and contemporary literary studies have consequently seen a rising interest in this phenomenon and the destabilization or redefinition of traditional notions of nationhood that accompany it. In her study of contemporary transnational literature, Azade Seyhan notes that the ‘recent history of forced or voluntary migrations, massive transfers of

\(^{19}\) Steiner, p. 85.
\(^{20}\) Steiner, p. 93.
\(^{21}\) Humboldt, p. 60.
population, and traveling and transplanted cultures is seen as part and parcel of the postwar, postindustrial, and postcolonial experience." The literature arising from such experiences of exile, migration and dislocation – and from the collisions and intersections of cultures they entail – reflects both the losses suffered and the new, hybrid cultural identities constructed in the process.

The body of literary works produced by bilingual, translingual and transnational authors challenges the conventional national categorization of literature, which relies on recognizable national borders and on linguistic coherence as an expression of national identity. The critical language used to describe and discuss these new cultural products needs to correspond to the challenges they present: to quote Seyhan, the ‘emergent literatures of deterritorialized peoples and literary studies beyond the confines of national literature paradigms have as yet no name or configuration.’ Seyhan defines transnational literature as ‘a genre of writing that operates outside the national cannon, addresses issues facing deterritorialized cultures, and speaks for those in [...] “paranational” communities and allegiances,’ meaning those who live within national borders but ‘remain culturally or linguistically distanced from them and, in some instances, are estranged from both the home and the host culture.’

Postcolonial studies have been instrumental in creating a critical language for the discussion of transnational literature. Indeed, some of the most notable instances of bilingualism and translingualism occur in the postcolonial context, and the debates about the appropriation and transformation of the languages of the colonial power by its marginalized former subjects touch on fundamental questions regarding self and language. If theories of language by European philosophers tend towards the abstract and focus on the individual, as in the case of Humboldt, the dispute between writers such as Chinua Achebe and Ngugi wa Thiong’o springs from personal experience and has a more obvious bearing on a social and cultural reality. Achebe advocates the use of English, ‘the world language which history has forced down our throats,’ by African writers, but insists that this world language in turn

23 Seyhan, p. 9.
24 Seyhan, p. 10.
pay a price of ‘submission to many different kinds of use.’ The non-native writer of English infuses the language with his native experience, creating ‘a new English, still in full communion with its ancestral home but altered to suit its new African surroundings.’ Ngugi wa Thiong’o, on the other hand, views the English language as an crucial weapon in the imperialist arsenal: ‘The bullet was the means of physical subjugation,’ he writes in *Decolonising the Mind*. ‘Language was the means of the spiritual subjugation.’ In the postcolonial era, the perceived universality of English (with its promise of a much wider readership than an African writer, for instance, might hope to reach in his or her native language) undermines and subsumes the cultural heritage of individual nations.

There are convergences and correspondences between the fields of transnational fiction and theory and postcolonial studies. Thus Seyhan acknowledges that ‘voices of postcolonial theory are in ample evidence’ in her study, but stresses that the diasporic writers she discusses – including Rafik Chami, Maxine Hong Kingston, Eva Hoffman, Gloria Anzaldúa and Emine Sevgi Özdamar – ‘do not share with their hosts the kind of historical, cultural and linguistic intimacy (however problematic) that exists between the colonizer and the colonized.’ Seyhan also distinguishes transnational literature and its ‘bilingual poetics’ from ethnic or immigrant literature: the term ‘ethnic literature implies that its signified is not an integral or natural part of a land’s history. The same is true of immigrant literature. […] [Immigrant] writing would suggest that this body of cultural production constitutes a transitory tradition in national literary history.’

These distinctions are important in the context of this thesis, too: the translingualism I discuss and the transformations of identity with which it is associated are a result of, and the means of coping with, exile. Stefan Heym (1913-2001) and Jakov Lind (1927-2007), the authors whose work is the focus of this study, both fled their native countries, Germany and Austria respectively, when their lives were shattered by the rise of Nazism. Unlike many immigrant writers, they were not raised in a bilingual environment, and as opposed to

---

26 Achebe, p. 198.
27 Achebe, p. 200.
29 Seyhan, p. 13.
30 Seyhan, p. 13.
31 Seyhan, p. 7.
32 Seyhan, p. 10.
writers from former British colonies, they were not educated in English, the language they adopted as adults.

Within the category of transnational literature, especially when defined broadly as literature written by writers who have crossed national boundaries, a fundamental distinction should be made between voluntary border-crossing – such as travel or certain forms of emigration – and exile. Edward Said stresses the ‘age-old practice of banishment’ that underlies exile. Exiles are violently uprooted, cut off from their home; exile is, then, ‘a discontinuous state of being’ as opposed to the sense of unity and belonging afforded by nationalism. Paradoxically, there is a permanence in this very state of discontinuity and transience, as André Aciman observes:

What makes exile the pernicious thing it is is not really the state of being away, as much as the impossibility of ever not being away – not just being absent, but never being able to redeem this absence. […] Bewildered by the narratives that pullulate everywhere he looks, an exile has yet to answer a far more fundamental question: in what language will he express his confused awareness of these intimate paradoxes?

For exiles from Nazi Germany and Austria, especially Jewish refugees, the relationship with the language of their former homeland was fraught with tension on several levels. The deepest, most acute conflict is a sense of banishment from and by language itself. Ernst Cassirer, for instance, writes about the transformation of German into a ‘magic’ language of performative rather than semantic functions:

If nowadays I happen to read a German book, published in these last ten years [1934-1944], […] I find to my amazement that I no longer understand the German language… words which formerly were used in a descriptive, logical, or semantic sense are now used as magic words designed to produce certain effects and to stir up certain emotions. Our

---

33 Stephen Clingman, in his book *The Grammar of Identity*, offers this as one of several definitions of transnational fiction (p. 7). Other definitions include fiction ‘written by, and directed towards, migrant and multi-lingual communities, who exist in multiple and in-between spaces’ (p. 8), and ‘works that travel, no matter the provenance or trajectories of their authors’ (p. 9). Clingman ultimately argues that ‘what makes fiction transnational are questions of form’ (p. 10), and that the informing characteristics of transnational fiction ‘concern the grammar of identity and location; the nature of boundaries, both transitive and intransitive; and navigation as a modality of existence in, and as defining, both the transitive self and transnational space’ (p. 11). See Stephen Clingman, *The Grammar of Identity: Transnational Fiction and the Nature of the Boundary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).


35 Said, p. 177.

ordinary words are charged with meanings; but these new-fangled words are charged
with feelings and violent passions.  

Jean Améry describes two different reactions of the exiles to their exclusion from their
native tongue. ‘Most of the exiles denied themselves the bits of it that were drifting from
Germany […] with the theoretically valid, but in practice only partially useful, argument that
there the German language was being corrupted and they had the mission of keeping it
“pure”.’38 Others, among them Améry himself, ‘made the hopeless attempt to cling to the
advancing German language[,]’ in spite of their ‘extreme aversion.’39 But those who fled or
were ejected from the nation, had – to return to Humboldt’s formulation – stepped outside
the circle that the language draws around the people that possesses it, and their perspective
was necessarily altered: ‘I was excluded from the fate of the German community and thus
from its language[,]’ Améry reflects on his attempts to read the German newspapers
published by the German occupying forces in Belgium. “Enemy bomber,” fine, but for me
these were the German bombers that were laying the cities of England in ruins, and not the
flying fortresses of the Americans, which were attending to the same business in
Germany.’40

The exile of German writers posed its own difficulties. Whether they fled out of
necessity – as did many Jewish and socialist writers – or emigrated as a result of a moral
opposition to the Nazi regime, they left behind, as Jean-Michel Palmier notes, libraries and
manuscripts: tools of the trade.41 But more importantly, they were leaving ‘their source of
inspiration, their language and their readers. Many knew that they would no longer be
published or read.’42 The work of exiled German and Austrian writers provides fertile
ground for exile studies. Individual writers who achieved and maintained literary fame –
Thomas Mann, Heinrich Mann, Bertolt Brecht, and Alfred Döblin are but a few examples –
have naturally attracted critical attention, and there have been numerous English-language

37 Ernst Cassirer, The Myth of the State, quoted in Michael Holquist, ‘What Is the Ontological Status of
Bilingualism?’, in Bilingual Games: Some Literary Investigations, ed. by Doris Sommer (London: Palgrave
38 Jean Améry, At the Mind’s Limit: Contemplations by a Survivor on Auschwitz and its Realities, trans. by
39 Améry, p. 53.
40 Améry, p. 53.
41 Jean-Michel Palmier, Weimar in Exile: The Antifascist Emigration in Europe and America, trans. by David
42 Palmier, pp. 89-90.
studies of German-speaking exiles. While these studies initially focused on writers, artists, and intellectuals, the scope has broadened considerably in recent years to explore the wider social fabric of exiles and refugees – the ‘exile of ordinary people,’ as Wolfgang Benz calls it.

Most German and Austrian exiled writers continued to write in German: critics of exile literature of the period have noted that generally, authors ‘of established literary reputation were less willing to adopt a new language […].’ Richard Dove observes that a ‘surprising number of German-speaking authors were able to produce political, historical, or biographical books in English, but probably fewer than a dozen novelists were able to make the transition.’ Dove briefly examines the work of four such authors – Hans Flesch-Brunningen, Peter de Mendelssohn, Hilde Spiel and Robert Neumann – all of whom settled in Britain between 1933 and 1945. Nicole Brunnhuber also notes the growth in recent years of scholarship on German-speaking exile fiction written in Britain during this period, and in her book *The Faces of Janus* she focuses on exile fiction written in English, which has not received much attention; she discusses the works of Ernest Borneman, Robert Neumann, Ruth Feiner, Lilo Linke and George Tabori. Both Dove and Brunnhuber note that the main reason for switching languages was facilitating publication and reaching a wide readership, as the exiled writers were not published or read in Nazi Germany and Austria. Yet linguistic migration, Brunnhuber maintains, was in some cases motivated by more than practical considerations: it was ‘a political act’ and an ‘assertion of loyalty to the host country.’

Both commercial and political or moral motives can be traced in Stefan Heym’s and Jakov Lind’s decision to write in English, but the linguistic switch had profoundly different

---


46 Dove, p. 95.


48 Brunnhuber, p. 34.
consequences for each of these authors. I have chosen to focus on them rather than on better-known translinguals such as Nabokov or Beckett, because they offer some common ground for comparison: both are native German-speakers and both adopted the same foreign language as a means of literary expression; the same historical circumstances led to their exile; both engage with the postwar social and political reality, and both struggle with a conflicted Jewish identity. Exploring the dissimilar ways in which the effects of translingualism are manifested in Heym’s and Lind’s works – reflecting each one’s perception of his identity and place in the world – I propose to trace two distinct models of literary translingualism: as creative refuge and as alienation from the self.

Heym was born in 1913 as Helmut Flieg, son of middle-class Jewish parents in Chemnitz, Germany. Writing poems and plays from an early age, he was expelled from his high school in 1931 because of his outspoken left-wing sympathies. Shortly afterwards, he began working as a journalist in Berlin, publishing articles and poems under a variety of pseudonyms. In 1933, soon after the Reichstag fire, a warrant was issued for his arrest and he fled the country – first to Prague, then, in 1935, to America. He continued to write for German-language anti-fascist publications and was the chief editor of a the Deutsches Volksecho, a communist weekly. Heym became an American citizen and joined in the US Army in 1943, serving, like several other German exiles, at a psychological warfare unit whose task was to write propaganda and interview German prisoners of war.

Heym’s first novel, Hostages, was published in 1942; the thriller, set in German-occupied Prague, became a bestseller and was adapted into a major motion picture by Paramount.49 The commercial and critical success of this novel and the war novel The Crusaders, published in 1948, established Heym as a noteworthy author.50 Yet the refuge Heym found in his adoptive country was short-lived: the rise of McCarthyism drove Heym, a committed socialist, into exile again in 1951. In 1953, after two years of uncertainty as to his destination, Heym settled with his wife in the German Democratic Republic. As Peter Hutchinson notes, the return to Germany was ‘a last resort’, as Heym could not obtain a residence visa elsewhere in Europe: ‘[his] views on the German mentality – as seen in his novels – were not favourable, and his view of Western Germany, with its minimal attempts

---

at de-Nazification, was contemptuous.\textsuperscript{51} The newly established GDR, however, was a socialist state that ‘insisted upon its anti-Nazi credentials’ and welcomed artists and intellectuals ‘who wanted to remind their audiences of the crimes of the “other” Germany – so long as they respected certain taboos.’\textsuperscript{52} Heym, however, did not respect these taboos, and became – in the 1960s and 1970s – a vocal critic of the oppressive regime in the GDR, despite his commitment to the ideas that the state purported to represent.

Heym’s position as a perpetual dissident (to borrow Hutchinson’s term) is, I will argue in this thesis, linked with his translingualism. Returning to Humboldt’s claim that stepping outside the circle described by one’s language alters one’s world-view, I would suggest that in Heym’s case, translingualism is associated with an advantageous doubling of perspective whose effects can be traced in his fiction. Significantly, Heym continued to write fiction in English even after he settled in East Germany, translating his own work into German. In the 1970s, he began writing his novels in German first and translating them into English. Heym thus maintained his international literary status through bilingualism and self-translation. This strategy was necessary to overcome the publication bans he faced in the GDR at various stages of his career,\textsuperscript{53} but it also allowed him to create and uphold the position of ‘Man-between’:\textsuperscript{54} an insider who is also an outsider, mediating between Germany and America, between Eastern and Western Europe, between exile and the choice to make a home in a country he nevertheless continues to criticize.

This position can be traced throughout Heym’s long and prolific career, from his earliest novels, \textit{Hostages} and \textit{Of Smiling Peace} (1944),\textsuperscript{55} which are characterized by a multiplicity of perspectives and a shifting narratorial focus, through the critique not only of Nazi Germany but also of corrupt American policies in \textit{The Crusaders}. The socialist tendencies (including the idealization of a Red-Army soldier) in \textit{The Crusaders} were tolerated in the context of the war against fascism; but Heym’s next novel, \textit{The Eyes of


\textsuperscript{53}A detailed account of Heym’s conflicted relationship with the GDR authorities can be found in: Meg Tait, \textit{Taking Sides: Stefan Heym’s Historical Fiction} (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2001).


Reason (1951), which deals with the communist coup in Czechoslovakia in 1948 and depicts communism favorably, was met with disapproval, as Peter Hutchinson describes, in both the West and the East:

The positive presentation of Communism incensed certain American reviewers, one of whom actually suggested that anyone who reviewed the work favourably should be imprisoned! In the East, too, though, there was unease. For the book contains ample criticism of rigid adherence to the party line (particularly on issues of personal freedom), and the presentation of capitalism, and of individual capitalists, is at points quite generous.

Heym’s writing is openly ideological: his belief in socialism remained unshaken even when its implementation, in the Soviet Union and in his own country, proved a disappointment. As his conflict with the GDR authorities deepened, it became increasingly difficult to write novels with a recognizable, contemporary setting. The novel Five Days in June (5 Tage im Juni), dealt with the strike of industrial workers in June 1953, which was suppressed by Soviet troops. According to Hutchinson, several novels have been written about the June uprising, all presenting a one-sided political interpretation of the event, based on the writers’ nationality. Heym’s novel, by contrast, ‘stands apart from all others in its presentation of activities on both sides of the border and in advancing a view which, as it were, straddles the interpretations of East and West.’ But because of its controversial content, the novel, which was started in 1954 and took four years to write, was not published until 1974 in West Germany and 1989 in the GDR. To overcome the political obstacles that stood in the way of his work, Heym turned to historical fiction to express his critique: five of the seven major works of fiction Heym published between his arrival in the GDR and the unification in 1989 had historical themes and settings. These include The Lenz Papers (1964; translated into German as Die Papiere des Andreas Lenz, 1963), set during the revolutionary uprisings of 1848; Uncertain Friend (1969; translated and published the

---

56 Stefan Heym, The Eyes of Reason (Boston: Little, Brown, 1951).
57 Hutchinson, p. 59.
58 Stefan Heym, Five Days in June: A Novel (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1977); 5 Tage im Juni (Munich: Bertelsmann, 1974). The early version of the novel was titled A Day Marked X (Der Tage X).
59 Hutchinson, p. 93.
60 Hutchinson, p. 95. The English version appeared in 1977.
61 Tait, p. 7.
same year as *Lasalle. Ein Biographischer Roman*), which focuses on the life of Ferdinand Lasalle, the founder of the first German workers’ union;\(^6^3\) *The King David Report* (1973; the German version, *Der König-David-Bericht* was published in 1972) is a retelling of the biblical narrative of the life of King David;\(^6^4\) and *Ahasver* (1981; published in English as *The Wandering Jew* in 1984), which juxtaposes Germany during Luther’s reformation with the contemporary GDR.\(^6^5\)

This is only a partial list of Heym’s works: his bound publications include nearly twenty novels and short-story collections in addition to several essay collections and children’s stories.\(^6^6\) Heym’s journalistic career, which started as the Nazis rose to power and outlasted the Berlin Wall, is beyond the scope of this study. The historical and political context is crucial to any discussion of Heym’s work, and other critics have naturally focused on these aspects in their readings of Heym’s novels. Drawing on their scholarship, I will analyze, through a close reading of three novels, the effects of translingualism as reflected in Heym’s works and the relationship between language and identity that emerges from them. The novels I have chosen – *The Crusaders, The King David Report*, both of which were originally written in English, and *The Wandering Jew*, which was originally written in German and translated by Heym – reflect different stages in Heym’s career and feature recurring elements in his fiction: the idealism of his American years, the struggle with GDR authorities, and the assertion of an artistic identity. I will trace how a conflict of identification, which in *The Crusaders* is linked to questions of language, is transformed in Heym’s later works into an ability to move between opposing positions through translation while remaining critical of both, and allows the translingual writer to contain and transcend contradictions. My central thesis, with regards to Heym, is that he constructs the Man-between figure – especially the figure of the writer and his mythical correspondent, the Wandering Jew – as an archetype of translingual and transnational identity.

\(^6^6\) See the comprehensive bibliography in Hutchinson, pp. 245-256.
If for Heym translingualism presented an opportunity and the doubling it involved became a productive feature of his writing, it could be said that in Lind’s case, the linguistic switch led to a solipsistic withdrawal into a fragmented self. Born in 1927 in Vienna, Lind, then still Heinz Landwirth, was evacuated in 1938 on a Kindertransport train to Holland. During the war, he assumed the identity of a Dutch labourer, and using forged papers he survived right in the lion’s mouth – in Germany. At the end of the war he again took on a false identity to overcome immigration restrictions, and arrived in Palestine in 1945 as Jakov Chaklan, a Palestinian-born Jew. The dream of finding a home in the Jewish land, however, was not fulfilled, and in 1950 Lind returned to Europe: to Vienna, Amsterdam and finally London, where he began his career as a professional writer. Although he lived in London for over fifty years (between 1954 and his death in 2007), Lind spent much of his time in New York and Majorca, and continued to consider Britain a tolerant and tolerable refuge rather than a home; as he put it in his autobiography: ‘Where else in the world could I have remained an Alien for so long?’

Lind’s first literary work was published in Israel: The Diary of Hanan Malinek (1949) was written in German but appeared only in Hebrew translation. It is the story of a nineteen-year old Holocaust survivor who dies in battle in 1948, four weeks after his arrival in Israel, and represents, as Lind recalls in his autobiography, an attempt ‘to shed oceans of tears for something irreversible, like the death of [his] Jewish world, before [he] could wipe [his] face with sarcasm towards the recent past.’ Indeed, Lind’s subsequent works are marked by a dark, scathing sense of humor and a tendency towards surreal and grotesque plots. His major German-language works, the collection of stories Eine Seele aus Holz (1962, translated as Soul of Wood) and the novels Landschaft in Beton (Landscape in Concrete, 1963) and Eine bessere Welt (Ergo in English, 1966) deal explicitly with Nazism and its legacy.

The tone is set with the opening sentences of ‘Soul of Wood’, the title story of the collection. ‘Those who had no papers entitling them to live lined up to die. The whole North-west Station was a gigantic waiting-room. It was a long, long wait, but eventually
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everyone’s turn came.” The reader is thus thrust directly and unceremoniously into the reality of organized mass murder, regulated by an underlying bureaucratic system that turns everyday ‘papers’ into a monstrosity. Writing of the crimes in the language of the perpetrators, German – or more specifically, as Lind repeatedly states in his autobiography, Austrian German – Lind exposes the brutality and madness of the society that violently rejected him, robbing him of his childhood, home and sense of identity.

At a time when much of the literature written in German tended to ‘circumvent, repress, or deny knowledge’ of the Holocaust, Lind confronts his readers with the inhumanity of which man is capable. While Austrian politics and culture cultivated the myth of Austria’s own invasion by Nazi Germany in 1938, thus ‘[regarding] its special status as exculpatory and [leaving] the Holocaust a uniquely German “problem,”’ Lind insists on Austria’s culpability by exposing the anti-Semitism endemic in its society and depicting Austrians as perpetrators rather than victims. If Landscape in Concrete portrays the mindless murderousness of a traumatized and deranged German soldier desperate to rejoin his army after his fellow soldiers had drowned in the Russian mud, Ergo focuses on the mental disintegration that is the legacy of the war and shows post-war Austria, to quote Stella Rosenfeld, as ‘a cesspool of guilt-ridden psychopaths, who alternate between fondly remembering the “good old days” of their Nazi past and trying to whitewash, even justify them.’

It is therefore not surprising, perhaps, that the reception of Lind’s works in Germany and Austria was not entirely enthusiastic. While Soul of Wood was ‘among the most discussed new books’ of the Frankfurt Book Fair in 1962 and was translated into ten languages within a short time, the reactions of critics, as Ursula Seeber shows, ‘represent a first phase of recognition that was characterized first by disconcerted interest, then by resentment and finally by hostility towards the young German-speaking author.’

---
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Anglophone world, on the other hand, Lind was greeted ‘as one of the most original authors of the 1960s.’ This gap in the critical and popular reception of his works is one of the reasons Lind decided, after publishing stories, novels and plays in German, to begin writing in English. But it was not only the search for a wider (and more lucrative) audience that motivated him: Lind felt that his mother tongue had been violated and contaminated by Nazism. Writing in German was a necessity in the beginning of his career: he felt he had no other language in which to adequately express himself. At the same time, he was haunted by the fear that writing in the language of the perpetrator amounted to ‘a betrayal of all [he] had to say about [his] past […].’

The first work Lind published in English was *Counting My Steps* (1969), the first part of his autobiography, which he felt needed to be written in a foreign language because the material required a certain psychic distance. This was followed by *Numbers: A Further Autobiography* in 1972, and the autobiographical trilogy was completed in 1991 with *Crossing: The Discovery of Two Islands*. Another short autobiographical work, *The trip to Jerusalem* was published in 1973, and later – three works of fiction: the collection of short stories *The Stove* (1983), and the novels *Travels to the Enu* (1982) and *The Inventor* (1989). Significantly, the switch to English marks, as Rosenfeld notes, a move away from a direct concern with Nazism and the Holocaust as a subject matter. Because Lind did not move back and forth between his languages as Heym did, but rather rejected German in favor of English, my discussion of his translingualism will naturally focus on his English-language works. Language is a central concern of the autobiographies, which depict Lind’s struggle to reconstruct his life and identity after the trauma of the war. The English-language novels can be read as a commentary on the translingual process and its relationship to exile. It is my contention that in and through these works, Lind’s translingualism emerges as a self-imposed, internal exile, and reflects his resolution to become a cosmopolitan writer, a willing wandering Jew who, having lost his homeland as a child, cannot and will not tie himself to any nation or land. While the war and the Holocaust underlie these works, the theme of madness, which features in his German works as a mark of postwar reality,

---
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emerges as an internalized conflict in the later novels: a separation of world and sign leads to a destabilization of reality and an erosion of identity in the translingual individual’s mind.

Lind’s later work has not received much critical attention: it seems that the linguistic switch and the increased solipsism it entailed ultimately undermined Lind’s efforts to reach a wide readership. As he detached himself from his native language, he also distanced himself from the subject matter which gave his early works their force and distinctiveness. Towards the end of his life, Lind was all but forgotten in the Anglophone world, while the late 1990s saw a renewed interest in his work in Austria as part of a rediscovery of ‘those citizens who were “turned away”’ in the late 1930s. Nevertheless, since his death there seems to be a renewed interest in Lind in the Anglophone world: 2009 saw the republication of Landscape in Concrete by the American publisher Open Letter (University of Rochester), who will also republish Ergo in early 2010; Soul of Wood is expected to appear in November 2009 in the New York Review of Books Classics series.

Scholarly work on Heym and Lind has not been extensive. Dennis Tate notes that although Heym continues to be widely read in Germany, ‘there has been a curious reluctance by critics in the German-speaking world, whether east or west of the postwar divide, to engage in detail with his creative opus.’ Several Anglophone critics – including Peter Hutchinson, Meg Tait, and Dennis Tate – have written about Heym’s work in recent years. Much of this work has naturally focused on the political aspects of his work and his troubled relationship with the GDR authorities. Substantial critical work on Lind is very limited: the 2001 collection of essays Writing after Hitler: The Work of Jakov Lind sheds light on various aspects of Lind’s life and work and has been the main critical source for my own research. In this thesis, I hope to contribute not only to the scholarship on each of these individual authors. Reading these writers in their specific postwar context, I propose to chart two models of translingualism – a productive doubling of perspective versus a schizophrenic alienation from the self – and to link them to the modes of construction of an exilic, diasporic and transnational identity.
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The first chapter of the thesis explores what is perhaps the most paradoxical aspect of translingualism: autobiographical writing in a foreign language. In the three volumes of Lind’s autobiography, *Counting My Steps, Numbers* and *Crossing*, language emerges as one of the defining aspects of Lind’s identity as the autobiography both chronicles the author’s quest for a viable literary language and embodies its outcome as it signifies the search in the language the author has chosen to adopt. Self and language are thus bound through the self-begotten structure of the work. Drawing on psychoanalytical theories of trauma and schizophrenia, I argue that the defense mechanism that allowed Lind to endure the war – the creation of a new self in a foreign language – is represented in the autobiography as evolving into a schizoid orientation in later life, and that the translingual self created by the process of splitting – the one writing the autobiography – represses a deep sense of personal loss.

The second chapter focuses on Heym’s writing about the Second World War. Considering Heym’s assertion that books are weapons in the war of ideas, I explore the relationship between narration, propaganda and ideology in *The Crusaders*. I draw on Bakhtin’s notion of dialogism to show how the narrative strategies of the novel are in fact closely linked with Heym’s position as a translingual writer and with his attempt to construct an identity that crosses borders of language and nationality. Translingualism is both a feature of the narrative and a figure within it, and the languages of Germany and America are juxtaposed and examined each in the light of the other, creating an intricate picture of identity and identification.

In the third chapter, I examine the figure of the writer that emerges in and through Lind’s and Heym’s works, and how each author’s relationship with his languages shapes his identity as a writer. I focus on two satirical works that feature a writer as narrator-protagonist: Lind’s *Travels to the Enu* and Heym’s *The King David Report*. The first is a story of mental disintegration which I read as an allegory of Lind’s conflicted relationship with language: as in his autobiography, language itself features here as a theme, and becomes an internalized battleground. Heym’s novel explores the relationship between historiography and truth as he proposes how the biblical narrative of the reign of King David might have been composed, recasting the story as a tale of political power and its oppressive force. Using drafts to trace the role of self-translation in the composition of this novel, I
argue that through the doubling of perspective that this process entails and through the reference to a single, universal origin – the Bible – this bilingual text positions its author as mediator between languages and cultures.

The final chapter shows how the two authors rework and reinterpret the figure of Wandering Jew to construct different visions of a humanistic Jewish identity that correspond to their own diasporic existence. Lind’s protagonist in *The Inventor* seeks redemption in a post-war world, only to be plunged into madness as reality is constantly warped and shattered by grotesque and fantastic events. In Heym’s *The Wandering Jew*, Ahasverus the Wandering Jew becomes a figure of rebellion: a fallen Angel, Lucifer’s companion, he is an eternal, transcendent figure, forever attempting to change the course of history. Although neither novel deals explicitly with language, I suggest that Lind’s disintegrative wandering Jew and Heym’s redemptive figure can be read as extreme expressions of each author’s translingual process. Thus, the doubling and mental disintegration in Lind’s novel are a function of the author’s translingualism, which becomes a form of internal exile and leads to literary homelessness. Heym, who moves between his languages as self-translator, maintains the transcendent position he had established in and through his previous works: unbound by ties of language and nation, a perpetual dissident like his Wandering Jew.

The two translingual trajectories that I trace in this thesis lead from the historical fact and personal experience of exile – of banishment, as Said has emphasized – to a complex negotiation of the impossibility of return. Translingualism, in both of these cases, is linked with an internal exile: for Lind, the abandonment of the mother tongue is an expression of his rejection of his fatherland; for Heym, who returns to his native land, the use of a foreign language becomes a means of maintaining distance and constructing a hybrid identity. The crossing of linguistic borders, then, contributes to the creation of an identity that is unbound by national borders. Literary translingualism is therefore central to the current discussion of transnationalism as an emerging critical category: it is bound with the concerns of exile and migrancy, and illuminates specific tensions that are reflected in the growing body of transnational, diasporic literature.
2. In Other Words: 
Jakov Lind’s Translingual Autobiography

When Jakov Lind’s American editor suggested in 1969 that he write an autobiography, Lind had reservations. He was, he explained to his editor, a writer of fiction, and ‘[what] a writer of fiction has to say about himself, his text makes clear.’ His collection of stories *Eine Seele aus Holz* (1962) and the novels *Landschaft in Beton* (1963) and *Eine Bessere World* (1966) had created a certain stir in literary circles: while his works were, as he put it, ‘crushed […] with a thud’ by German and Austrian critics, their English translations were received with enthusiasm by English and American critics. Despite Lind’s initial reluctance, he recognized that an autobiography could afford him an opportunity ‘to look at [himself] from behind the image [he had] cultivated: writer, foreigner, cosmopolitan, Casanova, coffee-house bohemian, anti-intellectual intellectual.’ It would also be Lind’s first work in English: ‘[the] autobiography I loathed starting,’ he reflects, ‘would, to keep the subject at a distance, have to be written in English.’

The product of this resolution is a three-part autobiography. Two of its volumes were written shortly after Lind returned to England with a contract to write his memoirs. *Counting My Steps* was published in 1969 and recounts Lind’s childhood in Vienna, his escape to Holland after the *Anschluss* in 1938, and his extraordinary survival of the war under an assumed identity. *Numbers* (1972) charts Lind’s wanderings after the war, as he tries, and fails, to find his place first in Palestine and Israel, then in Europe. *Crossing* (1991), written two decades after the first autobiography, opens with Lind’s arrival in England in 1954, and chronicles his experiences in London and New York in the fifties and sixties, as he establishes himself as a professional writer.

---

This final volume ends with Lind writing the first, thereby creating, to borrow Steven Kellman’s term, a ‘self-begetting’ autobiography.6 Kellman describes the device of a self-begetting novel as ‘an account, usually first-person, of the development of a character to the point at which he is able to take up his pen and compose the novel we have just finished reading.’7 The self-begetting work thus ‘begets both a self and itself.’8 Perhaps the most famous instance of such a literary work is Marcel Proust’s In Search of Lost Time. The application of this term, originally used to describe a work of fiction, in the context of an autobiography highlights the difficulty of maintaining a strict generic distinction between autobiography and fiction. The tension between the factual status or truth-value of events in autobiography and their imaginative arrangement and the question whether autobiography transgresses generic categories or transcends them have figured prominently in the theoretical debates of autobiography studies.9 Robert Elbaz observes that most critiques of the genre adopt a paradoxical stance: ‘autobiography is an imaginative arrangement of the world, and at the same time it repeats experiences as they were lived.’10

Rather than trying to separate fact from fiction in Lind’s autobiography, this analysis will follow Louis Renza in viewing autobiography not strictly as fictive or non-fictive, but rather as a ‘unique, self-defining mode of self-referential expression, one that allows, then inhibits, the project of self-presentification, of converting oneself into the present promised by language.’11 Language is a central concern of Lind’s autobiography: this work, as Edward Timms observes, is ‘not designed to give a balanced picture of his personal development or his family life. The essential theme is the quest of a writer for a viable literary language.’12 The three volumes, in a circular move that parallels the begetting of the work and of the writer’s self, both chronicle this quest and embody its outcome as they

7 Kellman, p. 1245.
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signify the search in the viable language the author has chosen to adopt. Self and language are thus bound through the self-begetting structure of the work.

Creating a link between self and language in this way raises the question whether the self constructed in a new language is authentic. After all, writing one’s autobiography in a foreign language - a language in which the events described did not occur and which did not inform the consciousness recalling them – seems, to quote Elizabeth Klosty Beaujour, to ‘work against the logic of the subject matter and context.’¹³ Moreover, the attempt to make the self present in language seems doomed to fail. As Michael Ryan explains: ‘[the] self in autobiography must attempt to become its own other – as observer and as observed. However, autobiographical desire arises from the self’s lack of alterity, its non-otherness.’¹⁴ The paradoxical result is that the portrait of the self ‘is never entirely autobiographical’ because ‘it cannot afford the self the pure and total alterity which it desires.’¹⁵

All autobiography, then, can be said to exist in the interplay between self and other, between fact and fiction, past and present. Autobiographical writing always entails a degree of alienation: ‘we will find,’ Renza contends, ‘that even in the “heat” of writing, writing autobiographically seems to occlude the writer’s own continuity with the “I” being conveyed through his narrative performance.’¹⁶ The translingual autobiography, where the self is written in a foreign language, inherently contains the psychic distance required by the genre. Is it perhaps the ultimate medium for such writing, or is the alienation from the self so extreme that it undermines the purpose of the work?

Autobiography is a form of ordering, in which the author shapes, if not his life, then its representation in narrative form. In this sense, too, choosing to write in a foreign language can be seen as a radical form of control. In Lind’s case, the attempt to subjugate the past to his own will can be read as a poignant reaction to the circumstances that produced the life recounted: the war which robbed him of his home, his language, his family and his identity. This fundamental trauma is the force driving Lind to write – not only his autobiography, but also his fiction. Language is at the heart of the world that was lost in 1938. The German language had been a ‘private oasis to hide from this world, the only safe
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place [he] could retreat to when the world around had gone insane."\(^{17}\) But in ‘March ’38 this well of […] privacy in the universe was destroyed forever’ as the language became one ‘used to yell and scream at people with venom and hatred, with threats and murderous slogans, […] a language of decrees and curfews, inhuman laws and black-framed announcements, a language of lies and falsehood, of murder and death.’\(^{18}\) It is, perhaps, not surprising that language subsequently becomes more than a mode of communication: it is a means of survival, a refuge, and a tool for the creation of a new identity – that of a writer.

The linguistic switch to English allows Lind to forge an identity as a cosmopolitan, English-language writer at the end of the self-begetting autobiography. I aim to show that when read in terms of the psychological trauma that underlies it, the translingual move is revealed as more than a necessary distancing measure. Rather, it is an expression of a psychic split caused by the trauma of war and the loss of family and home. The false identity which Lind adopts during the war in order to survive becomes the first in a series of reinventions of the self: a process of splitting which brings about an erosion of identity. Lind applies the term schizophrenia to describe his mental condition; it is not used in a clinical sense in his autobiographical works, and my own reading in turn does not seek to diagnose a psychosis in Lind. However, I do draw on psychoanalytical theories of trauma and schizophrenia to suggest that the defense mechanism that enabled Lind to endure the war becomes a schizoid orientation in later life, and that the translingual self that is created by the process of splitting – the one that is writing the autobiography – represses a deep sense of personal loss: a loss that is articulated through its relationship with language.

***

\(^{17}\) Lind, *Numbers*, p. 75.

\(^{18}\) Lind, *Numbers*, p. 75.
Initiation in Language

*Counting My Steps* begins with Lind’s school days in Vienna, where Lind – then still Heinz Landwirth\(^{19}\) – learns to read and write. Writing is thus established, as Andrea Hammel argues, as ‘[one] of Lind’s meta-narratives,’\(^{20}\) and language, writing and personal history are linked from the outset. At this stage, writing is a difficult, sometimes frustrating task. Whereas ‘[maths] were learned in life,’\(^{21}\) in the straightforward everyday calculations of money earned and spent, writing is an art that is quite distinct from the intuitive uses of language in speech. ‘More interesting but not less difficult than figuring out how to live was writing,’ Lind recalls. ‘To learn to say A B C D E was easy, to put the letters together so as to make words out of them, highly complicated.’\(^{22}\)

Lind considers the arbitrariness of the written linguistic sign and its relationship with its referent:

> More difficult than copying was spelling. A single word has sometimes one and sometimes two syllables. To know when to break up a word and when to rejoin it was magic. Why some words had one and others two of the same letter, no one could explain. Why not sister if you felt like saying sister? I could annoy my elder sister in particular by writing her with two t’s.\(^{23}\)

Writing becomes an alchemy, in which the skilled practitioner joins letters and syllables to form meaningful words. The writer has the power to write someone – not just represent, but create him or her in language – and affect that person in reality through his artistic choices.

The young writer’s freedom is curtailed by the directives of his teacher, Mr. Hartl, whose strictness in matters of spelling and pedantry regarding the tidiness of the written page are linked to a particular political ideology: ‘The rule was made by Hartl and Hartl was always right. He was a dictator. In 1938, one of the first to wear a big swastika in his

\(^{19}\) Timms, p. 74. The full name Heinz Landwirth does not appear in Lind’s autobiogaphy.
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The battle-lines are drawn: the budding writer, with his imaginative disregard for rules and conventions, is pitted against the authoritarian figure of oppression, the teacher-Nazi.

Lind’s first encounter with the English language is recounted in the foreword to Crossing. At the primary school in Vienna, Lind is struck, once again, by the discrepancy between the spoken language and its written form. Yet the same phenomenon he noted when first learning to write German is interpreted in a radically different manner in relation to English. Recalling the song taught by a young man from the British Council – ‘John Brown had a little Indian’ – Lind reflects:

> Just to pronounce the John and the Brown, with a different sound for the same o, gave me the first inkling that across the sea […], in England and America, people speak words one way and write them quite differently. The question ‘why’ was dismissed by the English teacher. Illogical. Maybe that was the very essence of this new language; you write little with two ts but pronounce it like a d; the e at the end of little evaporates like candyfloss. Th was supposed to sound like s, but worst of all was the problem of o and e, i and u. The total disregard the teacher had for a consistent use of vowels impressed upon me that English was something even natives spoke inconsistently, and only according to their private whims.

The apparent arbitrariness of English orthography is represented as whimsical, a source of freedom and equality: ‘[because] of this discrepancy between spoken and written language, I had the impression that anyone could speak or write it; it was a free-for-all and not just made for Englishmen and Americans, Australians and Canadians.’ This generous, inclusive tendency of the language stands in stark contrast to the German language, which rejects Jews as it becomes a ‘Teutonic abyss of Achtungs and Wird erschosssens, which followed the Judenraus and Judasverrecke language.’ Whereas the rules of German, allegedly created by the hated teacher Hartl, are restrictive and oppressive, ‘English [seems] to know no rules,’ and the English teacher’s dismissal of questions regarding the inconsistency is ‘illogical’, but not malevolent. This ‘first taste from across the ocean,’ Lind

---
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writes, cultivated ‘a secret love for a language that codified [his] childish ideas of freedom and equality.’

This description of Lind’s early education in each of the languages that will become, in turn, his means of literary expression seems to explain the later switch to English as a natural choice. It posits an early affiliation with this language of freedom and tolerance: a fondness for the language that has been nurtured since childhood. This representation, however, may be misleading. Gunnthórunn Gudmundsdóttir suggests that autobiographies can ‘create the illusion that we are present to something that happened earlier’ when ‘autobiographers attempt to write from the viewpoint of the past.’ Yet this method of writing ‘implies fictionality, as we can never speak authoritatively from the past, […] as the past is always in one way or another already mediated.’

Thus Lind’s reconstruction of his schooldays takes into account events that he could only know in hindsight: the reference to Hartl as ‘this old Nazi’ anticipates the teacher’s future political affiliation, and is anachronistic with regard to the events described. Moreover, the English teacher’s lessons could not have taken place much later than Hartl’s lessons: both languages were taught at the primary school, which Lind attended until 1937, when he was ten years old. It seems unlikely that what is essentially the same phenomenon, the perceived irrationality of a writing system, inspired two radically different reactions – frustration with one language and enchantment with the other – in the child. More probably, this portrayal of language acquisition illustrates Renza’s claim that ‘the writer’s references to his past are subordinate to […] a narrative essentially representing the writer’s present self-identity’ and that ‘autobiography is the writer’s attempt to elucidate his present, not his past.’ In other words, Lind’s actual recollection of his first encounter with English is colored by his later attitude towards both German and English, and specifically by his feelings towards German which changed dramatically after 1938.

***
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Eva Hoffman’s autobiography *Lost in Translation* recounts the loss of her native tongue, Polish, after she immigrated to Canada as a child. Writing of her autobiography, she notes: ‘what I recognized more clearly in the last few years, and what has been demonstrated both in coolly impartial researches and movingly personal testimonies, is that the kind of relationship one develops with an acquired language is deeply influenced by the kind of bond one had with one’s mother or father tongue.’ 35 Indeed, Lind’s narrative establishes German, his mother tongue, as the language of the maternal, and links Austria inextricably with the figure of his father. Language and national identity are thus intimately associated with the home that was lost with the rise of Nazism, and become the focus of Lind’s later inner battles, as the private loss proves too painful for him to articulate.

Although Lind opens his autobiography with the formal acquisition of the written German language, he also provides, as Timms observes, another ‘very suggestive account of how that original language was acquired.’ 36 This process involved both his mother and the Landwirths’ maid, Mitzi, who plays a significant role in the infant’s initiation into language:

> She had taught me to call things by their name, a *Reindl*, a *Schweindl*, a *Heferl*, a *Tepp* (a pot, a pig, a cup, a stupid ass-in Viennese jargon). Without her I didn’t know what to say. Proceeded to look for words, could never get enough of them, ran around looking for Mitzi’s breasts to feed and her lap to ride on. 37

Mitzi is explicitly associated with a loving, nourishing form of language acquisition, and the language she gives the young Lind is colloquial Austrian German, a dialect Lind repeatedly refers to as his true language, as distinguished from the German variety of the language. The relationship with Mitzi is a very physical one: apart from feeding on her breasts, Lind recalls how ‘she let [him] ride her knees, warmed her naked body with [him] in her iron bedstead in the kitchen, and taught [him] by the way a few simple words.’ 38

---
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Mitzi’s function in Lind’s early emotional life is clear: ‘Mitzi was love. My mother had two other children to attend to as well.’ This crucial bond is broken abruptly when Mitzi leaves the family and the two-year-old Lind. The effect of this abandonment is devastating and long-lasting: ‘I still choke easily with fear, emotion, overfatigue, and when in the arms of large women,’ Lind reflects. The loss of the maternal figure is associated with a sensation of choking: a life-threatening, even if momentary, loss of the ability to breathe, but also an obstruction or malfunction of the organs of speech.

The recollection of Mitzi and her seminal role in Lind’s life occurs, quite unexpectedly, towards the end of Counting My Steps. Rather than linking Mitzi narratively with the acquisition of language in the beginning of the autobiography, Lind mentions her at a moment that is defined by his feeling that language is lost at the end of the war. Significantly, the section that refers to Mitzi begins with the trauma of abandonment: ‘When I was two, our maid Mitzi left and went back to her village on the Czech border of Lower Austria.’ The fact of Mitzi’s disappearance is repeated three more times in the next two pages, and the link between this loss and the loss of language is finally cemented, before Lind returns to discuss the loss of language: ‘In German my wish-dream rhymed. I made it rhyme with Mitzi’s departure.’

Lind’s mother complements the child’s linguistic growth by providing him ‘with a model of literary German’ through the poems she writes. This influence is mentioned only after – and in relation to – the strict teacher Hartl’s lessons in the beginning of Counting My Steps. ‘My mother kept several notebooks of her poems (in ink and pencil) under the sheets in the linen cupboard. We were allowed to read them, providing we put them back in their place, under the linen with lavender and mothballs.’ Hartl’s teachings are necessary for Lind to access ‘the milk of literature, from [his] Jewish, moral, respectable mother.’ Unlike the spontaneous, natural connection with Mitzi’s Austrian German, Lind’s relationship with
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his mother tongue is mediated through formal education: ‘Hartl, who forced me to read and write, taught me to read my mother’s poems and to copy them.’

‘I needed them both,’ Lind reflects, regarding the influences of Mitzi and his mother. Yet from this early stage, mother-tongue is associated not with the first instances of self-expression, but with a written language that is distanced, removed from real life, and somewhat contrived. The mother’s poems ‘[rhythm] with red and death, on life and tears’ and represent ‘the finer things of this world turning yellow under the mothballs.’ The tears and pains described in the poems are not authentic, but ‘[echo] what she had learnt from Goethe and Schiller and a few lesser lights of German fogginess.’ Although Lind’s literary education begins with copying these poems, wanting ‘to be able to write poems just like her and if possible better,’ he later rejects them as ‘platitudes in the cupboard’ that complement the ‘repetition of irrelevancies at school.’

It is primarily the High German, or Hochdeutsch, the language of culture and literature, that Lind rejects later on. He considers it the ‘cultural infrastructure which erected the hell of our mid-twentieth-century tragedy.’ This rarefied upper-class language of poets and thinkers masked the true voice of the people, the Volksstimme, which was ‘much more sinister’ and which, as Lind learned it on the streets of Vienna, ‘taught [him] alertness.’ Austrian remains in Lind’s mind distinct from German and provides a sense of belonging, if only a tenuous one. After his evacuation from Austria on a Kindertransport in 1938, Lind still feels attached to his homeland, and his love-hate relationship with the country will haunt him in later life.

If the bond with the Austrian language is linked with the maternal as represented by Mitzi, Lind’s complex relationship with Austria, and particularly Vienna, can be linked to his intricate, sometimes inconsistent representation of his father. Simon Landwirth ‘was a Viennese businessman without much business in the world. Half Luftmensch and half duke,’
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Lind describes his father. He was born in Rabka in the Zakopane on the Polish side of the Tatra Mountains, an hour’s drive from the Czech border. A real Austrian. Landwirth arrived in Vienna around 1895, and “long before the big stream of war refugees arrived from the East, he was already “an old Viennese” and not a little proud of that.

Lind claims that he cannot recall many ‘special virtues’ in his father: “all I can remember are his generosity and unusual good humour.” Although Lind portrays his father as a rather unremarkable man – “[he] was an ordinary father, an ordinary Viennese” he emphasizes the emotional impact of their bond and links it with his bond to the city of his childhood. “I loved my father and my “fatherland”. Even now, after thirty years, when I curse and ridicule Vienna and the Viennese at the slightest provocation, I know I am in love with the town. I’m in love with my hatred.” The father’s association with Vienna is almost paradoxical: “my father was more Viennese than almost anyone I ever met and only because he was Jewish and was not born in the capital,” Lind writes in Crossing. As for himself, he asserts: “I was born in Vienna and am Jewish, but I am not Viennese, nor for that matter an Austrian Jew.”

The love-hate relationship with Vienna is a recurrent theme in the autobiography, as Lind moves between the polarities of his connection with the city and his wish to detach himself from it. After the Anschluss, Vienna, the father’s city, and Austria, the fatherland, can no longer provide a home for Lind. His departure from Austria in December 1938 on a Kindertransport train to Holland marks the break from all that defined his childhood and identity: family, land and language. The Kindertransports were a rescue operation in which some 10,000 children aged between two and 17 were brought from Germany and Austria to Britain through Holland between December 1938 and September 1939. Of these, some
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The children were ‘supposed to find a temporary or permanent new homeland while they hoped for a reunion with their parents,’ writes Wolfgang Benz. ‘Nine out of ten did so in vain.’

***

**Trauma: Separation and War**

It seems that during the war, a form of psychic splitting occurs in Lind that can, when read in the light of psychoanalytical theories, be identified as a defense mechanism against trauma. Laplanche and Pontalis describe trauma as ‘[an] event in the subject’s life defined by its intensity, by the subject’s incapacity to respond adequately, and by the upheaval and long-lasting effects that it brings about in the psychical organization.’ The trauma that is portrayed in the autobiography is, however, more complex: it comprises a series of events and weaves the personal trauma of loss of family and home into a more recognizable account of war trauma. In fact, Lind privileges the historical – the trauma of war – when explaining the root of a schizophrenic condition he self-diagnoses in the course of his narrative. Using psychoanalytical theories of trauma and of schizophrenia, I will argue that Lind’s account of the trauma of war attempts to repress, but ultimately reveals, the trauma of a deeper, more hidden separation from the maternal, through which his complex relationship to language can be more fully grasped.

Andrea Hammel’s study of five autobiographies by former child refugees evacuated to Britain via the Kindertransport charts structural and thematic similarities between the texts. Lind’s *Counting My Steps* seems to correspond with these autobiographies structurally, as, like them, it begins chronologically, presenting ‘the family background of the birth parents’ and describing ‘life briefly before and after the start of Nazi persecution.’ After the separation from the parents, however, *Counting My Steps* strikingly diverges from
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the pattern observed in the other child-refugee autobiographies. Hammel notes that the period immediately after the children’s arrival in Britain is ‘marked not only by trying to cope with their environment but also by constant thoughts about their birth parents left behind.’68 Letters from the parents ‘are an important part of this engagement with them’ and the moment ‘when it becomes impossible to write proper letters after the outbreak of the war is commented on in all four texts.’69

By contrast, reflections about his family in the aftermath of his evacuation are conspicuously absent from Lind’s narrative. The moment of Lind’s departure is marked by defiant Zionist sentiments which seem incongruous in the context of an eleven-year-old child’s separation from his parents:

In December ’38 a train left for the Hook of Holland. There would be delays, unnecessary stops, certain difficulties, but “If I forget thee Jerusalem may my right hand wither.” Embroidered on a silken white and blue flag around the golden Star of David, these words I repeated every night instead of the evening prayer my mother had taught me.70

The tone seems matter-of-fact, and the difficulties are understated: there are no tearful farewells, no fears of the uncertain future. That Lind’s mother is mentioned only in relation to Zionism, the ideology that apparently supplants her, is even more startling given that Lind would never see her again. When he finally fulfils his Zionist dream after the war and is reunited with his father and sisters in Palestine, Lind learns that his mother had died there in 1941.

Ute Benz, writing about the psychological impact of separation from family and home and focusing on the Kindertransports, argues that of ‘the numerous aspects that should be considered in all kinds of loss […], the aspect of separation from the person of reference is central.’71 Benz maintains that in psychological research and literature, ‘issues of separation are concentrated very much on the family and mother-child relationship and are therefore virtually isolated from the political historical and collective context, giving the
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impression that politics and history had no impact on individual and family."\(^{72}\) She suggests that this separation of the private, individual trauma from a wider political and historical context is ‘an expression of individual and collective resistance to making associations that some would rather forget.'\(^{73}\)

It seems that Lind reverses this tendency in his account of his own life: fusing the collective and historical with the private and personal, even allowing the former to supplant the latter. The specific manner in which the private is associated with the historical repeatedly elides – or represses – Lind’s intimate relationships. Thus, when Lind reflects on the fate of the Viennese Jews, he writes sardonically: ‘We probably lost only eighty-four uncles, aunts, and cousins in the last war. That’s all.’\(^{74}\) Hammel reads this statement as ‘a desperate attempt to detach himself from the grief lest it interfere with his self-styled heroic persona, or as a parody of heroism and an ironic treatment of the illusion of complete agency and survival.’\(^{75}\) Significantly, Lind provides this information at the close of the first part of *Counting My Steps*, immediately after the account of his own evacuation. This reference, hinting at the immense tragedy that is both historical and personal, marks the end of a narrative phase. From that point on, Lind chooses to tell the story of his war, as he puts it in *Crossing*,\(^{76}\) and the narrative is, as Hammel observes, ‘composed as a success story,’ with only ‘very few references to his personal loss.’\(^{77}\)

In its repression of Lind’s personal pain, *Counting My Steps* does not follow the conventional treatment of suffering and loss, especially the loss of family, in autobiographies by former child-refugees. Lore Segal,\(^{78}\) who was evacuated from Vienna at the age of ten, recalls her overwhelming grief writing her first letter to her parents from the home of her English foster family: ‘I cradled my head in my hands and planted my elbows on my knees and let homesickness overcome me as one might draw up a blanket to cover one’s head. […] Once, I came to as if with the wearing off of a drug that left me sober and
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\(^{74}\) Lind, *CMS*, p. 58.
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\(^{78}\) Lore’s Segal’s book, *Other People’s Houses*, is at once a novel and a memoir, as she explains in the preface: ‘If I want to trace the present from the occurrences of the past I must do it in the manner of a novelist. I posit myself as protagonist in the autobiographical action.’ Lore Segal, *Other People’s Houses* (London: Victor Golancz, 1965), p. xiii.
sorrowless in a strange room.” Lind does not share such feelings with his readers. Instead, he describes his first nine months in the Netherlands as ‘kind of prolonged sleep before the real war would start.’

While the private experience of loss is strikingly absent from one strand of Lind’s account, the personal aspect of the trauma emerges in another, and startlingly contrasts with the relationship between personal and historical outlined by Benz, in which politics and history are represented as having no impact on individual and family. Although the young Lind is almost oblivious to the German invasion of Holland, he feels he ‘might even have caused it by an act of pure magic.’ The invasion coincides with his first successful masturbation. He ignores ‘all kinds of stories’ about the perilous consequences of masturbation, and his sexual fantasies lead him to his sisters – one of the rare times they are mentioned in the narrative; he pushes back the thought that his act is ‘obscene, disgusting, forbidden.’ The next morning, Lind awakes to the news of the invasion.

Well, there it was. Neither madness, nor blindness. Not the loss of teeth but much worse. Behind the privacy of closed eyes there is a vision of paradise. Take two steps across and you are at the entrance of hell. Try to dissolve for a few moments into non-existence and reality will roar at you with insane fury. Sexual pleasure is a prelude for agony. While I was still floating in a strange, new, wonderful experience, the war invaded my sex fantasies, jumped down on me with the news of parachutists.

Andrea Hammel sees the preoccupation with sexuality as Lind’s ‘way of personalizing outside events.’ His account of his first sexual intercourse on the day the Nazis round up the Jews in Amsterdam is interpreted as ‘[sexual] prowess […] mingled with the defiance of the survivor.’ Yet the passage quoted above suggests another, less benign defense mechanism may be at work, especially when read in terms of Sigmund Freud’s theory of the splitting of the ego. According to Freud, ‘under the influence of psychical trauma,’ a subject’s ego may be faced with a ‘powerful instinctual demand’ whose
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satisfaction may result in ‘an almost intolerable real danger.’

Instead of resolving the conflict between the instinctual demand and the prohibition by reality by choosing one of the courses of action available to him – renouncing the instinctual satisfaction or disavowing reality – the subject takes both simultaneously. ‘On the one hand, with the help of certain mechanisms he rejects reality and refuses to accept any prohibition; on the other hand, in the same breath he recognizes the danger of reality, takes over the fear of that danger […] and tries subsequently to divest himself of the fear.’

The coexistence of the two reactions comes ‘at the price of a rift in the ego which never heals but which increases as time goes on.’

The dualism is apparent in Lind’s account: the sexual act is described as an internal vision of paradise, a momentary retreat from the hell of the outside world, but also as a prelude to agony that is incapable of withstanding the ravages of reality. The act is at once an expression of life-force, but also an attempt to dissolve into non-existence, and the danger it involves is far-reaching: rather than the clichéd threats of madness or blindness, sexual satisfaction brings about nothing less than the war. This description of Lind’s withdrawal from reality through sex and the perceived catastrophic result is in keeping with symptoms of regression in schizophrenia. Indeed, Otto Fenichel, following Freud, observes that fantasies of destruction are ‘frequently met with in the early stages of schizophrenia.’

The destruction that Lind observes is not, however, a fantasy: it is the very real devastation brought about by the war. Schizophrenia, a term Lind himself employs to describe his mental state as he struggles to survive the war and later in the post-war years, is not used as a clinical term in the context of the autobiography. Nevertheless, psychoanalytical theories describing the etiology and development of schizophrenia can be helpful in reading Lind’s autobiography – not in an attempt to diagnose a psychosis, but to show how Lind himself posits a schizoid mental organization as a defense against the trauma of war, and to explore how he constructs schizoid mechanisms as part of his narrative in relation to language.

89 Freud, ‘Splitting’, p. 276.
Ruth Leys, in her analysis of the concept of trauma, traces the sometimes conflicting approaches to the definition and treatment of trauma.⁹¹ Freud’s writings on the subject, Leys shows, reveal an unresolved tension between the theory of psychosexual desire and the economic theory that is used to explain traumatic war neuroses.⁹² The economic model (as outlined in Beyond the Pleasure Principle) explains trauma as a ‘rupture or breach in the ego’s protective shield’ due to excessive external stimuli,⁹³ which leads to a ‘radical “unbinding” of the death drive’ in an effort to defend the ego.⁹⁴ The psychosexual or libidinal paradigm (in Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety) suggests that war neurosis does not come into being ‘merely because of the objective presence of danger, without any participation of the deeper levels of mental functioning,’ and that the ‘fear of death should be regarded as analogous to the fear of castration,’ which invokes repression as a defense mechanism.⁹⁵

Although war neurosis is central to Freud’s account of trauma, his theory of the splitting of the ego in the 1938 paper focuses on psychosexual desire, and cannot therefore be used to explain the role of external trauma – the war – on the forms of psychic splitting that develop in Lind’s writing. Other theories of traumatic neuroses and schizophrenia are needed to supplement Freud. In the first place, the concept of trauma can be extended, following Hans Keilson’s study of the effects of Nazi persecution on Jewish children, ‘from an event which apparently occurs only once and suddenly, causing a shock to the emotional system and damage to the psychic “apparatus”, to the “traumatic situation”, associated with chronic, extreme psychological stress.’⁹⁶ Keilson’s study, which was started in 1967 and took ten years to complete, was a follow-up examination of the effect of what he termed
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⁹² Against this tension between Freud’s two explanations of traumatic neurosis – the theory of neurosis as a reaction to external danger versus its explanation as a consequence of repressed desire – Leys posits another dual paradigm: the mimetic and antimimetic theories of trauma. In this distinction, the mimetic theory assumes the victim’s identification with the aggressor, whereas the antimimetic theory depicts the traumatic event as an assault from without. The mimetic theory sees the traumatic event as an extreme that cannot become part of the patient’s memory system; traumatic memory involves a ‘kind of hypnotic imitation or identification’ (p. 298) in which the patient acts out, rather than remembers, the traumatic event. In the antimimetic theory, the reliving of the traumatic situation under hypnosis is perceived ‘not as a dramatic mimesis but as a verbalization or diegesis’ (p. 37), and the patient is capable of distancing himself or herself from the traumatic scene.
⁹³ Leys, p. 23.
⁹⁴ Leys, p. 24.
⁹⁵ Leys, p. 28.
‘sequential traumatization’ – the ‘long-term, successive traumatic experiences’ to which Jewish children who had survived in hiding in the Netherlands were subjected.\textsuperscript{97} According to Ute Benz, Jewish war orphans examined immediately after the war gave the impression that ‘in general the psychological reversion with all its pathogenic consequences was more significant than the physical,’ and Keilson’s findings show the long-term psychological effects of the traumatic situation, ‘[destroying] the naïve belief that after 1945 the suffering came to an end.’\textsuperscript{98} Lind expresses this lasting impact, referring to his own experience: ‘Can one say “Thank you” for being alive and cursed forever to explain existence as the result of an assumed identity? I don’t even know if I am back from the war. This war has never ended.’\textsuperscript{99}

The association of the deeply personal – Lind’s sexuality – with historical events continues, as Hammel points out: Lind has sexual intercourse for the first time on the day the Jews of Amsterdam are rounded up by the Nazis. As the raids draw near Lind’s house and his foster family prepares to hide in the attic, he goes to see a young married woman, Ilse, whose sexual appetite has become legendary among Lind’s peers. As Lind waits for her to undress in the adjacent room, the anxiety over his sexual performance mingles with, and overcomes, the fear of what is happening outside, on the streets. ‘The situation had reached the end phase. Mine in particular. A few minutes, maybe ten or fifteen, and I would have to face the ultimate test. I was not going to die in a concentration camp because I was never going to go there anyway.’\textsuperscript{100} The sexual encounter becomes, in Lind’s mind, a heroic and fatal task: ‘because I was a hero, a Trumpeldor,\textsuperscript{101} a Tarzan or Tom Mix, I had to face it. I

\textsuperscript{97} Ute Benz, p. 194.
\textsuperscript{98} Ute Benz, p. 195. In her discussion of the trauma of separation, Benz also draws on Anna Freud’s work at the Hampstead War Nurseries with children evacuated from their homes during the German bombardments of London. Benz notes the parallels between the experiences of these children and those of Kindertransport children, but this discussion is beyond the scope of this chapter. (Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham, Infants without Families: Reports on the Hampstead Nurseries 1939-1945 (London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1974)).
\textsuperscript{100} Lind, CMS, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{101} Russian-born Joseph Trumpeldor (1880-1920), who had been a decorated officer in the Russian army and lost an arm in the Russo-Japanese war, went on to become a Zionist activist and a Zionist folk hero. Trumpeldor led the establishment of a Jewish corps in the British Army during WWI. The Zion Mule Corps were ‘allowed to wear their own shoulder flashes bearing the Shield of David’ (Howard M. Sachar, A History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to our Time (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), p. 91.). His death in 1920 in the battle of Tel Hai, a Jewish settlement in the Galilee, elevated him to a near mythic stature, as a paragon of heroism and self-sacrifice. His last words are popularly reported to have been: ‘Never mind, it is good to die for one’s country.’
had to go through with it. There will be no need to hide under an attic at five, in half an hour or so she will have killed me [...] and if she won’t, her husband, who had to be back at any moment, would.¹⁰² Unlike the earlier masturbatory act, the satisfaction here is not purely physical, but involves a fantasy of becoming a fallen hero:

[A] few moments, and I died in the park, on my stomach, with eyes closed, just like the man in the Resistance. [...] White strips of bandage around my forehead, a hero executed, I rose from the ground, buttoned away this goddamned prick that had given me nothing but anxieties, and took my jacket. ¹⁰³

Whereas masturbation involves such feelings of shame and guilt that in young Lind’s mind the war itself is perceived as punishment, sexual intercourse with a woman becomes more than an adolescent assertion of manhood. Through it Lind is transformed from the source of calamity into a self-sacrificing hero. The references to childhood heroes such as Tarzan and Tom Mix, the American star of Western movies, reminds that this manly savior is, to an extent, still a child. The passage, however, also suggests a further development of the schizoid mechanism, as Fenichel observes: ‘In the same way that fantasies of world destruction are characteristic of the earlier stages of schizophrenia, various fantasies of reconstruction frequently occur in later stages. They consist [...] of delusions that the patient himself has the task of saving the world.’¹⁰⁴

This death and resurrection as a Resistance man foreshadow another symbolic death during the war, when Lind works in Germany under an assumed identity and repeatedly survives the threat of allied bombings, which wreak devastation on German towns. In one of the air-raids in the town of Giessen, he decides not to help a legless German in an SS uniform to reach shelter. This decision marks, for Lind, an emotional death, as his capacity for human relations is quashed. ‘My compassion for all human beings has ceased to be the essence, the humour, of my life,’ he writes.¹⁰⁵ Lind’s description of this sensation has strong echoes of depersonalization, another schizophrenic symptom, in which, as Fenichel explains, ‘[certain] organs, body areas, or the whole of the body are perceived as if they did
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not belong to the person, or at least as if they were not quite the same as usual.”

Lind describes the feeling:

Squeezed out of its shell, the mind leaves the body and you die with whom you wish
dead. The bombs had been my constant birth and rebirth, the man in the green uniform on
a stretcher killed me […] with the magic of a death-skull. He might have been the only
man I willfully killed. Had I done it with a gun in my hand, I might not have died
myself.”

After this incident, Lind feels ‘he [has] no fear left.’ Death becomes ‘a way of life,’ and it takes Lind twenty-five years to find out he was ‘killed’ in that air-raid.

The feeling of disembodiment Lind describes and the numbing of emotions are in
keeping with phenomena of dissociation or splitting that were observed by physicians and
psychiatrists treating soldiers suffering from war neurosis during the First World War.

W. H. R. Rivers identifies dissociation as a process in which a suppressed experience ‘acquires
an independent activity’ and this activity ‘carries with it independent consciousness.’

Rivers, however, stresses that the symptoms observed in war neuroses are the result of repression: ‘the attempt to banish from the mind distressing memories of warfare or painful
affective states which have come into being as the result of […] war experience.’

Yet unlike traumatized soldiers returning from the battlefield, Lind does not seem to wish to
repress the memory of the air-raid, painful though it may be, or the memory of other
experiences directly related to the war.

In contrast with Rivers’s emphasis on the primary role of repression, other
psychiatrists, Leys shows, maintain that psychical splitting of the ego in traumatic neuroses
occurs ‘prior to, or independently of, any mechanism of repression.’ Sandor Ferenczi, for
instance, posits that ‘there is neither shock nor fright without some trace of splitting of

106 Fenichel, p. 419.
108 Lind, CMS, p. 142.
109 Lind, CMS, p. 142.
110 Lind, CMS, p. 142.
111 Leys, p. 91.
112 W. H. R. Rivers, Instinct and the Unconscious: A Contribution to a Biological Theory of the Psycho-
113 Rivers, p. 187.
114 Leys, p. 92.
personality."\textsuperscript{115} The key to the split for Ferenczi, Leys notes, is an imitation or identification with the aggressor.\textsuperscript{116} As Ferenczi argues in ‘Confusion of Tongues,’ when the victim recovers from an attack, ‘he feels enormously confused, in fact, split – innocent and culpable at the same time – and his confidence in the testimony of his own senses is broken.’\textsuperscript{117} Thus Lind feels a complex identification with the SS soldier: he himself becomes an aggressor through his refusal to save the soldier, his inaction becoming agency rather than mere observation. This agency is far from empowering. Unlike Trumpeldor or the Resistance fighter of Lind’s fantasies, this contradictory, passive killing places Lind again as the victim of the soldier, who has managed to kill him almost magically, by sapping his humanity.

Another aspect of Ferenczi’s theory of war neuroses becomes highly suggestive in the context of Lind’s autobiography. Leys notes that as war neuroses ‘brought into prominence again the very phenomenon of dissociation or splitting,’\textsuperscript{118} they ‘came to be thematized – notably by psychoanalyst Sandor Ferenczi and by Freud – as a repetition of the child’s earlier reaction to the threatened loss or disappearance of the maternal figure.’\textsuperscript{119} Arguably, the mental content that is repressed and becomes inaccessible in Lind’s retelling of his life is his personal loss, and particularly the separation from his mother – the most significant tie severed by the war. This loss was prefigured, as discussed earlier, by the sudden departure of Mitzi the maid: a traumatic memory that returns within the narrative after the war, and is associated with the loss of language – the mother tongue.

***

**Splitting as Survival**

In Lind’s narrative, the traumatic splitting of identity seems to develop into a coping strategy that defines his life during and after the war. Between the fantasy of heroic death and the spiritual death in the air raid, there is a series of rebirths and a continual erosion of the sense of identity: a process compounded by the fact that Lind needed to assume and
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maintain a false identity in order to survive the war. When he emerges from his hiding place after the raid in Amsterdam, Lind dresses up as a Dutch Nazi and travels to the offices of the Zionist Pioneers, where he obtains the false papers that will transform him into a Dutch laborer.

From the street where I had lived a few months previously as an Austrian emigrant and Jew, born in Vienna 10th February 1927, I left in the body of one Jan Gerrit Overbeek, born in Aalten, province of Gelderland, on 7th January 1926. I was no longer an Aquarius, but now twice born.  

While the body is that of the Dutch man Overbeek, the Austrian Jew Lind is still alive within him. Unlike the splitting of the ego described by Freud, where two ‘psychical attitudes towards external reality’ coexist within the ego, this split – necessitated by external reality – adds a new dimension as it brings about a false self that must mask the real one. It is a split that Lind is fully aware of, and is willing to embrace as a strategy for survival in a world where reality and sanity have lost their meaning. ‘It’s insane to walk about freely when you are supposed to be sitting in some camp,’ Lind comments on this condition. ‘Insane maybe, but it also makes one contented and happy to be that insane. Schizophrenia did not hurt for a change. To be schizophrenic is to be normal; unreality is reality. I was both. Overbeek for the world and J.L. for this other world.’

As Overbeek, Lind works on a river barge which, like most Dutch boats, had been taken over by German firms. There, ‘sailing under the flag of a false self,’ Lind acts the part he has adopted while retreating to an internal world, confined to the mind as thinking becomes his only ‘freedom to be [himself].’ The withdrawal of the self from reality and the creation of false selves that interact with the objective world become strategies that are allied more closely with the schizoid mechanism described by R. D. Laing than with traumatic war neurosis. Laing distinguishes the ‘mask’ that every person wears in
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126 Laing was a neighbour and friend of Lind’s when Lind lived in Belsize Gardens, London, with his wife and children. In Crossing Lind recalls that Laing was one of the friends who ‘steered [him] away from German-Jewish topics, of which [he] knew just too much, while they knew just too little, towards wider horizons – to the brain, the mind, inner space (as it was soon to be called), to the madness locked within.’ (Crossing, p. 77).
ordinary life from the false self of the schizoid individual. The false self ‘arises in compliance with the intentions or expectations of the other, or with what are imagined to be the other’s intentions or expectations.’ In the schizoid person, the ‘basic split in his being is along the line of cleavage between his outward compliance and his inner withholding of compliance.’ Thus, as Overbeek, Lind fulfills the expectations of his surroundings, while secretly and defiantly retreating to the inner world of ‘J.L.’. As the false-self persona develops, the real self becomes progressively detached from it. All interactions with others are increasingly delegated to the false self; instead of a creative relationship with an other, the split self is capable only of a ‘quasi it-it interaction.’ Consequently, ‘the world is experienced as unreal.’

According to Laing, when the false-self system is a temporary schizoid mechanism employed by a ‘normal’ individual in a situation that is perceived as ‘threatening to his being,’ it is expected to be reversed once the threat is eliminated. For Lind, the end of the war does not mark a return to his former identity. Instead, the psychic split he depicts in his writing appears to develop into the type of false-self system or ‘schizoid organization,’ that becomes ‘a basic orientation to life.’

Indeed, Jan Overbeek has become more than a mask from behind which Heinz Landwirth operates. This persona, which originated as an intermediary between Landwirth the Austrian Jew and the world, takes over the first self, supplants it and alienates it from the world. An increasing sense of loss of reality ensues, and as he feels his body – the ostensibly objective reality of his physical being – as divorced from his mind, Lind comes to question his very existence.

Physicists might well conclude that my very special peculiar existence in the flea-ridden straw of the Matthias Stinnes is a natural phenomenon. I didn’t think so at the time. I thought I had fallen out of all spheres and beyond and underneath all levels. I was not
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While Overbeek functions in everyday life almost like an automaton – carrying out a ‘dreary routine of washing the boat, “splitting” ropes, cleaning out holds and making meals’, something ‘goes on underneath that may have taken only minutes to crystallize but has never dissolved. The feeling that I am something or someone special. Out of all worlds, a world of my own.’

Again there are striking resonances between this retreat of the self inwards and the process of dissociation observed by Rivers, where an ‘independent consciousness’ is identified as operating alongside ‘the consciousness of normal, waking life.’ In Laing’s model of the schizoid condition, the self, divorced form the body, delegates the direct relationship with people and things to the false-self system which incorporates the body, so that both body and the other become alien, unreal and dead. When the war ends and Lind sheds the identity of Jan Overbeek, he experiences not only a mental, but a physical breakdown. At a transit camp for survivors of the war, as others around him celebrate their imminent return home, Lind feels “even too sick to talk.” As he leans against the tree, trying to control the vomiting and diarrhea that convulse him, he is terrified: ‘Life is flowing out of me, I am dissolving. I don’t think I will survive the peace.’ He concludes that, unlike the ailments that afflict the camp survivors around him, his problem is not a physical one: ‘I am not well and I have a problem with identity.’

***
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**A Linguistic Split**

Returning to the key theme of language, it is possible to see how the psychic divisions and the consequent destabilization of the sense of reality are closely associated in the autobiography with the need to abandon the mother tongue. Although translingualism is initially a means of survival, it becomes another form of splitting in Lind’s narrative. As Jan Overbeek, Lind no longer uses his native language, but needs to communicate in a foreign language: Dutch. Former child refugees, Andrea Hammel observes, refer in their autobiographies to their difficulties with the acquisition of their new language.\(^{142}\) Hannele Zürndorfer, in *The Ninth of November*, ‘describes her first days at school as “like being deaf-mute in a busy crowd”.’\(^{143}\) Lore Segal, who had studied English at school in Vienna, describes the stress of preparing for an introduction to the mayor of Dovercourt shortly after her arrival in England: ‘That night I lay for hours in a waking nightmare. The more I worked on my speech for the Mayor, the fewer English words I seemed to know.’\(^{144}\) Eva Hoffman, though not a refugee but a teenage Polish immigrant in Canada, describes her encounter with the new language: “Shut up, shuddup,” the children around us are shouting, and it’s the first word in English that I understand from its dramatic context. [...] I can’t imagine wanting to talk their harsh-sounding language.’\(^{145}\)

By contrast, Lind’s depiction of his relationship with Dutch is positive: ‘I learned to speak Dutch within a very short time, which I loved,’\(^{146}\) he recalls, and feels comfortable enough with the language to keep a journal in Dutch throughout the war. Nonetheless, as Mary Besemeres argues in her study of the experiences of bilingual writers, ‘[natural] languages do not lend themselves to compartmentalization, because each makes a “call for totality”. Hence the conflict between them has the potential to split the person in two.’\(^{147}\) Besemeres cites as an example of this tension Tzvetan Todorov’s description of his relationship to his languages, the native Bulgarian and acquired French: ‘My twin affiliation
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produces but one effect: in my own eyes it renders inauthentic each of my two modes of
discourse, since each can correspond to but half of my being.’\textsuperscript{148} Lind himself reports
feelings of fragmentation which, by the end of the war, leave him with ‘no language.’\textsuperscript{149}
Despite his easy adjustments to changes in his linguistic environment, he finds himself in 1945 with ‘an antiquated Austrian, a fluent bargeman’s Dutch, and a few sentences in every other European language,’ and has ‘difficulties expressing even the simplest sentence. [He] couldn’t make plausible what [he] had to tell.’\textsuperscript{150}

Thus, language itself becomes the locus of a private, internal battle, as Lind seeks a
language he can write in. For Lind the German language acquires a monstrous connotation:
‘German gave me the creeps and there was no use in arguing this. […] [It] had nothing to do
with the people who wrote and write it – as it wasn’t what they \textit{said}, but that they said it \textit{in}
\textit{German}.’\textsuperscript{151} Content, in this description, becomes secondary to form as the very language
used obscures the meaning of the words uttered. This may be described as a rupture in the
linguistic sign, which signals a destabilization of reality on yet another level. Ferdinand de Saussure defines the linguistic sign as a ‘combination of a concept and a sound pattern,’\textsuperscript{152} two elements whose relationship he describes as arbitrary. Emile Benveniste, elaborating on
the nature of the linguistic sign, maintains that the link between the two components of the
sign is in fact necessary, since ‘[together] the two are imprinted on my mind, together they
evoke each other under any circumstance.’\textsuperscript{153} For a speaker, a concept cannot occur without
its sound pattern or name, for thought does not occur before language.

As signifier and signified seem to have already separated in his mind, Lind’s solution
is to tear them further apart, in order to detach himself from his native language and find a
language he can write in. He is aware of the difficulty and danger that this endeavor entails:

\begin{quote}
Madder than anything was to think I could ever unlearn sounds I knew by heart and
kidneys and replace them with other and better sounds. To do that, I had to try to go back
\end{quote}
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in time before I knew any language, back into a near autistic state of mind that communicates on a level of la-la.\textsuperscript{155}

Indeed, by fusing the English expression ‘by heart’ with the German combination ‘heart and kidneys,’ which resonates with the German idiom ‘auf Herz und Nieren prüfen,’\textsuperscript{156} Lind enacts and illustrates the impossibility of unlearning a language and replacing it altogether.

Returning to a pre-linguistic state is Lind’s attempt to wipe the slate clean and rebuild his internal world. This regression – and Lind is ‘conscious it [is] a regression’\textsuperscript{157} – is necessary for a pure language to emerge. While Lind may seek purity in the sense of a language untainted by the trauma of the war, his formulation – ‘I had to replace the private with the universal’\textsuperscript{158} – seems to echo Walter Benjamin’s notion of a pure language. In every language as a whole, Benjamin maintains, ‘one and the same thing is meant. Yet this one thing is achievable not by any single language but only by the totality of their intentions supplementing one another: the pure language.’\textsuperscript{159} The universal language – the word of God or the language of Paradise, as he calls it in ‘On Language as Such and on the Language of Man’\textsuperscript{160} – precedes and underlies the plurality of languages, which is a result of the Fall.\textsuperscript{161}

Lind’s project, however, reveals itself as more ambitious even than accessing an original, universal language. Perhaps not believing in the existence of such a language, he intends to create one:

\begin{quote}
I had to learn to make my own private language, which I then could apply in any tongue.
I had to discover my own references to things, people and ideas, which I would afterward.
\end{quote}
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be able to express in any language, even Chinese and Swahili. My Chinese and Swahili was English. 162

As a multilingual speaker, it is perhaps not surprising that Lind views self-translation into any language a possibility. For him, one element of reality in the world can be linked to multiple linguistic signs. What Edward Sapir terms the illusory feeling of naturalness of language is thus broken. 163 The reality of language, which, Benveniste observes, ‘as a general rule, remains unconscious,‘164 is brought to the fore in a ‘conscious awareness of option,‘165 as Beaujour explains, and the choice between systems of representation underscores their relativity. One of the consequences of this freedom is a ‘sensation that there is a space‘166 between the different languages the multilingual speaker masters, and more importantly, a ‘conviction that there is a physical distance between thought and expression.‘167 When he exists in this perceived gap, the multilingual writer is ‘distanced in both his use of language to communicate with the outside world, and, even more important, in his internal conversations with himself.‘168 Indeed, Lind describes that while searching for his private language, ‘in practice […]he existed in a permanent state of mess and disorder, in a primordial chaos, without the ordering soothing creative energy of words.‘169

***

Homeless in the Jewish Homeland

The theme of homelessness emerges as central to Lind’s struggle to redefine his identity. The question of language is therefore inseparable from that of nationhood. In the aftermath of the war, Lind cannot find his place: ‘J.L. is by nationality Austrian but probably stateless by now,’ he writes. ‘There is no one left in Vienna and I can’t live again in
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Amsterdam. The only solution, he resolves, is to make his way to Palestine, where his parents are. The prospect of reuniting with his parents is not the only reason behind Lind’s decision to immigrate to Palestine: ‘I was a veteran Zionist,’ he writes. ‘Palestine wasn’t just any country for me. Palestine was home.’ The decision to go to Palestine involves another shift in identity: because of the immigration quotas imposed by the British rule in Palestine at the time, Lind needs to reinvent himself again. ‘I translate my name into what I think is Hebrew,’ he recalls his registration for identity papers, ‘and say, “my name is Jakov Chaklan, born on the 10th of February in Haifa, which makes me Palestinian.”’

The voyage from Naples to Haifa is filled with hope and triumphant thoughts. ‘I felt I was part of the defeated remnants of an expeditionary force making our way back slowly to an ancestral shrine,’ Lind reflects. Contemplating the fate of Jews, the hatred that pursues them wherever they live, Lind feels himself vindicated, strengthened: ‘I am still alive – and my enemy Hitler had to commit suicide.’ Zionism is ‘the rebirth of every single Jew,’ and for Lind, as he views the coastline from the boat, his own being is inextricably bound with the country: ‘If Palestine exists, so do I.’ The experience of the passengers on the boat nearing the Promised Land is ‘near hysteria’ as they are overwhelmed by a sense of ownership and belonging no other land can provide.

Mark H. Gelber reads the description of the voyage as a positive and unequivocal identification with Zionist ideology. Indeed, the passage depicts a ‘visceral, cathartic, spiritual experience’ of the emotional encounter with the shores of the Promised Land. Yet even at the height of ecstasy (an ecstasy so intense it overwhelms Lind, who empties ‘a lifetime of Jewish indigestion’ on ‘the country of [his] dreams’), Lind’s

170 Lind, CMS, p. 168.
171 Lind, CMS, p. 188.
172 Lind, CMS, p. 190.
173 Lind, CMS, p. 190.
174 Lind, CMS, p. 190.
175 Lind, CMS, p. 191.
176 Lind, CMS, p. 191.
177 Lind, CMS, p. 191.
179 Gelber, p. 43.
180 Lind, CMS, p. 192.
identification is not unqualified. ‘This self has always been a Zionist,’ he declares; significantly, even at the moment of exhilaration, Lind cannot view himself as a whole and still refers to his self as divided, or more than one (‘This self’).

As soon as Lind lands on shore, disappointment sinks in, and the dream of a homecoming is dispelled when his family is nowhere to be seen. The reunion that occurs shortly afterwards is depicted in a muted tone that stands in contrast to the emotional turmoil of the arrival in Palestine. In this sense, it is similar to the description of Lind’s departure from Austria, when Zionist dedication overshadowed and masked the pain of separation.

Lind begins with those present: ‘He reappears,’ he describes the moment he sees his father, ‘smaller and fatter.’ His first glimpse of his sister recalls his last memory of her before the war: ‘she stepped over my head in her nightdress and I saw – for the first time – black hair between legs.’ Now ‘thinner and taller,’ she has a new life with a boyfriend in a kibbutz nearby.

Lind’s estrangement from his father, who is first referred to as ‘he’ and is only later acknowledged as ‘still my father,’ and from his sister, who is unnamed, is not uncommon, Ute Benz shows, in the case of former refugee children reunited with their surviving families. More overwhelming than the sense of estrangement is the palpable grief at the devastating news the father and sister bear: ‘They bring me sweets and cakes, fruit and underwear, and the message that my mother had died. Back in 1941. Of cancer. In a nursing home in Tel Aviv.’ The clipped sentence fragments that conclude the paragraph contrast sharply with the almost matter-of-factly, understated tone in which the reunion is described, as though the author, even through the distance of time, finds it hard not only to utter the words, but even to breathe as he recalls this moment. The text thus enacts the choking sensation that, as Lind noted earlier, grips him in moments of emotion – a sensation associated with the departure of the other maternal figure in his life, Mitzi.
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The death of his mother, who ‘had been the Zionist long before [him]’ signals the death of the Zionist dream for Lind.\(^{189}\) He spends his years in Palestine estranged from his surroundings, feeling he is ‘all the time asleep.’\(^{190}\) The zealous Zionist identification of his childhood – ‘I had learnt all the dates of all the Zionist Congresses by heart, two dozen pioneer songs, and ten words of Hebrew, and I had come because Trumpeldor had told me to come,’\(^{191}\) – is replaced by a detached, manufactured identification with Jews despite his professed dislike of them. ‘To be on the side of the Jews in the Arab-Israel quarrel,’ he explains his political stand, ‘no love for Jews is required. […] The Jews, whether I liked them or not, are my people, their friends are my friends, and their enemies my enemies. This emotion is easy to produce.’\(^{192}\) Even as he professes to belong to the Jewish people, Lind maintains a dual position – both insider and outsider, as he continues to refer to Jews in the third rather than first person.

It is significant that, in Lind’s quest for a new language, Hebrew is not considered a viable option. Whereas Dutch is the language of his wartime journal and is one of the languages – along with German and English – in which he conducts ‘[five]-finger exercises’ in writing later on,\(^{193}\) Hebrew seems to remain the language of his early childhood Zionism. Gelber surmises that Lind did not embrace Hebrew because ‘the timing and conditions were not ripe and he […] never became sufficiently proficient in Hebrew to consider developing into a Hebrew writer,’ and that his ‘failure may have encouraged him eventually to fashion in retrospect a cosmopolitan self-image.’\(^{194}\) Gelber also maintains that language-switching to Hebrew is unlike the adoption of other languages ‘because of the ideological impulse and the inevitable impact on identity in a Jewish context.’\(^{195}\) This observation might support an alternative explanation of Lind’s failure to write in Hebrew.

As Gelber notes, many other writers who immigrated to Palestine (and later to Israel) with ‘varying amounts of Hebrew fluency, ranging from zero to near-native proficiency,’ adopted the language and became Hebrew writers.\(^{196}\) The ease with which Lind seems to
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have written in Dutch can be explained by the linguistic features this language shares with his native German. Yet long after leaving Amsterdam, Lind feels an attachment to the Dutch language and to Holland. ‘[Every] time I speak Dutch with a friend from Amsterdam […] I too become Dutch,’ Lind writes in Crossing. ‘I love ‘our’ Dutch language, ‘our’ Amsterdam sense of humor.’

In Palestine, on the other hand, he feels completely out of place: ‘I probably belonged to the Palestine of my childhood dreams and didn’t know how to live in its reality,’ he explains. The decision not to write in Hebrew is perhaps not so much a failure as a rejection of the reality of Zionism in the sense of daily life in Israel, as opposed to the Zionist ideology that Lind continues to cherish even though he chooses life in the Diaspora.

Lind leaves Israel in 1950, after five years in a country that failed to become a homeland. The decision to leave the one place he had hoped he could call home leads to the adoption of a willful cosmopolitan and nomadic identity: ‘I didn’t want to live anywhere all my life,’ Lind explains; ‘[houses] are for burning and furniture for breaking up.’ In a reversal of the Biblical story of Exodus, he leaves the Promised Land and returns to ‘the fleshpots of Egypt’ which ‘[smell] of something new and exciting.’ The promise that Europe offers is peace, and as Lind ‘had had [his] five years of sleep,’ he feels he is able to ‘face the rats of this plague-stricken continent again.’

***

**A Hallucinatory Voyage in the Desert of the Mind**

*Numbers*, the second volume of the autobiography, is the tale of Lind’s personal exodus from Israel and his years of wandering in Europe. Lind’s concrete voyage becomes secondary to the psychic journey he depicts in the volume, and my reading will focus on the hallucinations and departures from reality that serve Lind to negotiate his identity and redefine his roots. When these fantasies are considered in the context of the autobiographical trilogy as a whole, they reveal Lind’s attempts to reconstruct his identity as another
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articulation of a psychic split – a split that is associated with the loss of the maternal – but this time along ethnic and religious lines.

The title of this volume echoes the Biblical Book of Numbers, whose Hebrew name is Bamidbar – In the Desert – and which recounts the long crossing of the Sinai Desert by the Israelites fleeing Egypt. Numbers opens with an introduction that asserts that everything begins, and in fact happens, in the head. Quoting the first words of Genesis, Lind asserts that it ‘didn’t start in history,’ but with God creating heaven and earth.²⁰³ He notes that the Hebrew word for ‘in the beginning’ – bereshit (ברֶשֶׁת) – contains orthographically the Hebrew word for head – rosh (ראש). ‘Here is the beginning. In this head there is a God that created heaven and earth,’²⁰⁴ he concludes. This internalization of the world and history sets the tone for the voyage Lind takes in this volume: a voyage that is at once in a geographical space – the continent of Europe, but moreover a mental journey in the space that he perceives inside his head. In Israel he had hoped to cross the space at jet speed: applying to become a pilot in the Israel Defense Forces, he explains his motivation to the military psychiatrist assigned to evaluate: “The pilot, Sir, symbolically crosses the airspace as if it were his own mind in search of the eternal self.”²⁰⁵ Unsurprisingly, Lind is allocated to training as ground personnel. Lind would have to cross the desert of the mind more tortuously, on the ground, in the nomadic fashion of his ancestors – biblical and more recent.

In accordance with its theme, Numbers is a fragmented text in its form. Graphically, passages are separated by spaces as the narrative’s content shifts from one subject to the next, from place to place and from one relationship to another. Within this disjointed narrative, two sections in particular stand out as digressions from the plot of the journey. One is the life story of Elphants Bush, who emerges as Lind’s double, and the other is a rather long and detailed dream sequence that has echoes in Counting My Steps and Crossing and is central to Lind’s reconstruction of his own roots and identity. Both can be read as a break from the reality of the autobiographical narrative while engaging with it thematically; the two tangential mini-narratives will also be shown to interact with one another.

²⁰³ Lind, Numbers, p. ix.
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Lind meets Elephants ‘(and not Alphonse)’ Bush during his first days back in Europe.\textsuperscript{206} Bush, Lind explains, is ‘insane,’\textsuperscript{207} and it is therefore not surprising that he introduces himself first as a ‘Corsican Austrian’ and then as a ‘White Russian’, a ‘Turkmelian Tartar who grew up first in Turkey and then in France.’\textsuperscript{208} Bush’s life story, quoted by Lind, forms a mini-autobiography within Lind’s own autobiography – a distorted mirror of Lind’s own story, reflecting its interrupted form and its themes. It is a fantastic story of Bush’s family’s escape from Russia during the Revolution, and their peripatetic search for a home – from Turkey through Greece, Italy, France and Corsica.

Bush’s account of his ancestry is strange, almost burlesque. His father, he claims, is a Tartar with an Austrian background: ‘an Austrian nobleman back in the seventeenth century’ stopped in his travels in the Black Sea, ‘fucked the daughter of the innkeeper and stayed.’\textsuperscript{209} This forebear’s name was von Busznitzky, ‘a good Polish German name such as so many Austrian aristocrats were settled with.’\textsuperscript{210} Listening to Bush’s convoluted and fanciful life story, Lind concludes that ‘Bush obviously lived in a real darkness,’\textsuperscript{211} and when he compares himself to Elephants, he cannot ‘see the difference between [Bush’s] compulsion to say anything that came into his diseased mind and [Lind’s] own insane desire to listen to everyone who had a story to tell.’\textsuperscript{212}

The similarities between Lind and Bush run deeper than this tenuous comparison suggests. Both are storytellers, both have had to flee their native country and lead a nomadic life, speaking foreign languages (Bush was educated at a Catholic Italian mission in Turkey, speaking Turkish and Italian), and both have changed their names. Bush’s father seems to be the reverse image of Lind’s father: Busznitzky the schemer who manages to elude every law of every land and bend it to his own advantage is, at first glance, nothing like Simon Landwirth who was ‘a Viennese businessman without much business in the world.’\textsuperscript{213} Curiously, however, Lind refers elsewhere to his own Tartar roots. In The Trip to Jerusalem, a short autobiographical work published in 1973 (one year after Numbers), Lind recalls the
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LSD therapy he received in London in 1958 under the supervision of Dr Tom Ling. During the sessions, he ‘discovered [himself] to be the offspring of a non-Jewish father of Tartar ancestry who had settled down to marry a Jewess.’ Thus, in his LSD-induced hallucination, Lind comes to share Bush’s Tartar-Austrian lineage.

Although Lind initially presents Bush simply as a character of the type he used to collect in his quest to become a writer (indeed, a similar character – Elim Ffinger – will appear in his 1989 novel *The Inventor*), he is, arguably, more significant. No other character from Lind’s gallery of types in *Numbers* is introduced to the reader in such detail, and none is accorded its own first-person narrative. When Lind later mentions Bush to one of his lovers, he reveals: ‘That’s me.’ Bush, then, is a double, perhaps a hallucinatory projection of Lind’s own break with reality at the time. This bond is reinforced as the hallucination or fantasy recurs under several guises in the autobiography. In *Crossing* Lind provides a more detailed account of his experience with therapeutic LSD. In his mind, he returns into his mother’s womb, and is horrified: ‘Am I this nauseating, disgusting, unborn creature of the female belly?’ Confused, he withdraws from her: ‘[away] from all this female protection I both love and hate and hate to love.’ Instead, he chooses to return to ‘[his] father’s balls and his sperm that created [him].’ United with his male forebears, he becomes his own father: ‘I am my own ancestor, a father of all my forefathers. I am riding a horse in the vastness of the steppe. Is that who I am? Is that where I come from? Azerbaijan? Kurdistan? Kazakhstan? I know for certain I am in the south of Russia, heading north.’ As he stops to rest, he leads his horse to a brook, and a ‘pleasant-looking woman’ appears and invites him into her home: ‘I’m the stranger she’s been waiting for, and not so strange to her.’ He spends the night with the woman, only to wake up the next morning and find his horse gone and himself trapped, ‘back in the womb [he] wanted to escape.’
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A strikingly similar dream appears in *Numbers*. Lind, on horseback, stops at a brook; a woman appears next to him and invites him to stay. She ‘looks familiar,’ and after she feeds him they ‘talk and fuck and laugh.’ After spending the night in comfort with her, Lind wakes up in the dream to find his horse gone. An angry and revealing exchange with the mysterious woman, who tells him that he had better stay, follows.

> “But I will hate you.”
> “One day you will love me for making you come down from your horse.”
> “You must be Jewish.”
> “I am.”
> “Are you my mother?”
> “Right.”

To Lind’s added consternation, a male child is born from this incestuous union, and despite his protest, the baby is circumcised. The baby screams as his blood ‘spatters over the walls,’ and the woman ‘takes him to her breast, stuffs a nipple longer than his penis into his mouth’ and the baby falls asleep. After a numbing period with the woman and baby, when the dream-Lind ‘can’t move from the bed, [stares] into the blue,’ he decides to leave the woman and baby, and contrary to his expectation, the woman ‘seems not to care one way or the other.’

Lind’s incarnation into a horse-riding ancestor who stops near the Black Sea to spend a night with a strange woman echoes the story of Bush’s Austrian forebear who stayed with the Tartar woman. In *Numbers*, the two tales – Bush’s life story and the dream – constitute fantastical departures from, or disruptions of, the purportedly factual autobiographical account. Oddly interwoven with the rest of the narrative, these hallucinatory scenes interact with it on more than one level.

The dream seems to provide a commentary on current events in Lind’s own life: most notably the breakdown of his relationship with his wife, Ida, and his abandoning of her and their child. Ida comes to Palestine from Holland, after a long correspondence ‘full of
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loves and kisses and hopes.’

Lind initially refers to her only as ‘she’, and describes her as ‘an ordinary, housewifely, quite attractive woman’ whom he had ‘asked […] to come to Palestine because [he] had wanted a secure sex life.’ Once she arrives, however, her expectations – settling down, having children and finding a responsible husband in Lind – are incompatible with Lind’s plans.

Ida is pregnant when the two leave Israel, and when their son is born, Lind vehemently opposes his circumcision, claiming that ‘a new baby should be neither Jew nor Christian, Arab nor Hindu, but just a human being.’ Yet behind this humanist position lurks a disavowal of his own roots: Lind wants nothing to do with his wife’s ‘lower-middle-class Jewish family’ because this connection is distasteful to his new cosmopolitan persona: ‘I was born among them. I can’t stand them. […] I want out and I don’t want my son to be forced into this tribe.’ The son is circumcised against his father’s wishes, and Lind witnesses as the ‘blood flowed from a small fountain of heavenly delights.’

The circumcision is at once a mutilation of the son’s penis – the source of sexual pleasure – and an initiation into ‘Kahal Israel, a notion of Jewish community’ that Lind himself has chosen to reject. As the baby is welcomed into the fold in an act symbolizing the covenant between God and his chosen people, the boy’s father breaks his own paternal bond and seems to reject his son along with the Jewish community. The narrative moves abruptly to another stage in Lind’s life – his days in Paris - and Grischa, the son who is named only once in passing, is not mentioned again.

When Lind’s dream is considered in relation to the entire autobiographical trilogy, it acquires new meanings – both in its various contexts and in the role it plays in the narrative construction of the autobiography as a whole. The version that appears in Crossing as an LSD-induced hallucination is self-consciously loaded with psychoanalytical elements. Lind himself provides a partial analytical commentary: he does not find the clear Oedipal content – becoming his own father, even giving birth to his own siblings – disturbing. ‘I didn’t have
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the situation of an Oedipus, fearing the wrath of his father,’ he explains. ‘My difficulty was, if anything, more complicated because I constantly cheated, as it were, on my mother.’

This comment might go some way towards explaining Lind’s relationship with women as represented in his writing. Lind consistently fails to form meaningful emotional ties with women. Even his relationship with Faith Henry, the woman he marries and with whom he starts a new family, does not escape this pattern whereby ‘mother and wife turn into the same person but, more than that, how the two women turn into one womanhood, all women becoming one.’ When all women become the mother, the relationship becomes incestuous but also terrifying, given the revulsion Lind expresses in his LSD-induced hallucination with regards to his mother’s womb.

Arguably, this explanation of the roots of Lind’s reluctance to form attachments to women is only a partial one. Lind’s very insistence on it – by virtue of the repetition of its elements – raises questions as to its validity. If the dream sequence in Numbers could, on its own, be construed as an intrusion of fiction in the otherwise factual narration of real events, its reappearance in Crossing further throws into relief the constructed nature of the autobiographical work. It suggests that, in fact, the dream might not have occurred when Lind was leaving his wife and newborn son, but that it is a later product of Lind’s psyche, one that he has placed at that point in the narrative to suggest – perhaps even prescribe – a certain reading of the events.

Moreover, the repetition of the story and reworking of its elements – especially its echo in the Elphants Bush episode - transform it into a literary device, a leitmotif. As such, it is already anticipated in Counting My Steps, in relation to the other mother-figure in Lind’s life, the maid Mitzi. When Lind writes about his feeling of abandonment after Mitzi’s departure, he remarks: ‘I would have been after her on the horse I would buy one day, to chase her breast to the ends of the world.’ This link to Mitzi signals a return, as elsewhere in the narrative, of the repressed experience Lind will not consciously access: the trauma of abandonment, of his separation from his mother and family during the war and his mother’s subsequent death.
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The loss of the maternal object and its emotional impact acquire significance in relation to language through Mitzi’s association with Lind’s true mother tongue, Austrian German, in *Counting My Steps*. In the course of Lind’s concrete and mental journey in *Numbers*, language is one of the key elements of identity that needs to be recovered and reconstructed. After the war, ‘language had lost its meaning. Words of love, words of faith and belief, words of hope and eternal devotion […]. All useless.’ The words which had once signified emotions are emptied of meaning, and Lind is therefore ‘amputated of romantic love.’

This emotional ‘amputation’ calls to mind Ferenczi’s observation that in the wake of trauma ‘the emotions become severed from representations and thought processes and hidden away deep in the unconscious.’ In Lind’s case the detachment is so severe that all feelings – not only romantic sentiments – become unreal and are rejected altogether: ‘To feel… I didn’t like this verb; I didn’t like the reference. […] Feel, don’t think! I liked to think about it, not “feelings” – or rather I didn’t, when I felt something, like to like feelings.’

In his relationships with women, Lind seems to preempt the threat of abandonment by becoming the perpetrator, and perpetuates a pattern of ‘flighty and unreliable’ object relations. Fenichel has observed such patterns in cases of schizophrenia, where the attempt to ‘regain contact with the objective world’ succeeds ‘only in abrupt spurts and for brief periods of time.’

On another level, Lind’s misogyny is linked with his hatred of Jews, which is also addressed by the dream sequence and the hallucination. When he leaves Ida, Lind feels, he ‘is leaving [his] people’ – the lower-middle-class Jews he despises. In his recollection of his LSD treatment in *The Trip to Jerusalem*, Lind recalls his realization that his hatred of anti-Semites is a disguised hatred of Jews: ‘I, who had always believed I had hated the enemies of the Jews more than they could ever hate me, discovered in the flesh that this hatred was directed against myself – since I happen to be Jewish – against the Jews, but even more against “The Jews” and all they meant rather than against myself.’

In this tortuous explanation, the hatred is turned doubly against himself: Lind hates the Jews and
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therefore himself for being one, and hates anti-Semites and consequently his hate turns against that part of himself. To resolve the inner conflict, he discovers, or rather creates, his Tartar roots: the Tartars Lind claims as ancestors are, he explains in a footnote, from the tribe of the Khazars, who converted to Judaism in the 8th century. Thus Lind can feel that he is ‘actually, in the depth of his heart and soul, a convert to the Jewish religion.’ In a move that recalls Freud’s conjecture that Moses was an Egyptian in Moses and Monotheism, Lind constructs an identity that is at once Jewish and non-Jewish, one that allows him to repudiate his belonging to a people whom he considers ‘weak’ and ‘dependent’ and imagine his nomadic nature as inherited from a ‘free-riding, Gentile father.’

Resorting to a non-Jewish and, as Edward Said observes of Freud’s Moses, a non-European Other as a forebear, however, does not resolve the conflict of Lind’s identification. If anything, it provides more instances of splitting, now represented along ethnic and religious lines. This split, followed by identification with the aggressor as observed by Ferenczi, can be traced back to the war when Lind first assumed a false identity. Hatred of Jews, it would seem, was initially a survival mechanism. Being Jewish meant being persecuted and killed; in order to live, Lind had to distance himself from the Jews, but in his own reading, this strategy takes the form of a perverse identification with the persecutor: “The Jews are our misfortune,” it said in big letters on every front page of the Stürmer. Our misfortune? They are certainly mine. To survive this calamity I would have to hate them.

It is no coincidence then, that Lind first disguises himself as a Nazi when he emerges from hiding after the Jews had been rounded up for deportation in Amsterdam. The identity that would serve him throughout the rest of the war, on the other hand, that of the Dutch youth Overbeek, requires a different attitude: ‘I knew I had to be an ordinary Dutch boy,
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with no hatred and no special emotions one way or the other. As he adjusts to his new persona, spending hours in front of the mirror, he can see ‘the non-Jew in [himself],’ the kind of non-Jew he ‘probably wanted to see.’ Nonetheless, Lind’s hatred of Jews persists long after the war, and becomes entwined with his misogynistic view of women. ‘Jews equaled women,’ he explains in The Trip to Jerusalem, echoing a view prevalent, as Sander Gilman shows, in nineteenth-century European science and popular thought. Indeed, Lind’s horror at his son’s circumcision – his initiation into the Jewish community – may now also be seen as an expression of Lind’s own ambivalent identification. According to Gilman, as the Jew observes his image as the feminized Other, ‘the altered form of his circumcised genitalia [reflects] the form analogous to that of the woman.’ Lind returns to this equation of Jews and women in Crossing, and elaborates on his conflicted feelings: ‘What it is exactly that (to my mind) turns all women into Jews is hard to define. […] I know all women are Jews because they are physically weaker than men, and […] all women and Jews are too virtuous for me.’

With conflicted feelings towards his real and imagined origins, Lind comes to feel that inside he is ‘neither Jew nor Gentile, neither male nor female, but all of them simultaneously, or the absence of all.’ The peripatetic journey through Europe becomes a struggle with the sense of unreality and an attempt to restore a sense of identity. ‘There was nothing wrong with the world,’ Lind explains, ‘there was hardly a world I could observe, but this “I” within myself didn’t know what to do.’ As he wanders through Europe, Lind returns to another origin: the city of his childhood, Vienna. The familiar streets awaken memories in him, but Lind is soon rejected once more: when he decides to ring the doorbell of his first childhood home, the current occupant, an old woman who had been a neighbor and had apparently taken over the apartment, refuses to let him in. Lind determines this would be ‘his last attempt to re-enter the womb.’ The experience drains him of the
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courage to knock on the door of the home he had left in ’38: ‘Where the hell am I?’ He wonders. ‘I must have died somewhere inside when I left this house in the summer of ’38 and I move in an underworld now.’

***

**Rebirth in Language**

To break the cycle of spiritual death and resurrection that began during the war, Lind resolves to forge a new identity for himself: that of a writer. The author’s powers of creation in language offer Lind the possibility of redemption: of gaining a measure of control over the traumatic perturbations of history that had shaped his life. Language naturally becomes a defining element of this identity, as Lind establishes himself first as an author of German-language fiction and, significantly, in his later shift to writing in English. As Lind makes his first steps towards writing professionally, he begins to contemplate the workings of language, and particularly of grammar: ‘Not German or English grammar. But grammar. The particular twist of the mind that protects us against schizophrenia. Some kind of revelation, no doubt. How else could one know what I, you, he she, it we, you, the, is?’

The preoccupation with grammar signals the way out of the desert Lind had been circling in for several years – the schizophrenic state of mind seen here in the breakdown of the distinction between pronouns.

Grammar allows a definition of identities and relationships. As Emile Benveniste explains, verbs and pronouns are classes of words ‘embodying the category of person.’ In focusing on pronouns, Lind is correct in insisting on their function in language in general, for as Benveniste maintains, the problem of pronouns ‘is a problem of individual languages only because it is primarily a problem of language in general.’ The reality to which pronouns like I or you refer is, Benveniste argues, ‘solely a “reality of discourse,”’ for these pronouns, or more specifically their referents, are defined only in the context of discourse.
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The pronoun *I* is ‘nonreferential with respect to “reality”’: it is empty and acquires its referentiality only within the context of its utterance, signifying “the person who is uttering the present instance of the discourse containing *I*.” It cannot therefore be misused and is not ‘subject to the condition of truth.’ The pronoun *I* functions as an assertion of subjectivity: it is ‘by identifying himself as a unique person pronouncing *I* that each speaker sets himself up in turn as the “subject.”’ Benveniste defines subjectivity – the capacity of the individual to posit himself or herself as subject – as a ‘psychic unity that transcends the totality of the actual experiences it assembles and that makes the permanence of the consciousness.’ Other elements of language – demonstratives, verbs, adverbs – ‘depend upon the *I* which is proclaimed in the discourse.’ The *I* is the key to the entire ‘system of internal references’ that construct language not simply as a system of signs (as described by Saussure) but language appropriated by the individual. Lind’s focus on grammar is essential to his attempt to create his own system of internal references, to ‘make [his] own private language, which [he] could then apply in any tongue.’

These formal questions of language and identity become more concrete as Lind moves from his private language to a consideration of the possibility of translation, and more specifically self-translation. The difficulties he encounters translating ‘terrible English love stories for Viennese housewives’ for a weekly magazine lead him to abandon this line of work in order to have ‘more time for writing about translation.’ The short passage – less than two pages – devoted to the problem of translation is another departure into the fantastic fictional realm, in which Lind becomes a troubadour entertaining his people with jokes and stories ‘as [his] great-grandfather did.’ Unsuccessful in his trade, the storyteller finds he can only earn money once he begins to ‘translate their jokes into our language and
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the other way around," and then proceeds to translate ‘novels, plays, short stories written in our peculiar idiom.’ This occupation affords the translator ‘plenty of work’, because there ‘are not many people left in this world who can speak the two languages simultaneously.’

There is no clear indication of who ‘us’ and ‘them’ might be. The peculiar idiom is the writer’s native language, for ‘there was not the slightest chance that anyone who could not speak our language as his mother tongue would ever be able to learn it.’ The language is defined by what it is not.

It’s not Turkish and not Tartar, not Russian and not Mongolian, not Jewish and not Armenian, not Slavic, not Arabic, not Magyar. In fact it has nothing in common with the 1,250-odd known languages and dialects. Unless you are born in this republic that never existed on any map, it’s impossible to learn it.

Among the languages (some more exotic than others) invoked and ruled out as the writer’s native idiom are those related to Lind’s imagined dual ancestry – Jewish and Tartar. The people without a homeland, whose republic does not exist, are not the Jewish people. The ‘us’ Lind identifies with are, like Jews but even more than them, characterized by their otherness, their difference. Moreover, the passage suggests a curious identity, defined not by nationality or geography, but only linguistically. Yet this identity is paradoxically revealed as impossible to sustain, for the language described is, in fact, an anti-language: ‘It’s one of those languages that change consonants and vowels constantly. A grammar never existed and would be unthinkable.’

A language without a grammar cannot exist, as Lind himself shows in the final part of the passage: when pronouns are indistinguishable, when ‘[singular] and plural, passive, active, imperative’ all ‘change with the mood of the speaker,’ the result is the complete breakdown of language. Lind’s meditation on translation – ‘a sacred and futile attempt to
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communicate between us and them\textsuperscript{282} – leads him to a language of non-sense, one that has ceased to signify, and renders translation impossible:

\begin{quote}
“Clear as the full moon in an empty glass” is one of our sayings, and “As long as a dog stretches himself he doesn’t scratch himself” is another. It means approximately: “Even a blind man can hear what you see.”\textsuperscript{283}
\end{quote}

The facetious tone of this passage does little to mask an existential anxiety. As Lind himself admits, ‘[all] this was not so funny’ when he came to consider translation as a job.\textsuperscript{284} It is not surprising that he concludes that shoveling snow for his livelihood would be preferable to translation, even though snow is ‘a hazardous occupation’, as from ‘one day to the next […] everything on which [his] life depended could be washed away by the rain.’\textsuperscript{285}

Beyond the practical considerations of the feasibility of translation as a profession, this passage also signals the danger that the private language Lind is trying to create may ultimately become an obstacle to self-expression, by simply disappearing or erasing itself.

Lind abandons his occupation as a translator and decides to become a professional writer. As he settles down in London, he finds himself battling with his languages. German, Lind’s native tongue, seems the natural vehicle for his writing. Yet he feels this language is imposed on him: ‘I knew I’d have no choice but to write my fiction, my first book of fiction and probably many more, in my mother tongue, which I’d say was Austrian with an East German inflection.’\textsuperscript{286} But as Lind prepares to write about the war, about ‘what it meant to [him] and what had happened,’\textsuperscript{287} using ‘the same language as the very people who had soothed us to sleep with calming phrases before bludgeoning us to death’ appears as a ‘betrayal of all [he] had to say about [his] past.’\textsuperscript{288}

Lind insists that his mother tongue is Austrian, yet admits that writing in his native Viennese dialect would only have been possible if he had stayed in Vienna.\textsuperscript{289} Writing in \textit{Hochdeutsch} smacks to Lind of ‘cultural rearmament’, of ‘cleaning and repairing the
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ultimate in all German “secret” weapons. He decides to distance himself from the language even as he writes it, believing himself to write German with ‘an Anglo-Saxon and no longer German-Austrian mind.’ And so begins his ‘private battle with sentences, with style and syntax, spelling and grammar, meaning and expression’ as he writes in German while passionately ‘collecting English words and using English syntax.’

Indeed, Lind’s first works were written in German: *Eine Seele aus Holz* (*Soul of Wood*) was published in 1962, *Landschaft in Beton* (*Landscape in Concrete*) in 1963 and *Eine bessere Welt* (*Ergo*) in 1966. Ursula Seeber, in her illuminating study of the reception of Lind’s work in Germany and Austria, writes that the reactions to these books ‘represent a first phase of recognition that was characterized first by disconcerted interest, then by resentment and finally by hostility.’ One of the ‘most often repeated’ objections of critics to Lind’s work is ‘the “incompetent use of German by this German-speaking author.”’

Dieter E. Zimmer writes in *Die Zeit* in 1962 of Lind’s ‘slovenly’ style:

> It is not the evident linguistic uncertainty which obliges us to make this criticism. This would not be surprising with a man who has spent the greatest part of his life outside the German-speaking world, and need not necessarily be a disadvantage, since it is after all conceivable that the medium of a native language might be that much more critically illuminated form afar. Even the fact that the book abounds with hundreds of mistakes […] is at most an indicator. […] But one is led to question not merely external points of detail, but the intellectual rigour of the author […].

Of *Eine Bessere Welt* (*Ergo*) Zimmer writes in 1966: ‘this book was sloppily written by someone who was to a most particular degree at war with the language.’ Few critics, according to Seeber, raised the question ‘whether Lind’s deviant speech […] might just possibly be a method by which the unspeakable of the National Socialist experience could find a medium of expression.’  

Franz Schonauer, for instance, notes that Lind is ‘a long way from mastering the writer’s craft, and it appears questionable he will ever do so. Lind
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suffers from the circumstance that he is not at home in the language which he writes. He is at home in no language.” 298 Nevertheless, Schonauer deems that which can be found ‘in fragments […] , in half and nearly complete form’ in Lind’s writing ‘sufficient for an important narrative work.” 299

Both Zimmer and Schonauer, from their different critical perspectives, point to important aspects of Lind’s writing, which Lind himself describes in his autobiography. He is a writer at war with his native language, in which he no longer feels at home, and although he speaks several languages, none of them become a new home. Timms, for instance, quotes an unpublished address by Lind from 1992, in which ‘he recalled that he soon felt so much at home in the language that he began to write in Dutch’ soon after his arrival in Holland as a child. 300 Lind continues to professes a great love for the Dutch language, yet the sense of belonging it inspires in the adult Lind is only momentary, and is achieved, paradoxically, because it will never become a permanent, real state: ‘I love everything about my Holland,’ he writes, ‘and I had come to do so more as the years passed and I realized I could never go back.’ 301

Out of this seeming linguistic impasse, English gradually emerges as the language of choice. Like England, it offers a shelter, but never a home. The decision never to go back becomes a defining element of Lind’s postwar identity. He is driven to England by his rejection of continental Europe: ‘I could think of only one good reason why I had crossed the Channel: to make sure I had no place to return to.’ 302 Although he settles in London, marries and has two children, he refuses to become an immigrant – to embrace England as his home – and resolutely remains a willing exile: ‘To be the perennial foreigner and to remain what one cannot change was, I always believed, one of my better ideas.’ 303

This position is supported by Lind’s presentation of his linguistic choices.

[In] the end I found that I could not write German – not because I was a Viennese who had forgotten his mother-tongue, but because I was an Anglophile Dutchman. […]
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Anyway, when all is said and done, I am neither this, that or the other nationality but just a writer and little else.  

Thus, switching to English is not an attempt to belong to a nation, but a move towards a universal, cosmopolitan ideal: ‘[thinking], or rather trying to think, in English was producing both liberal and radical thought through the most universal and at the same time the most accessible of all languages.’

This view of English as the most universal of languages differs somewhat from the description of the linguistic switch in Numbers. In that earlier account, English is merely a randomly chosen vehicle for the expression of a private language Lind felt he had to create in order to escape the ‘Teutonic abyss’ of the German language that had been tainted by Nazism. Lind proposed to return to a pre-linguistic state from which he could create a private, pure language, which could in turn be translated into any language. In Crossing, written almost two decades later, the linguistic switch is represented in more rational terms, and the adoption of English is no longer random. From the Foreword that sets up the English Lind learned as a child as the language of ‘freedom and freedom from want, the brotherhood of man and his independence’ to Lind’s later years in London, this volume signals a move from the private, pure language he strove to invent in Numbers to a universal language that is widely accessible.

As Lind establishes himself as a professional writer, the universality and tolerance of English are revealed as more than theoretical or imagined traits of the language. While the reception of Lind’s works of fiction in Austria and Germany was ambivalent and at times overtly hostile, British and American critics praised Lind as ‘one of the most original authors of the 1960s.’ The decision to write in English is also partly a practical, commercial one, motivated by the wish to reach a wide readership. ‘Maybe it was time I realized that many Germans could not accept what I had to say about Germany, coming from a writer who was using, and in their eyes misusing, their own language,’ he reflects on the animosity of the German critics. ‘I began to feel there must be something wrong with me
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if I could only find readers for my books in translation." The solution Lind found was to ‘translate [himself] into English by writing in English.’

The process of self-translation is not as easy as Lind had imagined it to be in *Numbers*: ‘I used English all day long,’ he writes in *Crossing*, ‘but now that I felt the need to be serious, as never before, my English proved inadequate to say what I wanted to say, while to say it in German if no one would read it equally made no sense to me.’ Yet this obstacle seems to be merely a technical one – a matter of proficiency that can be overcome with sufficient practice. He develops his mastery of the language with the joy of a collector: ‘every single English word was a rare bird, a colorful, beautiful creature on wings it required skill and intelligence to catch.’

Elizabeth Klosty Beaujour maintains that a writer who has written in his or her native tongue and then gives up writing in that first language ‘may experience the pangs of infidelity and guilt, as well as a sense of self-mutilation.’ Vladimir Nabokov, for instance, has referred to his switch from an ‘infinitely rich and docile Russian tongue’ to a ‘second rate brand of English’ as his ‘private tragedy.’ He describes the process of self-translation as ‘sorting through one's own innards, and then changing them like a pair of gloves.’ The Russian poet Joseph Brodsky writes in his autobiographical essay ‘Less than One’ that ‘it’s been [his] impression that any experience coming from the Russian realm, even when depicted with photographic precision, simply bounces off the English language, leaving no visible imprint on its surface.’

Remarkably, Lind does not share these authors’ concern with the limitations of self-translation and does not mourn the loss of certain layers of meaning available in German but not in English. Eva Eppler quotes from Lind’s typescript ‘Über Deutsch gesprochen’ (‘Speaking about German’, 1975) to show how German and English are associated with
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‘different ways of thinking and feeling.’

On the difference between the German word *boshaft*, which has ‘undertones of malice,’ and the English *angry*, Lind writes:

It is a completely different attitude towards things. In German you are for example *boshaft* in a certain German way, in English you can be angry, but one is angry in a different way than one is *boshaft* in German. I’m not sure whether it’s better or worse, it’s different anyway.

Of course, *boshaft* and *angry* are not semantic equivalents. Nevertheless, this juxtaposition is evocative: it reveals Lind’s own attitude towards the two languages as he represents English as lacking the malevolence that is apparently inherent in German. Moreover, in Lind’s description, the words in each language do not simply denote a different kind of emotion or attitude: language itself becomes performative, and the speaker changes with the language he employs, becoming *angry* in English and losing the malicious undertones of his German *boshaft* self. Switching languages, then, is not merely a matter of translation for Lind. Indeed, as the discussion of translation at the end of *Numbers* shows, the attempt to translate one language into another leads to the breakdown of language instead of bridging linguistic, national or cultural gaps. It is therefore no surprise that Lind, unlike some translingual writers, chose not to become the translator of his own works. Rather than self-translation, Lind’s translingualism amounts to the construction of a new self in a new language.

This new self that emerges at the end of *Crossing* is, of course, the one writing the autobiography. The notion of a self-begetting work, which Kellman argues is a ‘self-evident sham, whether applied to the narrative or to its main character,’ acquires new meaning in the autobiographical context, when the literary device, exposing its own artifice, undermines the authenticity of the autobiography. This notion, furthermore, becomes overdetermined by
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Lind’s translingualism, which is yet another ‘form of self-begetting,’\(^\text{322}\) and calls into question the authenticity of the very self it creates.

The autobiographical act, as Paul John Eakin suggests, reaches ‘back into the past not merely to recapture but to repeat the psychological rhythms of identity formation, and [reaches] forward into the future to fix the structure of this identity in a permanent self-made existence as a literary text.’\(^\text{323}\) The unified identity that Lind strives to create in and through the autobiography is that of himself as Jakov Lind the writer; it corresponds to what Paul de Man terms the ‘single subject whose identity is defined by the uncontested readability of his proper name.’\(^\text{324}\) It is an identity that transcends traditional boundaries – national, religious or linguistic – and is established as the only ‘essential existence’ that has remained intact since Lind’s childhood.\(^\text{325}\) Yet in equating writing with self, Lind suppresses the part of himself that precedes the acquisition of written language: the child who ‘defended [himself] against writing for a long time,’\(^\text{326}\) because writing seemed an arbitrary representation of the language he was familiar with orally and aurally, the language he was taught by the maid Mitzi. This child, whose life changed forever when the war broke out, is Heinz Landwirth, whose full name is never mentioned in the three volumes of the autobiography.

Indeed, when this child first struggles with written language in the beginning of *Counting My Steps*, Lind reflects that ‘words looked to me like unimaginative drawings. They still look the same to me now. […] How can the picture in front of one’s eyes be drawn with words? How can the intellect reflect itself in letters?’\(^\text{327}\) Initiation into language is a loss of innocence, Lind claims, but a welcome one: ‘instead of knowing we were taught to understand, instead of feeling we were taught to talk. Thank God.’\(^\text{328}\) The masking and suppression of emotion in writing become a key feature of Lind’s autobiography. His wartime diaries – an ‘intimate medium for the expression of thoughts and feelings’\(^\text{329}\) – are written in Dutch, the language of the assumed persona of Jan Gerrit Overbeek. Authentic
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feelings are thus dressed in a foreign language, until after the war Lind seems to lose the ability to express emotions altogether. Feelings become divorced from the empty shells used to describe them: ‘To feel… I didn’t like this verb; I didn’t like the reference,’ Lind writes in *Numbers*.³³⁰

Lind’s feelings remain part of a private self that is not revealed to the reader of his autobiographies, like a private language that cannot be communicated to another. ‘I couldn’t, by any stretch of my imagination,’ writes Lind, ‘find the words to talk about the shame and horror I had personally suffered at having to hide behind an assumed identity to save my own life, without the slightest chance of extending a helping hand to a friend, not even to my own sister.’³³¹ The shame and horror, along with the grief and fear of the war years remain largely outside the scope of the autobiography. Timms suggests that the ‘trauma of destruction is intimately associated with the motif of language deprivation, raising questions about experiences beyond the reach of linguistic expression.’³³²

What remains beyond expression in Lind’s autobiography is not the historical, collective trauma of the war, but, as I have shown, the private trauma of loss and abandonment. These two traumas are connected through language. The German language and its Austrian variety are associated with the maternal figures in Lind’s life: Mitzi who abandons him and the mother whom he never sees again after leaving Austria at the age of eleven. The mother tongue, in turn, abandons and betrays him, as it ceases to be a ‘private oasis’ and becomes the language of Nazi persecution.³³³ The psychic split initially caused by traumatic and repressed events grows with the need to hide behind a false identity; the link between the internal world and external reality, between the native language of the self and the language in which it operates in the world is severed.

Throughout the three volumes of the autobiography, Lind offers an extraordinary, often consciously psychological description of his struggle to come to terms with the circumstances that shaped his life and to define his identity. My reading builds on the terms Lind himself employs – most notably schizophrenia and false self – to show how Lind’s wartime survival mechanism, the creation of a false self in a foreign language, becomes a
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coping strategy throughout his life, as he reinvents himself again and again. Lind acknowledges at the end of his autobiography that ‘crossing any waters of language or culture is some sort of self-deception.’ As Lind is still ‘sailing under the flag of a false self,’ his autobiography ultimately fails to reveal a real self behind the many images and personas he has created for himself throughout his life.

***
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3. Fighting Words: Propaganda and Ideology in Stefan Heym’s *The Crusaders*

*The Pen and the Sword*

‘The art of prose,’ wrote Jean-Paul Sartre shortly after the Second World War, ‘is bound up with the only régime in which prose has meaning, democracy. When one is threatened, the other is too. And it is not enough to defend them with the pen. A day comes when the pen is forced to stop, and the writer must take up arms.’¹ For Stefan Heym, pen and sword had always been one and the same: not least when he enlisted in the American army in 1943 as a soldier in the Psychological Warfare Unit. The German-born writer would engage in a war of words, writing propaganda in an attempt to weaken the enemy: an enemy he was intimately familiar with, and had been fighting with his pen since childhood.

Stefan Heym was born in Chemnitz in 1913 as Helmut Flieg, the son of middle-class Jewish parents. From a very young age, he wrote plays and poems. In 1931, the local social-democratic newspaper published his satirical poem ‘Exportgeschäft’, criticizing the German army’s decision to send instructors to Chiang Kai Shek’s army in China.² At the time, National Socialist sympathies were rising in Chemnitz, and Flieg was expelled from his school. He finished high school in Berlin in 1932, where he continued to write political verse and began writing articles for left-wing papers and magazines under a variety of pseudonyms.

In 1933, soon after the Reichstag fire, a warrant was issued for Flieg’s arrest. His younger brother was able to travel to Berlin and warn him, and within hours Flieg escaped, crossing the border to Czechoslovakia; at nineteen, ‘he was Germany’s youngest literary exile.’³ Once in Prague, Flieg sent a postcard to his family informing them of his safe arrival, using the code name Stefan Heym.⁴ Heym stayed in Prague, writing in German-language newspapers, until in 1935 he was offered a scholarship to study in the USA. During his studies at the University of Chicago, Heym continued to write, publishing articles
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and poems in anti-Fascist German-language publications, and after completing his MA in German literature, was invited to become chief editor of a new communist weekly, *Deutsches Volksecho*, in New York. Heym intended the *Volksecho* to take ‘an active interest in American events,’ unlike other German-language newspapers published in America; another aim was to expose Nazi infiltration in America.

In the early stages of his career, Heym positions himself as a mediator between German and American cultures in an attempt to mobilize forces against the Fascist enemy. Manuscripts in the Stefan Heym archive bear witness to this commitment. A typescript from May 1939 titled ‘What Do German-Americans Think?’ is meant to – simultaneously – reassure Americans that the German-American community does not, by and large, support Nazism, and to warn against the danger of Nazi propaganda exerting its influence on this ‘seven-million’ strong population. In speeches to German-American audiences, Heym cautions that the rising power of Nazis within their organizations undermines the interests of the community as a whole, branding it a fifth column. He reminds German-Americans of the hostility they experienced during the First World War, and concludes: ‘Beware of another 1917! Beware of the people who want to throw us into such a calamity again! Americans, beware!’

In his typescript about German-Americans, unlike the speech addressing them directly, Heym invokes the notion of the American melting pot as a defense against Nazi infiltration:

> There is no German minority in this country today. America is made of particular stuff. You come here[,] you get off the boat, you find a job, you work hard – and something peculiar happens to you: you change. You grow new roots, sooner or later you are a full-fledged American, this is your home. It is the old story of the melting pot.

How does this insistence on an American identity, then, coincide with a lasting connection with Germany? In the same document, Heym asserts that, based on his
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conversations and correspondence with ‘hundreds’ of German-Americans, they still ‘identify with the fatherland.’¹⁰ Heym does not resolve this conflict, or even acknowledge it. Questions of ethnicity and transnational identity have, of course, been central to debates on American culture throughout the twentieth century, and the concept of the melting pot has been problematized and criticized, as Werner Sollors has shown, ‘on various, contradictory grounds’¹¹ – as a homogenizing, anti-universalist ideal on the one hand and as a myth or impossibility on the other. In the case of German-Americans during the war, however, the question of identity and identification takes on a special urgency, and loyalty becomes a matter of life and death.

Heym seems unequivocal in his allegiance. In various pre-war and wartime typescripts the lines are clearly drawn. The first person is an American ‘we’; for the Germans, the third person is reserved. Heym’s commitment is epitomized in his impassioned speech on the occasion of his naturalization as an American citizen in February 1943. Heym is already a soldier in the US Army, and as he addresses his ‘fellow soldiers, fellow citizens,’ he declares: ‘this act of becoming a citizen of the United States cannot be a mere formality.’¹² As citizens, the soldiers are fighting for the ‘New World imagined by those dreamers and idealists: The draftsmen of the Constitution, the gaunt speaker at Gettysburg, and the many others who laid down their lives for the dream’ of freedom and democracy.¹³ Heym is grateful for the opportunities America has given him after ten years as ‘a man without a country,’¹⁴ and outlines the mission ahead: ‘we are approaching the time when those who came to America to build a refuge of freedom, may return to the world the light which was safeguarded here, in this new country of ours.’¹⁵

There seems to be no better place for Heym the soldier than the Psychological Warfare Unit of Military Intelligence. His duties there include interrogating prisoners-of-war and writing propaganda leaflets and radio broadcasts aimed at weakening the enemy’s resolve. Exiles and immigrants like Heym naturally have an important task in addressing the enemy: ‘I know my German Unteroffiziere and the language they talk and write,’ Heym

¹⁰ Heym, ‘German-Americans’, p. 6.
¹⁴ Heym, Citizen Day, p. 2.
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writes in 1936.\textsuperscript{16} This familiarity is much more than a linguistic matter: it is an intimate knowledge of the enemy’s mind, which Heym sees as an essential weapon. ‘Any general staff officer will tell you that a battle is half won if you’re able to anticipate your enemy’s moves. If you know the workings of your enemy’s brain, his soul, you can determine how he will behave,’ he writes elsewhere.\textsuperscript{17}

Heym’s journalistic writing, Hutchinson observes, is characterized by strong statements: ‘[the] thrust of the argument is not weakened by the temptation to give two sides to the case.’\textsuperscript{18} His fiction is driven by the same ideological commitment as the journalistic and polemical writing. In speeches from 1942, Heym condemns escapist literature as ‘mental and moral appeasement’ that ‘in its effects, […] helps Hitler.’\textsuperscript{19} Writers who engage in such literature, fleeing into romance or ‘assorted fairy tales’, are condemned as ‘Chamberlains of the typewriter who write […] soft pillow books, befogging the mind, muddling the brains.’\textsuperscript{20} Not everyone needs to write books about the war, Heym maintains, but ‘we should write – and read – honest books, […] which help everybody to recognize what we’re living for and fighting for.’\textsuperscript{21} Literature, then, is a form of persuasion, and the enemy is already aware of its power: ‘Hitler, ladies and gentlemen, in preparing his total war, recognized the importance of ideas and books. So we must recognize that books and literature are nothing separate from life and war, but, as instruments of molding the mind, are weapons in the war of ideas.’\textsuperscript{22}

Considering Heym’s position regarding the social and political role of literature, this chapter will examine the relationship between narration, propaganda and ideology in Heym’s wartime novel \textit{The Crusaders}. I will use Bakhtin’s notion of dialogism to argue that Heym’s narrative strategies are linked with his position as a translingual writer. Translingualism, I will show, is both a feature of the narrative and a figure within it, as the interplay between languages in the novel creates an intricate picture of identity and

\textsuperscript{16} Stefan Heym, ‘Will Hitler Be Murdered?’ Typescript dated 5 July 1936. Stefan Heym Archive, Box A28, 5 pp., p. 2.
\textsuperscript{17} Stefan Heym, Speech at the Philadelphia Record Book Fair, 15 October, 1942. Stefan Heym Archive, Box A29, 6 pp., p.5.
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identification. Indeed, while Heym’s speeches proclaim an assured and unequivocal allegiance to his new homeland – seemingly in marked contrast with Lind’s rejection of any national identification – the translingual identity that emerges from *The Crusaders*, and which will be further developed in his later works, is in fact one that crosses borders of both language and nationality, maintaining a critical distance at all times.

***

**The Wartime Novels**

Heym’s wartime novels can undoubtedly be categorized as engaged literature: they serve the aims of the fight against fascism. In referring to books as weapons in the war of ideas, Heym is echoing a sentiment that, as Matthew Fishburn shows, had gradually evolved in American public opinion during the years after the Nazi book burning of 1933 from ‘[occasional] comments […] into nationwide interest and well-known slogans.’

The aphorism ‘books are weapons in the war of ideas,’ coined by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was used by the Office of War Information in propaganda posters.

The problematic nature of such rhetoric is illustrated by John Chamberlain, a book reviewer for the *New York Times*, who argued that the slogan “tends to pervert the honesty of words, which are supposed to carry as exact a meaning as we can give them. Writers should be concerned primarily with the truth behind words.”

If Heym views books as weapons and his novels have, as Hutchinson suggests, ‘a clear political purpose,’ what distinguishes them from straightforward works of propaganda? In *Propaganda and Persuasion*, Garth Jowett and Victoria O’Donnell suggest that the term *propaganda* is associated in some uses ‘with control and is regarded as a deliberate attempt to alter or maintain a balance of power that is advantageous to the propagandist.’

Such an attempt is linked ‘with a clear institutional ideology and objective,’ and the purpose is ‘to send out an ideology to an audience.’
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The term ideology poses an even greater challenge than propaganda: Terry Eagleton states in the opening of his book Ideology that ‘[nobody] has yet come up with a single adequate definition of ideology,’ and proposes six definitions ‘in a progressing sharpening of focus.’ One of these seems particularly useful in the context of the discussion of propaganda and literature. This definition

attends to the promotion and legitimation of the interests of [...] social groups in the face of opposing interests. [...] Ideology can here be seen as a discursive field in which self-promoting social powers conflict and collide over questions central to the reproduction of social power as a whole.

When, on the other hand, ideology is defined as ‘the general material process of production of ideas, beliefs and values in social life,’ encompassing ‘the whole complex of signifying practices and symbolic processes in a particular society,’ the definition is, as Eagleton points out, so general that almost nothing is allowed to remain outside ideology. More commonly, ideology is seen as referring to ‘ideas and beliefs [...] which symbolize the conditions and life-experiences of a specific, socially significant group or class.’ In his discussion of American novels of the Second World War, Joseph Waldmeir uses the term in this sense with reference to Heym’s The Crusaders, which he describes as the archetypal ideological war novel. Waldmeir is reading The Crusaders alongside works such as Norman Mailer’s The Naked and the Dead, Irwin Shaw’s The Young Lions, Anton Myrer’s The Big War and John Horne Burns’s The Gallery. The ideological novels of the First World War, Waldmeir argues, express a bitter disillusionment with terms such as glory and sacrifice, and their social criticism tends to be destructive, as they assert ‘a belief only in [...] the reduction of something to nothing.’ World War II writers on the other hand, he suggests, ‘either express or imply’ a belief in the war. This conviction does not amount to a celebration of war; on the contrary, war remains ‘the ultimate social evil,’ but a necessary
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evil nonetheless, as physical violence is perceived as the only means of destroying fascism. The novelists of World War II ‘do not confine their social criticism to the battlefield enemy,’ and their constructive vision affirms the values that are ‘to replace those destroyed and discredited.’

It is clear, then, how in the context of war literature, ideology can be seen as a discursive field in which social powers come into conflict. It is also clear how the values and beliefs of a certain social group can find their expression within this field. In some cases, as Heym’s novels demonstrate, ideology in these senses plays an explicit role within the literary work, as the novel openly promotes certain values or beliefs. Another key definition of ideology plays a role in the novel: Louis Althusser’s argument that ideology is the way people represent not the real conditions of existence, but rather ‘their relation to these conditions of existence.’ While these relations are imaginary, Althusser maintains, ideology has a material existence: it exists in its practices. In *The Crusaders*, ideology is often expressed through characters’ actions, and when the ideological battle-lines are thus drawn, they do not necessarily correspond to national ones.

What distinguishes war novels such as *The Crusaders* from propaganda, I would suggest, is that they are not – to return to Jowett and O’Donnell’s formulation – linked with an *institutional* ideology. Although Heym seems to espouse the American cause and rhetoric in his writing, he is – as I will show in this chapter – highly critical of certain aspects of American society, and especially of the conduct of the American military and government in the administration of occupied Germany during and after the war.

Furthermore, propaganda, according to Jowett and O’Donnell, is the ‘deliberate, systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions, and direct behaviour to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist.’ The term *manipulation* carries negative connotations, suggesting deception might form a part of this process. As if to refute such a charge, Heym declares in a speech about his first novel, *Hostages*, that ‘[truth] is the taskmaster of the writer.’

______________________________
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In the distinction between engaged literature and propaganda, the stress might therefore be on the interest that propaganda serves. Jowett and O’Donnell emphasize that propaganda promotes a cause ‘in the best interest of the propagandist but not necessarily in the best interest of the recipient.’ They distinguish the work of propaganda from the process of persuasion: an interactive process in which the recipient adopts the point of view of the persuader voluntarily, as the ‘persuadee’ comes to ‘[foresee] the fulfilment of a personal or societal need or desire if the persuasive purpose is adopted.’ This seems a much more accurate description of Heym’s literary project: the novel as a form of persuasion. As such, the novels promote not a national agenda or policy, but Heym’s belief in the fully ideological values of freedom and democracy: these, the novels suggest, are the values Americans fought to protect during the war, and they risk erosion by corruption and indifference.

The war against fascism is the theme of Heym’s first three novels, and the confrontation between the two ideological camps – the forces of freedom and the fascists – is told through various perspectives, as the narratorial voice shifts from one character to another. The juxtaposition of the different points of view allows Heym, particularly in *The Crusaders*, the most ambitious and intricate of these works, to draw out contradictions and complexities. The ability to see, represent and ultimately to transcend the conflicting and contradictory perspectives, I will argue, is a feature of the narratorial persona Heym forges for himself: the translingual, transcultural mediator. *Hostages* was Heym’s first novel. Written in English and published in 1942, it soon became a bestseller and was adapted into a film. A thriller set in Prague under the German occupation, it is the story of a Gestapo investigation into the apparent murder of a German officer. When Lieutenant Glasenapp disappears one evening at a bar, the Gestapo arrests five Czechs who were at the scene of the crime. Though the Gestapo detective, Commissioner Reinhardt, finds out early on that Glasenapp was not murdered but committed suicide, he is determined to make a hero of him: the five Czechs are kept as hostages, to be shot if the murderer is not delivered to the authorities. The hostages constitute a microcosm of Czech society: the industrialist Preissinger who collaborates with the Nazis, the artist Prokosch, the journalist Lobkowitz,
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the psychoanalyst Dr. Wallerstein and the Janitor and member of Czech resistance Janoshik. The plot centers on the investigation of the hostages, and questions of freedom, truth, and the brutality of the Nazis are explored through the psychological drama of the interactions among the hostages and the between the hostages and their captor.

A variety of characters and a multiplicity of perspectives is a striking feature of Heym’s wartime novels. *Hostages* was followed by *Of Smiling Peace* (1944) and *The Crusaders* (1948) – two novels that depict the American war effort in North Africa and Europe respectively. *Of Smiling Peace*, Hutchinson explains, 46 was rather hastily written, in part during Heym’s military training, and is less complex than *The Crusaders*, which deals with similar themes in much greater depth. I will therefore concentrate on the latter in my analysis. *Of Smiling Peace* explores the relations between the American forces landing in North Africa as liberators, the Germans who oppose them and the collaborators of Vichy France. The novel features the German-born Lieutenant Bert Wolff, who had fought in Spain and returns to face the fascist enemy as a Military Intelligence officer in the US Army. His main adversary is Major von Liszt, who is responsible for war crimes during the Spanish war and who, as the novel opens, is stationed with the German Armistice Commission as an administrator in North Africa. The plot never stays with one group of characters or episode for long, as Hutchinson observes. 47 It follows American soldiers in combat, headed by Sergeant Shadow MacManus; their commanders, such as Colonel Wintringham; a ruthless French Legion commander, Monaitre, who plots to join the Germans and fight the Americans back; opportunistic civilians like Jerez, who will collaborate with any occupying force in the pursuit of financial gain. The main concern, which will be developed more successfully from the post-war perspective of *The Crusaders*, is the tension between the ideals driving the American soldiers and the reality of compromise with collaborationist and fascist forces.

All three novels depict the brutality of the Nazi enemy, but Heym, who is concerned with the exploration and exposure of fascism as a more general and lasting threat, portrays Nazism as its immediate, though by no means only, manifestation. 48 The actions of

46 Hutchinson, p. 39.
47 Hutchinson, p. 31.
individuals, the novels stress, are politically significant, and can bring about change. Heroism is not limited to the battlefield: a Czech janitor, a housewife in a German mining town and an American soldier all perform acts of resistance. Likewise, collaboration with the fascist enemy is shown to occur at all levels of civilian and military life. Most importantly perhaps, the war is depicted not as a war between nations, but as a war of ideas.

When Stefan Heym began to outline his novel *The Crusaders*, he wrote that the book would be ‘the bitterest thing ever written and […] will knock the fat long fingers off a lot of people, all the fingers [he has] seen in this pie.’\(^{49}\) The novel is an ambitious work both structurally and thematically. Almost 650 pages long, it portrays American and German soldiers and civilians as it follows the progress of the American forces from Normandy through Paris to Germany.

The main focus of the novel is a psychological warfare detachment under the command of Colonel DeWitt; the detachment is part of the Armored Division commanded by Farrish, an authoritarian, overbearing General. Heym’s portrayal of the men of all ranks in this detachment is detailed, showing the idealists, the heroes and the reluctant soldiers as well as the forces of corruption and greed that permeate the American military. The villains are the ruthless Farrish, the opportunistic Major Willoughby, the corrupt Captain Loomis and the bigoted Mess Sergeant Dondolo. All strive to promote their own interests, regardless of the cost to the troops, the war effort or the very idea of democracy. The positive elements in the detachment – the heroic Tolachian, the honest Thorpe, the idealist Sergeant Bing – face not only the dangers of the war, but the obstacles created by the corrupt elements of their own army.

On the German side, the Nazi villains are also shown to have a variety of motivations. SS Colonel Pettinger is the arch-villain of the novel: cruel, cynical and calculating. He manipulates both his underlings and his superiors, and is determined to ‘stay on top, no matter what.’\(^{50}\) Major Dehn, the president of the Rintelen Steel Works, is motivated by his concern for his personal and financial future. Field Marshal Klemm-Borowski, Farrish’s counterpart, is an eccentric with delusions of grandeur. By juxtaposing the German and American characters, Heym shows that many of the sins and flaws of the
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Germans can be discerned – though usually in a lesser degree – in the Americans as well. It thus becomes clear that the enemy is not only Nazi Germany: the parallels between the Americans and the Germans prove that fascism can take hold anywhere, even within the American ranks.

The novel features such a profusion of characters and plot-lines that it becomes almost impossible to summarize, except in terms of its theme or motivation: to show the war as a war of ideas, and to warn against the persisting danger of fascism. Waldmeir argues that ‘the novel is intricate, lengthy, and quite involved, primarily because Heym desires to leave no questions unanswered, to set forth as clearly as possible his ideological position.’ He adds that the novel’s intricacy might be its major flaw and the reason it never achieved great popularity. Yet Waldmeir sees the intricacy as a necessity: ‘the details function integrally,’ he writes, ‘as the means of clarifying the situation in which an individual character finds himself in order that an unmistakeable if not inevitable ideological conclusion may be drawn […]. In other words, Heym has not hung ideology on his novel but has let it grow out of the interaction of plot and character.’

In the following analysis of this novel I will suggest that the narrative strategies of *The Crusaders* – and specifically the multiplicity of characters and the shifting position of the narrator – are in fact closely linked with the notion of ideology, but also with Heym’s position as a translingual writer: with his attempt to position himself as the Man-between, the translator and mediator of languages and national identities. In exploring the relationship between narration and ideology, I draw on Bakhtin’s notion that ‘[behind] the narrator’s story we read a second story, the author’s story; he is the one who tells us how the narrator tells stories, and also tells us about the narrator himself. […] The narrator himself, with his own discourse, enters into this authorial belief system along with what is actually being told.’

Bakhtin refers to a posited author, ‘who speaks (albeit in a refracted way) by means of this story and through this story.’ In discussing this posited author, I do not intend to
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explore a simple, direct link between Heym’s biography and the work. Rather, I will attempt to consider how, in this explicitly ideological novel, fiction becomes a form of persuasion, and to explore the relationship between an ideological argument made by and through the novel and propaganda, which features in the novel itself.

_The Crusaders_ is, as Heym asserts in his preface, a historical novel, based in part on real events. Yet as its subtitle - _A Novel of Only Yesterday_ - suggests, it is also a _Zeitroman_ - a ‘novel of contemporaneity.’ Heym stresses this aspect of the novel too: ‘to many of my generation the events portrayed here are not history in the sense of retrospect but part of their lives – and possibly a very important part.’ There is a sense of urgency, then, that underlies the novel: it is motivated not simply by a historiographic interest in the past, but by an impact it may have on the present lives of the readers. Guy Stern argues that ‘the closer a work of fiction reaches for its material into the time during which it is being told, the more the author or his/her narrator may be tempted or psychologically compelled to enter his/her work in the shape of an alter ego, one that takes part in the depicted events.’

Stern identifies one of the many characters in _The Crusaders_, Sergeant Walter Bing, as the novel’s hero. Indeed, this character bears a striking biographical resemblance to the author: he is a German-Jew who returns to his native land as an American soldier, a Sergeant in the propaganda unit. Yet, Stern notes, Heym himself denied Bing’s role as an alter-ego. Waldmeir identifies a different character as the novel’s protagonist. Lieutenant David Yates, Bing’s commander, he maintains, ‘comes to embody Heym’s message’ by means of his transformation from a passive compromiser to a committed crusader for democracy. Peter Hutchinson reads both Bing and Yates as projections of Heym himself: ‘Both are seeking something in the course of the American advance into Germany,’ he writes. ‘Bing the nature of the country he had to flee, and Yates, almost unwittingly, the true aims for which the Americans are fighting.’
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These three readings demonstrate the difficulty of pinning down the narrative focal point of *The Crusaders*. The novel does not have a single protagonist: the many heroes and villains interact in the narrative’s multiple subplots, and the third-person narratorial voice shifts with the action, entering the minds of each character as it becomes the focus — albeit briefly — of the narrative. In this context, Mikhail Bakhtin’s account of contemporaneity in the novel may illuminate Heym’s strategy. As the novel ‘comes into contact with the spontaneity of the inconclusive present,’ Bakhtin maintains, the author’s image appears within the field of representation ‘in a new relationship with the represented world. […] For] the “depicting” authorial language now lies on the same plane as the “depicted” language of the hero, and may enter into dialogic relations and hybrid combinations with it.’ Rather than through one character or another, then, Heym as the posited author enters the work through the very multiplicity of characters, as an absent narrator, ‘presenting situations and events with minimum narratorial mediation’ and seemingly adopting the various voices and points of view of his characters.

In Bakhtin’s work, dialogism defines the novel as a genre. In the novel, Bakhtin discerns a ‘system of languages that mutually and ideologically interanimate each other.’ The different ‘images of language’ are ‘inseparable from images of various world views and from the living beings who are their agents.’ The polyglossia characteristic of the novel genre takes on an added dimension in the context of Heym’s work: the variety of perspectives and voices in *The Crusaders*, as in Heym’s two previous wartime novels, is a feature of the translingual nature of these works. Heym’s translingualism creates a doubling of perspective, enabling him to write as a German and as an American, and to move between these positions. Translingualism thus becomes an extreme exemplar of dialogism in the novel: if it ‘is possible to objectivize one’s own particular language […] only in the light of another language belonging to someone else,’ the translingual writer, in appropriating another’s language, is in a privileged position of being able to truly set two languages – and two world views – in dialogic relations.
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However, as Lind’s autobiographies show, the translingual and translator’s freedom to move between languages entails certain psychic tensions and internal contradictions that find their expression in the narrative. The character of Sgt. Bing is central to an exploration of these themes when considered not so much as Heym’s alter-ego, but as the figure that embodies translingualism and its complexities. Lieutenant David Yates, a German teacher at university in civilian life, undergoes a change throughout the novel that mirrors and reverses Bing’s journey. Their two voices interanimate each other throughout the novel, as the languages of Germany and America are examined each in the light of the other.

Translingualism is then both a feature of the narrative and a figure within the narrative. Another topic, propaganda, will be considered both as one of the major themes of *The Crusaders*, and in its function as a feature of the novel: is *The Crusaders* ultimately a work of propaganda or a work of literature? How does this question relate to the position of the posited author behind the text? This chapter will attempt to explore the complex relations between the elements of language, ideology, narration and propaganda in *The Crusaders* as the prime example of Heym’s wartime novels. In the discussion that follows, I will focus on four elements or subplots of this intricate novel: the propaganda work of Sergeant Bing and Lieutenant Yates, the portrayal of the Nazi enemy, corruption in the American military, and the question of identity and identification.

***

**Propaganda: The Voice of America**

In the first part of *The Crusaders*, Sergeant Walter Bing takes it upon himself to articulate the American Army’s aims in the war. The division commander, General Farrish, wants to mark the 4th of July with an attack of 48 rounds from 48 artillery pieces (representing the 48 States and the 48 stars in the flag). ‘This is the voice of America,’ he boasts.68 Finally, the guns will fire a round of propaganda leaflets: ‘We will tell them why we gave them this hell,’ Farrish explains. ‘We will tell them […] what this Fourth of July means, and why we are fighting, and why they don’t have a chance...’69 Yates opposes the
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plan: ‘The leaflet imposed on him the necessity of facing questions he was not prepared to answer.’ But Sergeant Bing defies Yates and volunteers to produce the leaflet.

The leaflet in the novel closely resembles a real leaflet Heym himself wrote during the war. In the disclaimer note that precedes the novel, Heym distinguishes the historical events that inform the plot from the fictional characters and events. ‘Certain events described in this book took place’, he writes. ‘There was a Fourth of July leaflet; The American Army helped to liberate Paris, and it operated a radio station in Luxemburg.’ This rather extraordinary presentation of the elements, with the leaflet taking precedence over the liberation of Paris, underscores its central role in the novel.

The target of propaganda, writes Martin Hertz, who was the chief leaflet writer for the real Psychological Warfare Division during the war, is ‘the potential waverer,’ the man ‘who [was] still willing to fight but who fought without determination.’ Once transplanted into the context of the novel, however, the language of propaganda becomes hybrid and complex – dialogical. Heym’s original leaflet, a straightforward work of propaganda, was written in German and aimed at German soldiers. The Fourth of July leaflet in the novel is written in English. It therefore addresses not only the German soldiers, but, indirectly, the American waverers: Bing’s fellow soldiers within the novel, and – by implication – the American reader outside the text. Bing justifies the propaganda value of the leaflet to Yates: ‘“[The Germans] believe they know what they’re fighting for. And they think we don’t.”’ A sense of purpose is a source of strength, and the Germans, it would appear, are not entirely mistaken in thinking the Americans lack conviction.

Hertz asserts that it is ‘an axiom of all propaganda of the written word […] that the language must be truly that of the recipient – and that any queerness of idiom severely detracts from the effectiveness of the message.’ Yet Heym’s language evokes concepts and rhetoric more likely to resonate with an American audience. Indeed, the invocation of the
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birth of the American nation – ‘On July Fourth, 1776, the United States was born as a nation – a nation of free men, equal before the law, and determined to govern themselves’\(^{76}\) – calls to mind one of the most famous speeches in American history, Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address (which begins: ‘Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal’\(^{77}\)). Heym follows Lincoln in defining the current war (Lincoln’s address was delivered during the American Civil War) as a battle for those founding principles of liberty and democracy – ‘a government of the people, by the people, for the people’ in Lincoln’s speech.

The opening sentences of the message, which appear in Heym’s original German-language leaflet, take on a subversive layer of meaning in context of the novel. The sentence ‘This is the language of America’ is first uttered by General Farrish, one of the several villains of The Crusaders. Farrish, pompous and ambitious, is willing to disregard the very principles of democracy in order to further his own interests. ‘There is too much democracy in the Army,’ he tells his underling Colonel DeWitt, and explains that what he means by ‘democracy’ is ‘[t]alk, inefficiency, politics, double-crossing[…]. A war has got to be run on the basis of dictatorship,’ he concludes.\(^{78}\) The language of the cannons, of brute force, which would more naturally be associated with the Nazi enemy, becomes, in Farrish’s speech and actions, the language of America.

The impact of the leaflet is shown in a conversation between SS Colonel Pettinger and his subordinate Major Dehn. As the Americans advance through France, Dehn feels the pressure of the possibility of defeat. He shows Pettinger a copy of Bing’s Fourth of July leaflet; ‘And you want to tell me,’ Pettinger asks, ‘that you believe that hoary stuff?’\(^{79}\) Dehn does not believe in the lofty ideas of freedom and dignity of man invoked in the leaflet, but he is aware of the power of propaganda. His analysis of the leaflet shows that, in terms of the work of propaganda, Bing has read the enemy’s mind correctly and understood where the Germans’ weakness lies.

\(^{76}\) Heym, Crusaders, p. 63.
\(^{78}\) Heym, Crusaders, p. 258.
\(^{79}\) Heym, Crusaders, p. 134.
‘[When] you feel yourself beaten,’ Dehn explains to Pettinger, ‘you begin to ask yourself: What makes those fellows so strong? They have material superiority. So we are being told we have superior morale: we fight better because we’re fighting for a great idea.’ Dehn – who married into the Rintelen family, a major steel manufacturer, and is therefore in charge of German steel works – does not believe in big ideas. He admits he is motivated by greed, but so, in his account, is the Nazi regime in general: ‘we’re fighting for Maxie Rintelen’s profits; and one day, I’m going to inherit part of them.’ The difference between the cynical, calculating commanding ranks who do not believe they are fighting for a ‘great idea’ and the ordinary soldiers is that ‘many of the men believe it. And they believe it when they’re told that the Americans have nothing to fight for.’

Although Dehn suggests the German soldiers are fighting for a cause they believe in, he immediately proceeds to debunk this idea. The propaganda leaflet, he claims, ‘comes and […] says that the Americans, too, have a cause. […] So, they have a cause, and Goebbels says we have a cause. But they’re beating us, therefore their cause must be stronger.’ The German soldiers, then, are not motivated by conviction, but by the propaganda generated by Goebbels, the Nazi propaganda minister. Bearing in mind that, as Jowett and O’Donnell assert, propaganda promotes the interests of the propagandist but not necessarily those of the recipient, it becomes clear why the German soldiers’ sense of purpose may not be authentic, and how they are therefore susceptible to counter-propaganda. A mere ‘slip of paper’ has the power to undermine Goebbels’s achievement: one piece of propaganda is weighed against another, and the soldiers are swayed – not by the ideological content of the leaflet but by the relation of power they observe on the ground.

Yates, who in the beginning of the novel appears to be one of the Americans who need persuading – the other target of the propaganda leaflet – changes over the course of the novel and becomes one of the crusaders for democracy. Significantly, this change is not brought about by Bing’s words: the latter’s propaganda strikes Yates as simplistic. When he discusses the leaflet with Bing, Yates feels that ‘what we are fighting for [is] a maze of
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motives, some clear, some hidden, some idealistic, some selfish, some political, some economic, and that one would have to write a book instead of a leaflet; that even then, the issue would be anything but straight.\textsuperscript{86} Yates’s sense of commitment grows through experience. As Waldmeir observes, ‘Heym relentlessly pounds awareness into him […], putting him into relatively close contact with evil, […] letting him become conscious gradually of the motives as well as the actions of each man.’\textsuperscript{87} Indeed, for Yates, Bing’s attitude and actions speak louder than his words: ‘[in] retrospect he could see that the very fact of Bing had pushed him forward – the youthful insolence with which Bing had tackled the Fourth of July leaflet, the definition of the whole complex business of war […], the plucky matter-of-factness.’\textsuperscript{88}

Bing, by contrast, is motivated by genuine conviction in the cause of freedom. Himself a refugee from Nazi persecution, he states his belief that ‘this is a war of ideas as much as a war of guns and tanks and airplanes.’\textsuperscript{89} For him, the Fourth of July leaflet is a statement of his faith – a crusader’s faith – that America represents the forces of democracy in this battle. Unlike propaganda, such conviction is presented in the novel as rooted in experience and sustained by action. Yates’s transformation throughout the novel amounts to a change not in his ideas, but in his relationship to the reality of the war, specifically in terms of the responsibility of an individual acting within a social context. The change depends on the recognition of ‘his own prior indifference to the evil around him as responsibility for the evil.’\textsuperscript{93} Once this realization has taken hold, Yates is willing to ‘commit himself unselfishly to the Crusade.’\textsuperscript{94} This commitment is not a matter of rhetoric: it requires action and cooperation with others since ‘the individual alone is powerless in the face of evil,’ and Yates understands that ‘there must be a conspiracy of good corresponding to the conspiracy of evil which is closing in upon him.’\textsuperscript{95}

***

\textbf{The Nazi Enemy}
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The conspiracy of evil consists, first and foremost, of the Nazi enemy, whose embodiment in *The Crusaders* is SS Obersturbahnhführer Erich Pettinger. Pettinger is, Waldmeir observes, ‘the complete Nazi’\(^\text{96}\) – an arch-villain, cruel, calculating and ruthless, and it is through this figure that Heym explores the motivations and aims of the Nazi regime. For Pettinger, the pre-Nazi past was one of uncertainty and fear – ‘no job, no future in sight, tramping the streets of his own country, turned away from the doors of factories and offices by men who claimed to be his countrymen.’\(^\text{97}\) The Nazis offered Pettinger, personally, an opportunity, and he would stop at nothing to make sure things would not go back to the way they had been. He perceives the widespread destruction of Europe not as a regrettable side effect of the war, but as a goal in its own right. Forced mass migrations and ‘the destruction of home and town’ are to him ‘the real guarantees of a new time’ and of ‘ultimate National-Socialist victory.’\(^\text{98}\) The decimation of the permanent ‘strata of life’ – the peasants, the grocers and clerks – would force the little people to follow blindly the activists, leaders such as Pettinger himself.\(^\text{99}\)

When the Germans are beaten back, he coolly advocates a scorched-earth policy, willing to ‘evacuate’ millions of civilians, so as not to leave them exposed to American influence.\(^\text{100}\) Yet behind the rhetoric of ‘[not] a soul to the enemy’ lies an ulterior motive: Pettinger’s own financial gain depends on the preservation of mining interests. He is involved in lucrative deals with Prince Yasha Bereskin, the Russian-exile head of the French steel concern, Delacroix & Cie., and ‘[the] fact that the installations of Delacroix & Cie. in the border area […] would be left carefully untouched would escape attention when the trickle of refugees flowing east broadened to a stream.’\(^\text{102}\)

If Pettinger has no compassion or regard for the civilians of his homeland, it is hardly surprising that he does not obey the international conventions of warfare on the battlefield. Charged with the task of leading part of the German counteroffensive, Pettinger joins the unit commanded by Major Dehn during the Battle of the Bulge. They encounter an American infantry platoon, and after a fierce battle, some fifteen of the surviving American
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soldiers surrender. Major Dehn is worried that the ‘prisoners he had taken impeded his progress; he had no space on his tanks […] for them; neither could he let them go.’¹⁰³ Pettinger has no patience for Dehn’s deliberations: ‘Have ‘em shot,’ he orders, despite Dehn’s protests that unarmed prisoners should not be harmed.¹⁰⁴

Pettinger is prefigured by other Nazi commanders in Heym’s previous novels, the Gestapo Commissioner Reinhardt in Hostages and Major von Liszt in Of Smiling Peace. Both these men are thoroughly evil: the premise of the plot of Hostages is that Reinhardt holds the Czech hostages and executes them although he knows full well that they are not guilty of any crime, as the so-called murder he investigates is in fact a suicide. His investigation tactics include torture, from which he derives sadistic pleasure, and rape. Major von Liszt is a coward who desperately tries to save his own skin – lying, stealing, abusing and killing – as the Americans advance into Algeria. When captured by the Americans, he feels no remorse: ‘He was justified in all he had done. […]Theft], betrayal, murder […] , all is fair in this game.’¹⁰⁵ To Wolff, his interrogator (an early, less developed version of Sergeant Bing), he explains: ‘If you think this is a war for democracy, liberty, and all the big words that the fools are fighting for, you’re predestined for a sad, sad awakening. This is a war like all others – for power!’¹⁰⁶

Dennis Tate notes that Heym has been criticized by German readers for his negative portrayal of ‘(almost) all things German.’¹⁰⁷ The weakness of The Crusaders, he argues, ‘when viewed as the work of an émigré intellectual in a position to engage with his native German society in the same depth as with his American one, is its depiction of most of its German characters as morally inferior “others.”’¹⁰⁸ Tate acknowledges that the timing of the publication of the novel in part explains this flaw, as Heym lacked psychological distance

¹⁰³ Heym, Crusaders, p. 365-6.
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from the events he was depicting: ‘in the months after the war it was evidently too difficulty for [Heym] to present a more complex picture.’\textsuperscript{109}

However, I would argue that although the portrayal of the Nazi officers seems at times to verge on the cliché, this apparent over-simplification ultimately works, through the juxtaposition and interaction with an array of other characters, to create a more intricate picture. Firstly, there are German characters, though very few, who elicit sympathy. Moreover, the very othering that Tate views as a flaw is in fact at the heart of a conflict of identification that is central to the novel. Tate finds that ‘[most] disappointing of all is Heym’s depiction of Sergeant Bing as a man incapable of coming to terms with his own past […], unable, in his own words, to outgrow “the German in himself”.’\textsuperscript{110} This personal crisis of identity and identification will be discussed later on, but already here I would like to suggest that, more than being simply a form of distancing and self-repudiation, the portrayal of the German characters is central to the ideological argument of the novel: that individual action is possible and necessary in the fight against fascism.

There are, admittedly, very few sympathetic, or even tolerable, German characters in the novel. The prisoners in the Paula concentration camp, in whose liberation Yates participates, are victims of Nazi brutality. Among the survivors of the camp, two stand out in their humanity and courage: Professor Seckendorff, and Rudolf Kellermann. Seckendorff was incarcerated because his children, Hans and Clara, led a student revolt in Munich: ‘a protest against the slaughter of war, against being sacrificed at Stalingrad.’\textsuperscript{111} Here Heym clearly draws on the Munich student revolt of 1943, lead by siblings Hans and Sophie Scholl: like the Scholls, the Seckendorffs are caught distributing anti-Nazi leaflets and executed.\textsuperscript{112} Kellermann befriends the frail professor, and in his determination to survive does not neglect Seckendorff and saves him from the mass execution planned by the Nazi authorities as the Americans advance.

Another example is Elisabeth Petrik, a shoemaker’s wife, who becomes the unlikely leader of the people of Ensdorf, a mining village whose evacuation is ordered by Pettinger. In his prefatory note, Heym states that this character and her story are based on true events:
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‘[there] is a mining village called Ensdorf, and the tragedy of the Woman of Ensdorf, by and large, happened as I wrote it.’ These characters, who are not entirely fictional, represent the exception to the rule, the few righteous in a modern Sodom and Gomorrah – the biblical story Heym evokes in his autobiography as he recalls his attempts to find, as a soldier in Germany, those individuals who did not hide behind the oft-heard defense: ‘What could I do? I’m just a little man!’

When Pettinger orders the evacuation of Ensdorf as part of his scorched-earth policy, Elisabeth Petrik leads the five thousand villagers to hide in the disused mine, in the hope that the front will move away from the village and they will be able to return to their homes. She is aware of the gravity of this act: ‘What we have done is a – revolt. Whatever way you look at it, we haven’t followed their orders,’ she tells the four other villagers who, with her, ‘drifted into the job of organizing community life in the mine.’ Disobeying orders is no small matter for Elisabeth; ‘[she] knew what orders meant, she was a German.’ The narratorial voice here, commenting on Elisabeth’s thoughts, seems to suggest that obeying orders is an inherent, essential characteristic of Germans’ nature. At the same time, Elisabeth’s actions give the lie to this apparent naturalness, and exposes German obedience more as an ingrained, learned practice.

Elisabeth does not regard her deeds as a political activity, but as a desperate, personal act. When she encounters the soldiers sent by Pettinger to blow up the mine, she reflects on the position they claim, of having to follow their orders unquestioningly. ‘[She] might have disobeyed orders, but only in a personal way, and only when there was absolutely no alternative – and to expect the same from other Germans, especially soldiers, was far from her mind.’ Yet just as following orders is an ideological practice, in the sense – to return to Althusser’s definition of ideology – that it is a manifestation of a perceived relationship of power, so is Elisabeth’s defiance, or at least it has the power to
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shift the way relationships are seen. Indeed, the imagined relationship of power changes. Thanks to her boldness, she persuades the soldiers to postpone the execution of their orders, and finds their commanding officer, who in turn is also moved to use discretion: he feels it is ‘in his province to interpret orders,’ and gives her time to talk to the Americans and ensure the mine remains neutral territory. Blind obedience, then, is not an innate quality, a component of some essential Germanness: it is a matter of choice, and it is a choice that serves and sustains fascism.

Bing, who interviews Elisabeth Petrik as she reaches the American forces and demands to see an officer, observes: ‘There was something inhuman, something very German in her singleness of mind, her determination, her clinging to the idea of the Offizier and the infiltration of the mine.’ The dehumanizing perspective is held by Bing, whereas the impersonal narratorial voice, capable of representing all characters’ thoughts, reveals another picture, as it shifts into Elisabeth’s perspective. Her motivation is shown to be not uniquely German, but more recognizably universal: ‘The loss of Leonie, the girl whom Paul [her son] loved,’ and who accompanied her on her journey to the Americans, ‘made her drive to save her son and the thousands in the mine all the stronger.’

The issue then is humanity as a general principal, unlimited by national affiliation. Indeed, it is the Americanized Bing who, in his obsession with the strategic significance of the mine, appears slightly inhuman. As he understands the Germans’ ploy, he urges Captain Troy, the commander of the company fighting in the area, to move in with his troops: ‘If the woman and the people in the mine were an indication that something was cracking up on the other side, it was high time to hook in and to develop the crack.’ Yates, meanwhile, remains focused on the humanitarian crisis at hand, and demands action: ‘Cut out your theories, Bing! We have an immediate problem. There are five thousand people about to be suffocated.’

Nevertheless, Yates’s reaction is shown to be short-sighted: ‘Only later did he realize how right Bing had been in seeing the issue in its full implication; only later did he wish that the woman of Ensdorf had come to him at a time in his life when he was ready for her. His
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reactions at the moment were personal and emotional.” Bing sees much farther ahead, on the political level: spreading the revolt more widely would help in the long-term effort to rebuild Germany. ‘I’m thinking of much later,’ he tells Yates, ‘of what we are going to do with Germany? Now we must give them a program, now we must tell them what kind of democracy we want them to have, and where they’ll fit in, provided they do something for themselves…”

Rather than neutralizing each other, both these positions exist, I would suggest, in a dialogic tension which points to a third, more comprehensive viewpoint. Both Yates and Bing are correct, but both are also limited in their perspectives. Yates finds the woman ‘callous’ because by the time she tells him the story, ‘much of the emotion with which she had recounted it to Bing gave way to […] soberness.” Both characters’ limitations are highlighted by the narrator’s wide, seemingly all-encompassing perspective: his ability to know what Elisabeth told each one of them and the effect her words have had on each interlocutor. Furthermore, the narrator is not limited in his temporal perspective, and can therefore comment on how Yates would come to view the situation in the future. In narratological terms, the narrator of The Crusaders is omniscient, telling, in Gerald Prince’s terms, ‘more than any and all the characters know,” and impersonal, ‘with no individuating property other than the fact that he or she is narrating.” The narrator is able to shift in and out of each character’s consciousness as he reports not only their actions and dialogues, but their thoughts and feeling. At the same time the narrator’s own position remains hard to discern: he does not express an opinion, and it seems as though, to quote Prince, ‘the “I” [of the narrator] may have been deleted without leaving any traces but the narrative itself.” It is through the juxtaposition of the characters and their interactions – the dialogical relations established in the narrative – that the narrator’s perspective is revealed and shown, as I will suggest later, as not entirely impersonal or absent.

***
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**The Enemy Within**

This form of juxtaposition extends not only to individual characters, but also to the two armies and nations, Germany and America, breaking down the expected, more conventional binary representation of the two sides in the war. Thus another important aspect of the negative portrayal of the Germans in the novel is the light it sheds on the Americans. Rather than depicting the Americans as just and heroic, in opposition to the Germans, Heym draws similarities between the two sides to highlight the dangers of fascism for American society. As Hutchinson observes, ‘[almost] every feature of Nazism is to be seen in the portrayal of the Americans as a whole […], and it may be for this reason that its prime [representatives are] are fully discredited in so many spheres.’\(^{132}\)

One of the American figures who most clearly displays Nazi traits is the propaganda detachment cook, Sergeant Dondolo. A bigot and a sadist, he delights in victimizing the weaker soldiers, and preys particularly on immigrants such as the Rumanian-born Abramovici, whom he calls ‘the little Jew.’\(^{133}\) He is unapologetic in his anti-Semitism, and he feels the American involvement in the war is unjustifiable: ‘Bunch of Jews get themselves into trouble,’ he tells Bing, the German Jew, ‘and the whole American Army swims across the ocean. This fellow Hitler, he knew what he was doing, and Mussolini, he, too. Everything is wrong. We should be fighting with them, against the Communists.’\(^{134}\) Dondolo, then, openly identifies with the fascist enemy, and his violence – he viciously attacks Corporal Thorpe, one of the few soldiers who repeatedly challenge him, and tries to rape a pregnant German woman – links him with the other unambiguously evil figures, Pettinger and other Nazis.

Significantly, Dondolo is not a unique, isolated case among the American troops. Captain Loomis, one of the officers of the propaganda unit, rapes a French girl in Paris, and is involved, as is Dondolo, in the selling of military supplies on the black market. Bing articulates the link between Dondolo and the Nazis explicitly: ‘Germany, the German Army, the Nazi Party – they were millions of Dondolos.’\(^{135}\) The enemy is not therefore the German nation, but the fascism that the Dondolos – German and American alike – represent. The
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Nazi-like elements within the American forces threaten to undermine the American cause, as Bing emphasizes: ‘how could you fight [the Germans] if you had Dondolos in your own ranks, unchallenged and unchallengeable?’ While the Americans declare they are fighting for freedom and democracy, corruption and greed spread throughout their ranks, threatening to undo the war effort and dominate the American legacy in post-war Germany.

Corruption, then, is another theme that which highlights the porosity of national boundaries and divisions. Dondolo, the novel suggests, represents a single instance of a dangerously widespread phenomenon. Apart from his affinities with the Nazi enemy, he undermines the American aims by profiteering from the war, selling food supplies. When he is caught, he threatens to expose the illicit deals of his commanding officer, Captain Loomis: ‘You don’t think I’m the only businessman here,’ he sneers. Indeed, Loomis has been making double requisitions of gasoline and selling the surplus. The petty black-market trade is analogous to corruption on a much wider scale. The corporate world is exposed as underhanded and unscrupulous in one of the plot elements – the Rintelen Steel intrigue – that further highlights the similarities between Americans and Germans in the novel.

Major Dehn, Pettinger’s subordinate, is married to the daughter of steel manufacturer Rintelen, and is therefore in charge of German steel works. He introduces Pettinger to Prince Yasha Bereskin, a Russian exile who has become President of the Board of Delacroix and Cie., a major French steel company. The relationship between Pettinger and Prince Yasha, which begins with small mutual favors, blossoms ‘into a smooth and far-reaching arrangement.’ As the Americans advance towards Paris, Yasha decides to cooperate with them, claiming nevertheless that he is no traitor: he has ‘no loyalty to one or the other side,’ he explains to Pettinger. ‘In order to become a traitor, one must have had some loyalties, isn’t that so?’ Thus, negotiating his way between the Germans and the Americans, cooperating with the side that would best serve his interests at any given time, Yasha personifies ‘the absolute amorality of international business,’ and the corrupt elements in the American army, just like those of the German army, do not hesitate to conduct deals with him.
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Major Willoughby, the commander of the propaganda unit and a corporate lawyer in civilian life, uses his position in the military to seal a deal with Yasha on behalf of a client, the American corporation Amalgamated Steel, in the hopes that this coup would secure his future in the law firm that employs him. Corporate greed, it seems, knows no national or ideological boundaries, and so, even as the battle rages, Willoughby promotes his vision of an international conglomerate: ‘Amalgamated Steel, Delacroix, Rintelen – one combine, with a world to be rebuilt, rebuilt in steel!’ Notably, Willoughby’s commercial interests are directly at odds with his military mission: in his role as an intelligence officer, he is assigned the task of finding out about Yasha’s possible connection to black-market goods sold by American soldiers.

Whereas the black-market profiteering is perceived by most as a deplorable aspect of the war, the corporate wheeling and dealing is initially condoned even by Colonel DeWitt, the ‘Roosevelt liberal’ and one of the positive figures in the novel. DeWitt is outraged when he finds out about the sale of gasoline in Paris. The troops pay the price for the opportunists’ greed: ‘A few cans here, a few cans there. By the time the supplies reach the front, they’re half gone.’ He sees the wider implications of such seemingly localized acts: ‘I tell you what it is: We can’t take success. […] Sometimes I’m afraid of what will happen if and when we win the war.’ Yet DeWitt is reluctant at first to find similar fault with the corporations which Yates suspects of corruption. DeWitt ‘had a healthy respect for Big Business – not that he lacked the courage to treat it on his own terms, if that was necessary for the war. But he believed that the size of its transactions lifted it automatically to a higher level of ethics.’

Here the narrator conveys DeWitt’s attitude and comments on it at the same time. The ‘healthy respect’ for corporations and the willingness to stand up to them if ‘necessary for the war’ are compatible with DeWitt’s language and characterization as honest, experienced and circumspect. It seems unlikely, however, that the Colonel would say he attributed a ‘higher level of ethic’ to big business, and certainly not that he would do so ‘automatically.’ These appear, rather, to be instances of what Bakhtin calls a hybrid
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construction: ‘an utterance that belongs, by its grammatical (syntactic) and compositional markers, to a single speaker, but that actually contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two styles […]’. It is possible that this is in fact Yates’s understanding of DeWitt’s position, and that the criticism expresses his exasperation with DeWitt’s reluctance to side with him. But the shift from one character’s voice to another is, as a rule, much clearer in Heym’s narrative, and it is therefore reasonable to interpret this as an intrusion of the usually impersonal narrator.

Towards the end of the novel, however, DeWitt comes to change his mind, as he realizes that corruption and greed have undermined the very principles that seemed to guide the American military effort. The parallels drawn between America and Germany – the fascist and capitalist tendencies within the American ranks – finally lead to a merging of interests as American administrators, headed by General Farrish, compromise and cooperate with former Nazis in rebuilding Germany in the aftermath of the war. Willoughby, promoting his own agenda, identifies a powerful potential ally in General Farrish: ‘The future was with strong men,’ he reflects. ‘On the crest of the wave Farrish would beat up, a man could ride far.’ He becomes Farrish’s right-hand man, and encourages the General to embark on a political career as a senator back in America. DeWitt is surprised to learn of this new ambition.

A spark of irony lighted DeWitt’s eyes. “I thought you hated politicians.”
Farrish tickled the shining calves of his boots with the tip of his crop. Then he bared his teeth. “I’d be the politician to end all politicians. I’ve got my strategy all lined up. It’s like at Avranches. I break through, and then there’s no holding me.”

DeWitt senses the danger this prospect holds: ‘He was afraid of something. Not of Farrish, not of any one person – he didn’t know of what.’ Although DeWitt is unable to articulate it, the menace is clear: the language of the canons that is Farrish’s idiom – the ‘iron fist’ of fascism – threatens to echo far beyond the battlefields of Europe. Business and totalitarianism are thus shown as mutually implicated in a potential fascist regeneration.
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The threat to democracy from Farrish’s military brand of totalitarianism is complemented and compounded by the anti-democratic and amoral tendencies of Big Business. Willoughby articulates the corporate view of democracy when he explains his interest in Prince Yasha to Yates.

Democracy, Yates, is purely a matter of form. What we’re concerned about, is: will Yasha Bereskin, who knows about production and management, control the Delacroix mills? Or will it be a committee of the great unwashed, men from that DP camp, perhaps, who know only one thing – to work with their hands?

The aim of Willoughby and the financiers he represents is to run a profitable business and expand it after the war, no matter who their partners may be. Farrish, who after the war commands the military government in Kremmen, the town of the Rintelen steel mills, is interested in the potential gains for his political career. Neither man’s ambition coincides with the professed goal of rebuilding a democratic Germany. Crucially, then, in Heym’s depiction of the war of ideas, the scope of the battlefield broadens, anticipating the conflict of the Cold War. In this battle, the novel implies, identification is not a matter of nationality, but ideology.

Pettinger is aware of the American regard for big business, and therefore chooses to hide in the Rintelen home, with the Rintelen widow and Major Dehn’s wife. The Americans won’t search the house, Pettinger assures the women: the ‘name of Rintelen is a big name. It is known in America. […] The financial pages of their newspapers gave columns to him and his empire – such a man, his widow, his house, will not be touched.’ Pettinger believes he can bide his time and prepare for a German resurrection. It is a prophecy which – Heym seems to suggest in his depiction of the administration of postwar Germany – is not entirely misguided or deluded, and one which outlines the risk of compromising in the war against fascism.

The English and Americans will be sorry they ever won this war – they won it for the Soviets! […] I tell you, right now, in London and Washington, they are asking themselves the question: What kind of Europe, what kind of Germany is this going to be

---
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– their kind, that’s our kind – or the Russians? [...] Having destroyed us, they’ll have to coddle us and build us up again, because they need our help.  

Criticism of the way America handled the aftermath of the war is at the heart of the novel’s political purpose: to warn against complacency and to expose and denounce collaboration, willing or unwitting, with the forces of fascism (and, less explicitly, given anti-communist sentiments in America, with capitalism). Heym is convinced that the writer has a responsibility to write books “which help everybody to recognize what we’re living for and fighting for.” Through the dialogical juxtaposition of American and German attitudes and actions in the novel, Heym creates, to return to Eagleton’s definition of ideology, the discursive field in which social powers collide. He thus reminds his readers that the war of ideas rages on, and that this is a war not between two nations – America and Germany – but between systems of belief, between ideologies.

***

The Man-between: Identity and Identification

Heym’s seemingly unequivocal identification with America, expressed in his speeches in the early stages of the war, makes way for a more critical view of his new homeland as he no longer perceives the American war effort as a crusade for democracy. The Crusaders, which seeks to portray the battle of ideologies, also reveals a more personal conflict: the struggle of a torn identity. Heym’s unique position as the translingual, bicultural mediator allows him to see each one of his cultures in the light of the other. He seems to be at the same time familiar with both, and sufficiently distant to see the Germans and the Americans clearly. In The Crusaders, Bing appears to occupy the same position, one that can be defined, following Bakhtin, as a center that is ‘a relative rather than an absolute term,’ dependent on a dialogical relation between ‘two bodies occupying simultaneous but different space.’ These bodies can be physical bodies or bodies of ideas – ideologies –
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and the ‘non-centeredness of the bodies themselves requires the center constituted by an observer’ who is also ‘an active participant in the relation of simultaneity.’

This position is most clearly evident in the Fourth of July leaflet operation, where Bing plays a crucial role not only in composing the leaflet, but in handling the propaganda activity on the battlefield. After the cannons have spoken and the leaflets have been dropped on the Germans soldiers, Bing addresses them in his native tongue, German, using loudspeakers placed in the no-man’s-land between the American and German positions. Bing is worried at first that he would produce nothing but ‘disconnected stammerings,’ but once he begins speaking, he finds himself sounding ‘strangely sure and confident.’ His voice is ‘surprisingly strong’ and his ‘mind is clear’: he becomes ‘the voice of reason.’ He explains that the round of cannon fire marking the Fourth of July was only a taster of the Americans’ true power, and stresses the superior force of the American army and the desperate position of the German leaders. He gives the German soldiers a chance to surrender, promising that no harm would come to them. Fourteen German soldiers take up this offer, and as they approach the American side, four American soldiers are sent to take the Germans and escort them to the rear.

Satisfied that his job is done, Bing suddenly sees that in their surprise and excitement, the ‘four American soldiers were marching the German deserters straight back to the German lines.’ The Germans, meanwhile, hold their fire. ‘Perhaps they figured that the deserters had convinced the Americans to switch roles,’ Bing reflects. At that moment of confusion, Bing – the Man-between – seems to be the only one able to see both sides of the field for what they really are, and to instruct the American soldiers to walk in the correct direction. When he shouts at the Americans to turn back, they stare at him,

157 Holquist, p. 21.
158 Heym, Crusaders, p. 91.
159 Heym, Crusaders, p. 92.
160 Heym, Crusaders, p. 92.
161 Heym, Crusaders, p. 95.
162 Heym, Crusaders, p. 96.
163 I am borrowing the term Brian Fitch uses to describe the position the bilingual writer, specifically Beckett. In this case I do not, however, follow his distinction between the ‘Man-between’ and the ‘Go-between’: the latter is ‘characterized by his movement to and fro’ whereas the Man-between is ‘not completely static, but any change in his position, any displacement, remains circumscribed by the two polarities which alone define him as being what they are not.’ See Brian T. Fitch, Beckett and Babel: An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), p. 156.
uncomprehending. ‘Their eyes were blank. Their faces were like the faces of the German deserters – the same vagueness.’

In the fog of war, it falls to the mediator to influence the soldiers of both armies: stirring them to action and steering them in the right direction. It is no accident, then, that the task of explaining what the Americans are fighting for falls to the German immigrant, of all people. ‘In truth,’ the narrator comments, ‘it was the temptation to play a joke on history’ that pushed Bing to contradict his commanding officer: ‘He, Sergeant Walter Bing, a nobody, a boy who had come to America without roots and ties, banished from home and school, was about to state the aims of this war.’ Bing’s personal stake in the war is clear. Yet his own precarious position as a German-American haunts him. Crucially, the tension between these two identities - German and American? German or American? – ultimately proves impossible to resolve.

The identification with America seems at first clear-cut. ‘I hate ‘em’ he tells Yates, of the Germans, or ‘the Krauts’, as he refers to them. Yates questions the usefulness of such an emotion: “‘Hate…’ Yates said doubtfully, and added […]: “You want to understand the Germans, don’t you? If you have to gauge their state of mind, you have to put yourself in their place. How can you, if you hate them?”

Bing’s understanding of the Germans does not require an exercise in empathy. Rather than put himself in their place, imagine himself as one of them, Bing is desperate to imagine himself as other than them.

Bing seems to succeed initially in constructing himself as other than German, as American. He is unreadable to both sides: the American soldiers do not seem to regard him as an outsider, and the German prisoners he interrogates do not recognize him as a German. In Luxemburg, near the front, soldiers bring two men in American uniform for interrogation, accompanied by a note from their lieutenant, explaining that the men had been stopped at a roadblock because ‘there was something fishy about them.’ These are members of the elite unit of German spies Pettinger has trained for Operation Buzzard. These selected men are sent across the Allied lines to ‘disrupt enemy communications, blow up bridges and dumps, transmit wrong orders, eliminate isolated command posts and kidnap or kill the most
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important Allied commanders,’ including General Farrish.\textsuperscript{169} The German soldiers are trained to pass as Americans: they are ordered to speak English ‘even in their most personal and trivial conversations’ and are instructed in the finer details of American life.\textsuperscript{170} Their cover is so thoroughly prepared that ‘they knew more about their Congressman and their Senator than the average American did; they could tell exactly what streetcar line to take from the West side to downtown, and where to transfer if you wanted to go to Sears Roebuck.’\textsuperscript{171}

When Bing interrogates one of the two captives, he does not find anything suspicious at first. The soldier’s uniform looks authentic, and when Bing tests him by addressing him in German, the man does not respond, and insists he does not speaks the language. Yet it is precisely language that finally betrays the German: with ‘his ears sharpened,’ Bing notices ‘slight discrepancies – the occasional hissing s in the man’s speech, his using slang like \textit{Sarge} and \textit{Nigger} on the one hand, and calling his wounded driver \textit{Comrade} on the other – only a German would translate \textit{Kamerad} into \textit{Comrade}.’\textsuperscript{172} And only a German, like Bing, is able to discern these subtle linguistic markers.

Bing, however, is able to pass successfully for an American: he is never singled out by other American soldiers as German, nor recognized by the Germans he encounters in the field. Unlike the spies, who simply parrot the information that was drilled in them during their training, Bing has become truly bicultural. He has embraced not only the English language, but American rhetoric and American values. For a time, he seems to manage to be truly American, taking advantage of his ability to access the German psyche only in the line of duty, in his role as interrogator and propaganda writer.

Yet as Bing’s unit approaches the German border, the identity Bing strives to suppress becomes increasingly difficult to deny.

He understood these people all too well; […] Did he have this instinctive understanding because there was in \textit{him} the residue of \textit{them}? And if so,
what was to become of him since he hated them for what they were [...]?
Did he have to hate himself?173

The tension intensifies when Bing returns to his native town, Neustadt, after the Americans conquer it. Standing in his childhood home, which had been taken over by a Nazi, he believes his new identification is strong enough to defeat the old identity: ‘He felt the shreds of what he had feared was in him, fall away. He had no relation to these people […] because he had changed and grown roots elsewhere.’174 However, his sense of control over his identity and the pride of being a triumphant American are revealed as mere illusion when he is recognized by his family’s former maid: as she hails him, she ‘[brings] back to him the boyhood he wanted forgotten. And how easy it had been for her to approach him,’ he reflects. ‘Some conqueror!’175 Meanwhile, American control of Neustadt also breaks down as the infantry unit Bing had been accompanying, complacent in its victory, is caught in a German ambush and its soldiers are massacred.

Bing is wracked with guilt over his failure to warn his American brothers in arms. ‘When they needed him most, he hadn’t been there,’ he thinks. By letting his guard down and allowing himself to be overwhelmed by his past, Bing temporarily – and fatally – loses himself in the no-man’s land between the two identities, the German and the American. He is no longer the Man-between, the translator and mediator: he fails to read in time the signs of danger – the fact that the white flags have suddenly disappeared from the village houses. He does not anticipate the enemy’s next move, and a battle is lost.

There is another dimension to Bing’s failure. His vain triumphalism has caused the distinction between the American soldier and the German in him to collapse. ‘He had returned home to find that he was like those who had expelled him – a strutting conqueror; overbearing.’176 When American identification becomes American chauvinism, it comes dangerously close to the German identity Bing rejects. This is true not only on an individual level, but on a grander scale, as ‘the language of America’ loses touch with the ideas of freedom and democracy from which it originated and becomes a language of power, greed and corruption. Bing cannot overcome the internal contradiction: ‘wherever he turned, he
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was up against the same thing he thought he had escaped.\textsuperscript{177} He dies, unheroically, just before the end of the war, in an incident of what today is called, without irony, friendly fire: his tank is attacked by an American plane.

***

\textit{A Convert to the Crusade}

The Crusaders charts the movement of two central characters, Sergeant Bing and Lieutenant Yates, between two attitudes: conviction and inner conflict. Whereas Bing, who in the beginning of the novel articulates the American goals with great conviction, is gradually overcome by internal contradiction, Yates follows a reverse trajectory: he is transformed from a reluctant, hesitant soldier into a true crusader – a position that contains its own flaws and dangers. As Bing’s commanding officer in the Psychological Warfare unit, Yates too is involved in propaganda activity, and the change in him can be traced in relation to the key propaganda operations depicted in the novel.

The composition of the Fourth of July leaflet is a defining moment for Bing, but also for Yates’s initial position. He opposes the idea of the leaflet and dismisses the value of the grand statement it is meant to make: the job of the propaganda unit, Yates maintains, is ‘to inform the Germans they’re in a tough spot, and if they raise their hands they’ll be treated right and get corned beef hash and Nescafé.’\textsuperscript{178} ‘The war is not fought with words, but with ‘guns and more guns, planes and more planes.’\textsuperscript{179}

This practical approach to the war manifests itself also in his attitude towards the Germans. When Bing declares that he hates ‘the Krauts,’ Yates tries to persuade him of the value of recognizing the enemy’s humanity.\textsuperscript{180} ‘The man over there’s been doing the same thing you’ve been forced to do,’ he tells Bing; ‘he’s followed orders. He’s got the same trouble: protecting his own posterior. He’s the victim of his politicians as we’re the victims of ours.’\textsuperscript{181} Yates suggests that the soldiers of both armies are cannon-fodder exploited by cynical, ruthless politicians: this perceived similarity causes him to sympathize with the
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soldiers on the other side of the frontline. Bing refuses this description of the situation, and draws a parallel of his own: ‘You talk like the German prisoners,’ he accuses Yates.\textsuperscript{182}

Yates has, in fact, allowed the German soldiers’ rhetoric, their denial of personal responsibility for their actions, to affect him. It is an attitude that also characterizes his own position as the reluctant soldier: ‘once he became part of [the war], he followed the patterns and did what he was supposed to do without rancor and even with a show of pleasantness.’\textsuperscript{183} Yet as the American forces advance from Normandy into Germany, Yates experiences the horrors of the battlefield and witnesses the atrocity of the Germans’ policies towards soldiers and civilians. With Bing, he encounters in Verdun the Displaced Persons from Russia and Eastern Europe who were forced to work in the German mines; he sees Troy’s unarmed soldiers massacred by the German troops who captured them; he meets the survivors of the Paula concentration camp near Neustadt. If the deeds of the Germans shock him, Yates is also shaken by interactions within his own unit: the victimization of Corporal Thorpe, a traumatized soldier abused by the bigot Dondolo and framed for the black-market trading he seeks to expose, weighs heavily on Yates’s conscience. He feels he failed to intervene when he had had the power to protect Thorpe against Dondolo, and that his lack of action contributed to Thorpe’s eventual, possibly preventable, mental breakdown.

The realization that individual action is not only morally significant but can affect events big and small naturally brings with it a rejection of the Germans’ refutation of personal responsibility. When Heberle and Musinger, the two spies who were sent to assassinate Farrish, are sentenced to death, Heberle pleads with Yates: “Don’t you see, sir – I only followed orders! I’m not responsible!”\textsuperscript{184} This argument is no longer acceptable to Yates:

Yates found that no understanding whatever was left in him for this man’s problem, viewpoint, and feelings. And this was not because he had the man in his power, squirming, but because there was only one side that was right in this fight, and that was his own side.\textsuperscript{185}
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Yates has ceased trying to empathize with the enemy: he has become a true crusader, believing in the righteousness of the cause he serves. The doubts that undermined him and hindered his action appear to dissipate as he allows himself to identify fully with the American effort.

The gradual transformation in Yates reaches an apex associated with the second type of propaganda activity in the novel: radio broadcasts. Yates’s unit operates Radio Luxemburg, broadcasting propaganda to the Germans. As the German counter-offensive advances, the station becomes a target, and the threat of its capture by the Germans is imminent. In Colonel DeWitt’s absence, Major Willoughby decides to shut the station down, much to Yates’s dismay. DeWitt’s return sees the decision swiftly overturned, and the station’s transmissions resume, the broadcast opening with the national anthems of the Allied forces. As the ‘Star-Spangled Banner’ echoes through the airwaves, Yates is overcome with emotion. He ‘was very close to his country, then; perhaps for the first time. It was a wonderful, sweeping feeling. And he thought he wanted to hang on to it; and dimly, he perceived that he might be able to do it.’\textsuperscript{186} The patriotic feelings boil down to ‘something real and human and warm and genuine, to something profoundly stirring – a call to action.’\textsuperscript{187}

Yates initiates a propaganda project after his own heart for the renewed radio broadcast. Whereas Bing was happy to formulate the American aims of the war in his leaflet, Yates pursues a path that is closer to his initial conception of the role of propaganda. Rather than ‘the great slogans, so seductive and so empty,’\textsuperscript{188} he chooses a form of address that represents not the voice of America, but the voice of German soldiers, defeated. He offers Heberle and Muslinger, the spies awaiting execution, to address their fellow Germans:

I’m giving you the chance to talk to your people to the soldiers of your Army, on this, your last night – to tell them what you went out to do, and who ordered you, and how you were tried, and why you have to die. I’ll give you the chance to warn them – so that others don’t have to go the way you will go.\textsuperscript{189}
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After he records the prisoners, Yates provides the German listeners with a recording of the execution itself accompanied by a detailed description of every step of the event, explaining that the execution should be seen as ‘a warning that the American Army doesn’t tolerate any infringement on the law of warfare.’ The Americans, his message states, are fighting fairly, according to the international conventions of warfare; war criminals will be duly punished.

Yet behind the scenes at the recording, a disturbing picture emerges. When Clements, the engineer, admits he is ‘sort of excited’ about his ‘first execution,’ Yates calmly reflects “I used to say it was unnecessary, cruel, stupid to take men’s lives systematically. […] I don’t think so any more. To me, these guys are like bugs. You don’t have any compunctions using DDT, do you?” He no longer considers the Germans as men, but as bugs, and systematic killing – extermination – is the solution. This is no slip of the tongue: Yates later explains to DeWitt that the Germans ‘are no good to the world’ and acknowledges the change that occurred in him.

“Back in Normandy, sir, I was an extremely objective gent. I believed we were about as vicious and foolish as the Germans, and the war was unnecessary, and I, certainly, didn’t belong in it. Now, I’d love to apply for the job of Extermination Commissioner.”

Thus, as sheer hatred displaces the humanistic values guiding the American war effort, the language of Nazism crosses national and linguistic boundaries and permeates the language of America. Yates is redeemed, to an extent, when he finds he cannot remain completely detached during the execution. As the chaplain leads the men in The Lord’s Prayer, ‘Yates fell silent. He caught himself, his lips were moving too. It wasn’t so easy.’

The reader is not privy to the broadcast in its entirety. The German spies’ voices are heard as they prepare for the broadcast, but the recording itself is represented in the text only indirectly, through the commentary on the two men’s performance, their insistence on revising the recording and ‘polishing their last statements to the very dots on the i’s.’ Their address to the German people, it seems, is genuinely aimed at a fictional German
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audience within the novel. The part of the broadcast that is represented in full, as a direct quotation, is Yates’s narration during the execution. This is the message, it would appear, that is aimed at the American reader: the punishment was warranted by the crime, and – unlike the Germans who ignore international conventions – the Americans go out of their way to insure procedures are carried out fairly. The sentence of the military court is read ‘in English first, then in German – though both prisoners understand English very well.’

The Chaplain prays with the prisoners: “Vater unser, der Du bist in Himmel – Our Father, which art in heaven…”

Though the prisoners would have prayed in their native tongue (and the entire broadcast would have been recorded in German, of course), the first line of the prayer appears in both languages. The repetition of the text in two languages underlines the universality of the sentiment expressed by the prayer – the appeal to a single, common God: the very sentiment that causes Yates to join the prayer and acknowledge, if only for a brief moment, the German prisoners’ humanity. It is striking that the only German-language text in this passage is a religious, and specifically Christian one, whose function is unifying, whereas the new crusader for democracy Yates succumbs to the dehumanizing language of Nazi rhetoric.

Indeed, the very notion of the crusader seems to be problematized in the novel. Tate notes that the novel provides no information about the source of the idea of the crusade, and explains that ‘readers in the late 1940s might have been in no doubt that it was the Allied Commander-in-Chief, General Eisenhower, who gave the address to the D-Day troops about the war as a “Great Crusade” against “Nazi tyranny.”’ He adds that ‘the only clue […] in the text is when one of its opponents refers to the idea of the war as “a god-damned crusade” having been “mimeographed in some order.”’ In fact, the speaker, Crerar, is criticizing Bing’s Fourth of July leaflet: ‘You consider this war as a God-damned crusade. I know that was mimeographed in some order. I like your idealism, your naïve approach. In fact, it gives me some hope. But I’m inclined to be a realist.’
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A crusade requires religious, unquestioning conviction. Crerar’s criticism of Bing’s belief in his own propaganda as naïve is validated as the plot, in all of its complexity, unfolds. While the acts of propaganda that feature in the novel prove successful, they fail to effect a fundamental change. The language of propaganda serves the purposes of power; it is part of an argument made with ‘guns and planes and men and guts and endurance.’ This argument, Yates realizes, ‘had won the war. But the disease remained.’ Moreover, the language of propaganda is revealed as simplistic, suppressing complexities and contradictions, and therefore at risk of masking totalitarian tendencies. Indeed, at the end of the war, Heym – the patriotic American soldier and writer of wartime propaganda – is bitterly disillusioned: ‘The war, which began as a crusade, ended as a tale of robbery,’ he writes in his autobiography (‘Der Krieg, als Kreuzzug begonnen, endet als Räuberstück.’).

***

**From Crusader to Skeptic: the Narrator as Outsider**

Sergeant Walter Bing and Lieutenant David Yates are, as critics have noted, the most fully developed characters in *The Crusaders*. Tate argues that Heym ‘felt it necessary to divide his historical self into two fictional figures,’ killing Bing off in his attempt to distance himself from the German within him, and allowing Yates to ‘take up the moral baton.’ Rather than regarding these two characters as reflections of the historical author, I would like to consider their position in the narrative in relation to posited author, to use Bakhtin’s term.

Bing, the native German speaker, adopted the English language and American rhetoric in a bid to stifle his German identity. Yates’s journey, on the other hand, while leading him to embrace the crusade Bing advocated in the beginning of the novel, has also resulted in his adoption of Bing’s German-hating attitude. Whereas in Bing’s case this hatred is ultimately turned against himself, in Yates’s case it leads to dehumanization of the enemy that is more extreme than Bing’s. As Nazi Rhetoric infiltrates Yates’s speech, the language of America appears, yet again, to echo the language of fascism.
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Both perspectives – Yates’s and Bing’s – are ultimately limited, and potentially dangerous; neither one, therefore, can be said to embody the author’s message fully. The author’s message is conveyed through the interaction of all the various perspectives in the novel, or as Bakhtin puts it: ‘The author (as creator of the novelistic whole) cannot be found at any one of the novel’s language levels: he is to be found at the center of organization where all levels intersect. The different levels are to varying degrees distant from this authorial center.’

The multiplicity of perspectives and voices allows the author to let the various ideologies and world views interact in the novel. As Hutchinson notes, this novel, ‘so firmly ideological in its implications [is] almost lacking in “editorializing.”’ The narrator hardly ever makes a clear statement or expresses an opinion, but rather lets the political and ideological commentary emerge from the characters’ own speech, thoughts and actions. There seems to be no narratorial persona within the novel. Heym himself once described his process of writing as allowing the characters he created simply to interact as they would in real life: ‘they moved according to their own laws and precepts, I was just the medium through which they spoke, in which they mirrored themselves and their hearts.’

This description of authorial neutrality, however, is misleading. The posited author does in fact reveal himself in the paratext – the prefatory note. Paratexts, Gérard Genette explains, present the text ‘in the usual sense of the verb but also in the strongest sense: to make present, to ensure the text’s presence in the world, its “reception” and consumption.’ A preface, Genette explains, ‘has as its chief function to ensure that the text is read properly’: as the author intended it to be read. Thus, by affirming that the events depicted in the book are based on historical facts and the author’s personal experience, Heym creates a space for his projected self, not as one (or two) of the characters, but as the narratorial persona who is able to enter the minds of each of his characters and to maintain a horizon much greater than any one character can achieve: an outsider who is also
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an insider. This doubling of perspective that is linked to Heym’s translingualism will be further developed in Heym’s later fiction, as I will show in the next chapters.

*The Crusaders*, I would suggest, is ideological, but is not a work of propaganda: it is a form of persuasion. The persuader ‘is a voice from without, speaking the language of the audience members’ voices within,’ Jowett and O’Donnell write. In a sense, Heym – the exile, the bicultural translingual – writes from without: no longer from the position of the enthusiastic American immigrant, but from that of a disillusioned critic. Yet he writes for an American audience, in their own language. The novel is a call for action, for a fight against fascism. It justifies a crusade: not an American crusade, but a crusade for democracy, an idea in which the skeptical Heym continues to believe wholeheartedly. The novel’s ending does not provide closure. The American victory is a qualified, incomplete victory. The representatives of the major facets of fascism in the American army, Willoughby and Dondolo, are discredited, but are also shown to have gained from the war. They return to America better off than they had originally been. The war has not been won; the battleground has merely shifted.

* ***

---

4. The Writer and His Languages

The move from one language – and from one culture – to another features distinctly in the works discussed in the previous chapters. Lind represents translingualism in his autobiography optimistically, as a possible solution to a crisis of identity, whereas Heym reveals in *The Crusaders* the tensions of identification that consume and ultimately destroy his translingual character, Walter Bing. Although translingualism itself is not a theme of the authors’ later works, I will contend that it nevertheless underlies and shapes these works and the figure of the writer that emerges from them – both in the text and as the identity constructed by the authors as a means of self-definition.

In this chapter, I focus on two satirical and allegorical works that feature a writer as the narrator-protagonist: Lind’s *Travels to the Enu* and Heym’s *The King David Report*. Language is a key theme of Lind’s novel, and becomes, as in his autobiographical works, an internalized battleground. Heym’s novel, a subversive retelling of the biblical story of the life of King David, was composed in English and translated by Heym into German. Using drafts to trace the role of self-translation in the composition of this novel, I will argue that through the doubling of perspective that this process entails and through the reference to a single, universal origin – the Bible – this bilingual text positions its author as mediator between languages and cultures.

In the three volumes of his autobiography, Lind charted the process of becoming a writer, and more specifically – an English-language writer. The three volumes created a link between language and identity, and established one seemingly unified, if not entirely stable, identity: that of Jakov Lind the writer. The choice to write in English emerged as the solution to Lind’s conflicted relationship with his mother tongue: an alienation that is necessary for the reconstruction of a life and an identity shattered by Nazism and the Second World War. That language is a main preoccupation of the autobiography shows the centrality of the linguistic struggle in Lind’s life: the theme endures from the moment Lind decides, in the late 1960s, to write his autobiography in English in order to gain psychic distance from the difficult subject matter of *Counting My Steps*, and throughout the two decades that passed until the publication of *Crossing* 1991. It is no great surprise, therefore, that the theme persists in the fiction Lind wrote between these two volumes. In what
follows, I will explore how this concern finds its expression in Lind’s first English novel, how the linguistic switch is associated with a thematic shift from Lind’s earlier fiction in German, which dealt directly – if in grotesque and fantastic ways – with the Second World War, and ask whether the Lind’s translingualism is, as Stella Rosenfeld argues, what ‘sealed his personal and literary homelessness.’

In *Travels to the Enu* (1982), his first published English-language novel, Lind uses the genre of travel and adventure writing, inspired first and foremost by Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels,* to create, as Rosenfeld suggests, a satire ‘of a writer permanently uprooted and alienated, and seeking, however obliquely, to condemn the wrongs that men inflict upon their fellows.’ *Travels to the Enu* is the story of an English writer, Orlando, who, after a bizarre and nightmarish cruise from London to South-East Asia, finds himself shipwrecked on Kawflick Atoll, an island inhabited by the Enu – ‘a tribe of hominid baboons’ with birds nesting in their hair. This initial encounter carries clear echoes of Gulliver’s first glimpse of the Yahoos and his failure to recognize them as fellow humans. Yet the Enu, even in their exotic foreignness, seem uncannily familiar to Orlando. When he first sees these ‘unbelievable creatures,’ he observes that their ‘big, brown cow-like eyes gave them that particular look of slave and savage I had seen so often before in my life.’

Gradually, Orlando discovers that these savage and alien people are in fact survivors of a nuclear holocaust, and that ‘inside their minds’ they are ‘as exotic as [his] neighbours at home.’

*Travels to the Enu* displays many of the elements of traditional and, more specifically, of twentieth-century satire. According to Brian Connery and Kirk Combe, satire insists ‘upon its historical specificity’ with ‘torrential references to the peculiarities of […] the society that it represents […].’ Lind’s novel deals with ‘[our] post-World War II
generation,”⁹ the nuclear arms race and the rise of consumerism in the Western world. In an uncharacteristically explicit passage, Orlando condemns ‘contemporary and nationalistic tendencies all rolled into one with racialism and bigotry’ which he sees everywhere: ‘in South Africa and Argentina, in Cambodia and Chile, in Czechoslovakia, in Cuba and many African and Asian countries.’¹⁰ He calls this world order the ‘Fourth Reich,’ and warns: ‘[we] are half way down a spiritual cul-de-sac and once more preparing undreamed-of disasters and that the way it is where I come from, right now at the beginning of the eighties […]’.¹¹

This passage is unique in its direct and undisguised critique, as the novel generally follows the Swiftian model of satire, in which – as David Rosen and Aaron Santesso observe, the world ‘appears distorted, a place where nothing can be recognized clearly; images that remind us of allegory abound, but the organizing system is brutally absent.’¹² Thus, the voyage on board the SS Katherine Medici, an inexpensive cruise that promised a unique experience of ‘social tourism’ – where passengers are offered ‘a working holiday and [the] crew a well-earned rest’¹³ – deteriorates into a nightmare of exploitation, intimidation, violence and finally the attempted annihilation of the boat and its passengers by the piratical crew. Roy Arthur Swanson, building on the name of the ship, suggests that this part of the novel ‘amounts to a symbolic summary of Western civilization from the time of Catherine de Médicis to World War II’ and that the sinking of the Katherine Medici ‘spells the failure of modern social movements’ and the inception of totalitarian movements.¹⁴ Eva Meidl, on the other hand, reads this section as ‘a metaphor for Hitler’s Reich and the Holocaust’ and Orlando’s and his fellow survivors’ arrival on the island of the Enu as symbolizing ‘the post-war period of chaos and displacement.’¹⁵
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Some elements of the cruise support Meidl’s reading: the passengers’ diminishing rights, the increasing brutality of the crew, and most notably one of the passengers’ observation that ‘[without] guns to defend themselves [they] are animals before the slaughter […]’.¹⁶ Yet this interpretation seems somewhat reductive considering other aspects of the chaotic voyage, which point to a wider critique of Western society. As Meidl herself notes,¹⁷ the ship’s captain is named Gilbert Cook, no doubt a reference to Captain James Cook who sailed and chartered the Pacific Ocean in the eighteenth century and to the project of colonial expansion. Swanson points out that the ‘century of Catherine de Médicis saw both the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacre’ of 2000 Huguenots in Paris¹⁸ ‘and the opening up of the New World.’¹⁹ Arguably, the satire also extends beyond World War II into the contemporary, post-colonial era when the ship’s crew stage a mock-invasion by ‘the PLA, the Polynesian Liberation Army’ struggling to ‘liberate their homeland, Tasmania, from the colonialist, imperialist fettlers of a bygone age,’²⁰ and later retreat with their booty to the sound of Elvis Presley playing on the ship’s intercom.

While the ‘critical vision’ in Travels to the Enu is then, as Edward Timms contends, ‘related to a specific historical moment’ of the early 1980s,²¹ the target of Lind’s satire is wider and more diffuse. The novel reflects an unease and perhaps a pessimism that is characteristic of twentieth-century, and particularly postwar, satire. In ‘Juvenal’s Error’, Theodor Adorno, responding to Juvenal’s remark that ‘it is difficult not to write satire,’²² argues that it is in fact difficult to write satire in the second half of the twentieth century. Postwar reality, ‘which needs [satire] more than any ever did, makes a mockery of mockery,’²³ and irony loses its power in the face of ‘the deadly seriousness of comprehended truth.’²⁴ While satire traditionally aims to effect change by exposing
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corruption and warning against social ills, the writer ‘[after] Hitler’ might feel, like Adorno, that ‘total decay has absorbed the forces of satire.’ Nevertheless, as Marjorie Perloff shows, satire – both Swift’s in the eighteenth century and Beckett’s in the twentieth century to name but two examples – may have ‘less to do with social or political critique or with attempts to provide correctives for human foibles, than with what Claude Rawson refers to as the ‘radical incurability of the human condition, grounded in the ‘nature’ of the human animal.’’

Thus, Enu society is revealed to display, or adopt, many of the ills of western society. The preposterous restrictions placed on Orlando and his fellow survivors upon their arrival on the island – a month without food or water, after which the ‘uninvited foreign visitors’ might be allowed to work as slaves – are comparable to more familiar immigration barriers, as the Enu King delivers them ‘with the tired tone of the immigration officer and HM Customs Shed at Dover […].’ If foreigners are unwelcome, the elderly do not fare much better: the Enu have ‘underground old people’s homes to which all citizens over the age of eighty are confined, to save the trouble of burying them later.’ Orlando recognizes this attitude: ‘we lock up our old people, but so far mainly above ground.’ The Enu – like other, less exotic nations – are also ‘constantly at war with all sorts of rebels,’ their king explains to Orlando, and although they have – as survivors of a nuclear disaster – ‘rejected war machines and ballistic missiles quite some time ago,’ they are eager to learn about western approaches to war.
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The Enu people’s main achievement is a ‘revolutionary concept of nutrition.’\(^35\) Turning a threat – an increase in human waste – into an opportunity, the Enu developed a process of recycling excrement and turning it into food ‘reshaped and remodeled to resemble the original items completely.’\(^36\) Pok, or ‘recycled bread,’\(^37\) is ‘cheaper by half than the original, and its price keeps going down, thanks to over-production of raw materials.’\(^38\) Pok has transformed Enu society: ‘[starvation] and famine, endemic malnutrition and rickets and other diseases and the social upheavals that go with this kind of plague, instantly became a thing of the past.’\(^39\) The description of the advantages of Pok and the opposition of ‘traditional minded Enu’\(^40\) to this new method of food production evokes, as Timms notes,\(^41\) the contemporary debate about genetically modified food, and contains a stark warning. The culture of plenty brings about other ills: although ‘emaciated ghosts […] holding out bony fingers towards passers-by’ no longer haunt the streets of G’naau, the Enu capital, as they do ‘from São Paulo to New York and from Bombay to Birmingham,’ the island is soon filled with ‘obese monsters, outsize wobbling figures.’\(^42\) More ominously, since the ‘basic needs of the masses were now taken care of,’\(^43\) work is no longer a necessity but becomes a privilege, with the majority of Enu suffering from boredom: ‘[to] be occupied is everyone’s ambition but hardly anyone’s good fortune and the masses look just as disgruntled and miserable as in our major cities,’ Orlando observes.\(^44\) The solution to boredom, for some of the Enu leaders, is war: ‘War is the stuff of life,’ the Defence Minister explains to Orlando. ‘Peace, its opposite, is a deflated useless time and ultimately we all suffer the mental agonies it entails, the greatest of which is boredom.’\(^45\) Orlando is again struck by the familiarity of this argument, and assures the minister it is ‘common knowledge.’\(^46\)

The nuclear arms race, consumerism, and Western politics are just some of the wrongs decried and satirized in Lind’s short novel. Rosenfeld asserts that Lind’s ‘satire
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reaches such excess that it often loses its credibility (and tires the reader’s tolerance). Satire is not, as a rule, concerned with credibility; readers of satire, as Ruben Quintero explains, enter a tacit agreement with the satirist. Recognizing the writer’s intentions, they suspend their disbelief and tolerate – even enjoy – the fantastic and grotesque twists and turns of the satiric tale, and do not accuse the writer of “mad incoherence.” Travels to the Enu, I would suggest, breaks these conventions because rather than a political satire, it is ultimately an allegory of madness, and at times even of mad incoherence.

Rosenfeld links what she perceives as the failure of this novel and of Lind’s other English-language novel, The Inventor, which will be discussed in the next chapter, with the choice to abandon German and write in English. When Lind wrote his German-language works, Rosenfeld argues, ‘he was still close enough to his Viennese past and his victimization by Nazism to react naturally – and with rage – in German against the homeland that had outlawed him and the hunters who had marked him for death.’ Other German-language writers – whether living in Germany and Austria like Günter Grass or Thomas Bernhard or in exile like Erich Fried and Elias Canetti – ‘remain participants in the fate of their nations.’ Lind, by contrast, ‘was irreversibly robbed of the native ground on which a narrative literature of protest such as his can sustain itself.’ In what follows, I will build on Rosenfeld’s criticism to show how Lind’s translingualism – an extra-narrative factor – is linked to the mental disintegration that defines Travels to the Enu and features in it. By comparing this novel with some of Lind’s German-language works, I will argue that the linguistic switch is marked by, and possibly caused, a turn from a satire that engages with the world to a solipsistic withdrawal into the writer’s own mind in which a preoccupation with language is central.

***
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The Writer as Madman

Early on in *Travels to the Enu*, Orlando criticizes the only other account of the Enu inhabitants of the island of Kawflick Atoll, written in 1742 by one ‘Dr Tomaso Silva de Goncales, King Esteban II of Portugal’s private trouble shooter to Timor.’ Orlando observes that ‘by page five you begin to realize that what the doctor had in mind was a political pamphlet, a fable disguised as an adventure story – and that he probably never left his verandah overlooking the Timor Sea.’ Orlando’s own voyage and adventures among the Enu are similarly revealed as fantasy in a very literal sense: at the end of the novel, Orlando finds himself still standing at the travel agent’s shop in London, contemplating the offer of a cheap cruise to Sarawak. This remark is one of a series of intimations that the experiences narrated are not only unrealistic – the reader would expect this in a satirical fable – but unreal. Orlando himself seems unable, throughout his stay among the Enu, to believe the bizarre circumstances he is confronted with, and wonders if it is all a drug-induced hallucination: ‘At moments I believe I must have swallowed all thirty-two Dramamins [sic] at one gulp,’ he reflects, but remains unsure. ‘On the other hand if the bottle remained untouched (and I can’t be certain of that) my mind is capable of producing this present hallucinogenic state all by itself.’ *Travels to the Enu* is in fact a voyage of the mind and into the mind: it is a portrait of mental disintegration that is associated, I would argue, with the choice to abandon one’s own mother tongue.

Language is more than just one of the themes of the novel. Timms argues that the novel offers ‘an exploration of the language of violence’ and that Lind ‘transforms the interactions between war and language into a highly suggestive allegory.’ I would go further and suggest a reading of the novel as an allegory of Lind’s own conflicted relationship with language, which leads to his increasingly solipsistic retreat into his own mind at the expense of a meaningful engagement with the society he sets out to critique. The linguistic switch, as I have shown in my reading of Lind’s autobiography, is associated with
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a separation between signifier and signified that leads to a destabilization of the sense of reality and mental disintegration. The same process can be traced in *Travels to the Enu*, and here too, as in Lind’s autobiography, language itself becomes an internalized battleground.

Lind himself announces the central role of language in the novel on the jacket flap of the American edition.

[This] present tale is my first voluntary plunge into a new world: English fiction – and it will not escape some astute critics that *Travels to the Enu – Story of a Shipwreck* is “pure” literature in the sense that it is about words, about language and to be more precise about the English language.  

This novel about language and about the estrangement from language is the story of a writer struggling to recover his identity. Orlando contemplates a cruise in which he can ‘dissolve into an ocean” after suffering the eviscerating attacks of literary critics who ‘destroyed’ his novel ‘by calling it “ungrammatical, incorrect, inaccurate, faulty, improper, incongruous and abnormal” and [his] mode of expression and choice of words “obscure, crabbed, involved, and confused; diffuse and verbose; grandiloquent, copious, exuberant, effusive, pleonastic, and long-winded, ambiguous and digressive”[…].’ This hostility calls to mind Lind’s own critical reception by German critics: Ursula Seeber notes that their ‘most often repeated objection is directed against the “incompetent use of German by this German-speaking author.”’ Lind here enacts the repeated complaint to the point of absurdity, as the critics’ unimaginative assault, ‘using every word and every insult they could find the *Thesaurus,*’ is reduced to ‘allusive gobbledegook.’

By focusing on language and style, the critics bury Orlando’s ‘genuine concern for the human predicament’ under a torrent of derogatory adjectives, which Orlando is unable to simply shake off: the critics’ verdict threatens Orlando with ‘a fate worse than […] the hangman’s noose,’ the ‘unspeakable catastrophe […] of anonymity.’ The power of the
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written word is a central theme of the novel. The written word constitutes the author’s identity, his very being, and is also capable of robbing him of it. The impact, however, is even more extensive: while ‘verbal asphyxiation’\textsuperscript{65} threatens the writer as an individual, the same tidal wave threatens to engulf Western society as ‘we are gradually choking to death on verbs and nouns – if not on air pollution.’\textsuperscript{66}

To avoid the peril of anonymity and preserve his identity, then, Orlando sets out on a voyage to an island where, paradoxically, the written word does not exist. The Enu, although they speak several languages, ‘have no written language, for which they see no need.’\textsuperscript{67} This withdrawal from written language, which constitutes the writer’s identity, echoes Lind’s account in Numbers – the second volume of his autobiography, which can be characterized, like Travels to the Enu, as a hallucinatory voyage of the mind – of his battle with his native language after the war. In a key passage analyzed in my earlier discussion of the autobiography, Lind recalls how, trying to unlearn the German language, he attempted to ‘try to go back to a time before [he] knew any language, into a near autistic state of mind’\textsuperscript{68} and to ‘make [his] own private language’ which could then be applied ‘in any tongue.’\textsuperscript{69} In Numbers, the private language is a stage in the recovery of identity and of a relationship with the world: ‘I had to discover my own references to things, people and ideas, which I would afterward be able to express in any language,’\textsuperscript{70} Lind explains, and notes that while forming this private language, he existed in ‘a primordial chaos.’\textsuperscript{71} As I have argued in the first chapter, Numbers seems to reflect that chaos: it focuses on ‘the beginning’ which is ‘nowhere but in the head.’\textsuperscript{72} The tension between the private language and the need to communicate can be said to define Lind’s work, as Timms notes:

That which “takes place inside my head” may suffice for a personal memoir, but a novelist needs to reach out to a wider world. Lind’s later fiction, almost exclusively composed in
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English, can be seen as an attempt to escape from the impasse of “private” discourse by creating fictional correlatives for his own sceptical consciousness.\textsuperscript{73}

*Travels to the Enu* is such a “fictional correlative,” where the unwritten language is equivalent to a pre-linguistic state. As Eva Eppler points out, language for Lind is inextricably linked to writing. In his article “Über Deutsch gesprochen,”\textsuperscript{74} Lind distinguishes between “dialect,” the spoken variety, and “language,” the written variety: “I only start calling my other dialects, Dutch, Hebrew and French, languages when I’m able to write in them.”\textsuperscript{75} This sentiment is repeated in various notes and drafts: “Language is the writing of it,” Lind declares in an undated typescript titled “Language.”\textsuperscript{76} Elsewhere Lind suggests that “language and [its] use is the most important regenerative force in civilized men.” The “conscious and semi-conscious self” understands “the inner & outer world by knowing roughly two dozen letters,” and the “suffering of the inarticulate and illiterate must be equal to the suffering of the schizophrenic.”\textsuperscript{77} As in his autobiography, Lind employs the term schizophrenia here to describe a state of linguistic crisis, closely associating a lack in language – but here specifically written language - with the rupturing of identity itself. “I [definitely] felt “I am getting mad,”” he adds, “if I can’t say what I want to say, which by implication means, write what I want to write down.”\textsuperscript{78}

Significantly, all of these quotations equating writing with consciousness and identity are taken from sources dated after 1970: after Lind had switched to writing in English. They correspond to the depiction of writing as the essence of identity in Lind’s autobiography, and as I have argued in the first chapter, this insistence on the primacy of writing obscures and even obliterates the identity constructed before Lind’s days as a schoolboy struggling to master the rules of spelling, who regarded written words as
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‘unimaginative drawings.’ The oral language that is suppressed by the writerly identity is Lind’s mother tongue, the Austrian-German the child Heinz had learned from his mother and from Mitzi the maid: the language so deeply associated with unspeakable loss.

Writing, then, is constitutive of identity for Lind, and the tale of Orlando’s sojourn among the illiterate Enu is, I would argue, an allegory of the breakdown of that identity: a portrait of the artist as a madman. The Enu people embody, as Timms observes, ‘the rupturing of rational identity,’ and they do so in ways that are directly related to language. Orlando describes his first impression of these strange creatures: the men ‘had their hair stacked high in fuzzy, towering constructions, which at first glance looked like birds’ nests and which, to my surprise, on closer examination, turned out to be used for that very purpose.’ The relationship between the men and the birds nesting on their heads is described in de Goncales’s log: ‘the Enu of the Kawflick Atoll are overlorded by birds of many types,’ and Orlando later observes that ‘[when] the Enu mind goes blank and can make no decision, unlike us they can depend on their feathered super-egos to make up their minds within seconds on their behalf.’ The birds, then, appear to be part of the Enu man’s self, and it is no surprise that different types of birds attach themselves to different konka – the Enu term for a ‘devoted slave’ of the bird, or urupa. The king and his courtiers, for instance, sport ‘formidable fortresses’ on their heads, and the king’s urupa is the ‘largest of the imperial vultures.’

The picture Lind paints here is surreal and hallucinatory enough in itself, but it acquires a crucial significance, as Eva Meidl points out, when the image is considered in light of an interaction between the English-language text and a particular German idiomatic expression: ‘Lind makes a virtue out of transposing the German idiom, einen Vogel

---

79 Lind, CMS, p. 17.
80 Timms, p. 93.
81 Lind, TE, p. 31. It should be noted that the Enu women do not share this trait, and are of very little consequence in the novel. Orlando does, however, describe the women in this initial encounter: there are ‘two totally different physical types’ of women, the first ‘tall and handsome,’ and the second physically repulsive (p. 32). The women among the survivors, too, seem to be insignificant, except in their roles as uninhibited sexual object (Bella) or the virtuous wife (Sylvia) who, ‘no longer naïve,’ knows ‘that all men [are] savages’ (p. 63). Lind’s often misogynistic representation of women is explored, to an extent, in the context of his autobiographical writing in the first chapter. Although this topic merits further analysis, it is beyond the scope of the current discussion.
82 Lind, TE, pp. 33-4.
83 Lind, TE, p. 52.
84 Lind, TE, p. 34.
85 Lind, TE, p. 36.
haben, a colloquialism meaning to ‘be off one’s rocker or head.’ Thus the German language – which makes only an indirect appearance in the novel through the English translation of von Clausewitz’s *On War*, which will be discussed below – underlies the tale, and provides the voyage of the emphatically English writer Orlando an inescapable German origin.

The complex relationship with one’s language is a feature of the Enu culture, which is characterized by linguistic variety: different languages are spoken by different social classes, and the Enu nobility is multilingual. The birds are involved in the process of language acquisition: according to de Goncales’s log, the young sons of the Enu nobility undergo ‘a strange form of initiation,’ in which, over time, ‘an urupa, a holy bird, pecks and mutilates his tongue’ until ‘the child […] speaks with the same impediments as his mentors, a language entirely incomprehensible to the rest of the ordinary Enu.’ This appears almost like a dramatization of the Lacanian process of entry into the symbolic order, the ‘matrix of social meaning that every human being is born into, but without at first realizing it.’ The insertion into the symbolic constitutes the subject, and since Lacan ties this process ‘with the Oedipal stage and hence the fear of castration, the insertion […] is seen as a mutilation and the creation of a lack […].’ The birds, which Orlando describes as ‘feathered super-egos,’ initiate the young boys into the social order and at the same time into language, mutilating their tongue and teaching them ‘the vulgar goulgoul for daily use and oungoul, which has a rich vocabulary and is in use only by a few Enu.’ The stratification of society further coincides with linguistic distinction as the king and his close kinsmen ‘might also converse in Kauuu, which is, in a strict sense, not a language at all, but purely acoustics.’

If Enu society seems to resemble a Tower of Babel in its multiplicity of languages, the most surprising linguistic feature is the Enu’s proficiency in English. When Orlando first
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encounters the Enu king and tries to win his favor, he is startled when the king addresses him in fluent, albeit crude, English: ‘Cut the shit, you alien devil.’ He discovers that the ruling class is the product of strange events in 1937, when a couple of English socialites crash-landed on the island. They taught the Enu English, mainly by reading and rereading Lawrence’s *Sons and Lovers*, a book which the Enu turn from a ‘literary diet’ into a literal one, as the book disappears and then reappears ‘half digested in the faeces of those most eager to learn the new language.’ The Enu’s appetite for the new language knows no bounds: after ingesting the literature, the Enu decide to ‘to enrich their vocabulary still further’ by ‘“know[ing]” the handsome couple first in the flesh,’ and finally incorporating them by ‘grilling their remains over hot ashes and stuffing them down with a gluttonous determination unequalled even among savages.’

The horrifying zeal with which the Enu take to learning English seems like an exaggerated, parodic account of Lind’s own voracious appropriation of English as he started to write, when his ‘true passion was collecting English words and using English syntax.’ Likewise, the Enu’s ‘rare over-confidence in the magic power of impressive-sounding English words’ is not dissimilar to Lind’s own description of his idealization of English: as a child he saw this language as one which, in stark contrast with his native German, ‘spelt everything: freedom and freedom from want, the brotherhood of man and his independence,’ and after the war every ‘single English word, every new English phrase […] armed [him]’ against the ‘ever recurring nightmare.’

Furthermore, as the king’s initial outburst demonstrates, the Enu display an impressive mastery of various dialects and registers of English – ‘[not] just their everyday Bloomsbury, Kensington, Foreign Office and BBC English’, but anything from British regional dialects to the language of the Aussies and Kiwis, Irish, and American. The English couple, justifiably ‘[fearing] the effects of their disciples’ starvation of their customary idiom,’ had taught them ‘any English they could think of.’ Similarly, Lind experiments in
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this novel, as Eva Eppler notes, with ‘a variety of stylistic registers’: combining quotations from various texts, fictitious (such as Dr Tomaso Silva de Goncales’s travel log) and real (Carl von Clausewitz’s *On War*), mixing the language of officialdom (in the king’s speech on the island’s immigration policy, for instance) with the foul-mouthed ‘hoarse Cockney’ outburst of a xenophobic ‘elder statesman.’ Eppler maintains that Lind is ‘taking liberties such as only someone feeling really at home in a foreign language would dare to take.’ The appropriation of different literary forms is, as Connery and Combe confirm, characteristic of satire, which, ‘itself formless, is mimetic of other forms of discourse.’ Yet in Lind’s novel it is the very use of the English language that becomes mimetic and, significantly, inauthentic: the Enu’s fluency in the various registers of English amounts to no more than a ‘most extraordinary example of linguistic cloning.’

Indeed, Orlando believes that he, the Englishman, and the Enu king speak the same language, but the king soon disabuses him of any notion of comfortable familiarity: ‘What you and I speak here I won’t call “Englgh,”’ he tells Orlando. ‘You are strange to me and I am a stranger to you. We speak. Let’s say we speak “strange” and let’s see who can speak stranger, you or I?’ Thus Orlando is estranged from his native tongue, which becomes the language of an incomprehensible other; at the same time, this estrangement has some advantages, and Orlando is ‘convinced that it was the strangeness of [his] language which made [the King] listen.’ Both the King and Orlando do in fact speak ‘strange,’ and English, which Lind described in *Crossing* as ‘the most universal […] of all languages’ and as a home, becomes in the novel eerie and uncanny (*unheimlich*): an imitation of language in which sense is ultimately lost. Moreover, English here is detached from its positive connotations and, through its very universality, becomes tainted by universal evil.

In the first instance, the English spoken by the Enu in their initial encounter with the survivors of the shipwreck displays nothing of the tolerant and inclusive tones Lind associates with the language in *Crossing*. From the king who addresses Orlando repeatedly
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as ‘alien devil,’ ‘foreign bandit’ and ‘mongrel bastard’ to his courtiers who demand that the ‘fucking foreigners’ go ‘back to where [they] bleeding well came from,’ the language is employed to reject the newcomer, the refugee, the migrant. In Crossing, Lind reflects on the limitations of the benevolence of the people among whom he has settled:

There is a certain condition attached to the English tolerance towards the foreigner and one which I can only agree with. The foreigner, the alien (as he is called) mustn’t try too hard or fast to assimilate or he will meet with a lot of resentment. As long as he doesn’t try to be what he is not, he is in nobody’s way.

Lind seems willing – even happy, to judge by this quote – to accept this caveat: after all, he chooses to be a ‘perennial foreigner’ and, having been banished by one nation, resolutely refuses to tie himself permanently to another. In Travels to the Enu, on the other hand, the very terms that were acceptable to Lind in England – foreigner, alien – resonate with an abusive xenophobia that a writer who has suffered its extreme manifestation cannot, will not, tolerate. Orlando strikes back, in the same crass, violent tone: ‘And fuck you too, you bigoted bastards, you stinking arseholes, you motherfucking, cocksucking, dirty baboons.’ No rational arguments can prevail against the irrational hatred of the foreigner, it seems; Orlando is saved by this outburst: his words ‘must have convinced [the King] that [Orlando] wasn’t one to be intimidated by the brute bastards at his court.

Once Orlando overcomes the preposterous visa restrictions imposed by the king and is admitted to the island, he discovers that the Enu’s hostility is not confined to newly arrived foreigners. The scorn the Enu express towards their enemies, the Hurru – ‘from “to hurry”, from being always on the move’ – sounds to Orlando ‘like all prejudices on the subject of minorities.’ To dispel any impression that the Hurru represent only that other wandering people, the Jews, the universal nature of the persecution of minorities is spelled out: Hurru is ‘but one of their many names. They are also known as NINNIES and SISSIES,
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SOFT EGGS and MEAN BASTARDS, PINKS and REDS, CRACKPOTS and COWARDS, ARSELICKERS and FAGGOTS, JEWS and NIGGERS, POUFFS and PAKIS, WOGS and FROGS and a few other familiar epithets.'

‘Jews,’ the only neutral term in this litany of abuse, becomes derogatory by virtue of association, suggesting that within the universality of bigotry, a special place is nevertheless reserved for the Jews: they seem to be hated in any language. Typography carries meaning here: small capitals are used throughout the novel to indicate words in the Enu language (or languages). The Hurru’s names appear in this typeface as Enu words, thus seemingly divorced them from their exclusively English connotations and context; this new contextualization further universalizes the phenomena of racism, discrimination and persecution.

It is curious that English, the language represented in the autobiography as a safe haven after German had become the language of persecution, should become in this novel the vehicle for prejudice, irrational hatred and warmongering. It seems almost as if English comes to resemble German, as the writer reaches the pessimistic conclusion that a language of tolerance does not exist, only a universality of evil. That evil permeates all languages and cultures becomes clear when, towards the end of the novel, the Enu prepare to go to war, and the Defence Minister, Pautok, tries to secure Orlando’s help. Pautok is a power-hungry warmonger, claiming ‘the bitterness of war’ produces ‘many virtues,’ superior to ‘the sweet-smelling but shortlived flowers of peace.’

War, for Pautok, is a solution to the boredom he sees spreading among his people in peacetime, and when Orlando suggests there might be other solutions to this problem, Pautok’s true motives are revealed: ‘The truth is,’ he tells Orlando, ‘we want to kill [the idle youngsters] off because we hate them for surviving us.’

War – whether it’s the cold war threatening Orlando’s world or the Enu’s war, carried using the warriors’ hands and teeth – is a cynical, calculated exercise that has nothing to do with the best interests of a nation. The Defence Minister, Orlando reflects, despite ‘his nudity and his painted-on decorations, his bare feet and the great number of charms he wears, […]’

looks very much like all soldier-politicians anywhere in the world.
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As survivors of a nuclear holocaust, the Enu have discarded the use of weapons. Nonetheless, Pautok is eager to hear Orlando speak about the theory of war, and Orlando ‘fan[s] his enthusiasm’\(^{123}\) by quoting the Carl von Clausewitz’s book *On War*.\(^{124}\) The Prussian General’s book, published posthumously in several volumes between 1832 and 1834, attempts to ‘construct an all-embracing theory of how war works.’\(^{125}\) Orlando quotes extensively from the opening chapter of the first volume, ‘What is War’: remarkably, he is able to cite entire paragraphs ‘just as if [he] were reading them from the printed page in J. J. Graham’s translation from the original German.’\(^{126}\) Nearly three pages of the novel are devoted to quotations from Von Clausewitz’s theory. The Enu learn that war, according to Von Clausewitz – the ‘Prussian Junker,’\(^{127}\) as Orlando refers to him – is “*an inherent necessity*”\(^{128}\) and that “*he who uses force unsparingly, without reference to the bloodshed involved, […] dictates the rules […]*.”\(^{129}\) F. N. Maude, the editor of the 1908 edition of *On War*, asserts that this work ‘reveals “War,” stripped of all accessories, as the exercise of force for the attainment of a political object, unrestrained by any law save that of expediency,’ and he sees this as ‘the key to the interpretation of German political aims, past present and future […]’\(^{130}\)

While Maude may be overstating the centrality of Von Clausewitz’s amoral philosophy of war to German political thought, the inclusion of extensive passages thereof in the novel and the reference to its German origin seems to identify the German language, which lurks at the background of this work as the key to its principal metaphor, as the language of war. Yet like the vocabulary of persecution, the language of war is universalized through its translation into English: these ‘few mouthfuls of Clausewitz’ have ‘fed many generations of aspiring officers at the Frunze Academy, as well as at Sandhurst and West Point,’ and they go down ‘like sweet liqueur’ with the Enu,\(^{131}\) who are almost as eager to imbibe this sinister product of written language as they were to ingest Lawrence’s *Sons and
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\(^{130}\) F. N. Maude, ‘Introduction’ in *On War*, pp. xxv-xxx (p. xxv).

Lovers. “More, more,” they beg,132 delighted to learn that, in the twentieth century, there are in fact no significant differences between the wars of so-called savages and those of purportedly civilized nations, as Orlando concludes:

Let me finish in his words, more informative than anything I have to say on the subject, as I am merely a traveler and writer and neither a philosopher nor a general. “The constant progress of improvements in construction of weapons is sufficient proof that the tendency to destroy the adversary which lies at the bottom of the conception of war is in no way changed or modified through the progress of civilization.”133

Thus, if the reference to Catherine de Médicis in the first part of the novel signals, as Swanson has suggested,134 the exploratory and expansionist aspirations of Western civilization, the use of von Clausewitz’s text suggests that the open horizons reveal nothing but the same ailments wherever the traveler may go: there is, ultimately, no progress, only more or less sophisticated ways for humans to persecute and destroy one another. Orlando’s hallucinatory voyage casts this critique in linguistic terms, as all languages in the novel – the Enu’s languages, Orlando’s English and von Clausewitz’s German – are shown to signify the universal intolerance and savagery of the human race.

***

The Writer as Moralist

The picture of humanity that emerges from Lind’s novel is bleak. Throughout the world, the ‘power of evil’ rules: Orlando lists ‘the Reagans, the Schmidts, the Miterrands and the Thatchers’ alongside tyrants such as Pinochet, Gaddafi, Brezhnev and Botha.135 The arms race continues despite the horrors of World War II; no lessons been learned, and resistance is subdued: ‘[after] Hitler there seems to be no one worth fighting against,’ Orlando explains.136 Waltraud Strickhausen argues that ‘Lind’s view of human nature may appear to be overwhelmingly negative and even embittered. But to attach the label of
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pessimism to his writing would be an undue simplification. Indeed, Orlando rejects this label as he tries to explain his position to one of the Enu:

“Would you call yourself a pessimist then?”

“What is that? I am a moralist, like all writers. Can’t you tell?” […]

Before leaving he asks: “Excuse me but what is a moralist?”

“Someone who cares,” I hear myself say.

“And a writer?”

“Some people say a writer is a person who finds the words and has the courage to write what he thinks. I think a writer is someone who locks himself up with his typewriter, pens and paper and ruins his health because he believes his craft and his ideas are needed. A writer is someone who hates himself and loves the world. In short, a madman of sorts.”

This definition of ‘a writer’ reflects the sense of purpose Quintero identifies in the work of the satirist, who is ‘fundamentally engagé’ and writes with ‘a sense of moral vocation and with a concern for the public interest.’ For Lind, however, writing is more than a vocation: ‘My “essential existence”, as I like to call it with Nietzschean paraphrase, is my writing,’ he declares in *Counting My Steps*. Lind’s memoirs, I have shown, both construct and, in a circular movement, depict the construction of the self as writer. In these works, identity and language are inextricably bound, and the loss of the mother tongue as a ‘private oasis’ is associated with a breakdown of the sense of identity. Yet before changing tongues and recreating his identity as an English-language writer, Lind wrote several works of fiction in German. Lind’s stories and novels, the best-known of which are *Soul of Wood* (*Eine Seele aus Holz*, 1962), *Landscape in Concrete* (*Landschaft in Beton*, 1963) and *Ergo* (*Eine bessere Welt*, 1966) are marked, like *Travels to the Enu*, by ‘anger and hatred of the evil in men,’ but they deal much more clearly with Nazism and its legacy.
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138 Lind, *TE*, p. 89.
139 Quintero, p. 2.
140 Quintero, p. 1.
141 Lind, *CMS*, p. 171.
142 Lind, *Numbers*, p. 75.
143 Rosenfeld, p. 11.
The Holocaust, to quote Strickhausen, is ‘the underlying reference point to which all events before and afterwards are related.’\(^{144}\) In *Travels to the Enu* and Lind’s last novel *The Inventor*, references to the Holocaust are at times oblique (as in the example of the voyage on the *Katherine Medici*), or embedded among plot twists that ultimately obscure them as they depict a postwar world gone mad. But when Lind embarked on his literary career in the 1960s, his aim was clear: ‘my theme evidently was the war, my war, what it meant to me and what had happened. This was the theme, with many variations, I must write about.’\(^{145}\) Through grotesque images and surreal situation, Lind delivers a scathing and unrelenting critique of man’s capacity for evil and inhumanity, but in the specific context, setting and – perhaps most importantly – the language of Austria and Germany.

The collection *Soul of Wood* features in its title story Hermann Wohlbrecht, an Austrian First-World-War veteran with a wooden leg, who is happy to take possession of his Jewish neighbors’ apartment in return for a promise to take care of their invalid son Anton. Wohlbrecht soon abandons Anton in a secluded cabin in the countryside, not killing him – after all, ‘[a] promise is a promise’\(^{146}\) – but fully aware of the impossibility that a paralyzed young man (Anton was born ‘with nothing but a head’\(^{147}\) and gradually grew useless limbs) could survive. Wohlbrecht fails to profiteer from the Barths’ apartment, and finds himself instead in an insane asylum where inmates are subjected to a ‘special treatment’ with ‘a new drug,’ which the doctors use to dispose of a daily quota of inmates.\(^{148}\) As the war is about to end and the German defeat looms ahead, Anton suddenly becomes of interest again to Wohlbrecht, as an insurance policy: the German doctor running the deadly experiments in humans explains to him, ‘[o]ne Jew can help a great deal. To have saved even one individual would be proof positive that we were not guided by feelings of hatred in the performance of our work.’\(^{149}\)

Wohlbrecht represents, Rosenfeld states, ‘the Austrian Everyman’ who is ‘not a monster of mythical proportions,’\(^{150}\) but is nevertheless capable of evil, and guilty of
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cooperating with and even sustaining the Nazi regime and its values. The language Lind uses, Timms explains, is the ‘an Austrian vernacular that is “cruel” and “sentimental” at the same time.’ Timms quotes a passage from the story to illustrate the ‘unmistakable’ Austrian dialect inflections: contemplating the lack of trains carrying supplies to the front, Wohlbrecht explains to a friend that the Jews took the trains away.

The Jews? You don’t say.
Sure, I saw it myself. They jumped on the train like wild men and made off with them.
They didn’t just take one, they took hundreds, the bastards.
Take our trains away? Where did you hear that? Asked Elfriede.
Hear it? I don’t hear nothing. I saw it. At North-west Station, I saw it with my own eyes.
Yeah, the Jews, and they didn’t even bring them back. They took them away to Poland.
What do you say to that, all the way to Poland!  

Die Juden? Was du sagst.
Uns die Eisenbahn wegnnehmen, wo hast du das gehört? Fragte Elfriede.

The grotesque ‘discrepancy between banal attitudes and momentous events,’ as Timms puts it, in Wohlbrecht’s complaint about the Jews who so inconsiderately took away the trains and did not return them, remains effectively shocking in Ralph Manheim’s English translation. But the translation cannot convey the distinctive tones of the Austrian original. Gitta Honegger explains the difficulty that ‘acoustic masks,’ a term used by Elias Canetti to describe the characterization in two of his plays written in Viennese dialect, pose to the translator: these ‘masks’ are ‘ethnic and deeply rooted in local culture and mentality, whose hypocrisies and meanness they capture with chilling precision. […] To the initiated ear they
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establish a person’s entire background including his most immediate personal environment.”\textsuperscript{155} To take one example, Viennese-born Ruth Klüger, who was transported to the death camps as a child,\textsuperscript{156} ‘keeps going back to her native Vienna only to listen to the language,’\textsuperscript{157} and writes in her autobiography that the Viennese-Austrian language has ‘peculiar inflection and rhythms […] and a wealth of malicious half tones that would be obscene in any other tongue; also an intense lyricism that easily degenerates into kitsch.’\textsuperscript{158}

‘Soul of Wood’ is steeped in this language, the dialect which, in Lind’s linguistic development as charted in his autobiographies, preceded the written language he privileges in later life. It is the native idiom whose ‘aural motifs,’ as Timms calls them,\textsuperscript{159} resonate with the nursery rhymes Lind learned in Mitzi’s lap and the songs he had heard on the streets of Vienna: nationalist songs in which, Lind explains, ‘it all rhymed. Dead rhymes with red. Blood with courage. And the new writings on the wall, “Jews perish in your own filth,” rhymed as well.’\textsuperscript{160} These songs make an appearance in the story as Alois, Wohlbrecht’s brother-in-law, helps Wohlbrecht smuggle Anton Barth into the forest:

> Rain or shine, dust or soup, sang Alois, who was tight by now, we’ll knock the Prussians for a loop. Juchei tralala, juchei tralala. He remembered the song from primary school.\textsuperscript{161}

> “Ob Regen oder Sonnenschein”, sang Alois, der bereits einen sitzen hatte, “wir hauen dem Preuß die Groschen ein. Juchei, tralala, juchei, tralala.” Ein Lied, an das er sich noch aus der Volksschule erinnerte.\textsuperscript{162}

The defiant patriotism soon dissipates, however, when the pair encounters two gendarmes, members of the Austrian Resistance, who are suspicious of their cargo. The gendarmes strike Alois for greeting them with a ‘most friendly Heil Hitler,’\textsuperscript{163} and once they are out of earshot, Wohlbrecht rages:
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Hitting a sick man! He shouted at the empty highway. The goddam nerve. Just for that:
Heil Hitler, and a double-triple Heil Hitler, and a “Judas drop dead” for good measure.\(^{164}\)

Einen Kranken so zu hauen! Schrie er in die leere Landstraße. Eine Gemeinheit ist das.
Jetzt justament Heil Hitler und ein dreidoppeltes – und ein “Judas verrecke” dazu.\(^{165}\)

Thus, as the nationalist songs of Vienna easily give way to cries of ‘Heil Hitler’ and ‘Judas verrecke,’ Austrian attitudes, embodied by Wohlbrecht the Austrian Everyman, are exposed as indistinguishable from those of Nazi Germany. In Lind’s portrayal, Austria is not Germany’s first victim – a common notion after the war\(^{166}\) – but a willing constituent of the Reich. In his use of the Austrian language, Lind distinguishes himself from other Austrian writers at the time who, according to Wolfgang Bernhard Fleischmann, tended to skirt descriptions of the holocaust and whose protagonists were ‘often little people, Austrian in speech, confronted and overcome by “other”, sinister, Nazi forces.’\(^{167}\)

Lind, then, is not sentimental or nostalgic in his use of this mother tongue: on the contrary, he uses it to expose the brutality of the society that so forcefully rejected him. Writing about Nazism and its legacy in the language of the perpetrators, Lind strikes well-aimed blows: ever since the war, he claims, “[writing] and fighting were the same.”\(^{168}\) Even ‘by writing unpublishable stuff, [Lind] felt that [he] was fighting the Nazis.”\(^{169}\) Writing is, then, a form of resistance, but also an expiation of guilt: as Kathleen Thorpe maintains, Lind’s works dealing with Nazism can be seen as ‘a type of “Wiedergutmachung” for the blows he did not strike’ during the war.\(^{170}\) Lind himself is haunted by guilt over his survival: ‘I hated myself for having run away, for not having stayed behind to fight the bastards.’\(^{171}\)
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166 Tony Judt notes that this view had been so widespread that, as early as 1943, under an Allied agreement, ‘Austria had been officially declared Hitler’s “first victim” and was thus assured different treatment from Germany at the war’s end.’ See: Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945* (London: William Heinemann, 2005), p. 52.
Thus Lind fights back by exposing the cruelty and the madness of the world which shaped him. Monstrosity is encountered in everyday settings: a cannibal on a train to Paris tries to lull his fellow passenger into a sleep from which he will not wake up in ‘Journey through the Night’, and when he fails, he vanishes in the dark with his tools ‘[like] a country doctor on his way to deliver a baby.’\footnote{Lind, SW, pp. 99-105 (p.105).} Lind’s works return time and again to what Hannah Arendt terms the ‘word-and-thought-defying banality of evil.’\footnote{Hannah Arendt, \textit{Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil} (London: Penguin, 2006), p. 252.} In \textit{Landscape in Concrete}, the giant, feeble-minded German soldier Bachmann, carrying out ‘a monstrous order,’\footnote{Jakov Lind, \textit{Landscape in Concrete}, trans. by Ralph Manheim (London: Methuen, 1966), pp. 70-71.} unquestioningly butchers a family of civilians and still reflects: ‘[Humanity] is the most precious of treasures, how true.’\footnote{Lind, \textit{LC}, p. 71.} The bizarre and the grotesque characterize Lind’s German-language work and lend it much of its power. As Strickhausen contends, ‘grotesque scenarios […] bring out the underlying structures and motives which defy a realistic description.’\footnote{Strickhausen, p. 63.}

When Lind abandoned German as his language of literary expression, his fiction was uprooted. In \textit{Crossing} Lind describes his decision to switch languages as twofold: on the one hand, it is a moral choice, as writing in German felt like aiding ‘German cultural rearmament.’\footnote{Lind, \textit{Crossing}, p. 66.} On the other hand, the switch is also motivated by the negative critical reception of his works in Germany and Austria. In a draft of his speech ‘Über Deutsch gesprochen,’ Lind describes his reaction to the critics’ attacks of what they saw as his misuse of German: ‘Und wie ein Feigling, habe ich mich von einem Tage zum andern entschlossen, von der Sache wegzulaufen. Die Sprache einfach zu boykottieren, sie nicht mehr verwenden.’ (‘And like a coward, I decided, from one day to the next, to run away from it. To simply boycott the language, not to use it anymore.’)\footnote{Jakov Lind, ‘Ueber Deutsch gesprochen’, undated draft, 4 pages, p. 2. In the Jakov Lind Archive, file 1.3.1.13.} In this revealing description, Lind is forced once again to abandon his language, as he was at the age of eleven: he is exiled from his language, and feels – as he does about his wartime survival– that his decision to boycott the language is, in fact, a cowardly escape. This aspect of Lind’s
translingualism is not mentioned in his memoirs, and it lends his linguistic exile an additional, tragic dimension.

Lind’s translingualism, then, is a form of exile which is not wholly self-imposed, although Lind tends to represent it as an empowering choice in his autobiography. Viewed in this light, it becomes painfully clear why language is a central theme of his later fiction, which depicts an uprooted existence. The change of tongue has brought with it a change of theme, as Lind writes about exile, language and the possibility of finding solace in a cosmopolitan existence. Thus Orlando is shipwrecked on an island where his own language becomes ‘strange,’ and the wandering Jews of The Inventor descend into madness in their peripatetic existence. While the theme of madness in a mad postwar world, which characterized Lind’s German-language works, persists, the well-aimed blows of his earlier fiction become increasingly diffused as the focus shifts from Germany and Austria to the world at large, as is evident in Travels to the Enu.

These tendencies can be seen clearly when comparing Travels to the Enu with Ergo, Lind’s last major work in German. Ergo is opaque and challenging, at times almost inaccessible: indeed, Rosenfeld sees it as Lind’s ‘most difficult and enigmatic’ work. In post-war Vienna, two former friends turned rivals, Wacholder and Würtz, are trapped in their mad obsessions: Würz has sealed himself and his family in a house he struggles to sterilize, constantly battling invisible particles. Wacholder, who lives surrounded by mounds of paper in an abandoned customs house, vows to lure Würz out of his self-confinement or annihilate him altogether. The two, whose Nazi past is implied but never entirely revealed, struggle with postwar reality, and Wacholder finally buries himself in a hole he has dug, assisted by the younger generation – his adopted sons, who are preoccupied with their own existential projects: one tries to articulate a so-called placental theory of existence, and the other struggles and fails to write a book titled The Better World. In a twisting, sometimes rambling plot, Lind conducts what he calls a ‘post-mortem on the Nazi decade’ whose legacy is insanity, violence, and the breakdown of social ties. Vienna is a city which ‘calls
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itself the teat of the occident and has suckled nothing but madness.‘

Austria has not changed, as Wacholder affirms:

All this democracy stuff is a hoax. This live-and-let-live routine, it’s not for us. It’s foreign, it’s alien. Sooner or later we’ll have to get rid of it.

Das mit der Demokratie, das ist ein Schwindel. Das mit dem Leben und Lebenlassen, das ist nicht für uns. Das ist etwas Fremdes, etwas Ausländisches. Das müssen wir früher oder später einmal los werden.

Language plays a role in this post-mortem of Nazi Austria, and the destructive power of words, which will become so prominent in Travels to the Enu, features in this work: Wacholder plots to oust Würz by using a ‘nerve shower’ – a foam made of words: ‘A flood of words, when he’s up to his ears in it I’ll send in a rescue party.’

Evoking the gas chambers in Nazi concentration camps, Lind dramatizes the murderous nature of German as the language itself becomes a weapon of mass destruction; the deadly power of language is thus linked to a specific language and national context. The connection is cemented as Wacholder gloats over what he perceives as the success of his plans:

By words! By the correct use of our language. This is a glorious country. It wouldn’t have been possible in any other country. This is one more proof. The heritage of our forefathers! Long live German-Austrian culture!

Durch Worte! Durch die richtige Verwendung unserer Sprache. Das ist ein gesegnetes Land. In keinem anderen Land wäre das möglich gewesen. Da sieht man es wieder. Das Erbe der Väter! Es lebe die deutsch-österreichische Kultur!

---
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Travels to the Enu, by contrast, seeks to condemn western civilization as a whole, and language – any language – is shown as a vehicle of intolerance and war. As in Ergo, words flood and ‘gradually [choke]’ mankind, and the written word is the most dangerous of all: Orlando claims that ‘a mere few typewritten pages called the Wannsee Rapport […] destroyed more lives between 1942 and 1945 than all the plagues of the European Middle Ages put together.’ The Enu, who have no written language, cannot conceive how ‘a pamphlet, or a book, or a few sheets of newspaper are capable of sending a man to Vorkuta, into exile, into a lunatic asylum or simply into his grave[,]’ he explains. The ‘magic power of the written word’ carries a moral responsibility for those who use it: hence writers are – or should aim to be – moralists, and use their words for the benefit of mankind.

Paradoxically, by ascribing magic powers to language, Orlando in fact diminishes the moral responsibility of those who use it: when words are seen as having their own agency, blame shifts away from regimes and individuals who commit atrocities. When linguistic signs are thus divorced from the social context which creates them, language ceases to signify. Thus, in one passage, Orlando argues that ‘[words] such as “communism” and “capitalism” are murderous[,]’ but also that ‘[whether] we call America “communist” or “capitalist” or the Soviet Union “fascist” or “socialist” actually makes not the slightest difference […]’ In this contradictory attitude to written language, the same words – ‘communism’ and ‘capitalism’ – are at once powerful, even murderous, and also empty of meaning: they can be applied to the US or the USSR without ‘the slightest difference.’

It is not just Orlando, but also Lind himself who ascribes magical power to language and words. In Numbers he describes the construction of a new self in a new language after severing the link with his native tongue and creating a private language that can later be translated into any language. But the separation of signifier and signified that occurs during this process, as discussed in the first chapter, destabilizes reality. A private language is ultimately an illusion, or a hallucination. Language cannot be private: by its very nature as a means of communication, it is always social. The image of language Lind creates both in his autobiography and in Travels to the Enu as magically powerful and independent from its
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speakers ultimately undermines his own position as a writer. A writer, as a moralist, fulfills a social role: he seizes the written word and subjects it to his will. Orlando, it appears, realizes this as he emerges from his hallucination at the end of the novel and returns to his vocation. Lind, on the other hand, seems trapped by his own preoccupation with language and his attempts to rid himself of Austria through translingualism; the withdrawal into a fragmented mind will only intensify in his next novel, *The Inventor*, as I will show in the next chapter.

***

**The Writer and the Truth**

The power of the written word, which preoccupies Lind in *Travels to the Enu*, is also a main theme in Stefan Heym’s *The King David Report* (1973). The novel, written in English and translated by Heym as *Der König David Bericht*, uses the biblical account of the life of King David and, focusing on the contradictions in the narrative, recasts it as a satirical tale of political power and its oppressive force. Although it is the story of how David became King of Israel and of his reign and succession – the King David Report is commissioned by his son, Solomon, in order to establish himself as the only legitimate heir to the throne – it is also the story of the historian hired to write the report, Ethan the Ezrahite. As Ethan conducts his research, he discovers that the truth is often unflattering to the previous king and uncomfortable to the current one; he struggles with his conscience as he tries to strike a balance between his obligation to his readers and his need to please the authorities. Truth, he learns, can be an elusive concept, and the quest for truth in a totalitarian regime – biblical or modern – puts the writer’s very life at risk.

Ethan is not Heym’s only writer-protagonist: the questions of the writer’s role and position are central to both the earlier novella ‘The Queen Against Defoe’¹⁹⁵ and the later novel *Collin*.¹⁹⁶ In ‘The Queen Against Defoe,’ written in 1968, as Czech liberalism was being crushed by an armed Soviet intervention,¹⁹⁷ Heym uses the setting of Eighteenth-century England and the historical figure of Daniel Defoe, who was pilloried for the

¹⁹⁷ Hutchinson, p. 139.
publication of the satirical pamphlet *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, to depict the fate of dissenters in an authoritarian system. The story is written in archaic English, which, as Meg Tait points out, ‘emphasises the historical distance between the events narrated and the reader’s own time,’ although ‘the subject matter clearly contained much that was relevant to readers in the GDR.’ Peter Hutchinson notes Heym’s ‘close adherence to established fact’ in this story: this allowed Heym to refute the charge of dissent in his own work by maintaining that the story ‘was in the first instance a historical re-creation.’

The need for deniability stems from Heym’s own position at the time as a critic of the regime in the GDR. In a speech at the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the SED (Socialist Unity Party), Erich Honecker, who would later become the party leader, denounced several writers and artists, including Heym, who did not conform to the cultural guidelines of the regime. Like other vocal opponents of the party’s policies, Heym was ‘regularly warned against making statements which could be seen as detrimental to the GDR, […] denied publishing outlets […] and banned from travelling.’ In light of these difficulties and the more severe threats (some dissidents were jailed or exiled), Heym chose to turn to historical subject matter, both in ‘The Queen Against Defoe’ and in novels such as *The Lenz Papers* (1964, about the uprisings of 1848) and *Uncertain Friend* (1969, about Ferdinand Lasalle); this distancing measure reduced the risk of antagonizing the authorities.

Unlike ‘The Queen Against Defoe’ and *The King David Report*, which are set in the distant past, *Collin* (1979) was originally written in German and is set in the contemporary GDR. The novel opens with its protagonist, Hans Collin, an award-winning author, lying in a hospital bed: the heart condition from which he suffers, it is suggested, may be related to his struggle with writer’s block. Collin hopes that the key to unblocking both his pen and his arteries lies in the completion of his memoirs, in which he will deviate from his role as state-approved and state-approving writer, and reveal the truth about his past and, by extension, the past of the East German nation. During the Spanish Civil War, Collin’s life was spared
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‘for the express purpose that [he] should write about what [he has] seen.’ 204 But Collin feels he betrayed the trust placed in him by failing to speak up about, and colluding with, the show-trial of his wartime comrade Havelka. His dilemma is whether to ‘act as a martyr for the sake of some truth’ and ‘exclude [himself] from the ranks’ of power and privilege, 205 or continue to ‘suppress what he knew and curb his doubts’ and keep enjoying ‘the protection and warmth’ that ‘being part of a clan’ offered. 206

The writer, for Heym as for Lind, has an important social role to play, but there is a fundamental difference in the way the two fulfil this function. Lind’s work exposes and explores the darkest aspects of human nature. According to Strickhausen, it can be seen as a revival of a ‘tradition in German literature which has been marginalized as a result of one and a half centuries of vigorous belief in the “perfectibility” of human beings and the irresistible progress of mankind.’ 207 Heym, on the other hand, seems firmly to believe precisely in this Enlightenment idea of perfectibility, and that the writer can and should strive to bring about real change. This view underlies and drives his fiction, and is reflected, for instance, in the changes that Bing’s idealism in The Crusaders brings about in Yates’s actions, despite the imperfection in the execution of the struggle against fascism.

Heym’s polemical writing expresses this belief explicitly and forcefully, from the early wartime speeches and articles discussed in the previous chapter, where Heym condemned escapist books and asserted, following President Roosevelt, that ‘books are weapons in a war of ideas,’ 208 to articles written decades later. In an article from 1970 titled ‘The Position of the Writer in this World,’ 209 Heym refers to Defoe on the pillory as an iconic image that ‘keeps appearing in the back of [his] mind,’ 210 and asserts that writers are regarded with suspicion because of ‘the material they work with: ideas.’ 211 This material is so explosive because no ‘borders, censorship, police offer protection against ideas.’ 212
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writer reflects reality, Heym claims, and ‘the devilish thing is’ that when the reader, through the writer’s words, ‘grows conscious of what moves the world,’ he or she is impelled ‘to try moving it too. Thus reality properly reflected may lead to a change of reality[,]’ and the writer ‘has turned himself into that most dangerous of persons: an active agent of change.’

Here, I believe, lies the essential difference between Lind’s writing and Heym’s: at its best, Lind’s work reflects reality – to borrow from Swift’s Houyhnhnm – ‘as the Reflection from a troubled Stream returns the Image of an ill-shapen Body, not only larger, but more distorted.’ Lind fulfils what Quintero sees as the author’s (specifically the satirist’s) responsibility as an engagé writer: to act as a watchdog ‘unmasking imposture, exposing fraudulence, shattering deceptive illusion, and shaking us from our complacency and indifference.’ Yet while Quintero’s watchdog ‘[alarms] others that the barn is on fire’ and thus ‘rousing us to put out’ the blaze, Lind, distrustful of humankind’s capacity for change, does not expect his work to be a catalyst for action. His English-language work especially turns inward, becoming ever more self-reflective. Lind views language as the building blocks of identity and writing as an essence; for Heym, writing is a vocation, and he uses words as building blocks for a better world. In what follows, I will explore the writer’s position in Heym’s The King David Report and, by examining Heym’s drafts of both the English and German texts, I will argue that Heym uses English as a means of universalizing the themes he explores and self-translation as a form of productive doubling of perspective, enabling him to reach and affect different audiences.

In The King David Report, Heym reads the biblical account of the life of King David subversively, as a tale of authoritarian power and its oppressive force. The novel explores the relationship between historiography and truth as it examines how the story as told in the Bible came to be. Heym works closely with the biblical sources: his studies for the novel, listing stages of the lives of Saul, David and Solomon with precise references to chapter and verse in I and II Samuel and I Kings, confirm that the elements of the plot relating to David are based directly on the biblical narrative. By pointing out, through Ethan’s often reluctant probing, the inconsistencies which the biblical text glosses over, Heym shows that
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the story as it appears in the Bible is not an impartial account of the facts of David’s life, but serves a political purpose: to establish David’s legitimacy as God-anointed, his legacy as unifier of Judea and Israel, and his dynasty, particularly in the person of Solomon.  

Ethan the Ezrahite, ‘one of the wisest men in Israel,’ is summoned to Solomon’s court to join a committee charged with writing the account of the life and times of the king’s father, David. The task is a delicate one: Solomon wishes to establish his right to the throne beyond any doubt, but ‘Israel abounds with stories’ that suggest a rather more tenuous claim to the title of rightful heir. The full title of the committee is the ‘Royal Commission on the Preparation of The One and Only True and Authoritative, Historically Correct and Officially Approved Report on the Amazing Rise, God-fearing Life, Heroic Deeds, and Wonderful Achievements of David the Son of Jesse, King of Judah for Seven Years and of Both Judah and Israel for Thirty-three, Chosen of God, and Father of Solomon.’ The ironic juxtaposition of terms such as ‘historically correct’ and ‘officially approved’ reflects the doublespeak typical of repressive regimes, and the comically hyperbolic language further underscores the hypocrisy and duplicity that are at the heart of the project. As Hutchinson shows, Heym inserts socialist-state jargon here and throughout the novel to establish ‘parallels between the society of ancient Israel and that of following totalitarian regimes, in particular those of the twentieth century.’ While “‘wonderful achievements,’” for instance, is ‘a standard Soviet term of the Stalin era for military and economic advances,’ the parody strikes even closer to home: in the 1950s, the regime defined the task of the nation’s historians as follows: ‘By means of thorough scholarly investigations and by the dissemination of correct historical insights to show the mass of our people the way to victory over their opponents and to a national, unified, democratic and peace-loving Germany.’

The power of the written word is established as a theme in the opening pages of the novel. Ethan, who was brought to the court because he is ‘well versed in the use of the
learns during his first encounter with the king and the committee that this talent is not always appreciated. Benaiah ben Jehoiada, the captain of the host (or head of the security services) is dismissive: ‘How many words have I heard mouthed in the days of […] King David: and where are those from whose lips they sprouted?’ Indeed, Benaiah has eyes and ears everywhere and, with his army of mercenaries, the Cherethites and Pelethites, he brutally quashes any sign of dissent. Nathan the prophet reminds Benaiah ‘that some live by the sword and some by the word, just as our Lord Yahveh, in his infinite wisdom, had created animals of more than one kind […]’. The value of this endorsement, however, is somewhat diminished considering that Nathan is a writer inspired by God who ‘rarely [has] an opinion unless and until Lord Yahveh instructs [him] as to [his] words.’ Zadok the Priest, who like Benaiah represents another nexus of power, the centralized religious administration, responds to Nathan’s evocation of the various animals, pointing out that ‘it was the snake who started Man on the road to hell; therefore beware of the smooth tongue and the gilded word.’

Indeed, the snake recurs in the novel as a symbol of subversion. It appears again in the minutes of the committee debate on ‘the inclusion of undesirable matter in works of history, and the ways of presenting same’ – the ‘undesirable matter’ being the suggestion that the young David, while on the run from King Saul, joined the enemy Philistines. Nathan the priest argues for consistency, and for adherence to an overriding ideological principle:

[Once] we are agreed that David is the chosen of the Lord, then everything he does is for the good of Israel. But as knowledge of the facts may lead a person to dangerous thoughts, the facts must be presented so as to direct the mind into the proper channels.

Zadok the priest, however, observes that this method ‘has been tried since the Lord God told Adam certain facts, back in Eden. The most excellent words may be twisted by any serpent that happens along.’ Ethan, when pressed on the matter by the king himself, proposes that undesirable matter should be relayed with discretion: ‘Discretion, I said, was not the same as
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lying. Surely the wisest of kings, Solomon, would never condone lying in a history of his father King David. Discretion was truth controlled by wisdom.⁴⁲³ Ethan is fully aware of the precariousness of a court historian’s position: he knows that ‘there is no escaping [the king’s] favour,’ and that he ‘might end, as some writers did, with [his] head cut off and [his] body nailed to the city wall,’ but he is also lured by privileges associated with the job and hopes that he ‘might wax fat and prosperous if [he] guarded [his] tongue and used [his] stylus wisely.’⁴²⁴ Therefore discretion becomes his own guiding principle.

As Ethan learns more about David the man and king, however, his conscience increasingly troubles him, and he seeks ways of revealing the truth and recording it for posterity. He gathers information from a range of sources: from those who knew David – like Michal the daughter of Saul and David’s first wife, or Joab, David’s captain of the host who is persecuted by the current captain, Benaiah; from the ‘tellers of tales and legends,’⁴²⁵ and from a variety of written documents: correspondences and journals. Intriguingly, as Tait states, the members of the commission often ‘go out of their way to ensure that Ethan becomes aware of the historical truth of David’s career […] even while insisting upon the ideological truth of the official version of events.’⁴²⁶ This ‘ideological truth,’ the belief in Yahweh’s laws and ways, is seen to override the historical truth and to justify the selective or creative telling of the latter, as reflected in Nathan’s plea for consistency. Ethan, who is appalled by some aspects of the kings’—David’s and Solomon’s—rule, nevertheless sees the God they purport to serve as ‘the embodiment of Truth’ in its absolute and most desirable form.⁴²⁷ This conflict is symptomatic of the writer’s position in the socialist state, according to Heym:

> In the West and in many parts of the Third World the writer is at ease with his conscience when he criticizes the society he lives in or attacks the powers that be. But in socialism? Whatever distortions socialism has suffered since it began to be applied in practice, it remains the aim to strive for, the one order of things that could embody mankind’s best dreams […]. To the writer, the gulf between the imperfections of socialism and the
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promise it holds poses a question of ethics: does he do more harm than good by a full reflection in his work of the new and often cruel and crude contradictions?238

The tension between the writer’s responsibility to his readers and his faith – whether religious or ideological – is further complicated when he is working under conditions of censorship and repression. Authoritarian regimes are threatened by the writer’s power to expose them: in ‘The Queen against Defoe,’ Lord Nottingham, Defoe’s main adversary, remarks that ‘[an] army of felons […] is no threat to established order. But a rebellious writer belongs safely locked in Newgate […]’.239 In The King David Report, the writer’s enduring power is articulated by Amenhoteph, the Egyptian Eunuch in charge of the king’s harem: ‘[You], Ethan, and all those in your trade make man immortal by your words; so that the names of the men you wrote of will be remembered thousands of years hence. Therein lies your power.’240

Ethan, however, is reluctant to make use of his power as a writer and tries to belittle it: ‘It is not part of my duties to label people as good or bad. I collect, I order, I organise, a minor servant in the house of knowledge.’241 In his attempt to shirk his responsibility for the product of his labor, he ascribes to words themselves an independent, magical power of their own, divorced from authorial intent: ‘words have their own life: you cannot trap them or hold them or rein them in, they are of many hues, they both conceal and reveal, and behind each line that is written lurks danger.’242 This representation of language as performative recalls Orlando’s claim in Travels to the Enu that written words have magic powers, but here the argument is raised only for its fallacy to be exposed. The danger lurks not in the words themselves, but precisely in the manner that the writer chooses to use them: it is by ordering and organizing them that the writer creates meaning; the words conceal and reveal according to the writer’s intention. Indeed, Ethan recognizes the subversive potential of organizing the facts he collects: there are ‘certain undeniable, publicly known facts,’ he reflects, which fit with the content of a damaging document that Benaiah has made available to him. ‘Working from there, as a weaver inserts a new thread into his web, could I not weave into the King David Report some of [that material]?’ Thus the deliberate inclusion of
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inconsistencies and contradictions in the officially sanctioned report becomes a strategy for the writer struggling with censorship, a way of ‘[alerting] readers to the fictional nature of what is offered as fact.’\textsuperscript{243}

As Tait rightly states, ‘Ethan is not a character who evolves in an exemplary manner into a courageous opponent of deceit,’\textsuperscript{244} and thus differs from the outspoken crusader for freedom and democracy, Bing, whose moral position is unambiguous. But Bing does not face the same constraints as Ethan: as an American soldier, he belongs to a society that holds free speech to be a fundamental right. Ethan, on the other hand, pays dearly for his subversion. Charged with ‘high treason committed by word, and in writing, through the interspersion of doubts, and of evil thought,’\textsuperscript{245} he is spared a death sentence which would be inconvenient ‘in that it might cause evil-minded people to claim that the Wisest of Kings, Solomon, was fettering thought […]’.\textsuperscript{246} Instead, the Solomonic judgement decrees that Ethan be ‘silenced to death […] so that his name be forgotten as though he were never born and had never written a line.’\textsuperscript{247} Indeed, Ethan the Ezrahite is mentioned only twice in the Bible: in I Kings (4:31), where he is said to be one of the wisest of men, and as the author of Psalm 89, titled ‘Maschil of Ethan the Ezrahite.’ In this psalm, God’s Covenant with David is confirmed: ‘I have sworn unto David my servant / Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations.’\textsuperscript{248} Solomon, who has appropriated various of Ethan’s other poems and proverbs as his own, makes an exception of this one – a clearly desperate attempt on Ethan’s part to prove his loyalty to the king – because it is, the king claims, ‘trite, and full of platitudes, and bare of imagination […]’.\textsuperscript{249}
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**The Writer as Self-Translator**

Heym, though vocal and direct in his criticism of the East German regime, managed to avoid a fate similar to Ethan’s. Hutchinson suggests a number of reasons why Heym was never jailed for his dissent: he was a Jew in a ‘state which prided itself on having eradicated anti-semitism,’ he had fought against National Socialism from as early as 1931, and had become ‘too well known to imprison. His arrest would have caused an uproar in both parts of the nation.’ Indeed, as Tait points out, Heym’s denunciation by Honecker at the Eleventh Party Plenum in 1965 transformed Heym’s status in West Germany: he became regarded as a ‘prominent East German “dissident”,’ and the publication of *The King David Report* in English and German cemented this reputation in both parts of Germany and beyond. In what follows, I will explore the production of the two versions of the novel, the English and the German, and consider how Heym constructs his own identity as a writer through the use of his two languages. I will focus not on a comparison of the two final texts, but rather on the process of composition of what I suggest is one text in two languages, rather than an original and a translation. My analysis of the drafts will engage with Tait’s reading of the different early versions and contest it.

As the novel is inspired by the biblical story of King David’s life and narrated in mock-biblical language, Heym relies on the King James version of the Old Testament, whose ‘glorious language […] still moves the hearts of people in all English-speaking countries’ (‘die glorreiche Sprache […] die heute noch die Herzen der Menschen bewegt in allen englischsprechenden Landen’), and on Luther’s Bible respectively for each of his two versions of the story. The use of archaic language is a technique Heym also employs, as noted above, in his earlier novella ‘The Queen against Defoe’ and in sections of his later novel *The Wandering Jew*, which will be discussed in the next chapter. In each of these, the language of original composition corresponds to the specific cultural and historical context depicted in the work: eighteenth-century England and Germany during Luther’s Reformation respectively. In this sense, these texts can be described as monolingual

---

250 Hutchinson, p. 137.
251 Tait, ‘Between the Lines’, p. 97.
252 Tati, ‘Between the Lines’, pp. 102-110.
although Heym translated both; by contrast I would suggest that *The King David Report*, drawing on sources that are themselves translations, is a bilingual work which, through the doubling of perspective that its composition entails and through the reference to a single, universal text, positions its author as a mediator between two cultures: between what he termed the West, or the capitalist world, and East, or the socialist world.\(^\text{254}\)

The biblical language is shot through with socialist jargon, creating direct parallels with the reality of the socialist, and particularly the Stalinist, state. Both Hutchinson\(^\text{255}\) and David Roberts\(^\text{256}\) draw attention to the use of terms such as ‘un-person,’\(^\text{257}\) which effectively describes Ethan’s state at the end of the novel, and the use of Trotsky’s phrase ‘the scrapheap of history.’ These allusions, like the full title of the King David Report, would resonate powerfully with the East German readers. While for them the novel would thus evoke their own immediate past, Western readers might read this novel as a more general allegory of historiography as a reflection of political power.\(^\text{258}\)

In his insightful analysis of Heym’s method of self-translation, Hutchinson, comparing passages in German and English from several of Heym’s works, argues that Heym’s self-translations are successful in following and maintaining the principles of the original texts, while at the same time taking certain liberties that a professional translator would not be likely to indulge in.\(^\text{259}\) Examining the first passage of the fifth chapter of *The King David Report*\(^\text{260}\) and *Der König David Bericht*,\(^\text{261}\) he explains why a detail of Ethan’s address (‘No. 54 Queen-of-Sheba Lane, the King’s Own Houses, Jeroshalayim’) is omitted in the German text:

> [Although] a reference to the “King’s Own” might encourage an Englishman to see possible parallels with earlier periods of British history, the phrase does nothing for the German Reader. The paralleling, and binding together, of past and present – which is so

---


\(^\text{255}\) Hutchinson, p. 153.


\(^\text{257}\) Heym, *KDR*, p. 138.

\(^\text{258}\) Roberts, p. 203.


\(^\text{261}\) Stefan Heym, *Der König David Bericht* (München: btb Verlag, 2005), p. 44.
strong in the English – is thus not weakened (in the translation) by an allusion which is inappropriate to the present German environment.\textsuperscript{262}

Ethan is summoned from his home to ‘Government House, there to attend the first regular session of the Royal Commission on the Preparation of […] \textit{The King David Report}.\textsuperscript{263} “‘Government House,’” Hutchinson writes, carries ‘clear overtones of the British Empire. Such tones would be lost through a simple ‘Regierungsgebäude,’” but the ‘rather unusual ‘Haus der Regierung’” Heym uses instead seems like ‘a veiled allusion to the seat of power in East Berlin, the ‘House der Ministerien,’’ and thus ‘[relates] the events to an East German background.’ \textsuperscript{264} The changes are subtle, and are the result of Heym’s ‘deep understanding of the text, of two different languages, and of two different readers’ as he provides ‘the closest possible equivalent in the circumstances of languages and cultures.’\textsuperscript{265}

Hutchinson also notes that Heym considers the prospect of translation while composing a text. In an interview with Hutchinson, Heym stated: “‘it sometimes happens that I rewrite a German sentence, because I know the way it’s originally written I would never get it into English.’”\textsuperscript{266} Thus, Heym’s preparatory notes for \textit{The King David Report} include a list of English biblical terms and phrases and their German equivalents.\textsuperscript{267} The Stefan Heym Archive at the Cambridge University library contains drafts of both the English and the German texts. In an attempt to trace the writing process and the authorial intent it reveals and conceals, Tait identifies two English-language manuscripts: the one she refers to as the ‘English Revised Version’ is ‘a typescript with a considerable amount of handwritten alteration’; the second ‘is a clean copy bound as the “Final English Revised Version”’.\textsuperscript{268} The main difference between these two versions, according to Tait, is a sharpening of the vocabulary as ‘political euphemisms’ in the Revised Version give way to the more powerful ‘language of the revolution’ in the Final Version.\textsuperscript{269} Yet the published novel, Tait notes, contains the milder language of the Revised Version.

\textsuperscript{262} Hutchinson, ‘Self-Translator’, pp. 33-4.
\textsuperscript{263} Heym, \textit{KDR}, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{264} Hutchinson, ‘Self-Translator’, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{265} Hutchinson, ‘Self-Translator’, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{266} Hutchinson, ‘Self-Translator’, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{267} Stefan Heym Archive, A199: ‘\textit{The King David Report}: Studies, Outline, Sources’.
\textsuperscript{268} Tait, ‘Between the Lines,’ p. 102.
\textsuperscript{269} Tait, ‘Between the Lines,’ p. 103.
As Tait states, Heym began to translate *The King David Report* after completing the English draft, and continued the revising the novel while he was translating it.\(^{270}\) The translation into German, Tait maintains, ‘follows what appears to have been the earlier, English Revised Version […]’, favouring its muted political references over the more explicit language of what [Heym] at one stage seems to have regarded as the definitive text.\(^{271}\) In other words, Tait identifies a process in which the German translation weakens the ‘Final’ English version and reverts to a tamer original version, replacing terms such as ‘political crisis’ with ‘unrest’ and ‘the principle of the revolution’ with ‘the cause of the Lord.’\(^{272}\)

While Tait is undoubtedly correct in her assertion that Heym ‘refined’ his texts ‘through the process of translation,’\(^{273}\) I would suggest that what she identifies as the later version, the ‘Final Revised Version,’ is in fact an early draft of the novel, and that both the ‘English Revised Version’ and the draft of the German translation rework and refine this original text, possibly simultaneously. Heym himself stated that his writing process involves numerous drafts: ‘There are sections of manuscripts that I have rewritten ten times and over.’\(^{274}\) It is quite probable that the drafts available at the archive do not represent Heym’s entire work process. Tait does not provide the catalogue reference numbers of the drafts she discusses; however, it appears that the draft she considers as the later, ‘Final English Revised Version’ is the volume catalogued as A190, titled ‘*King David Report* Fair Draft’. It is the only English-language, single-volume fair copy, with no corrections or annotations. The draft Tait considers an earlier version appears to be A184, a single-volume, heavily annotated carbon copy of the novel. The changes and annotations in this draft correspond to those in another set of volumes (A186 - A189), each titled ‘English Revised Version’ and containing several chapters of the novel. The German translation appears in volumes A194 through A196, and these drafts are, like the ‘English Revised Version,’ heavily annotated.

Tait seems to rely in her description of the process of writing the novel on the organization and cataloguing of the drafts in the archive. Indeed, the annotated carbon-copy (A184), which replicates the ‘English Revised Version’ (A186-A189) is labelled,
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presumably by the archive, as ‘original copy with heavy corrections.’ In this system, the Fair Draft, A190, would be the latest one composed. I believe, however, that this representation of the process might be erroneous. The corrections evident in the ‘Revised Version’ (and the annotated ‘original copy’) are made to a text that is identical to the one in the ‘Fair Draft’: Heym crosses out words, sentences and at times entire passages, and inserts handwritten changes. In some cases, where a passage has been changed extensively, he types a new version and pastes it over the original text. Moreover, when the German translation drafts are examined alongside the two English versions, it becomes clear that the same changes are made in German to a German text that corresponds to the ‘Fair Draft’. The published versions of the novel, in English and German, resemble the corrected and annotated drafts which, in the English version, are labelled (somewhat confusingly) as ‘original copy’ for the single-volume and ‘Revised Version’ for the multiple-volume drafts.

I would propose that the order in which these drafts were composed is as follows: the ‘Fair Draft’ is an early, if not the first, draft of the complete novel. Again, given Heym’s self-professed tendency to revise his manuscripts many times, it is probable he did not save – or at least did not pass on to the Cambridge archive – his earliest drafts. This draft was then translated into German (although no corresponding German ‘Fair Draft’ is included in the archive collection), and further revisions were made to both language versions to produce the two published texts. Some stylistic revisions occur throughout the drafts: thus the phrase ‘the son of’ in characters’ names in the Fair Draft (such as Ethan the son of Hoshaijah) is consistently changed to the biblical, Hebraic ‘ben’ (‘Ethan ben Hoshaijah’) in the Revised draft, and so they appear in the published version. A comparison of a few passages from the three draft versions – which I will refer to as ‘Fair’, ‘Revised’ and ‘German’ – might illustrate this process.

In Chapter 3, Ethan records the story of the factions in Israel at the time of Solomon’s accession to the throne, as told to him by Penuel ben Mushi, ‘administrator third grade in the royal treasure,’275 and inserts his own thoughts on the material recounted in brackets. Ethan learns that Solomon was not, in fact, considered the undisputed successor to the throne: David’s son Adonijah, ‘a very goodly man’ considered himself the ‘Heir
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Apparent’ and prepared to take the throne, supported by the army and the country clergy. Nathan the prophet and Zadok the priest, who favored a centralization of power (‘one big temple from which to direct all priests and Levites’), supported Solomon, the ‘Little One, [David’s] second-born out of Bath-Sheba,’ and with Bath-Sheba they intervened and persuaded David to have Solomon anointed as his successor.

In the Fair Draft, Penuel describes the aging, ailing David:

> And he knew that his days were numbered, but if he had any preference for any of his sons to succeed him, he kept it to himself, for the King, David, was a wily man and inclined to wait for the Lord Yahveh to tip the scales before deciding which side to support.

In the Revised Version, there is a specific reference to Solomon and Adonijah:

> And he knew that his days were numbered; but if he had any preference for Adonijah, or for Solomon, or for another among his sons, he kept it to himself.

The implication is that David was aware of the conflict, but chose not to weigh in. More importantly, the characterization of the king as ‘wily’ and opportunistic (waiting to see which party wins in order to then support it) in the Fair Draft is omitted in favor of a more subtle, enigmatic representation of the king’s silence. The German draft corresponds to the Revised Version (‘[…] aber wenn er eine Vorliebe besass fuer Adonija, oder fuer Salomo, oder fuer einen anderen unter seinen Soehnen, so schwieg er darueber.’), and this version appears in the final German and English versions.

While the omission of a sentence so explicit about David’s passivity may be perceived as muting the more critical original version, this description is more fitting of a state official’s depiction of the former king. Moreover, the later versions compensate for the omission by allowing Ethan to reflect on David’s silence:

---
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They no longer paid heed to him. All he could do was to wait for Lord Yahveh to tip the scales this way or that. He had only his word, the word of a dying man; and if, God forbid, he spoke out for the loser, what would remain of him? For judgment lies with those who come after us; and a father’s name is fashioned by his son.\textsuperscript{283}

Thus David’s passivity, rather than being a simple matter of opportunism (a trait which will emerge clearly from other accounts of his actions), gives occasion to a reflection on the power of the word and the nature of historiography, two major themes of the novel. As Solomon’s ‘King David Report’ shows, ‘a father’s name’ is indeed ‘fashioned by his son’: history is written, or rewritten, to serve the interests of the current regime, rather than to reflect the truth.

Chapter 13 in all three drafts opens with a meditation on the writer’s task. The different versions show that this section has, through revisions, been significantly condensed, and in the published text a much shorter version appears at the end of chapter 12: it is the passage discussed earlier, in which Ethan describes his role as a ‘servant in the house of knowledge.’\textsuperscript{284} In the Fair Draft, the passage begins:

\textit{What is there as irksome as a tablet of wax which stares up at you, white and empty, as though it were saying, Well, now, where are your great thoughts, and your wisdom, and your fine measured words? Have you sucked dry the teat of history, or has your eye lost its sight and your mind its edge? Come on, let me feel the touch of your stylus: I am your void that awaits your creation, so that light may be divided from darkness, and the waters from the dry land, and the land be peopled.}\textsuperscript{285}

In the German draft, the highlighted lines, translated into German, are clearly crossed out, and the amended text reads:

\textit{Welch groesseres Aergernis ist da als das unbeschriebnen Wachstaefelchen, das einem entgegenstarrt, weiss und leer, als wollte es sagen: Ich bin der unendliche Raum, der deiner Schoepfung harrt, so dass das Licht sich scheiden moege von der Finsternis, und die Wasser von dem trocken Land, und Leben entstehe auf der Erde.}\textsuperscript{286}

The Revised Version has been similarly compressed:

\textsuperscript{283} Heym, \textit{KDR}, p. 24. A similar passage appears in the Revised and German versions, but not in the Fair Draft.  
\textsuperscript{284} Heym, \textit{KDR}, p. 117.  
\textsuperscript{285} Heym, A190, Ch.13, p. 1 (my emphasis).  
\textsuperscript{286} Heym, A195, Ch. 13, p. 1.
What is there as irksome as a tablet of wax which stares up at you, white and empty, as though it were saying: I am your void that awaits your creation, so that light may be divided from darkness, and the waters from the dry land, and the land be peopled.  

In the carbon-copy volume (A184) marked ‘original copy,’ the corresponding page has the passage as it appears in the Revised Version pasted onto a previous version that can be traced on the reverse side of the thin carbon-copy paper, and appears to be the text of the Fair Draft. This example, I would suggest, clearly illustrates that the earliest text is the one in the Fair Draft, and that the changes in the Revised Version were most probably made as the German translation was revised.

The drafts continue:

> But I am no god. I people my world with those who have lived and who left their traces. I collect, I order, I organize, a minor servant in the house of knowledge. I invent nothing; I interpret, adding a touch here, a highlight there, trying to outline the shape of things and to chart their drift.  

The comparison with God is abandoned altogether in the published version:

> It is not part of my duties to label people as good or bad. I collect, I order, I organize, a minor servant in the house of knowledge; I interpret, trying to outline the shape of things and to chart their drift.  

After all, God in the novel is of course the creator of the world, but – more importantly – he represents the absolute truth which is corrupted by various interpreters. The published version, then, reflects in a more personal and direct manner on Ethan’s social responsibility as a writer and on his desire to tell the truth while fearing the consequences of such an act. Finally, the drafts also include a discussion of the difference between the historian and writers of fiction, ‘who range unfettered through the realms of fancy,’ unburdened by ‘the weight of the past’ or the ‘responsibility for the future.’ This distinction is also omitted from the published versions, which, on the contrary, universalize Ethan’s dilemma as one that afflicts all writers, and intellectuals more broadly, in authoritarian regimes.

---
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The changes to the Fair Draft, therefore, appear to me to be refining and universalizing the satire, rather than ‘emasculating a subversive satire of the GDR,’ as Tait suggests.\textsuperscript{291} Thus, changes that mute allusions to a ‘revolution’ and refer instead to ‘the cause of the Lord,’\textsuperscript{292} or replace the ‘intellectuals’ of the Fair Draft with ‘learned men’ (‘Intellektuellen’ and ‘gelernten Herren’)\textsuperscript{293} in the later versions, do not detract from the critical allegory but enhance it: the language becomes more consistently mock-biblical, thereby highlighting the jarring references to socialist jargon. It is precisely this parodic juxtaposition of biblical and modern language that renders the parallels with the contemporary East German state patently clear, as Hutchinson and Tait (among others) have argued, both to those German-speaking readers living in the GDR, the German-speaking readers in the West, and English or American readers who are further removed from the concrete circumstances that the text allegorizes.

Moreover, the references to ‘the cause of the Lord’ create a vision of a transcendent cause, an ideological truth that is at the heart of the writer’s beliefs, without unnecessarily limiting the vision. When Ethan finds himself at the end of the novel banished from Jerusalem, penniless, an unperson, he stops on a hilltop and looks back at the city of David: ‘And I saw it lying there upon its hills, and I wanted to curse it; but I could not do it, for a great splendour of the Lord lay over Jerusholayim in the light of the morning.’\textsuperscript{294} The novel thus ends with an affirmation of faith in a higher principle that rises above the concrete circumstances and the current sense of failure. This kind of faith – in Heym’s case, the faith that socialism ‘remains the aim to strive for, the one order of things that could embody mankind’s best dreams’\textsuperscript{295} – drives the writer to continue aspiring to the ideal even as its earthly – or political – implementation, remains profoundly flawed. By exposing the flaws of the current system and insisting on promoting the ideal, the writer becomes an active agent of change in the world.

The figure of the writer that emerges from Heym’s work – whether it is ‘The Queen against Defoe’, The King David Report, or Collin – is one that actively engages in the issues that shape his society. The exemplary figure is that of Defoe on the pillory, proclaiming:

\textsuperscript{291} Tait, ‘Between the Lines’, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{292} Tait, ‘Between the Lines’, p. 103.
\textsuperscript{293} Heym, Ch. 13, p. 4 in A190, A187 and Ch. 13, p. 5 in A195 respectively.
\textsuperscript{294} Heym, KDR, p. 252.
Tell them, it was because he was too bold!
And told those truths which should not have been told!...
Tell them, he stands exalted there
For speaking what we would not hear!...
To make men of their honesty afraid....

Even when Heym’s writers are not as outspoken and courageous as Defoe – and neither Ethan nor Collin is – they struggle with the restrictions imposed on their ability to tell the truth. ‘Truth is the taskmaster of the writer,’ Heym proclaimed in a speech in 1942, and in his own writing he aims to serve this taskmaster faithfully. For an East German writer who continues profoundly to believe in socialism, this mission is complicated not only by external difficulties – the restrictions imposed by the authorities – but also by the internal conflict of wanting to denounce the flaws of the regime while remaining committed to the ideas this regime purports to represent.

Heym chose to remain in the GDR despite the difficulties created by his criticism of the regime. This was ‘the country in which he felt a duty to his readership, as well as a sense of communion with them’ Hutchinson explains, and ‘he still hoped a proper form of socialism might develop there.’ Despite his commitment, Heym cannot be defined simply as an East German, or even a German writer. The years Heym spent in America were, by his own account, ‘some of [his] most formative years.’ His literary roots, Heym claims, ‘lie more in American and English literature than in German Literature,’ and he cites ‘Hemingway, Twain [and] Dickens’ as his influences rather than ‘Thomas Mann and Fontane.’ (‘Ich glaube, meine literarischen Wurzeln liegen mehr in der amerikanischen und englischen Literatur als in der deutschen. Hemingway, Twain, Dickens waren eher meine Lehrer als Thomas Mann und Fontane.’) Having lived and written in the West for nearly twenty years, he continues to address a Western, non-German audience by writing in English. ‘As I am of two languages, I am of two worlds,’ he explains. But for Heym, this splitting of his self between two languages and cultures does not, by and large, cause a crisis
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of identity, as his identity is not bound with nationality nor with language: it is bound with an idea and an ideal. Language is a vehicle for the idea, the writer’s tool, and writing in two languages allows Heym to expand his arsenal and disseminate his ideas more widely.

***
5. The Wandering Jew

Condemned to an eternal life of wandering for an offence against Jesus, the mysterious figure of the Wandering Jew has featured in European folk tales, visual art and literary works since the Middle Ages. As Regine Rosenthal maintains, the Christian legend constructs the Jew as the Other: ‘as an element alien to hegemonic Christian Culture, who is therefore to be shunned and excluded from participation in the discourse of power.’\(^1\) The popular legend developed over centuries, and although the wanderer remained, for the most part, a negative figure, by the nineteenth century this figure was reworked and transformed. References to Jesus ‘[seem] to be omitted in very many, probably most’ mentions of the Wandering Jew in the nineteenth century,\(^2\) and in works of Romantic writers the Jew is assigned ‘qualities ranging from the Romantic rebel, grand sufferer, Byronic hero, mysterious stranger, to conceited blasphemer, Gothic villain, eternal skeptic, and ceaseless instigator of change.’\(^3\) Although the legend, with its emphasis on the Jew’s culpability, is virtually nonexistent in Jewish oral tradition,\(^4\) the Wandering Jew does feature in the works of Jewish writers as a figure symbolizing the Jewish people exiled from their homeland.

In the twentieth century, as Sidra Dekoven Ezrahi shows in *Booking Passage*, the ‘Jewish poetics of exile and return’ is revolutionized by ‘the experience of migration, dislocation and extermination of masses of Jews […] and by the reinvention and settlement of the ancient Jewish homeland.’\(^5\) The state of exile no longer defines the Jewish people as it had for nearly two thousand years, as the dream of a return to Zion – traditionally associated in Judaism with a Messianic vision of the end of days – becomes a reality. The reconnection with the physical land and the establishment of a political, rather than a spiritual, entity in the form of the State of Israel resulted, to quote Ezrahi, in ‘an intoxicating – and toxic –

---


\(^3\) Rosenthal, p. 135.


encounter with the only place that had the status of the real. Yet not all Jews embrace the Zionist solution of a return to a concrete Jewish (home)land. Choosing to stay in the diaspora, some, like George Steiner, argue for ‘exile as both the necessary condition of and the catalyst for that particular Jewish prerogative of being “unhoused” in the world and “at home in the world.”’

The unhoused cosmopolitanism Steiner describes is reminiscent of Jakov Lind’s definition of his own exilic position in his autobiography. In his novel The Inventor (1989), Lind explores the diasporic state through the correspondence of the Borovsky brothers, Emmanuel and Boris, as Emmanuel, the restless inventor-protagonist, embarks on a quest to raise funding for the development of his Redemption Machine, a computerized Messiah. Emmanuel’s travels take him from the Cayman Islands to Iceland, Germany, New York and Jerusalem, among other destinations, in a variation on the theme of the Wandering Jew which addresses questions of redemption, Messianism, Jewish history and Jewish identity. These themes also feature in Stefan Heym’s novel The Wandering Jew (1981), which explicitly takes the sixteenth-century German version of the legend, reworking and subverting it in a plot that alternates between several historical periods and an a-historical plane. In Heym’s novel, Ahasverus, the Wandering Jew, is in fact a fallen angel who has existed since the creation of the world, and who challenges the established order throughout the course of history.

The two novels present two distinct versions of the Wandering Jew. Lind’s Emmanuel seeks redemption in a post-war world only to be plunged into madness, as reality is constantly warped and shattered by grotesque and fantastic events. Heym’s Ahasverus, on the other hand, is a figure of rebellion: a truly eternal, transcendent figure, and at the same time an active participant in concrete historical events. In this chapter, I will examine how the two authors reinterpret the legend of the Wandering Jew from their diasporic, post-war perspective, and argue that the Wandering Jews in the two novels can be read as extreme expressions of the two authors’ different translingual trajectories. Lind’s Emmanuel is the post-Holocaust Jew who ‘can’t tell whether [wandering is] a curse as long as [he is] free to

6 Dekoven Ezrahi, p. 4.
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move.” This freedom, I will attempt to show, is costly. As Stella Rosenfeld argues, the novel ‘reveals symptomatically the impasse to which [Lind’s] exile-in-permanence has led him. The impasse, according to Rosenfeld, is directly related to Lind’s choice to write in English, a choice that ‘sealed his personal and literary homelessness.’ If Lind’s linguistic switch has led him to an impasse, Heym’s ability to move between his two languages creates a unique position for him. In *The Crusaders*, this ability was represented by Sergeant Bing, who ultimately could not sustain the inner conflict between his two identities – the German and the American; it was also expressed more obliquely through the position of the narrator, who moves successfully between the multiple perspectives represented in the novel. By self-translating and composing bilingual texts such as *The King David Report*, Heym creates a space for himself as writer that transcends language and nationality. This transcendent position is in some ways similar to that of his Wandering Jew, Ahasverus, who is both an outsider and insider, a historical figure who is also an a-historical being.

In what follows, I will contextualize the novels by discussing the origins of the legend of the Wandering Jew and the Christian and Jewish traditions on which the two authors draw. I will explore the use of doubling in the novels, showing how in Lind’s case the device is related to a fragmentation of the mind – to the psychic split that he describes in his autobiography, whereas in Heym’s novel the Wandering Jew’s doubles represent two moral and existential positions which Ahasverus mediates. Using Freud’s notion of the uncanny, I will show how the authors use and subvert anti-Semitic stereotypes to construct a humanistic Jewish identity that fits their own diasporic existence – the cosmopolitan wanderer in Lind’s case and the non-Jewish Jew in Heym’s.

***

---
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The Legend of the Wandering Jew

The legend of the Wandering, or Eternal, Jew grew out of Christian oral traditions, two of which can be traced back to the New Testament (John XXI:22-23 and John XVIII:22). In the first, Jesus implies that his beloved disciple John would remain until Jesus returns; in the second, one of the High Priest’s officers, Malchus, strikes Jesus with the palm of his hand, and is punished with immortality until Jesus returns. As R. Edelmann notes, ‘[in] the first case eternal life means a gift of mercy and bliss, an idea that can be found in Jewish sources of the time […]. In the case of Malchus, on the other hand, longevity is meant to be an eternal punishment, a punishment not after death, but still in this life.’ These traditions evolved into the 13th century version told by the monk Roger of Wendover in St Albans, England. According to this tale, Pontius Pilate’s doorkeeper Cartaphilus struck Jesus on the neck when he was on his way to Golgotha, and said to him “Go Jesus, why do you tarry?” – whereupon Jesus said to him: “I will go, but you shall wait until I will come again.” Cartaphilus repents and becomes a Christian, and lives peacefully. Significantly, in these early versions and other medieval tales, the punishment is longevity, not wandering, and the character is not always a Jew, or his Jewishness is not the central element of the tale.

In 1602, a pamphlet appeared in Germany, titled *Kurtze Beschreibung und Erzehlung von einem Juden mit Namen Ahasuerus* (*A Short Description and Story of a Jew Named Ahasuerus*). The contents of the pamphlet is summarized by Eduard König:

Paul von Eitzen, Doctor in the Holy Scriptures, and Bishop of Schleswig, who is respected by all, and considered to be a teller of the truth, told this to me and to other students very often:

Once, when during my students days in the winter of 1542, I went to visit my parents at Hamburg, I saw the next Sunday in church during the sermon, a very tall man standing opposite the pulpit; he was barefoot, and his hair hung down over his shoulders. The man listened to the sermon with such attention that he stood there perfectly still and stiff, but every time the name Jesus Christ was mentioned, he bowed,

---
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beat his breast, and gave a deep sigh. In conversations which I had with the man later, he informed me that he had been in Jerusalem at the time of Christ, had helped towards His condemnation, and on His last sorrowful journey had repulsed Him from his house with rough words. Thereupon Jesus had looked hard at him, and said: “I shall stand here and rest, but you shall wander forth and be everlastingly restless.” Then he saw Jesus die on the Cross, but could not possibly return to his people in the town of Jerusalem; ever since he had been a wanderer on the face of the earth, and longed for death. The same man was also seen in the town of Danzig shortly before 1602.16

In this version, the Jew is doomed not only to immortality, but to eternal wandering: having sinned against Christ, he ‘carries the collective guilt [of the Jews] upon his shoulders and consequently also the collective punishment through all ages and all countries.’17

The 1602 pamphlet was rapidly reproduced and distributed: in 1602 alone, twenty different editions appeared in Germany,18 and within a few decades the pamphlet had spread all over Europe and was ‘transformed in accordance with local conceptions and spiritual conditions.’19 Edelmann sees the pamphlet as a ‘cunningly camouflaged statement of the new theology [Protestantism] about its attitude towards the Jew and his position in the world, an attitude which in itself was not new but had only to be restated.’20 The pamphlet therefore cites Eitzen, an authority in theological questions, who ‘had studied with Luther just during the period when he was at the peak of this anti-Semitic stage.’21

The 1602 pamphlet, known as the Ahasver Volksbuch, became the main source of later popular European versions of the legend and is also the basis for Heym’s The Wandering Jew (or Ahasver in the German original).22 Indeed, Paulus von Eitzen is one of the main characters of the novel, featuring in a plot strand that takes place in 16\textsuperscript{th} Century Germany. The Wandering Jew of the novel is called Ahasverus, as is the figure in the 1602 pamphlet. An odd name for a Jew, it is the biblical name of the Persian King Xerxes who, according to the Hebrew Scriptures, married the Jewess Esther (besides the Book of Esther,

---
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the name is mentioned in the Old Testament only in Daniel 9:1 and Ezra 4:6). The biblical Ahasverus (or Ahasuerus) is persuaded by his minister, Haman, to destroy the exiled Jewish people.

![Image](http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/k/kjv/kjv-idx?type=simple&format=Long&q1=Ahasuerus&restrict=All&size=First+100, accessed 12 December 2008.)

Esther manages save her people, convincing the king to kill Haman the plotter instead. This salvation of the Jews from their enemies is celebrated every year in the festival of Purim, during which the Book of Esther is read publicly.

How then, did the Eternal Jew of German legend come to bear the name of a Persian King who intended to destroy all the Jews in his vast kingdom? There is no clear explanation for the choice of this name. König suggests that it arose from the reading of the Book of Esther at the Purim Festival, the *Purim Spiel*: ‘the dramatic reading aloud’ of the book ‘gave an opportunity of cursing all who were of different faith,’ he explains. ‘It is not unlikely that, in view of this abuse hurled every spring through words and mimicry at the religious standpoint of the Christians, the idea of composing a counterpiece should have suggested itself to one of them.’

Aaron Schaffer also sees the choice as related to the *Purim Spiel*, and hypothesizes that in the plays, the *Volksbuch* author had seen Ahasuerus ‘first cursed then lauded,’ and that this reaction suited the author’s intention of making his hero a repentant Jew willing to defend Christianity. Moreover, the name ‘had the added advantage of being exceedingly unusual.’

In Heym’s novel, however, the name Ahasverus acquires a different significance, unrelated to the biblical reference. The fallen angel himself explains that his name ‘means Beloved by God,’ in a striking deviation from the traditional portrayal of the Wandering Jew as a despicable figure – the first of a number of key modifications of the legend in Heym’s hands.
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The *Ahasver Volksbuch*, then, more than any of the earlier versions of the tale, established the figure of the Eternal or Wandering Jew as a guilt-ridden, alien element in the Christian world. Although repenting for his mistreatment of Jesus – and, by implication and extension, for the Jews’ role in the Crucifixion of Christ – the Jew ‘cannot expiate his guilt’ and ‘his punishment is implemented without pardon,’ in contrast with the Christian notion of forgiveness.29 As Ahasverus comes to represent the blasphemy and sin of the entire Jewish people, he is, as Regine Rosenthal maintains, constructed as a cultural Other that is ‘both a particular figure originating from a specific legend and a stereotype of the Jew’ in general.30

It is significant that the Wandering Jew is known, in German, as the Eternal Jew (*Der Ewige Jude*). Adolf Leschnitzer explains the importance of the immortality of the figure as a metaphor for the Jewish people: ‘Normally […] a people is born, lives, achieves, and dies. Jewry, on the other hand, is something abnormal, as if it were a living corpse, a specter. It has survived the great peoples of ancient history and reaches into our time, a mystery, an enigma.’31 This representation of the Jewish people as an uncanny specter, a people that has served its purpose on earth and is therefore superfluous, echoes in anti-Semitic discourses throughout the centuries; the monstrous implications are, of course, evident in the Nazi effort to systematically annihilate the Jews. However, the uncanny attributes of this figure becomes, in the works of Jewish writers, the basis for a positive construction of Jewish identity, as I will show in the final part of this chapter.

Yet even in Christian consciousness, the Jews, guilty though they are of the crucifixion of Christ, also fulfill a role in bringing about the Second Coming. The Jews are seen, since the days of Augustine, to ‘have lost their claim to being the Chosen People’, and as a ‘punishment for having killed Christ and for refusal to believe in him, the Jews have been scattered.’32 When Christ returns, ‘they will be converted and will gain entry into the Kingdom of Heaven.’33 Moreover, through their scriptures they bear witness to ‘the fact that Christians did not invent their prophecies concerning Christ.’34 In the 1602 pamphlet,
Ahasverus bears witness not only to the truth of the prophecies, but to the historical veracity of the accounts of the Gospels: he is a still-living eyewitness who can testify to Jesus’ suffering. Nevertheless, even if the Jewish people is seen to have a role in human and religious history, this does not entail its acceptance as part of Christian European society: the Jews are still seen as alien and suspect.

Jewish writers are challenged with the need to confront this legacy – in Rosenthal’s words, the ‘negative construction of the (Wandering) Jew as paradigm of the cultural Other.’ For any group assigned the place of the Other, the question becomes whether to identify with the marginalizing discourse – in this case, that of dominant Christian culture – or to create an ‘identity-asserting counterdiscourse.’ Significantly, Jewish discourse provides its own tradition of representation and interpretation of exile and identity. Leah Garrett, for instance, distinguishes two standpoints regarding the concepts of exile and return: ‘historical readings’ focusing on ‘the causes and repercussions of Jewish displacement,’ and ‘religious readings’ in which Jewish exile and return become ‘connotative’ of a universal condition of loss and desolation – an exile from God himself, as in certain Kabbalistic traditions, which will be discussed below. The novels by Heym and Lind engage with both of these traditions, and explore through the figure of the Wandering Jew both the history of Jewish exile and suffering, and the wider state of a perilous and imperiled post-war world.

***

**Politics and Mysticism: Two Wandering Jews**

Both Heym’s and Lind’s novels rework and subvert the legend of the Wandering Jew. Heym’s novel The Wandering Jew takes the version of the 1602 pamphlet as its point of departure; using extensive research into the historical context and figures that feature in the novel, Heym creates, in Meg Tait’s words, a ‘critical allegorical account’ of life in the GDR by drawing parallels between sixteenth-century Germany and East Germany in the late
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twentieth century.\textsuperscript{39} Heym had used historical and biblical figures and sources in his fiction in the past, for instance in ‘The Queen Against Defoe’ and The King David Report, discussed in the previous chapter. If in his wartime novels, especially The Crusaders, Heym relied on his own experiences and on current events to create narrative fiction that is also a call for immediate and concrete action – the fight against fascism, his methods in \textit{The Wandering Jew} differ significantly. Here Heym completely abandons the realism of his early novels and departs from the conventions of the historical novel, which had also served him in his 1964 novel \textit{The Lenz Papers}, set in the revolutionary uprisings in Germany in 1849, and the biographical novel \textit{Uncertain Friend} from 1969, about Ferdinand Lasalle.\textsuperscript{40} Instead, he creates a mythical and mystical dimension to an exploration of history and political order and uses satire and irony to criticize oppressive and reactionary regimes, religious hypocrisy and political brutality.

The central conceit of the novel is that Ahasverus, the Wandering Jew, is in fact a fallen angel, who rebelled with Lucifer and refused to bow down to God’s creation, Man, and serve him. Thus Ahasverus’s immortality is inherent in his nature as a supernatural being, and not a form of punishment as in the conventional telling of the legend of the Wandering Jew. Heym allows his protagonist to wander not only on earth, but in heaven and hell, as he seeks to ‘destroy the status quo, to change man and the world, and to bring about the promised kingdom of God.’\textsuperscript{41}

The narrative alternates between several storylines and time periods, all unified by the presence of Ahasverus. The novel is structurally complex, and any analysis of its themes requires a description of the form and plot lines. The plot is organized along three historical time levels and one trans-historical (or a-historical) level.\textsuperscript{42} The first time level is that of the life of Jesus – or Joshua, the Rabbi, as Ahasverus refers to him. Ahasverus is present at key moments of Joshua’s life, and constantly tries to radicalize the Rabbi and persuade him to subvert the order created by God and bring true justice to the world. The second time level

\textsuperscript{39} Tait, p. 13.
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consists of the story of Martin Luther’s student Paulus von Eitzen, the same Eitzen who in the 1602 pamphlet tells of his encounter with the Wandering Jew. In Heym’s version, Eitzen is portrayed as an ambitious and dogmatic fool who forms an unhealthy alliance with the mysterious Leuchtentrager (‘carrier of light’, or Lucifer, in German) and an obsession with the equally mysterious Jew Ahasverus. Centuries later, on the third historical level, an East German scholar, Siegfried Beifuss, corresponds with an Israeli colleague, Jochanaan Leuchtentrager, about the legend of Ahasverus, trying to refute the latter’s claims that Ahasverus exists and, moreover, that he was indeed present at the time of Jesus’ crucifixion. Finally, in the a-historical (or trans-historical) strand which Peter Hutchinson calls limbo, the immortal participants – Ahasverus, Lucifer, Jesus after his crucifixion and God – move in the realms of heaven and hell from the moment of Creation to a final apocalypse, debating the nature of man and the desirable order of the world.

Heym’s allegory engages mainly with the Christian tradition of the Wandering Jew, and most notably with the popular German version of the legend from 1602. The choice of Reformation Germany as the setting for one of the plot strands is significant not only because of the propagation of the Wandering Jew legend at that time. The novel, published in 1981 in West Germany (it would not be published in the GDR until 1988), was written while preparations were taking place in East Germany for the celebrations of the five-hundredth anniversary of Luther’s birth in 1983. The occasion was the culmination of a three-decade process of ‘rehabilitation’ of Luther’s image as ‘the Great Reformer’. The post-war attitude in East Germany – partly a result of the policy of de-Nazification and partly a result of Stalin’s suppression of independence among the communist regimes in Eastern Europe – was ‘characterized by a very negative view of the German past.’ Luther in particular was seen as an anti-revolutionary figure, who contributed to the suppression of the peasants’ revolt and the delivery of power to princes. Stephen Hoffmann cites Wolfram von Hanstein’s Von Luther bis Hitler, which casts Luther as the spiritual ancestor of Hitler,
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the ‘ultimate source of the reactionary attitudes which finally led to the annihilation of Germany in 1945.’

The gradual rehabilitation was related to a 1951 decision of the Central Committee that ‘affirmed as one of the main ideological tasks of the party the development of a “true” German patriotism.’ Central to this was ‘the concept of German history as an inexorable revolutionary process which culminated in the establishment of the first truly democratic German state,’ the GDR, and it is within this framework that the reinterpretation of Luther and the Reformation occurred. The 450th anniversary of the Reformation in 1967 prompted a reassessment of Luther’s role and a new popular history portrayed him more favorably, as a ‘revolutionary activist who mobilized the masses against the feudal power of Rome.’

Heym mocks this rehabilitation in *The Wandering Jew* both by portraying Luther’s drunken, rabid anti-Semitism and Eitzen’s dogmatism and opportunism, and through the correspondence between Leuchtentrager (who is in fact Lucifer) and Siegfried Beifuss, a professor at the East German ‘Institute for Scientific Atheism,’ set in 1980. Heym outlines the parallels between Germany of the Reformation and the GDR, stressing the anti-Semitism and hypocrisy of both, creating a continuity within German history that the East German authorities would rather repudiate. Heym uses the same method of dialogical juxtaposition that served him in *The Crusaders* to draw parallels between German and American rhetoric: just as the flaws of American idealism became apparent through the infiltration of German undercurrents of violence, so the professed socialism and revolutionary zeal of the GDR are shown, by the unflattering comparison with Luther’s Germany, to be masking intolerance and oppression.

Thus Eitzen, after successfully passing his oral examination for the title Master of Divinity at Wittenberg (with the help and other-than-divine inspiration of Leuchtentrager), preaches a sermon about the Jews. Leuchtentrager disdainfully notes the opportunistic nature of the topic: ‘So you are doing it for Luther’s sake,’ he observes. ‘You have closely listened to his cursing the Jews and railing against them […]’; and as the prophet says: He
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that shapes his lips by the tongue of his master will rise in his favor."\(^{52}\) Eitzen’s anti-Semitic sermon wins Luther’s approval ‘for these thoughts about the Jewish people are exactly his own,’ and Eitzen ‘senses that his pronouncements are touching the hearts of his congregation, and that not only Doctor Luther but all of them consider his words more than justified.’\(^{53}\) After the sermon, Luther expresses his pleasure with the candidate’s discourse: ‘you must have been reading the thoughts in my mind,’ he tells Eitzen, and warns him: ‘listening to you I also was thinking to myself: a fellow like this is the very butt of the devil’s temptations […]. Therefore let me advise you always to keep a humble heart and occasionally look back over your shoulder to see if Satan may not be close behind you.’\(^{54}\)

In the part of the novel set in late twentieth-century East Germany, Professor Beifuss shapes his own lips by the tongue of his master as he follows the edict of Würzner, the Chief of Department of Ministry of Higher Education. Würzner is alarmed that the correspondence between Leuchtentrager and Beifuss might be leading in politically undesirable directions. ‘I would suggest your giving some thought to the preparation of a project through which […] you might prove the close interaction of religion and imperialist expansionism, particularly in relation to Israel,’ he advises. In the same breath, Würzner betrays the double-standard that underlies the GDR’s anti-Israeli stance: ‘I am stressing Israel,’ he continues, ‘because we observe similar tendencies in Islamic countries as well; these, however, we will disregard in view of the political aims pursued by our Soviet friends and ourselves.’\(^{55}\)

Beifuss responds accordingly to a letter from Leuchtentrager, which cites the Dead Sea Scrolls as evidence of the meeting between Ahasverus and Jesus. One of the scrolls, Leuchtentrager writes, ‘tells among other things the story of the resurrection and eventual return of the Teacher of Righteousness.’\(^{56}\) Along with him appears a Chief Elder of the Church, ‘the beloved by God.’\(^{57}\) The scroll itself seems to depict the encounter between Ahasverus and Jesus on the way to Calvary; yet the fragmented text refers, rather obscurely, also to ‘the poor and oppressed’ who are ‘lined up in seven rows of assault’ and are ‘but
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waiting for the call...." Beifuss cannot know, but the reader will soon learn, when Ahasverus himself narrates the scene of Joshua’s crucifixion, that Ahasverus tried to enlist Joshua to rebel against God’s order and bring true justice to the world.

Beifuss dismisses the Qumran scroll as evidence of ‘the mass hysteria […] spreading in the first and second centuries.’ He draws his own conclusion from the encounter described in the scroll: whereas Leuchtentrager notes that the two were ‘probably seen by the people of Qumran as messianic personages,’ Beifuss contends that the two ‘were not spirits of any kind […] but were both human beings.’ The scroll, according to his interpretation, does nothing more than describe a brawl between two men who were either ‘a couple of crooks’ who exploited the ‘superstitions of their congregation,’ or ‘simply paranoiacs.’ Considering the tale in relation to the ‘mass hysteria’ of the time and to the paranoia clearly indicated by the Chief Elder’s ‘obvious military-religious fanaticism,’ Beifuss speculates that ‘the spirit of the person whom scroll 9QRes calls Ahasverus is in truth immortal,’ and to establish this hypothesis he recruits two of his colleagues ‘to check through the Bible, the Apocrypha, and other writings of this kind for similar utterances of other Jewish figures.’ Beifuss’s proposed study, then, no longer has Ahasverus as its subject, but is a politically motivated effort to prove that the eternal spirit of paranoia is the essential characteristic of Jewishness. By tracing Jewish ‘military-religious fanaticism’ to biblical and apocryphal sources, Beifuss complies with the demands of the Ministry of Higher Education to link Israel’s ‘imperialist expansionism’ with Jewish religion, and to expose the long-lasting paranoia that underlies it. The juxtaposition of this correspondence with Eitzen’s venomous sermon on the Jews, which immediately precedes it, shows the concern with Zionist expansionism expressed by the GDR authorities as something other than a response to a current political problem: it is, rather, the continuation of the anti-Semitism manifested by Luther and Eitzen, the religious authorities of sixteenth-century Germany. That Eitzen and Beifuss meet a similar end – both are carried off by the devil – further reinforces the parallels between the two German societies.
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The historical context and political content of the novel have been discussed in some detail, most notably by Meg Tait in *Taking Sides*. The novel criticizes totalitarian regimes everywhere, yet as Tait notes, Heym ‘repeatedly voiced his support for the ideals of socialism which the government claimed as their guiding force’ and held on to the hope that true socialism can be achieved.\(^{65}\) The aspect that remains more obscure, and which will be the focus of my fuller discussion of the novel, is the Jewish consciousness that informs the novel and the Jewish identity that emerges from it as Heym’s own ambivalence about his Judaism is at play in the creation of a complex, sometimes contradictory Jewish figure.

***

Heym’s novel ends with an apocalypse that reflects his horror at the proliferation of nuclear arms.\(^{66}\) Lind’s short novel *The Inventor* similarly reveals a certain despair at a world ravaged by war and corruption, with ‘half the world starving while the other half drowns in unspeakable plenty,’\(^{67}\) yet its central theme is, as Stella Rosenfeld argues, ‘the fate of the Jews in a mad world.’\(^{68}\) The main feature of the Wandering Jew – or rather, wandering Jews – in *The Inventor* is a negotiation of the historical state of exile and diasporic existence. Exile is the defining condition of the two Polish-Jewish brothers, Emmanuel and Boris: the novel opens with Emmanuel in ‘godforsaken exile’ in the Cayman Islands,\(^{69}\) where a failed investment in a suspect company – a tax-evasion scam – has left him penniless, while Boris leads a comfortable life as a doctor in London. Unlike his seemingly sensible, successful brother, Emmanuel is a *luftmensch*, a ‘footloose [freelance],’ who must ‘invent and keep on inventing new mechanical devices’ in order to survive.\(^{70}\)

Whereas Heym draws on a Christian tradition in creating his Ahasverus, Lind engages with a tradition of Jewish mysticism. The book is prefaced with an epigraph quoting Kabbalist Rabbi Hayyim Vital:

There is no being  
not even the lowliest
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which may not serve as a prison
for the sparks of the banished souls
seeking restoration from their exile.

Lind evokes here the sixteenth-century Kabbalistic notion of exile as a fundamental state of the universe and the related idea of tikkun, or reparation. As Gershom Scholem explains in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, in the wake of the crisis of the expulsion of Jews from Spain in 1492, Kabbalists in Safed found a way of confronting ‘the nature of Galut [exile] and the nature of redemption.’

71 Galut was seen as ‘a terrible and pitiless state permeating and embittering all of Jewish life, but Galut was also the condition of the universe as a whole, even of the deity.’

72 When he created the world, God ‘confined and concealed Himself’ and ‘exiled Himself from boundless infinity to a more concentrated infinity.’

73 After this act of limitation, God emitted ‘beams of light into the vacuum of limitation and [built] our world.’

74 God created vessels to ‘serve the manifestation of His own being,’ but as the divine light entered them, the vessels ‘could not contain the light and thus were broken.’

75 Sparks of divine light fell as a result of the breaking of the vessels: this is an exile of the divine itself, Scholem explains, and quotes Rabbi Hayyim Vital, who provided Lind’s epigraph: “‘These sparks of holiness are bound fetters of steel in the depths of the shells, and yearningly aspire to rise to their source but cannot avail to do so until they have support.’”

The breaking can be healed, and it is up to the Jewish people, the Kabbalist mystics claim, to ‘amend the world in its visible and invisible aspects alike’ through the Torah and the commandments, which are ‘the secret remedies which by their spiritual action move things to their ordained station, free the imprisoned divine light and raise it to its proper level.’

77 Redemption then, for this strand in Kabbalah, is ‘synonymous with emendation or restoration’ – *tikkun* in Hebrew – of a universe which is inherently flawed and broken: once ‘we have fulfilled our duty […] and all things occupy their appropriate places in the
universal scheme, then redemption will come of itself. It is important to note that this mystical explanation of exile and redemption differs greatly from the perception of these notions in Rabbinical Judaism. As Scholem explains, ‘Jewish Messianism is in its origins and by its nature […] a theory of catastrophe.’ It is associated with ‘apocalypticism,’ with the belief that redemption is preceded by destruction and accompanied by the Last Judgment. At the same time, redemption ‘is in no causal sense a result of previous history.’ The Messianic era is not produced by any historical event or process, but arises from the ruin of history unannounced, without the involvement of human agency.

Lind’s epigraph, then, invokes the Kabbalist mystical system of thought, and redemption is a central preoccupation in the novel. Emmanuel conceives of a means of repairing the world: a computerized Redemption Machine, a ‘non-political, non opinionated pragmatic device’ which would ‘cope more efficiently than human agencies’ with the ills of the world. Yet Heym’s novel, too, is concerned with the notion of redemption, and explores the possibility of bringing about a true messianic age through human agency. Thus both novels draw on a heretical tradition within Judaism, but whereas Lind’s mysticism ultimately leads to mental disintegration and a withdrawal from the world, Heym’s allegory advocates political engagement in the face of a dispiriting reality.

***

**Doubling as Disintegration**

Doubling is a central device of Lind’s novel, and the multiplication which constructs the Wandering Jew as a collective identity also signals the fragmentation and erosion of Emmanuel’s identity as an individual. The theme of madness is linked in the novel to the question of the possibility of personal and universal redemption. As Emmanuel and his doubles are revealed – in one way or another – as insane, the redemption they seek is problematized. *The Inventor*, like *Travels to the Enu*, is a tale of madness; although language, which figured prominently in the earlier novel, does not play an explicit thematic
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role in this work, the destabilization and splitting of the self, a key concern here, are a recurring motif in Lind’s English-language works. Thus the schizophrenic existence portrayed in *The Inventor* can be associated – through its echoing of processes described in Lind’s autobiographical works – with the author’s linguistic switch.

As Emmanuel travels the world trying to recruit investors for the development of his redemption machine, he encounters several eccentric Jews, doubles whose machinations and inventions mirror aspects of his own quest. Their stories also serve to reflect, as in a distorted mirror, the fate of the exiled Jewish people as a whole. The double, according to Freud, is one of the phenomena that provoke an uncanny feeling – of that which is at once familiar and strange, frightening. Doubling can be manifested in ‘characters who are considered identical because they look alike’ or are related by ‘mental processes leaping’ from one character to another, or it can be ‘marked by the fact that the subject identifies himself with someone else, so that he is in doubt as to which his self is, or substitutes the extraneous self for his own.’ With the ‘dividing and interchanging of the self’ comes ‘the constant recurrence of the same thing.’ Doubling is thus linked to the repetition compulsion which, as Freud explains fully in ‘Beyond the Pleasure Principle,’ is ‘powerful enough to overrule the pleasure principle.’ Neil Hertz adds that the uncanny feeling is created ‘by being reminded of the repetition compulsion, not by being reminded of whatever it is that is repeated.’ It is not the item that has been repressed and returns into consciousness through repetition – in this case doubling – that is uncanny, but the awareness of the process of repetition. Indeed, the repetitions in *The Inventor* – the similarities and coincidences that unite Emmanuel with his doubles – create an uncanny impression, destabilizing the sense of reality and confusing identities.
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Doubling, however, can perform different functions in a narrative. Robert Rogers distinguishes between two kinds of doubling in literature: doubling by multiplication and doubling by division. In the case of multiplication, several characters representing a single concept appear in the narrative. Doubling by division ‘involves the splitting up of a recognizable, unified psychological entity into separate, complementary, distinguishable parts represented by seemingly autonomous characters.’

Lind uses both kinds of doubling in *The Inventor*: the doubles of minor importance – such as Irving Cohen and Walter Wertheimer – are doubles by multiplication. They make brief appearances and contribute to the creation of a grotesque, unreal and somewhat disjointed narrative.

Doubling in *The Inventor* is also used to mark the fragmentation of Emmanuel’s self, and is also linked with the fragmented structure of the novel itself. The plot twists and turns, splitting into multiple subplots which are not always developed and seem to lack coherence. Stella Rosenfeld claims that the novel ‘reveals symptomatically the impasse’ to which Lind’s exile has led him. Indeed, the fragmentation of the narrative is increased though the device of doubling, and especially through doubling as division: two significant figures in the novel, Elim Ffinger and Emmanuel’s brother Boris, repeat and echo Emmanuel’s traits, actions and ambitions, and appear at times almost to be projections of Emmanuel’s own self. The fragmented narrative thus reflects a fragmented self, and is ultimately a tale of mental disintegration. The splitting and the ensuing destabilization of reality echo similar elements in Lind’s memoirs, with their repeated allusions to schizophrenia. Indeed, although *The Inventor* does not feature language as a theme, I would suggest that the effects of Lind’s translingualism, which is a result of exile and a means of coping with it, are manifested in this novel through the trope of psychic division.

One of the doubles who can be seen as a multiplication of the aspects of the inventor’s character is Irving Cohen, a ‘brilliant investment lawyer,’ who invites Emmanuel to join him on a yacht with the King and Queen of Spain. Seeking a remedy for the expulsion of the Jews of Spain, Cohen suggests the return of two million Jews to Spain and the restoration of the great Jewish synagogue in Palma, destroyed in 1395: ‘1995 would be the proper date after six hundred years to reinaugurate the Palma Synagogue on its
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original site,’ Cohen suggests. The restoration of the golden age of Spanish Jewry would not be without its benefits to the world at large, for Cohen has an idea for uniting Jews, Muslims and Christians: a new breed of deer pig, a kosher pig ‘with two stomachs that chews the cud’ and can be bred commercially in ‘the higher altitudes of the Sierra Madres, where the climate is just right.’ For centuries, Cohen explains, Christians, Jews and Muslims could not share the same table: ‘[what] more convincing evidence of the brotherhood of men can we think of than a Holy Communion of kosher suckling pig in which Jew, Muslim, and Christian can participate?’ This vision of peace on earth is greeted with general laughter, but Cohen is not offended. The harebrained idea, more obviously ridiculous than even Emmanuel’s Redemption Machine, is but a distraction, he explains: ‘The only way to make them listen to my plea for the restitution of Jewish capital and property after six hundred years, is to make it all sound like Jewish jokes.’ Cohen’s main goal is not the creation of an end-of-days utopia, but the restoration of a lost diasporic community to its former glory.

Another representative of the fate of the Jewish people in the diaspora is Walter Wertheimer, a German millionaire whom Emmanuel hopes to recruit as an investor. Wertheimer is a wandering Jew who aspires, it seems, to become eternal like the legendary figure. With ‘homes in New York, Phoenix (Arizona), Paris and Los Angeles’ as well as Berlin, he hopes the inventor would create ‘an invention to make him live to 184 if not longer, eg another 100 years.’ While Wertheimer’s wish for an eternal life is dismissed as mere vanity, the millionaire is strongly linked to the history of German Jews. This relationship is symbolized by his attachment to, and pride in, a family heirloom: an antique desk whose history reflects the complex relationship of German Jews to their land. The desk, ‘made of solid German oak,’ is ‘a table of many legends,’ Wertheimer tells Emmanuel. Richard Wagner ‘supposedly wrote his anti-Semitic pamphlet The Jews in Music on this table.’ In 1939, when Wertheimer’s family fled Berlin, the desk was stored
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in a ‘villa on the Wannsee,’ which was later requisitioned by the SS to hold the Wannsee conference, where plans were drawn up for the ‘Final Solution’: the systematic destruction of the European Jews. ‘Quite possible that Eichmann, Himmler, Kaltenbrunner, sat around my family’s heirloom,’ Wertheimer reflects. ‘My enemies planned the destruction of my family on my own family table – and the curse fell back on them.’ Wertheimer’s desk is associated with key moments and figures of German anti-Semitism, yet its owner proudly displays it as a reminder both of the historic persecution of the Jews and of the Jews’ triumph over adversity: the Wandering Jew carries with him the marks of his suffering, but in this Jewish version, he is not repentant but victorious.

The encounter with Wertheimer causes Emmanuel to consider his own position as a wandering Jew. ‘Maybe I am just the old wandering Jew but I can’t tell whether it’s a curse as long as I am free to move,’ he writes to his brother. ‘Would we have left Poland without being forced to?’ he wonders. ‘I might have. You’d probably still be there if it hadn’t been for the war.’ Emmanuel’s choice to be a wanderer, much like Lind’s own willing and willful cosmopolitanism, makes a virtue out of necessity: exile has shaped Emmanuel’s life as it has the lives of Jews throughout history. Here the Wandering Jew is no longer an allegory: it is a position forced upon Jews by concrete historical circumstances. Unlike the legendary figure, who was punished for a specific affront, European Jews in the mid-twentieth century, like their forefathers in fifteenth-century Spain, are doomed to wandering and homelessness through no fault of their own. Expressed in these terms, The Inventor can be read as a sustained commentary on the perils of exile.

The reflections on the crisis of Jewish life after the war are only cursory glimpses of reality in a narrative that constantly subverts and destabilizes reality, as Emmanuel meets one eccentric Jew after another. While Irving and Walter serve as doubles and mirror some of Emmanuel’s traits and concerns, their role in the narrative is limited. Two other characters – Elim Ffinger and Emmanuel’s brother Boris – fulfill the function of the double in more lasting and significant ways, and in both cases, the doubling is closely linked with mental disintegration.
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Elim Ffinger is a Wandering Jew and false Messiah, bringing together the two central aspects of Emmanuel’s character – wandering and the (misguided) quest for redemption. A mysterious figure, he is ‘a man in his mid-fifties who knows fourteen languages, was born Samuel Butterfield in Transylvania [sic.], but now calls himself “Elim Ffinger” (spelled with two ‘f’s),’ Emmanuel has heard from a friend. 103 Ffinger came to Antwerp after the war, married the daughter of the diamond king of Antwerp, and studied Kabbalah. He ‘kept a secret friendship with a Turk, a Muslim who was himself secretly a Jew, belonging to the sect of apostates called DÖNMEH.’ This Turk ‘somehow managed to convince Elim he (Elim) was the reincarnated Sabbtai Zvi, the Messiah, and had the right charisma, sublime intelligence, financial means and aristocrat’s noble manners to become the Redeemer “in our day”’. 104

Shabtai Zvi105 was the seventeenth-century leader of what Gershom Scholem termed ‘by far the most significant Messianic movement in Diaspora Jewish history.’ 106 The Sabbatian movement ‘crystallized around the figures of the widely acclaimed pseudo-Messiah’ Zvi (1626-1676) and ‘his prophet and theologian Nathan of Gaza.’ 107 Zvi came to Palestine declaring himself the Messiah, but no one, Scholem stresses, had taken these proclamations seriously until Nathan of Gaza became convinced, in 1665, by his own ‘ecstatic visions’ that Zvi was indeed the Messiah. 108

Zvi’s claims had initially been disregarded, Scholem explains, because he was ‘physically a sick man.’ 109 Yet his affliction, Scholem argues on the basis of a ‘mass of documentary evidence,’ was not physical: he was in fact ‘constitutionally a maniac depressive,’ and under the influence of his manic enthusiasm, this ‘Kabbalistic ascetic and devotee’ felt compelled ‘to commit acts which run counter to religious law.’ 110 The holy sinner, as Scholem refers to Zvi, ‘combined a utopian vision of a new Judaism […] with an equally outspoken inclination to invent bizarre and ludicrous rituals that took over items of
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the Jewish tradition […], but stood them on their head.\footnote{Scholem, \textit{Messianic Idea}, p. 144.} In an extravagant move, the self-styled Messiah went to Constantinople in 1666; his supporters ‘expected him to remove the crown from the head of the Sultan and inaugurate the new Messianic era,’\footnote{Scholem, \textit{Messianic Idea}, p. 145.} but Zvi was arrested by the Turkish authorities, and to the surprise of his believers, ‘purchased his life by conversion.’\footnote{Scholem, \textit{Messianic Idea}, p. 145.}

Remarkably, many of Zvi’s followers did not desert him after his apostasy, and a new mystical theory was developed to explain and justify the Messiah’s heresy. Based on the Lurianic Kabbalistic idea of the divine sparks that need to be gathered from their existential exile in order for redemption to occur, Sabbatianism contended that redemption was ‘contingent upon the Messiah himself venturing among the nations in order to […] liberate and “elevate” the sparks of holiness.’\footnote{Scholem, \textit{Messianic Idea}, p. 145.} The Messiah must descend into the very ‘realms of impurity’ to fulfill this mission,\footnote{Scholem, \textit{Messianic Idea}, p. 145.} but he remains a Jew despite being outwardly a Muslim: he ‘lives on two levels – the exoteric and the esoteric one – which until his return in the full splendour of Messianic dominion must remain in contradiction.’\footnote{Scholem, \textit{Messianic Idea}, p. 146.} Moreover, some of Zvi’s adherents followed him and outwardly professed a belief in Islam, forming the Dönmeh – ‘the word meaning “apostates”’ – sect in Turkey.\footnote{Scholem, \textit{Major Trends}, p. 303.}

Like Zvi, who needed Nathan of Gaza to proclaim him the Messiah, Elim Ffinger’s messianic aspirations required the encouragement of the Sabbatian apostate: Elim has ‘accepted [the Turk’s] calling to be the new Sabbtai Zvi,’\footnote{Lind, \textit{Inventor}, p. 64.} and his plans for redemption involve mass apostasy: he strives to ‘convert all non-Jews to Judaism by persuading all Jews to become Christians, Muslims, Hindus or Buddhists.’\footnote{Lind, \textit{Inventor}, p. 63.} Emmanuel believes this scheme is simply ‘mad’ and sees Elim as a ‘provocateur’ rather than a savior:\footnote{Lind, \textit{Inventor}, p. 63.} the ‘Turk has destroyed his mind,’ he declares.\footnote{Lind, \textit{Inventor}, p. 64.} Elim’s plan appears particularly mad when he insists that prominent political figures and world leaders are in fact secretly Jewish: ‘Miss Bhutto’,
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whom Ffinger would ‘like to see […] in charge of Pakistan’ is ‘one of us’, he claims. ‘Her real name is Baruchia.’\textsuperscript{122} The German Chancellor Helmut Kohl ‘had a great-grandfather who still spelled his name with an “n” and not with and “l” at the end,’ and Mao Tse Tung’s real name was Moshe Zung.\textsuperscript{123}

Emmanuel’s account of Elim’s scheme suggests that this heir to Shabtai Zvi should not be taken entirely seriously. Elim’s own business card, in fact, presents him as President of ‘The Universal Society of Messianic Pretenders,’\textsuperscript{124} and he confesses to Emmanuel that his ‘desire to rule the world stems from [his] sexual impotence’\textsuperscript{125} and that ‘impotence is the cause of [his] messianic ambition.’\textsuperscript{126} It is tempting – for Emmanuel and for the reader – to dismiss Elim as nothing more than a madman. Indeed, Emmanuel later encounters Ffinger in Jerusalem, where he is confined as a patient in a mental institution. Yet there is something about Elim Ffinger that will not allow Emmanuel (or the reader) to dismiss him as entirely ridiculous.

When Emmanuel, whose name means ‘God is with us’ in Hebrew, meets Elim Ffinger, who has chosen a name that alludes to divine power (‘Elim’ means Gods in Hebrew),\textsuperscript{127} he has a strange sense of recognition.

The first thing that struck me about him was that he looked strangely familiar. […] I stared at him, couldn’t quite believe my eyes. Here was a man I had definitely never met before, yet I knew him, knew him only too well. What I report to you here is the absolute truth, yet I can’t expect you to believe me. Except for his nose, which was thinner than mine, he looked more or less like…myself.\textsuperscript{128}

The mirroring in this passage explicitly establishes Elim as Emmanuel’s double, and initiates a process of repeated identification and repudiation that characterizes Emmanuel’s relationship to Elim.

Thus Emmanuel is relieved to note, once Elim starts speaking, that their voices are not identical. It is not only the different voice that he finds reassuring, but Elim’s words: ‘I
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enjoy frightening people. While I frighten others, I am never afraid myself.\footnote{Lind, Inventor, p. 31.} With these words, Emmanuel feels, Elim betrays himself: ‘[his] case was beyond the simple description of mad or crazy, yet, just like his face, extremely familiar.’\footnote{Lind, Inventor, p. 31.} Not only Elim’s appearance, but his oddity is familiar to Emmanuel. This stranger’s very strangeness – his possible madness, even – is reassuring, as Emmanuel at once recognizes himself in it and also rejects the implication of this recognition. He feels that continuing the conversation would be a waste of time: ‘I now realized I should have stayed in the Caribbean, instead of going halfway around the world to meet, at best, a future investor, and, at worst, my doppelgaenger – only one who sounds much weirder and seems to be much more eccentric than I could ever be.’\footnote{Lind, Inventor, p. 31.}

The term Doppelgänger here signals the conscious use of a literary device that carries a weight of psychoanalytical significance. In his review of the development of the Double motif, Clifford Hallam notes that the German word Doppelgänger ‘was brought into the literary tradition – as term only – by the novelist Jean Paul (Richter), who in 1796 defined the word in a one sentence footnote: “So heissen Leute, die sich selbst sehen”\footnote{Clifford Hallam, ‘The Double as Incomplete Self: Toward a Definition of Doppelgänger’, in Fearful Symmetry: Doubles and Doubling in Literature and Film, ed. by Eugene J. Crook, vols (Tallahassee: University Presses of Florida, 1981), pp. 1-31 (p. 5).} (“What people who see themselves are called”). Andrew Webber, too, sees the Doppelgänger as ‘above all a figure of visual compulsion.’\footnote{Andrew J. Webber, The Doppelgänger: Double Visions in German Literature (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 3.} The ‘autosopic, or self-seeing, subject beholds its other self as another, as visual object,\footnote{Webber, p. 3.} as occurs in the mirroring experienced by Emmanuel. In the encounter with a Doppelgänger, ‘[subjective] identity becomes an object of both agonistic and visual contention, a struggle for control over speech and gaze.’\footnote{Webber, p. 7.} Emmanuel is drawn into such a struggle as his relief at the difference between his and Elim’s voices, ideas and eccentricities proves premature.

At the end of his first meeting with Elim, Emmanuel has trouble sleeping. Tossing and turning in bed, he is unable to keep his eyes closed: ‘[whenever] I shut them I saw and
heard myself, I could swear, talking to myself with his voice."  

The next morning, Elim looks ‘even more like’ Emmanuel, and ‘[to] cap it all he now claimed to be a kind of inventor as well.’ More ominously, Emmanuel’s sense of self and his perception of reality are further eroded in another mirroring scene. Stating that ‘all reality is an illusion,’ Elim hands Emmanuel a mirror. ‘Look at yourself,’ he tells Emmanuel.

“All you believe you can see now you may call recognition. You have seen yourself before and will recognize yourself. God created man in his image, now look at the image.”

I looked, and whether it was aquavit or his hypnotic voice and stare, something strange happened. Instead of seeing my own face in the mirror I saw his. Again and again I looked and again and again I saw his face in the mirror and not mine.

The process that has taken place can be described as a reversal of the Lacanian Mirror Stage, in which the child recognizes its own reflection and through it comes to realize its own subjectivity. In Lacan’s account of ‘the transformation that takes place in the subject when he assumes an image,’ the child ‘seems suddenly to have a discovery to celebrate, and to be able to formulate, however roughly, the propositions “I am that” and “That is me.”’ Indeed, this instance of mirroring also appears in the novel. Boris, Emmanuel’s older brother, is able to reflect on Emmanuel’s self-discovery as a small child:

You were only three and I was five but I’ll never forget how you shrieked, laughed and danced […]. The reason for all this spectacle? You had just, I believe it must have been for the first time, identified yourself in a mirror! I wish I had been that happy when I discovered myself. You were instantly happy with yourself, must have believed you had caused, “made” yourself, come true.

This self-recognition, jubilant at first and habitual in later life, is shattered and replaced with estrangement when the image reflected in the mirror – again and again – is uncannily

---

136 Lind, Inventor, p. 33.
137 Lind, Inventor, p. 34.
138 Lind, Inventor, p. 42.
139 Lind, Inventor, p. 42.
143 Lind, Inventor, p. 127.
usurped by the stranger, Elim. The *Doppelgänger* here becomes, to quote Webber, ‘a figure of displacement,’ and embodies ‘a constitutive […] split in subjectivity.’

Emmanuel seems to recover from the hallucinatory encounter with Elim and the temporary loss of self by interpreting the significance of the event in practical terms.

The longer I thought about it, the more I realized how important this encounter with a kind of *doppelgaenger* was for me. Just listening to him proved I had been wrong about my own state of mind all along. In some inexplicable way this man, so similar yet so alien, articulated my own troubled mind, preoccupied with universal solutions for my limited concern. When I listened to him, talked to him, I felt both very depressed but also exceedingly liberated. He made me feel quite normal so to speak.

The realization that his own project, the Redemption Machine, is as misguided as Elim’s preposterous Messianic plans, suggests at first that the mirroring experience with the *Doppelgänger* may have had a positive effect: that the jarring reflection in the mirror has led to a self-reflexive re-integration of the fragmented self. False messianism, Emmanuel seems to suggest, is a preoccupation with the universal that masks the limited, private concern. Elim’s messianism, driven – by his own admission – by his sexual impotence, is a grotesque version of Shabtai Zvi’s messianic trajectory, which began when he came to Nathan of Gaza ‘as a patient to a doctor of the soul.’

The insight, however, is quickly suppressed. Emmanuel continues to pursue his mission despite his feeling that the Redemption Machine ‘alas, is not about to take over the world, just the world in my head.’ Upon reading Emmanuel’s account of the meeting with Elim, Emmanuel’s brother Boris remarks that the story bears indications of ‘a dose of mild depression and schizophrenia.’ Boris himself, who initially reproaches his brother for being ‘[still] on the road’ and ‘running like a white mouse in a wheel, […] never weary of producing new fantasies,’ suffers a crisis that ultimately brings him closer to Emmanuel’s position. As Boris’s marriage comes under strain, he is engulfed by jealous delusions that lead him to shoot his wife’s dog; he is subsequently hospitalized at the Herzweg Clinic.
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Although he initially seems to serve as Emmanuel’s antithesis – the stable, conservative and practical brother, Boris also gradually emerges as Emmanuel’s double, mirroring him in his own mental disintegration. Even when Boris seems to occupy a position completely different to Emmanuel’s, his comments on Emmanuel’s life and experiences provide confirmation and reinforcement to Emmanuel’s narrative. Just as he was able to testify about Emmanuel’s discovery of his own self in the mirror as a child, Boris is also able to confirm the authenticity of Emmanuel’s identity as a wandering inventor: referring to Emmanuel’s ‘flighty existence of the luftmensch’\textsuperscript{150} (a term Emmanuel himself previously used), Boris testifies: ‘When you were sixteen,’ and the ‘headmistress asked you what you wanted to be after you finished school, you looked at her as if she had insulted you. “What do I want to be? I don’t want to be anything,” you said. “I am an inventor.”’\textsuperscript{151}

The parallels between Emmanuel’s mental state and Boris’s breakdown are drawn explicitly when Boris, who diagnosed Emmanuel with schizophrenia, suggests he might be afflicted by the same condition:

I often thought of you as stark raving mad, as you well know, because of your life style, because you are trying to live out your own fantasies, a kind of Walter Mitty, a Baron Munchausen, a light-hearted, irresponsible fool. I am no longer so certain who of the two of us is which. Does my identity crisis show symptoms of latent schizophrenia?\textsuperscript{152}

The past-tense opening ‘I often thought of you as […] mad’ suggests at first that a change of heart has occurred, and that Boris no longer views his brother as an ‘irresponsible fool.’ But this expectation is quickly dispelled: rather than declaring his brother sane, or even pronouncing himself mad, Boris admits to an uncertainty: he can no longer distinguish himself from Emmanuel. Like Emmanuel who gazed into the mirror and saw Elim’s face reflected in it, Boris suffers an ‘identity crisis’ in which he sees himself as his brother, or his brother as himself.

The triple mirroring – between Emmanuel, Elim and Boris – and the mental disintegration are intensified as not only Boris finds himself in a psychiatric clinic, but so do Elim and Emmanuel. Emmanuel arrives in Jerusalem to meet a financier about his project, and finds himself at an international convention of psychiatrists at the Alexander Herzweg
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clinic, a ‘timeless Victorian mansion built from Jerusalem rock right in the heart of Jerusalem’s German Colony.’ The architectural mixture of English and German at the heart of Jerusalem reflects a deeper confusion associated with the clinic. Boris is hospitalized at the Herzweg Clinic in Chelmsford, England, which is run by the nephew of the same psychiatrist who was in charge of the Herzweg mental home in Jerusalem. Both clinics, Emmanuel explains, ‘are more or less one and the same, like two branches of the same banking house. Both run by a Kohnstamm, uncle and nephew.’ As locations and identities are mirrored and merged, an uncertain sense of place becomes associated with an erosion of the sense of self for the three uprooted, wandering Jews.

The focus and key event of the conference at the Jerusalem Herzweg clinic is an address by none other than the ‘Messiah from Antwerp,’ Elim Ffinger. Despite being the ‘sole benefactor and […] major shareholder’ of the clinic, Elim is confined there, ‘under house arrest.’ As Emmanuel points out, ‘[it’s] a unique case when a patient who owns the clinic he is in needs the support of eminent psychiatrists around the world before the will let him out.’ It is alleged that Elim devised and financed a plot to send ‘Palestinian suicide squads’ to detonate trucks in the capitals of ‘the three “confrontation” states,’ Syria, Iran and Libya. Elim is thus the figure through which contemporary postwar concerns and anxieties are evoked – whether it is the world order of the cold-war or terrorism in the Middle East, whereas Emmanuel’s intentions for world redemption remain rather abstract. But these references to a concrete historical context serve only to distort and preclude any meaningful engagement with the political reality, as Elim’s messianism is exposed as madness – certifiable madness – with far-reaching and dangerous consequences.

Elim’s plan fuses perverse messianic ideas with warped political and historical observations. On the one hand, Elim claims he has ‘one aim and one aim only: the defence of this state.’ He is not, however, a Zionist: Zionism is ‘a political dream, the brainchild of a cultural provincialism of Czechs, Poles, Serbs and Hungarians’ whose ‘ideas are passé.
now.\textsuperscript{161} The Zionists, he claims, have led the Jews from the ghetto of Eastern Europe to ‘another ghetto in the Middle East ten times as forbidding.’\textsuperscript{162} A shift in the Jews’ approach and self-perception is needed: ‘as the most progressive and most advanced nation in the area,’ Elim argues, ‘we are equally entitled to call the tune in other capitals of the Middle East!’\textsuperscript{163} At the heart of Elim’s messianism is an aggressive, belligerent message: the expansion of the Jewish state, its aspirations of domination, are ‘part of a process in the slow and gradual conversion of all mankind to worship the One and Universal and not specifically Jewish God.’\textsuperscript{164}

In his tirade, Elim employs the rhetoric of contemporary Zionism – ‘the most progressive [...] nation in the area’; the commitment to defend the state at all costs – while seeming to reject the fundamental principles of the movement as ‘passé’. His fervent speech is contradictory and incoherent, and the preposterous critique of Zionism, it would seem, can be dismissed as the ravings of a madman: indeed Emmanuel mocks the ‘milennial questions’ raised by this false messiah and highlights the absurdity of Elim’s claim by comparing him with Boris: ‘He argues like you with your wife’s late dog. Kill or be killed. […] It’s not surprising you are both locked up.’\textsuperscript{165}

Nevertheless, in the context of a novel where the acutely painful questions of exile and return in a postwar world are wildly satirized, the reader might hesitate to dismiss Elim’s speech quite so easily. In Heym’s novel, the East German attitude towards Zionism – the claim that Israel’s so-called imperialist expansionism is rooted in inherited paranoia – is exposed as anti-Semitic hypocrisy in what is, for Heym, a rare display of support, however qualified, for Israel. Here, expansionist ambitions are in fact articulated by a delusional madman, a fake messiah; yet I would suggest that the satire, in all its distorted excess, reflects an ambivalence about Zionism as a solution to Jewish exile, especially in light of Lind’s own disappointment with life in the newly founded Jewish State as expressed in his autobiographies.

Zionism holds the promise of the ingathering of Jews: of putting an end to their exile and wandering. When Theodor Herzl, the founder of political Zionism, proposed the idea of
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a Jewish state in 1896, he did so in response to what he saw as a ‘national question, which can only be solved by making it a political world-question to be discussed and settled by the civilized nations of the world in council.’ The creation of a nation-state for Jews would normalize their position among the so-called ‘civilized nations.’ Yet alongside the European idea of nationhood, Zionism also contains, as Jacqueline Rose shows, a ‘messianic strain.’ Indeed, in the Jewish tradition, as discussed above, the ingathering of the Jews follows the arrival of the Messiah, and any attempt to upset this order is considered heretical by Rabbinical Judaism. As the arrival of the Messiah brings about the end of history, the attempt to usher in, or forcefully bring about messianic time carries a destructive potential: ‘At its most explosive,’ Rose writes, ‘messianism sheds its religious colors and enters the language as violence.’ It is this volatility and violence that Elim’s speech reflects.

Zionism – in its political or messianic forms – is ruled out in The Inventor as a solution to the problem of Jewish exile: for Emmanuel, as for Lind, Israel is but one stop in his ongoing wandering. Instead of normalizing the Jews’ position and making them a nation among all other nations, Zion attracts would-be Messiahs from all corners of the earth: Elim’s companions in the asylum include ‘[another] saviour, [...] two Kings of Israel’, ‘three Jehovas’ and ‘only one Jesus.’ Emmanuel himself willingly joins Elim at the Herzweg clinic and finds the arrangement quite comfortable: ‘I’ve found my Redeemer, I’m fine,’ he tells Boris. Madness, then, turns out to be a form of personal redemption, whereas the idea of universal redemption, for a generation that suffered the ‘shock therapy’ of the Second World War, is a form of madness.
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**Doubling as Redemption**

Although doubling in Heym’s *The Wandering Jew* may not be as explicit as in Lind’s novel, Ahasverus can also be seen as moving between two doubles: Leuchtentrager and Joshua. If in *The Inventor* doubling highlighted the mental disintegration that is a central preoccupation of the novel, the use of doubling in *The Wandering Jew* is in keeping with Heym’s creation of a position which, as I have shown in the previous chapters, allows movement and mediation between polarities. Ahasverus, I will argue, is another manifestation of the Man-between, the figure Heym constructs in his fiction and which reflects his own position as a translingual writer. Ahasverus’s two doubles, the Devil (Leuchtentrager) and Jesus (Joshua), traditionally symbolize good and evil, but Heym subverts the conventional, Christian representation of a battle between these forces to represent both as ultimately lacking, and somewhat weak. Through the three immortal figures, Heym explores different approaches to the question of the proper response ‘to a fundamentally flawed present.’

The doubling and movement between the two positions is most clearly evident in the framing of the narrative through a repetition of a fall through endless space at the beginning and end of the novel. ‘We are falling,’ are the first words of the novel, as Ahasverus and Lucifer are expelled from heaven after the creation of the world. These are also the first words of the last chapter, in the aftermath of the apocalypse in which the Rabbi Joshua joined forces with Ahasverus to destroy the world God had created. During the first fall, through ‘the endlessness of the upper heavens that are made of light’, Ahasverus sees ‘Lucifer in all his nakedness, and how ugly he is, and [he trembles].’ The second fall is down ‘the bottomless pit that is […] an everlasting twilight’ where light and darkness have yet to be differentiated again, and as Ahasverus sees ‘the Rabbi, and [sees] his stigmatized hand reaching toward [him],’ Ahasverus’s ‘heart goes out to him.’ Despite the terror the first companion seems to inspire and the palpable sympathy towards the second companion,
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Ahasverus responds to their identical question – ‘Do you regret it?’\textsuperscript{176} – in the same manner: ‘No, I do not.’\textsuperscript{177} Thus, reworking the Christian tradition of the Fallen Angel, Heym also constructs the Fall from Paradise as the original form of exile, one which will end only when the world is redeemed.

Heym’s use of the double here seems to draw on yet another tradition, in which as ‘a theological signifier, the double signals the battle between good and evil for the human soul.’\textsuperscript{178} Andrew Hock Soon Ng explains that unlike psychoanalytical readings of the double, which see it as ‘a shadowy other residing within the psyche,’\textsuperscript{179} the theological tradition depicts the double as ‘an external, diabolical agent bent on destroying the hapless self by instigating the latter’s proclivity towards sin.’\textsuperscript{180} Faust is ‘the supreme example’ of such doubling,\textsuperscript{181} and indeed, there are parallels between Heym’s Leuchtentrager and the Faustian Mephistopheles, most notably in Leuchtentrager’s relationship with Eitzen: the cleric accepts Leuchtentrager’s help in advancing his ecclesiastical and political career, only to find he has become, through his dependence this mysterious benefactor ‘the prey and property of the devil,’ who comes to claim his soul.\textsuperscript{182} Beifuss suffers a similar fate after his exchange with Professor Leuchtentrager of Jerusalem. Yet Beifuss is a mere functionary, and his narrow-mindedness and dogmatism do not amount to the crimes committed by Eitzen. As Tait contends, ‘the ease with which [Eitzen] is able to exploit the anti-Semitism of his peers and the cynical satisfaction he feels when he realises how much personal power he can acquire […] make him a sinister figure. [Beifuss], however, is simply ridiculous.’\textsuperscript{183} Therefore, while Eitzen’s soul is violently torn from his body which is left, lifeless, ‘his head twisted backward […] and his eyes staring in horror,’\textsuperscript{184} Beifuss simply disappears from his house through a ‘man-sized hole’ in the ‘reinforced concrete’ wall of his house.\textsuperscript{185}
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and is seen flying over the Berlin Wall held by the two strangers, who are described by the border guards as shapes with fiery tails.\footnote{Heym, \textit{WJ}, p. 279.}

Although these two villains, Eitzen and Beifuss, are hardly equal in malice or influence, their similar fate highlights the parallels between Reformation Germany and twentieth-century East Germany that Heym has drawn throughout the novel. As Nancy Lauckner puts it, ‘Heym intends [Beifuss] to represent dogmatic communism, just as Eitzen represents dogmatic Christianity,’ and their shared fate symbolically ‘indicates that both Christianity and communism have failed to achieve their goal of an ideal world of peace, justice and brotherhood which Heym calls “das wahre Reich Gottes”’ (the true Kingdom of God).\footnote{Lauckner, p. 74.} What is important to note in the context of this discussion of doubling is that in both cases, the sinners are being carried off not by the devil alone, but by the devil – Leuchtentrager – and Ahasverus. The traditional devil figure is thus doubled: two angels, not one, fall from heaven after the creation of the world; the two continue to travel together throughout human history, and both take the souls of men who, unlike traditional religious sinners or Faustian overreachers, come to represent the ills of society in their time.

With his hump and club foot, Leuchtentrager seems to conform to conventional representations of the devil. He is, however, not the villain in the novel: this role is, as Tait notes, reserved for Eitzen,\footnote{Tait, p. 103.} whereas the devil is ‘not an unpleasant character.’\footnote{Tait, p. 115.} Leuchtentrager rejects the order God has dictated, placing Man at the center of creation, but his rebellion does not translate into a revolution, but to a nihilistic attempt to facilitate the destruction of that order by ‘encouraging his subjects to develop the logic of their ideology to its extreme.’\footnote{Tait, p. 94.} As Leuchtentrager explains to Beifuss, to him, ‘order is a most desirable state; the more orderly the manner in which the affairs of a country are run, the more [he likes] it,’ because God ‘created simultaneously with this world the laws by which He wanted it to move.’ If these laws are scrupulously adhered to, the destruction of the same order is inevitable, for ‘any thesis carries within itself its antithesis and […] you just have to have sufficient patience to wait till things change in their own, God-given time.’\footnote{Heym, \textit{WJ}, p. 222.}
The fundamental difference between the two rebellious fallen angels is that while both see God’s order as flawed, Ahasverus believes in the ability to change it for the better. Even as they fall from heaven, the lines are drawn, as Ahasverus himself recounts:

> Everything can be made to change, says I.
> But it’s so very tiring, says he.
> And with this we parted, and he went his way and I, Ahasverus, […] went mine.\(^\text{192}\)

Despite this ideological parting of the ways, the two continue to operate alongside each other: both observe human cruelty and injustice – the one revelling in it, the other trying to intervene.

The splitting of the devil’s traditional role between Leuchtentrager and Ahasverus occurs again in a rewriting of the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness (Matthew IV:5-10 and Luke IV:1-13). In the biblical text, the devil takes Jesus to Jerusalem, sets him ‘on a pinnacle of the temple,’ and says: ‘If thou be the son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bare thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.’\(^\text{193}\) Jesus refuses to test God in such a manner. The devil then shows him ‘all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them,’ and offers to give them to Jesus if Jesus would worship him.\(^\text{194}\)

In Heym’s novel, it is not Leuchtentrager who shows Joshua the kingdoms of the world (although he does challenge the Rabbi in the manner described in the bible), but Ahasverus, and with a very different purpose: he wishes Joshua to see ‘how in each one of them injustice and iniquity were the rule […] and in every place the strong were oppressing the weak and driving and tormenting them.’\(^\text{195}\) It is one of the several instances in which Ahasverus, who sees revolutionary potential in Joshua, urges the Rabbi to truly redeem the world: ‘If you be the son of God, then look well how wisely your father has ordered things, and take them into your own hand and turn them downside up, for the time has come to erect the true kingdom of God.’\(^\text{196}\) Redemption, then, can and must be actively brought about: Heym’s emphasis on the role of human agency and responsibility (Jesus here is ‘Rabbi Joshua’, rather than the son of God) distinguishes him from both the Jewish tradition that
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prohibits the rushing of the Messiah and from Lind, who represents redemption as a delusion.

All of Ahasverus’s encounters with Joshua are narrated in the first person by Ahasverus himself. In these chapters, key moments from the New Testament – the temptation in the wilderness, the Last Supper, Judas’s betrayal and the Passion of Christ – are reworked into opportunities for Joshua to reveal himself as, or rather to become, the true ‘meshiach.'

Thus, within the narrative, Ahasverus fulfils the Wandering Jew’s function as witness to the events recounted in the gospels, while at the same time contradicting their essential religious significance: the portrayal of Jesus as the Messiah. Thomas C. Fox maintains that *The Wandering Jew* ‘provides us with Heym’s most explicit statement that Jesus Christ could have been the Messiah but was not; instead, the Wandering Jew serves as the real revolutionary.’

Indeed, Ahasverus, disappointed and angry with Joshua’s refusal to engage in the battle for justice and his passive recital of scriptural prophecies of the coming of Messiah, exclaims: ‘No, you are not he who is to come and exalt every valley and make low every mountain and hill […]; for this, we shall have to await another one.’

Ahasverus, however, is not, and does not claim to be, the Messiah. He does not believe in prophecies and rejects the idea of predestination: ‘[a] wheel cannot choose the rut in which it moves,’ he tells Joshua, ‘but the drover who leads the oxen can change direction. Therefore don’t act as though your fate were predestined for you, but rise up and fight.’

Ahasverus repeats his call when he sees Reb Joshua carrying his cross on his way to Golgotha. He offers him ‘a sword of God,’ and urges him to ‘throw off [his] cross and straighten [his] back and be free’ to lead the people in the ultimate fight. Only action can bring about salvation, because salvation, for Ahasverus, is not a religious but a social concept: one that is not associated with the end of days, but with an attainable future.

Joshua’s refusal to take up the sword fills Ahasverus, again, with anger, and it is then that he refuses to let the Rabbi rest at his doorstep: ‘Get going, you idiot!’ he calls out. ‘Do you really think the One up there cares whether or not […] you die piecemeal on that cross? Wasn’t it He who made people as they are? How, then, can you hope to change them
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through your miserable death? The transgression against Christ – the cause of the Wandering Jew’s curse – is not a contemptuous slight, but a passionate expression of the frustration of the angel who is doomed, like Walter Benjamin’s Angelus Novus, to see human history as ‘one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet’ – the angel who ‘would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed.’ Awakening the dead and mending the world suggest a messianic solution which Benjamin’s angel, like Ahasverus, is unable to bring about by himself. Unlike the angel of history, however, Ahasverus is not content to watch the pile of wreckage growing.

Despite Ahasverus’s frustration with Reb Joshua, there are certain parallels between the two. Nancy Lauckner observes that ‘[on] several occasions, [Ahasverus] is implicitly analogous to Christ,’ and suggests that ‘perhaps Heym intended him to be Jesus’ revolutionary alter ego.’ Regine Rosenthal also notes that ‘[whereas] in the beginning’ both Ahasverus and Lucifer ‘represent disorder and revolt’, Ahasverus, through his ‘persistent search for a beneficial change in the service of mankind,’ grows ‘closer and more similar to Reb Joshua and even, to some extent, interchangeable with him.’ John Milfull, on the other hand, sees Ahasverus as ‘[representing] a third principle, mediating between the other-worldly thesis of God […] and the cynical-materialist anti-thesis of Lucifer.’ This description is, arguably, more productive than the ones offered by Lauckner and Rosenthal: reducing Ahasverus to Jesus’ alter-ego is problematic given the connection between Ahasverus and Lucifer. Similarly, charting a unilateral movement from Lucifer to Jesus overlooks Jesus’ own shift towards Ahasverus’s position at the end of the novel. This position of mediator, I would suggest, is another manifestation of the position of Man-between which Heym constructs in his fiction, and which reflects his own position as a translingual writer. In Ahasverus, Heym creates a persona not unlike that of the narrator of

---

202 Heym, WJ, p. 117.
204 Lauckner, p. 71.
The Crusaders, the outsider who is also an insider, who is able to move between positions and expose the weakness of each one, in a constant struggle to bring about change.

Perhaps the most powerful and subversive doubling in the novel is between Ahasverus, the Wandering Jew, and Joshua, or Christ. Several parallels between the two arise throughout the narrative. The compassion Ahasverus exhibits when he repeatedly declares – as, for instance, in his encounter with Joshua in the wilderness – that his ‘heart went out to [Joshua],’ is also a virtue associated with Jesus in the Gospels: ‘And Jesus, when he came out, saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd.’ The analogy between the two immortal figures is most clearly evident in a scene during which Ahasverus is tormented by Eitzen, becoming, as Rosenthal points out, ‘a reflection of Christ and his suffering.’ Eitzen is by now a superintendent – an authority on ecclesiastical matters and a ‘spiritual militant and advocate of the one and only true faith.’ To fight ‘the whisperings of the dissenters’ in his own diocese and to bring about ‘the kingdom of God in Sleswick,’ he effectively establishes a dictatorship that relies on oaths of loyalty, submissive bureaucrats and informants. Heretics are persecuted, and Eitzen decides to hold ‘an ecclesiastical court’ in order to deal with ‘hardened miscreants,’ in which he would act as prosecutor. To Eitzen’s astonishment, Ahasverus appears as the defendants’ attorney. He is not allowed to fulfill his role, however, as Eitzen accuses him of being a swindler, a black magician and a deserter (Eitzen had previously seen and unsuccessfully hounded Ahasverus on a battlefield), has him arrested, and insists that he be made to run the gauntlet. The Duke, upon hearing from his privy councilor Leuchtentrager that the man in question was no magician and had ‘conversed for hours on end with one Reb Joshua, which was the Hebrew name for Jesus,’ has his doubts. Finally, after ‘[washing] his hands, thoroughly and at
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length’, the Duke tells Eitzen that the punishment is his sole responsibility: ‘see you to it,’ he tells Eitzen, who feels ‘uneasy’ hearing ‘these last words, which were Pilate’s.’

By echoing Pilate’s proclamation, ‘I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it,’ the Duke casts Ahasverus – whom Eitzen sees as representative of the Jews who proclaimed, before the crucifixion, ‘His blood be on us, and on our children’ – in the role of Jesus. Ahasverus must run the gauntlet eight times: Eitzen knows that this amounts to a death sentence, and like the priests who mocked Jesus (‘If he be the King of Israel, let him come down from the cross’) he thinks, ‘if Ahasverus is indeed the Everlasting Jew […], then nothing more harmful will come to him than a sound thrashing.’ In front of a large assembled crowd, Ahasverus runs between the two long rows of men bearing whips, his flesh tearing; he reaches Eitzen and pleads, as Joshua did his way to Golgotha: ‘Let me rest a little with you, for they have beaten me sorely and I am weary to death.’ Eitzen recognizes these words, and he dismisses Ahasverus angrily: ‘Get going! This is what you said to Christ, and you drove our Lord from your door, and he damned you….’ Ahasverus, in turn, promises Eitzen that the devil will take his soul: ‘I shall be around when he comes to claim you,’ he echoes Joshua’s promise that ‘you shall remain here and tarry till I come.’ Finally, Ahasverus is pronounced dead after running the gauntlet, only to be resurrected later to fulfill his promise and assist Leuchtentrager in claiming Eitzen’s soul.

Ahasverus, then, mirrors Jesus’ suffering, crucifixion and resurrection. Thus, as the devil figure is doubled in the relationship between Ahasverus and Lucifer, there is also a suggestion of a doubling of the Messiah figure. Indeed, Leuchtentrager refers in a letter to Beifuss to one of the Dead Sea scrolls of the Jewish sect of Qumran, where he claims to have found evidence of the existence of Ahasverus at the time of Jesus. This congregation, Leuchtentrager writes, ‘thought of the Messiah as having a twofold character or even being two persons, one so-to-speak civilian and the other military.’ Crucially, however, Joshua
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is not represented as the one true Messiah in the novel. When Eitzen calls upon Ahasverus to publicly testify to the truth of the Gospels and declare that Jesus was indeed the Messiah – as does the Wandering Jew of the German legend – Ahasverus responds: ‘I loved the Rabbi, and he might have been the Meschiach. He might have, just as everyone created in the image of God has in himself the power to be a savior of men.’\textsuperscript{224} The Messiah, then, is not preordained; the prophecies about redemption, about swords beaten into ploughshares, are not linked to one individual. Rather, any man can bring about redemption, and Joshua failed to redeem the world because he insisted on passively waiting for the prophesied Second Coming. ‘My father has set the day,’\textsuperscript{225} he tells Ahasverus, who in turn insists on what in Talmudic Judaism is referred to as ‘“[pressing] for the End”, that is to say, force its coming by one’s own activity.’\textsuperscript{226}

In a sense, Joshua, far from being the Messiah, doubles instead with Leuchtentrager, since both represent two approaches to God’s order that are revealed as equally rigid and destructive. ‘God is immutability, He is the law,’\textsuperscript{227} Lucifer tells Ahasverus as they float in Sheol. Fearing for the stability of his brainchild, the world, Lucifer explains, God is ‘like the noisiest revolutionaries [who] turn into the most avid champions of law and order.’\textsuperscript{228} The world, he believes, ‘is fated to perish through precisely the order of things which God gave to it,’ and Ahasverus’s attempts to change the world are nothing but ‘patching and mending’ that ‘is futile and merely prolongs the agony.’\textsuperscript{229} Lucifer wants the world to perish so that he can ‘establish a realm of freedom.’\textsuperscript{230} To bring about that end, he encourages manifestations of petty and oppressive law and order. Yet his realm, Sheol, which ‘extends outside the limits of creation,’\textsuperscript{231} consists of ‘infinitely small granules of nothingness which are moving from one nothing to the other.’ In response to such nihilism, Ahasverus observes that ‘harder than the thought of the vastness of the nothing is the thought of its lasting forever.’\textsuperscript{232}
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On the other hand, Joshua’s ‘utter inflexibility,’ as Ahasverus terms it – his unquestioning acceptance of God’s plan for him and his progress towards his own earthly end ‘like a wheel running along in its rut’ results in the perpetuation of the corrupt human world his sacrifice was meant to redeem. After Reb Joshua’s crucifixion, Ahasverus seeks and finds him ‘enveloped in the gentle love of God,’ gazing down upon the world from his heavenly throne. ‘I am seeing all those men and women whom I delivered from the debt of their sins,’ he tells Ahasverus, but admits that he does not see them ‘quite clearly’: they are ‘so small, and there is a multitude of them.’ If Lucifer’s realm is nihilism, Joshua’s is denial: the truth, Ahasverus tells him, ‘is visible to all who have eyes to see it, and all who will think may fathom it. You, however, are seated on your throne and see nothing, and the unfathomable is to you a source of consolation.’

Thus, Ahasverus is able to see each of his doubles’ positions for what it truly is and to relate to each one, while offering a path that differs fundamentally from theirs: a battle for change. He not only moves between the two stances, but is able to ‘contain two contradictory attitudes within his person,’ as Tait notes: ‘scepticism and faith.’ Ahasverus shares Lucifer’s rejection of God’s order from the moment he is required to serve Adam, yet he never loses faith in God himself. ‘I am an angel like [Lucifer],’ he tells Joshua, ‘and like him I know the truth.’ The truth is that God’s order is corrupt, and that a rebellion against it is required. Unlike Lucifer, Ahasverus does not dismiss God as ‘a minor God of a minor desert tribe.’ He tells Lucifer that ‘God is change,’ and explains that when ‘He created the world out of nothing, He changed the nothing.’ Faith in God, then, is for Ahasverus the belief in the possibility of change, and vice versa. This faith allows Ahasverus to accept imperfection, both in man and in God. The ‘imperfection of man has been the excuse of every revolution that failed to achieve what it set out to do,’ Ahasverus tells Joshua, and yet he does not despair, and hopes that the next revolution – his revolution – would be
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successful, for it is necessary. Like Lucifer, Ahasverus is able to spot contradiction – the ‘hole in the web of [God’s] order through which the sand is running out.’243 The contradictions, Ahasverus tells God himself, ‘are like the salt in the porridge and the leaven in the dough, and the soul of the business, yours and mine.’244 The ability to see and hold contradictions is the source of Ahasverus’s power: his ‘sceptical faith,’ as Tait puts it, ‘simultaneously distances him from the establishment while giving him an understanding of the truth.’245 The revolution he tries to promote would bring together elements represented by Lucifer – a rejection of God’s order – and elements represented by Joshua – essential compassion and love. ‘The No is as necessary as the Yes,’ Ahasverus tells Lucifer, articulating his dialectical approach in a manner which crystallizes both the basic organizing principle of this novel and Heym’s broader vision: ‘out of the reciprocity of the two grows all action.’246

Indeed, action grows when Ahasverus manages to draw each of the poles toward him, albeit for a limited time, as is the case with Lucifer. The two angels witness the events of the last days of the Warsaw Ghetto, observing the depths of evil to which mankind has sunk: ‘no devil could have invented the methods used for this program of annihilation; it was humans who planned and executed it,’247 Leuchtentrager observes. Even Leuchtentrager, the champion of nihilistic destruction, cannot simply stand by: as the attack against the SS is launched, he joins Ahasverus in helping the rebelling Jews. ‘We managed to hold out several weeks,’248 he later writes to Beifuss about the event, but not even the angels can change the outcome of this rebellion.

Ahasverus’s persistence finally brings Joshua to support his cause. Once the Rabbi allows himself to listen to Ahasverus and see the world for what it is, he joins the angel and confronts God. As God is unable, or unwilling, to change the world that has deteriorated so badly since the day he created it, Joshua concludes, rebellion against him is just: ‘instead of praying piously and waiting until this world blew itself to Sheol one had better rally all forces, even those of hell, against this God whose own creation had slipped from his
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control,’ he declares, ‘and unite the powers of Christ and Antichrist for the assault on the seven heavens […]’. This rebellion ends in a failure that is even more ‘monstrous’ than that of the Warsaw uprising: it is an apocalypse that destroys the world, but the attempt ‘had to be made so that everything would round itself and return to its beginnings.’

The apocalypse leaves Ahasverus and Joshua falling together through the ‘bottomless pit’ of ‘everlasting twilight’ in a repetition of the original fall from heaven. Hutchinson points out that ‘critics have rarely been prepared to view the novel’s conclusion positively,’ and have viewed it as extremely pessimistic. Hope, Hutchinson maintains, survives ‘in the unbowed figure of the revolutionary [Ahasverus] himself,’ rather than in the plot, which suggests that man has not changed throughout history. Tait provides a more positive reading of the novel’s ending. While the ‘events on a human time-scale wholly contradict the notion of progress,’ she writes, ‘recurring textual patterns reveal progress on the most fundamental level in the relationship between [Ahasverus] and the Rabbi.’

Specifically, the repetition of the fall through space in the final chapter sees ‘the Trinity transformed by the reintegration of the dialectical element expelled in the earliest moments in time.’ Indeed, the novel, which began with an image of division as Ahasverus and Lucifer were torn from heaven, concludes with a union between Ahasverus and his other double.

And I leaned my head on his breast, as I had done at his last supper, and he kissed my brow and said that I was like flesh of his flesh and like a shadow which belonged to him, and like his other self. And we were united in love and became one.

And as he and God were one, I too became one with God, one image, one great thought, one dream.

This image of unity suggests that despite the apocalyptic devastation, there is hope for the creation of a new, just world, as Ahasverus’s dream becomes one with God’s. This conclusion is also optimistic on another level: it posits an integration of self and ‘other self’
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in a way that differs dramatically from the specter of disintegration that arises from Lind’s novel. Ahasverus’s success as a mediator between the poles represented by Lucifer and Joshua is due not only to his ability to move between the two: the triumph of unity is achieved only after Ahasverus persuades Joshua to join him. Ahasverus thus succeeds where Walter Bing, the mediator from *The Crusaders*, fails: whereas Bing was consumed by the contradictions that his split identification entailed, Ahasverus contains contradictions and transcends them. His stable identity does not depend on his affiliations. That the figure who is the successful Man-between is in fact not a man but an angel might indicate that the vision of triumphant unity is a fantasy. But perhaps it is more precisely regarded as an ideal that the politically engaged translingual writer and self-translator can productively aspire to.

***

**The Non-Jewish Jew**

Although I read Ahasverus as the idealized figure of the translingual writer as mediator, he is first and foremost the Wandering Jew. Yet he is not a Jew in the conventional sense of the designation, and I would like to suggest finally in this chapter that Heym creates this fantastic, transcendent figure to tackle another inner conflict – the question of Jewish identity. Heym’s Jewishness, Leah Hadomi maintains, is an ‘unsettled problem’ which he brings into his later novels. In *The Crusaders*, as Fox points out, there is a ‘lack of emphasis on Bing’s Jewish background.’ This is partly explained by the ‘standard practice during the war to avoid any hint that the US was fighting a “Jewish” war,’ but more importantly by Heym’s ‘attitude of the assimilated Jewish intellectual arguing for universal solutions which are going to include the Jewish problem.’ When McCarthyism in America forced Heym to emigrate again in 1951, he visited the newly established state of Israel, where the question of this part of his identity surfaced forcefully:
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Heym allows these difficult questions of Jewish identity, anti-Semitism, and – to an extent – Israel’s role as a Jewish state to play out more explicitly in *The Wandering Jew* than in his other works, and he often uses Leuchtentrager – the angel who ‘knows the truth’ to instigate the discussion of these issues. Thus, in his reincarnation as an Israeli professor, Leuchtentrager addresses the symbolic value of the figure of the Wandering Jew and its relationship to German anti-Semitism in his correspondence with Beifuss. He notes that ‘[until] the time of the Reformation, the main components of anti-Semitism had been religious, for wasn’t it the Jews who had Jesus crucified and hadn’t they refused, up to this day, to acknowledge him as their messiah?’ After the Reformation, however, anti-Semitism acquired an economic foundation, and focused on the Jews’ economic role as money-lenders. ‘[In] the territories ruled over by the Protestants the Reformation did away with the financial monopoly of the Catholic Church and its big banking houses,’ Leuchtentrager explains. ‘The Church had long ago begun to ignore Deuteronomy 23:20, in which the law against usury […] is proclaimed; this is why Luther […] shook the foundations of the mercantile structures of his time.’ Yet Deuteronomy ‘forbids merely the taking of interest from your brother; a stranger, however, may be bilked without your troubling your soul over it’; as the Jews were considered strangers by the majority of the population and were ‘anyhow deprived, by gentile law, of the right to other possessions and professions, they went into this business.’ Significantly, ‘[it] was Luther himself who procured the trade of both prince and peasant for the Jews, only to condemn them all the
more noisily for it and to unleash a pogromist campaign against them from which all later anti-Semites, including the Nazis, drew a good part of their slogans.\textsuperscript{265}

Leuchtentrager’s theory of the economic basis of anti-Semitism echoes Horkheimer’s and Adorno’s thesis on the roots and development of anti-Semitism.\textsuperscript{266}

According to Fox, it is central to Heym’s own ambivalent relationship to his Jewish identity. Heym, he explains, ‘tended to view anti-Semitism as a secondary, class-related phenomenon: ruling classes utilize Jews as scapegoats to divert the attention of the masses from their true oppressors.’\textsuperscript{267} This phenomenon ‘should disappear in the classless society’ along with ‘societally constructed forms of Jewish “difference”.’\textsuperscript{268}

The historical-economic analysis appears reasonable and convincing: so reasonable, in fact, that Beifuss immediately receives a letter from the Chief of Department of the Ministry of Higher Education – the representative of dogmatic, corrupt power – advising him that ‘such a discussion is by no means in our interest’ given the approaching ‘Luther year of 1983 which […] is being sponsored by the highest representatives of our state and party.’\textsuperscript{269} Yet the ending of Leuchtentrager’s treatise on anti-Semitism seems to give the lie to the very thesis it advances. After the Reformation, ‘anti-Semitism acquired a clearly economic foundation,’ he concludes, ‘and, along with it, a symbolic figure whom it was easy to hate and who, moreover, gave substance to your ancient fear of the alien element, the transients, the Jews: in other words, Ahasverus’\textsuperscript{270} (my emphasis). The roots of anti-Semitism lie, then, not in the economic role of usurers assigned to the Jews by the very society that hated them, and not even in the religious view of the Jews as murderers of Christ: it is a primal, ‘ancient fear’ of the ‘alien element’. In the German original, Leuchtentrager refers to the fear of ‘dem Andersgearteten, dem Unheimlichen, dem Jüdischen’\textsuperscript{271} (my emphasis).
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The resonance of the term *Unheimlich* with Freud’s use of the word seems significant when this attribute is considered as a feature of Jewish identity. In ‘The Uncanny’, Freud explores the connections between *heimlich* and its antonym *unheimlich* (‘uncanny’ in the English translation), and goes beyond the initial temptation ‘to conclude that what is “uncanny” is frightening precisely because it is not known and familiar,’\(^{272}\) to argue that the uncanny is in fact ‘that class of the frightening which leads back to what is known of old and long familiar.’\(^{273}\)

Considering the various dictionary definitions of the adjective *heimlich*, Freud cites two meanings - ‘belonging to the house, not strange, familiar, tame, intimate’\(^{274}\) on the one hand and ‘[concealed], kept from sight, […] withheld from others’\(^{275}\) – and notes the ambiguity in the word, which ‘belongs to two sets of ideas, which, without being contradictory, are yet very different.’\(^{276}\)

The antonym *unheimlich* is ‘customarily used […] as the contrary only of the first signification of *heimlich*.\(^{277}\)’ The word *heimlich* has a meaning which ‘develops in the direction of ambivalence, until it finally coincides with its opposite, *unheimlich*.\(^{278}\)

The class of frightening things that constitute the uncanny, Freud suggests, is the ‘one class in which the frightening element can be shown to be something repressed which recurs, […] and it must be a matter of indifference whether what is uncanny was itself originally frightening or whether it carried some other effect.’ If this is ‘the secret nature of the uncanny, we can understand why linguistic usage has extended *das Heimliche* [‘homely’] into its opposite, *das Unheimliche*; for this uncanny is in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through the process of repression.’\(^{279}\)

Some of the examples Freud gives of situations that produce an uncanny effect can be traced in Eitzen’s relationship with Ahasverus in *The Wandering Jew*. The more Eitzen tries to persecute Ahasverus, the more startling he finds the Jew’s constant reappearances; this process culminates in Ahasverus’s resurrection after the running of the gauntlet, and as
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Freud notes, ‘[apparent] death and the re-animation of the dead have been represented as most uncanny themes.’

Eitzen’s encounters with Ahasverus are often accompanied by unnatural or magical events: when, for instance, Eitzen challenges Ahasverus, who is speaking in the town square of his acquaintance with Joshua, the Jew raises his hand and proclaims: ‘as I am the Wandering Jew, by name Ahasverus, and damned by the Rabbi […] that golden cock up there on the tower will crow three times and then lightning will come down from God and strike.’

To Eitzen’s astonishment, a cock crows and lightning strikes, sending the gathered crowd running away in terror.

According to Freud, ‘an uncanny effect is often and easily produced when […] a symbol takes over the full functions of the thing it symbolizes.’ In the traditional Christian representation, as Beifuss explains to Leuchtentrager, Ahasverus is ‘to be viewed as a symbolic or allegorical figure, and a very typical one,’ who symbolizes ‘the homeless and hounded Jew who must wander from country to country and is welcomed nowhere and persecuted everywhere.’ Ahasverus is therefore ‘the personification of his people’s fate.’

In the novel, the persecuted wanderer is given a concrete existence in the person of Ahasverus. Thomas Fox has shown how Heym’s tendency to depict Jews as revolutionaries (and revolutionaries as Jews) in his novels culminates ‘in a forceful fashion’ in The Wandering Jew. Thus Ahasverus ‘takes over the full functions’ of the Jews in another sense: as he embodies the spirit of unrest, the allegory gains a new meaning and the Jew becomes synonymous with the eternal revolutionary.

This view of the Eternal Jew as the spirit of revolution is articulated in no uncertain terms by Leuchtentrager, as he debates the nature of the Wandering Jew with Beifuss.

Of course, Ahasverus may also be considered as a symbol; since he is a Jew and always was a Jew, his fate necessarily is that of a Jew and his attitudes and his way of looking at the world are Jewish, his dissatisfaction with existing conditions, his efforts to change these. Although this is not an exclusively Jewish characteristic, he is unrest personified;
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any fixed order exists for him only to be put in question and, depending on the case, to be overthrown.\(^{285}\)

Although Leuchtentrager is clear in defining Ahasverus as ‘unrest personified’, his characterization of Ahasverus in the first part of this quote is rather dubious. Leuchtentrager, who bombards Beifuss with apparent evidence of Ahasverus’s continued historical existence – from extracts from the Dead Sea Scrolls to blood tests that ‘confirm that the blood of the person examined actually did contain traces of radioactive materials with a half-life of at least two thousand years’\(^{286}\) – has had a long-lasting personal acquaintance with Ahasverus. As Ahasverus’s companion in original rebellion and fellow fallen angel, Leuchtentrager knows that Ahasverus was not ‘always’ a Jew: strictly speaking, he was never a Jew. The symbol, then, not only takes over the functions of that which it symbolizes, but changes the latter’s very nature: to borrow from Kristeva’s account of the semiotics of uncanniness, ‘the material reality that the sign was commonly supposed to point to crumbles away to the benefit of imagination,’\(^{287}\) as the historical figure of the Jew, symbolized by the legend of the Wandering Jew, becomes an a-historical angel. The new meaning which Heym’s Wandering Jew acquires develops – like the word *heimlich* in Freud’s semantic analysis – ‘in the direction of ambivalence, until it finally coincides with its opposite,’\(^{288}\) the non-Jew.

There is another dimension to this complexity, which can be related more directly to Heym’s lived experience: for the ambivalence, or inner conflict, reflected in the figure of Ahasverus can be described in terms of what Jean Améry calls the ‘necessity and impossibility of being a Jew.’\(^{289}\) Austrian-born Améry refers to his own sense of a paradoxical identity as a Jew: he lacks any religious or cultural connection to Judaism, and yet ‘[society], concretized in the National Socialist German state’ made him ‘formally and beyond any question a Jew.’\(^{290}\) Freud, too, stated his complex identification as one who is ‘ignorant of the language of the holy writ, who is completely estranged from the religion of his fathers […] and who cannot take a share in nationalist ideals,’ but who nevertheless
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‘feels that he is in his essential nature a Jew and who has no desire to alter that nature.’ As the pressures of anti-Semitism mounted with the rise of National Socialism, Freud attempted to isolate and define this elusive essence of Jewishness in *Moses and Monotheism*, and resorted – as Heym would decades later – to the creation of a non-Jewish Jew when he imagined Moses, the founder of Judaism as a monotheistic religion, as an Egyptian.

Heym is not estranged from his Jewish heritage in quite the same way as Améry or Freud. In his autobiography, he recalls going to Jewish history and Hebrew classes with the local Rabbi instead of religion classes at his school, and going to the synagogue on Jewish holidays. At the same time, the consciousness of ‘what others perceived as his “Jewish identity”’ in the anti-Semitic climate of the late 1920s and early 1930s had an undeniable effect on Heym. In an interview in *Der Spiegel* in 1998 he recalls: ‘You weren’t Jewish “by choice”, but were labeled Jewish and behaved accordingly’ (‘Man war nicht “freiwillig” Jude, sondern wurde zum Juden abgestempelt und verhielt sich dann entsprechend’).

The instruction Heym receives in Jewish religion and history does not bring him closer to Judaism *per se*, but is among the building blocks of a humanistic outlook that will characterize his writing throughout his life. Thanks to the Rabbi’s stories of the Maccabees and other Jewish heroes, for instance, Heym’s consciousness of difference, he insists, was accompanied from an early age by a recognition that ‘an outsider’s position could sometimes be a source of pride’ (‘eine Position als Außenseiter mitunter auch Anlaß zu Stolz geben konnte’). Significantly, Heym stresses the outsider’s position, rather than the heroes’ Jewishness, as the point of identification. As a member of the Zionist youth movement B’nai Brith, Heym – then still Helmut Flieg – receives the ‘decisive push’
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towards socialism, not Judaism or Zionism. The group leaders talk of the exploitation of man by man – ‘a formulation which the young Flieg finds very powerful,’ yet their socialism, Heym suggests, is flawed: they are concerned first and foremost with the fate of the oppressed Jews, whose future, they maintain, is in Palestine. Heym rejects this form of exceptionalism in favor of universalist ideals of equality and freedom.

The socialist ideal of a society founded on the fundamental equality of all men and women entails a rejection of religious and ethnic differences, and therefore would seem to require ‘the dissolution of Jewish identity.’ Heym reconciles this impossibility of being Jewish with the necessity of being Jewish dictated by history – the label imposed by German society even on those Jews who did not choose to see themselves as Jewish – by creating in *The Wandering Jew* a Jewish identity that is able to contain this and other contradictions. Ahasverus is an outsider whose position, as Milfull suggests, ‘must be thematized as legitimation, and evidence of the survival, of an alternative paradigm.’ As the Wandering Jew, Ahasverus is not an eternal victim but a committed rebel and skeptic.

The suggestion that the Jew’s– and specifically the non-Jewish Jew’s – position as an outsider encourages unorthodox, revolutionary thought has also been put forward by Isaac Deutscher, who explores a tradition of Jewish heretics like Spinoza, Heine, Marx and Freud who ‘transcend Jewry.’ In a manner that seems almost to anticipate and describe Heym’s Ahasverus, Deutscher explains how the outsider’s position allows the revolutionary non-Jewish Jew to perceive and contain contradictions.

Their manner of thinking is dialectical, because, living on the borderlines of nations and religions, they see society in a state of flux. [...] Those who are shut in with one society, one nation, or one religion, tend to imagine that their way of life and their way of thought have absolute and unchangeable validity [...]. Those, on the other hand, who live on the borderlines of various civilizations comprehend more clearly the great movement and the great contradictoriness of nature and society.
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While Jews may live on the borderlines of civilization, Jewishness in Heym’s novel, as Tait contends, ‘can scarcely be said to be a marker of liminality.’

Yet Tait’s claim that ‘the divine or immortal players’ in the narrative ‘are all Jews’ is perhaps too sweeping.

Although Lucifer writes to Beifuss as Jochanaan Leuchtentrager, an Israeli scholar, this seems to be one of the devil’s various personas rather than a significant mark of identity: casting the reactionary Lucifer as a Jew would undermine the reinterpretation of the Wandering Jew as the spirit of rebellion. Even if God in the novel is in fact the ‘capricious and Jealous God of the Old testament,’ the Creator himself cannot, by definition, be Jewish (and in fact, he scolds Ahasverus for his ‘Jewish impudence’).

Joshua, Tait points out, is “‘Jesus Christ” only to his supposed followers in Reformation Germany and […] Siegfried [Beifuss].” Indeed, when he appears as a character, it is as the Rabbi, or Reb Joshua – names that stress his historically Jewish origins. Crucially, however, these appearances are narrated by Ahasverus and reflect his perception of this ‘false meschiach.’

While Ahasverus appears to historicize Joshua and stress his humanity, Joshua is nevertheless an immortal being like Ahasverus: indeed, Ahasverus continues debating the need for rebellion with him as the Rabbi is seated on his heavenly throne and presents himself as ‘Jesus Christ, God’s only begotten son.’

It would seem, then, that Joshua’s Jewishness is limited to his life on earth. The final fall of Joshua and Ahasverus after the apocalypse marks the union of two characters who appear to be Jewish in a specific historical setting – be it Biblical Jerusalem or Reformation Germany – but who ultimately transcend the divisions between Jew and Christian in their attempt to bring true, universal redemption.

***

Lind, too, struggles with ambivalence towards his Jewish identity, as his autobiographical works show. In my discussion of Lind’s autobiographies, I examined his feelings of disgust with Jews whom he perceives as victims, his identification at times with
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the Nazi aggressor, and his guilt over both these impulses. Unlike Heym, who uses the tales of Jewish heroism to draw universal conclusions, for Lind, the same heroes serve as an antidote to ‘this pain in [his] bowels, this fear when someone mentioned the word Jew, Israel, Yid, Jude, Dsjid, in whatever language or connection.’ As a child suffering anti-Semitic abuse in Vienna, he would rather ‘die like Bar Kochba, Maccoby, Trumpeldor, than one of those long-bearded, pious Jews who get struck down from behind while they bend over the Talmud.’

Despite Lind’s disappointment with the realities of life in Israel after the war, he remains committed to Zionism as an ideology. Israel represents for Lind, as for many Zionists, a new type of Jewish spirit: strong, heroic, unbowed – a rightful heir to the heroic figures he had read of in his youth. Especially after the 1967 war, his perception of what it means to be Jewish changes dramatically: ‘Since June 1967, everything is different and will never be the same again. [...] Anxiety has been removed as if by magic. For forty years of my life, twenty-four hours of every single day, I had been ready for the role of victim or hero, or both.’ Nonetheless, when Lind travels to Israel in 1970, ‘the old phobias’ return, and in the midst of Jewish-Israeli patriotism, he suddenly feels that he is actually not a Jew.

The mind boggles. This discovery alone had been worth the trip. If I am not a Jew, which I always thought I was and to which my friends and family could swear, what am I? I certainly cannot call myself a non-Jew, and to call myself simply a human being is too simple to express the truth.

Lind’s attempt to resolve this conundrum is twofold. Admitting to himself that he does not ‘like to live only among Jews,’ he decides not to settle in any one place, but, as a wandering Jew, to embrace his exile: ‘I never feel all right where I am, but at least I know: In exile nothing lasts, nothing is permanent.’ Furthermore, like Heym’s creation of a Jewish angel and Freud’s invention of an Egyptian Moses, Lind imagines that his ancestors were Khazars – converts to Judaism and therefore not entirely Jewish (this fantasy of non-
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Jewish origins, which occurs both in *The Trip to Jerusalem* and in *Numbers*, is discussed in detail in the first chapter).

In *The Inventor*, boundaries between Jew and non-Jew are also repeatedly blurred and questioned. Elim Ffinger’s main project is, after all, ‘to convert all non-Jews to Judaism by persuading all Jews to become Christians, Muslims, Hindus or Buddhists.’\(^{318}\) Elim’s plan draws on Shabtai Zvi’s conversion to Islam and on his followers’ conversion in his wake: he explains to Emmanuel that ‘[we] are the spark of Divine light in the spiritual darkness of the world, even if we have to become “secular” or “atheist” – if that is the current religious fashion.’\(^{319}\) As Scholem explains, Zvi’s apostasy is ‘an exile of the Messiah himself who, as it were, cuts himself off from his holy roots or exiles himself in order to fulfil the redemption.’\(^{320}\) The spiritual aspect of Elim’s plan, however, is soon undercut when its absurd and extravagant operational details are revealed, namely the secret promotion and appointment of world leaders who, Elim claims, are – despite appearances to the contrary – Jews.

Ludicrous as Elim’s schemes may be, his insistence on the blurring, or perhaps coexistence, of Jewish and non-Jewish identity – when Emmanuel asks him, ‘[you] are a Jew, aren’t you?’ Elim’s response is: ‘[a] question to which I can only answer “Yes and No.”’\(^{321}\) – betrays an inner conflict familiar to Jews who have suffered persecution because of their religious or cultural heritage: ‘It’s better not to be Jewish outwardly if you want to be more of a Jew inside,’ Elim tells Emmanuel.\(^{322}\) He echoes a difficult choice made by Jews ‘compelled to lead, as it were, a double life’\(^{323}\) – from the days of the Marranos, the offspring of Spanish Jews who converted to Christianity in the persecutions of the fifteenth century but continued to practice the Jewish religion in secret, to Jews who, like Lind himself, assumed a false, non-Jewish, identity to survive the Holocaust. For the Sabbatians, Zvi’s apostasy ‘opened a gap between the two spheres in the drama of Redemption, the inner one of the soul and that of history.’\(^{324}\) Lind repeatedly expresses and explores this contradiction between the inner and outer worlds – between the soul and being in history –
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in *Counting my Steps*, as he recalls how he retreated behind the assumed identity of the Dutch labourer Overbeek: ‘I was both. Overbeek for the world and J. L. for this other world.’

In *The Trip to Jerusalem* and in an interview title ‘Hands Off Our Own Dirty Jews’, Lind describes how his interest in Sabbatianism and in Kabbalah more generally follows a spiritual revelation:

> On 23 April, in Majorca, I had an experience, a sudden awareness of perfection, a kind of flash of enlightenment. After that I became very preoccupied with the Kabbalah. This extraordinary experience changed me a lot. When writing *Counting My Steps* I considered myself an atheist. […] Atheism, I suddenly realized, makes no sense at all.

I would suggest that the attraction of this branch of Judaism, considered heretical by orthodox Judaism, lies not only in the spiritual dimension it adds to Lind’s non-Jewish Jew, but more importantly in the redemptive potential it holds for Lind’s exilic existence. In Lurianic Kabbalism, as discussed earlier in this chapter, exile is seen as a fundamental condition of the universe, and redemption is ‘not so much the end of that exile which began with the destruction of the Temple’ – a specifically Jewish exile – but rather ‘the end of that inner exile of all creatures which began when the father of mankind was driven out of paradise.’

Furthermore, the notion that the Messiah (and his Sabbatian followers) must ‘venture among the nations’ to liberate the holy sparks and restore them to their divine place, gives a sense of purpose to every individual’s exile, for – as the epigraph of *The Inventor*, quoting Rabbi Hayyim Vital suggests – ‘[there] is no being[,] not even the lowliest[,] which may not serve as a prison for the sparks of the banished souls seeking restoration from their exile.’

Lind’s exile, which, like Emmanuel’s at the end of *The Inventor*, becomes a matter of choice rather than chance, acquires a spiritual significance and a moral purpose: it allows Lind to hope and declare: ‘I feel we live in the *Yemei Hamaschiach*, the days of the
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It also becomes a means of constructing an alternative Jewish identity, one that does not depend on national or geographical ties: a diasporic, nomadic identity that turns wandering into a positive trait rather than a curse. In this sense, Lind joins other Jews who seek to similarly define their Jewish identity through *Galut*, exile, or Diaspora. For George Steiner, for instance, who argues that ‘nationalism is a sort of madness, a virulent infection edging the species towards mutual massacre,’ Jewish identity lies in the ‘deeper truth of unhousedness.’

Unhousedness, the lack of a home – *Heim* in German – is, as Leora Batnizky points out in her analysis of Franz Rosenzweig’s work, what makes Jews uncanny, *unheimlich*: ‘Jews are different because they are without a home in the world; they thereby disrupt the “homey” sameness of others.’ One of the consequences of being without a home is, according to Rosenzweig, being without a language: ‘While every other people is one with its own language, while that language withers in its mouth the moment it ceases to be a people, the Jewish people never quite grows one with the language it speaks.’ For Lind, as I have shown in my reading of his autobiographies in the first chapter, the loss of home is closely associated with the similarly traumatic loss of language and the necessity to adopt a foreign language as part of his false identity. The gap between Lind’s inner and outer worlds – ‘between the inner experience and the external reality which had ceased to function as its symbol,’ as Scholem puts it, referring to the apostate Sabbatians – grows into a psychic split that Lind cannot overcome when the war ends. In *Counting my Steps*, Lind describes this state as a form of schizophrenia, a term he uses again in *The Inventor*, as Boris diagnoses both his brother and himself with this condition. As we have seen, the psychic split also has a linguistic aspect: signifier is torn from signified when Lind tries to detach
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himself from the German language, which he perceives as contaminated by Nazism, and tries to mend this schism by adopting a new language, English.

Despite his efforts, Lind does not achieve what Steiner calls ‘a final “at homeness”’ in his new language. Steiner, who advocates a reinterpretation of the Jew’s rootlessness as a virtue (the Jews’ exemplary role is to show ‘that whereas trees have roots, men have legs and are each other’s guests’), does not idealize the wanderer’s position, and is well aware of the cost of willing cosmopolitanism: though the text may be the Jew’s home, language is not. The ‘unconscious, immemorial intimacy which a man has with his native idiom, as he does with the rock, earth and ash of his acre’ eludes the Wandering Jew. Améry, too, stresses the connection between homeland and language: like Lind, he mourns the contamination of his native tongue by the poisonous Nazi idiom, but he insists that the language that evolved ‘in the hostile homeland’ was, ‘along with enemy bomber, enemy action, […] indeed even along with all the actual Nazi slang – a language of reality.’

Lind needed to divorce himself from that very reality in order to survive the war, but the break is so profound that a sense of reality, it seems, is never truly recovered in his writing. The schizophrenic existence which during the war brought a sense of relief (‘it makes one contented and happy to be that insane,’ Lind writes about taking on a false identity. ‘Schizophrenia didn’t hurt for a change.’) carries over into Lind’s English-language work. In The Inventor, the doubling, splitting and hallucinations create an uncanny narrative that seems to chart, like Numbers and Travels to the Enu, a voyage in and of the mind.

Whereas the Wandering Jew is a disintegrative figure in Lind’s novel, reflecting a crisis of exile in an alienating postwar world, Heym’s Wandering Jew emerges, within the same historical context, as a redemptive figure. The eternal dissident remains, despite his scepticism, a believer who is able to see the truth beyond the contradictions that seem to obscure it. As I have suggested, this ability to transcend limited perspectives is a reflection of Heym’s perception of his own translingual position. Lind’s translingualism stems from a
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rejection of his mother tongue and a suppression of the emotional content associated with it; Heym, on the other hand, uses the doubling of perspective and self-translation to create an identity that allows him to transcend the linguistic and political contexts of each of his languages. Thus, while Lind becomes preoccupied, in his English-language works, with mental disintegration and with language itself, Heym explores the power of the word as a tool in the hands of the writer – both as a theme within his fiction, and in his own approach to his social role as a writer.

***
6. Conclusion

The two Wandering Jew figures that emerge from *The Inventor* and *The Wandering Jew* articulate Lind’s and Heym’s respective diasporic identities, but are also extreme manifestations of their translingual process. Exile, language and identity are intertwined in each of the translingual arcs I have charted in this thesis. In both cases, translingualism is a response to exile, and the course it takes as a strategy for literary creation reflects each author’s way of perceiving his identity as a writer and his place in the world. Consequently, the effects of translingualism are manifested differently in each author’s work.

Lind’s linguistic switch is a rejection of German: a language he sees as contaminated by Nazism and which he associates not only with the historical realities of the war and the holocaust, but, on a more personal level, with banishment and abandonment. English, Lind’s adopted language, becomes a refuge, but never a home, and translingualism becomes a form of internal exile and ultimately leads to a destructive alienation from the self. By abandoning his mother tongue, and particularly the spoken language that shaped his earliest experiences, Lind suppressed a vital part of his identity. The creation of a new self in a foreign language – a survival strategy during the war – evolves into a coping mechanism in later life, at the cost of psychic splitting and a repeated erosion of identity. As a result, the translingual self Lind presents in his autobiography – that of the cosmopolitan writer, a resolute wandering Jew – is inauthentic and represses a profound personal loss.

Heym, on the other hand, never abandoned his native language, and continued to write in German, as a journalist, throughout his years of exile in America. Heym sees literature as a form of persuasion, and the English language provides an opportunity to reach and affect a wider readership. By taking on a second language, Heym gains another way of viewing the world; for him, translingualism constitutes an advantageous and productive doubling of perspective. As he moves between his languages through self-translation, Heym constructs his identity as Man-between, mediating between his two languages and cultures while maintaining a critical distance from both.

Language itself features prominently as a theme and preoccupation in Lind’s English-language works. In his autobiography, language and self are bound together as the three volumes chart the construction of Lind’s identity by language as a child and the
reconstruction of his shattered identity through a new language after the war. Language is portrayed as more than a means of communication: it is an oasis in Lind’s early childhood, and the forge of his new identity in later life. However, when language acquires transformative, magical powers, it is increasingly divorced from its function as a signifying system: it ceases to fulfil its social role as it becomes independent from its speakers, and reality itself appears to be destabilized as signs are detached from the world they represent.

Indeed, Lind’s English-language works depict a schizophrenic existence in which reality is uncertain and identity is eroded. The splitting of language – as signifier is separated from signified – and of the self is described in Lind’s autobiographies, and its consequences are evident in Travels to the Enu, where the underlying German-language metaphor of madness – the idiom *einen Vogel haben* – takes on a literal meaning in Orlando’s hallucinatory stay among the Enu, the people who have birds nesting on their heads. In this novel, language is alienated from its users as English becomes ‘strange’ to both its native and non-native speakers. Words are depicted as performative: capable of mass murder and destruction. At the same time, these murderous words lose their sense as their signifiers can be attached, almost randomly, to various signifieds.

While madness is a central theme of Lind’s earlier, German-language works, it is linked with a specific social context: Lind uses the surreal and the grotesque to deliver a scathing attack on the inhumanity of the culture that created and sustained the Nazi regime, in the language of that very culture. With the switch to English, Lind abandons the theme of the war and tries to address wider contemporary concerns. Yet as Lind’s focus shifts with his language, the satire turns inwards, and the madness of the world is increasingly overshadowed by the individual madness of Lind’s first-person narrators and protagonists – Orlando in Travels to the Enu and the Borovsky brothers in The Inventor. The fragmentation of the self, a central concern of these novels, is expressed in a fragmented narrative, and doubling is used to reinforce the uncertain sense of self and reality.

Heym also portrays the psychic tensions that accompany the move from one language and culture to another. In The Crusaders, translingualism is embodied in the figure of Sergeant Bing, the Jewish refugee from Germany who serves as a propaganda officer in the American army. As Bing moves between his two languages and cultures, translating the American goals into German and interpreting German attitudes to the Americans, the
conflict between his German and American identities – one which he desperately tries to repress – overcomes and finally destroys him. Aware, perhaps, of the dangers inherent in an existence between language and cultures, Heym bridges the cultural, linguistic and psychic gap through self-translation, and creates a translingual identity that transcends national boundaries and identification.

In Heym’s later works, language does not appear as a theme: for Heym, it is an instrument used in the service of an ideal and an ideology. His works are openly ideological, and reflect his perception of the writer’s role as an active agent of change in society. Translingualism allows Heym to view and represent different perspectives, setting them in dialogic relations with each other and remaining critically distant from them. Heym paid a price for his refusal to conform to national agendas: McCarthyism drove the committed socialist out of America, and Heym’s criticism of the GDR regime and its interpretation of socialism led to the restriction of his personal and artistic freedom. Translingualism, for Heym, becomes a practical means of overcoming these external limitations: by writing in English and publishing outside the GDR, he was able to reach a wide, international readership. Yet translingualism also serves a more private, internal purpose: it allows Heym to construct and maintain an identity that transcends national and linguistic boundaries.

Both authors reread and recast the Wandering Jew as a formative myth and as an expression of their determination to reject and resist conventional national categorization. Lind’s evocation of the Kabbalistic tradition in which exile is the existential state of the world allows him to infuse his own peripatetic cosmopolitanism with spiritual meaning and a sense of purpose: to contribute to the restoration of the world to its original, divine state. This is, perhaps, the ultimate role of the writer as a moralist. But Lind’s exile has become internalized through his translingualism and his fiction, too, becomes uprooted. The cosmopolitan identity Lind constructs for himself lacks an anchor: his willing and wilful homelessness amounts to a rejection of a sense of community, and therefore precludes a meaningful social engagement. Lind’s works reflect this withdrawal from the world and the retreat into a solipsistic, private language that increasingly ceases to signify. Translingualism, then, can be seen – to borrow Nabokov’s terms – as Lind’s private tragedy: the identity he tried to construct by repressing his loss and rejecting his mother tongue ultimately undermines its own purpose, as Lind loses his power as a writer. As one of his
characters in *Ergo* put it, ‘we’ll never be rid of austria even if we write in greenlandic like some of my fellow writers. that only makes the problem more unintelligible.’

Whereas Lind embraces the ‘wandering’ component of the Wandering Jew identity, Heym redefines its Jewish element: indeed, the German legend portrays Ahasverus as the ‘eternal’, rather than ‘wandering’ Jew. In his rereading of the legend, Heym creates a non-Jewish Jew: a transcendent, eternal revolutionary who cares deeply for mankind and tries repeatedly to bring about a new, more just, world order. Ahasverus, a fallen angel who believes in God but not in the order God has created, is at once outside history and inside it as a participant in world events. Moreover, as Lucifer’s companion in the Fall, he shares the status of original and ultimate exile, and his exile can end only when the world, in its entirety, is redeemed. Thus, Ahasverus is an idealized and mythologized version of the Man-between: of the identity Heym has forged through translingualism. An immortal angel, Ahasverus is unencumbered by the traces of a national identity that prove to be Bing’s undoing in *The Crusaders*, or by the human weakness that prevents Ethan from becoming a martyr for the sake of revealing a truth that may never be heard in *The King David Report*.

Faith in a universal ideal is what unites Bing, Ethan and Ahasverus. In all three novels, this faith is represented in quasi-religious terms: Bing is a crusader for democracy (although the so-called crusade is problematized in the novel); Ethan believes in the cause of the Lord, and Ahasverus is engaged in a debate with the devil over the true nature of God. An unwavering belief in socialism provides Heym, who rejects national and religious forms of identification, with an anchor. Ideology is a form of attachment to his social, political and historical reality, and motivates his continuing political engagement. Heym’s return to Germany does not undo his exile; instead, he adopts the position of outsider thrust upon him, and turns it into a vantage point that allows him to maintain a critical distance from the society which he nevertheless sees as his own – be it in America or the GDR.

Both authors represent exile as a condition that requires universal redemption, and both seek to mend the world through writing. Yet as each internalizes his personal exile differently through translingualism, the outcomes of the linguistic switch are also drastically different. Lind’s exile shapes his experience and becomes a key component of his identity; his linguistic switch – a second exile – leads to a withdrawal into, and preoccupation with,
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the fragmented self. Heym, who continued to write in English after his return to Germany, uses his translingualism to sustain an oppositional identity on the one hand, and to act as a cultural mediator on the other. Thus, the foreign language functions, paradoxically, both as a form of exile and as the antidote to exile, and translingualism not only reflects each author’s perception of his place in the world, but in fact shapes their positions as authors. In his autobiographies, Lind’s ascribes to language the power to transform the individual, to forge a new identity; language, then, becomes the gateway to personal redemption. Heym, by contrast, stresses both in his fiction and his polemical work that the individual – and the writer in particular – can, indeed must, harness the power of words to change, even redeem, the world.

Exploring this relationship between language and identity in the works of Stefan Heym and Jakov Lind has allowed me to address aspects of their work that have not received much critical attention – namely Lind’s English-language novels and the role that language, translingualism and self-translation play in shaping Heym’s work. Apart from contributing to the scholarship on each individual author, my aim has been to consider wider questions regarding the ways in which an author’s translingualism might find its expression in his or her work, and the implications of translingualism for literary criticism in an era of increased global mobility, which challenges conventional national forms of categorization. Using Lind and Heym as examples, I have charted two models of translingualism and literary creation. On the one hand, translingualism can be a form of alienation from the self, expressed in the author’s work as a schizophrenic existence where identity is split and reality is destabilized. On the other hand, translingualism is seen as a productive doubling of perspective, allowing the author to move freely between cultures and languages, setting them in dialogic relations and allowing them to illuminate and complement each other.

The role of translingual writers as cultural mediators, reflecting the concerns of minority populations – exiles, migrants, refugees, and diasporic communities – is of particular interest as the crossing of national and linguistic borders becomes increasingly common, giving rise to a growing body of work by transnational authors. The movement between languages internalizes and reflects both the freedom associated with geographical mobility and the emotional price it inevitably entails. I would therefore suggest that translingualism – a still under-researched and under-theorized area of literary scholarship –
is a productive field of inquiry within the emerging category of transnational literary criticism, as language is, after all, one of the fundamental elements of both national and personal identity.

I have focused on writers whose border-crossing was – at least initially – involuntary. Are the effects of translingualism different when the linguistic switch is not associated with the trauma of exile? One of the main differences I have identified between Lind’s and Heym’s translingualism is the unidirectional nature of the former – the abandonment of one language for another – as opposed to the movement back and forth between languages in the latter. Bilingualism, however, does not necessarily involve self-translation; moreover, although self-translation allowed Heym to bridge the psychic gap associated with translingualism, the same is not true for all self-translating writers: Nabokov, for instance, described the process as extremely difficult, like ‘sorting through one's own innards, and then changing them like a pair of gloves.’ The translingual writer – whether writing in one language or more – often infuses his or her languages with inventive vocabulary, innovative grammatical structures, and new cultural references: how does this foreign accent affect the national literature it infiltrates?

These are only some of the issues that the study of translingualism can illuminate. The two translingual moves I follow in this thesis occur within a specific historical and geopolitical context; I have limited myself to authors of the same postwar generation, who move between two Western languages. I was thus able to examine two complete literary careers and two comparable personal trajectories. Despite this specificity, I propose these two models as archetypes: translingualism as loss as opposed to translingualism as an opportunity, and fragmentation versus mediation. Furthermore, I would argue that the key difference between these two paths is an anchor that lies outside the individual and beyond language, in the social sphere. With the current distrust of grand narratives, Heym’s commitment to socialism may seem naive; nevertheless, it was, for him, a transcendent form of identification that replaced traditional identities –national, religious or ethnic. A sense of community, it would seem, is the antidote against the mental disintegration that a solipsistic position such as Lind’s entails, and against the fragmentation of society that is the inherent risk of identity politics. The nation as an ‘imagined political community,’ to quote Benedict

2 Quoted in Beaujour, ‘Prolegomena’, p. 65.
Anderson’s definition,\(^3\) has not disappeared; yet contemporary border-crossings – geographical, cultural and linguistic – create the need to re-imagine this community: to find new paradigms to negotiate the hybrid cultural identities and social structures that arise as former national subjects become international, multinational, or transnational.

***
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