

and treated in Germany.

All told, this is an interesting volume, covering an array of present issues, though the intended audience remains unclear. Readers completely unfamiliar with the Jewish community in Germany will lack context on intra-Jewish debates and might not discern the essayists' individual biases. On the other hand, the issues and debates surveyed here are already known to readers familiar with contemporary Jewish life in Germany.

JAY HOWARD GELLER, *Case Western Reserve University*

Jehuda Reinharz and Yaacov Shavit. *Glorious, Accursed Europe. An Essay on Jewish Ambivalence* (Tauber Institute Series for the Study of European Jewry). Trans. M. Engel. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2010. Pp. 301. Cloth \$39.95.

In this volume, originally published 2006 in Hebrew, noted historians Jehuda Reinharz and Yaacov Shavit propose to examine how during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries an elite group of European Jews—often characterized by elite European Gentiles as the exemplary resident non-Europeans or, conversely, as the exemplary “good Europeans”—*themselves* “imagined and invented the idea of Europe.” They extend their survey to European Jews who immigrated to Palestine as well as to contemporary Israeli Jews in order to explore how “Europe [...] existed in [their] collective memory” (1). The volume is subtitled, “An Essay on Jewish Ambivalence,” and the authors convincingly illustrate that ambivalence more accurately characterizes the range of Jewish opinions about “Europe”; even Zionist views are shown as far more diverse than any assumed blanket repudiation of “Europe” (1). They suggest that Israeli Jews, in particular, continue to focus upon Europe and do so with such varied regard because “modern Jews are European Jews in the sense that a large and central part of their values, culture, and behavior is European” (1).

To move beyond a collation of illustrative citations, the volume requires clear and consistent meanings for the key terms “Europe,” “Jew,” “modern,” and “culture.” For example, Reinharz and Shavit rightly begin by noting how determining and delimiting “Europe” has been a problem since the concept’s emergence in the fifteenth century among Gentile humanists inhabiting the Western heading of the Eurasian land mass. Yet recognition that the concept “Europe” and its history continue to be contested is limited to bibliographic lists in the endnotes. Omitted are such significant contributions by Jewish thinkers as Jacques Derrida’s *Other Heading* and Jonathan Boyarin’s response in *Thinking in Jewish*. Consequently, the volume addresses neither how ongoing debates affected its analysis of Jewish notions, nor how its analysis fits into these discussions.

The authors draw principally upon Germanophone and Slavophone (especially Russian) voices, and this privileging creates related problems. Aside, again, from an endnote, the question posed by many in Western and Central Europe (including by a number of their German sources) of whether Russians should be considered Europeans goes begging. Nor are the possible effects of this non-recognition upon

the notion of “Europe” of European-identifying Russian Jews considered. Many of the quoted judgments on Europe—the authors later concede, often parenthetically—were actually directed at a specific region or nationality. Ultimately, what the authors present under the rubric “European culture” proves to be the inverse of one of their would-be confirmatory witnesses to Jewry’s European identification. Whereas Franz Rosenzweig judges Hermann Cohen’s self-identified *Deutschtum* as, in fact, *Europäertum*, Reinharz and Shavit’s European culture—both the good and the bad—is not just primarily evidenced by, but also repeatedly referred to as, German culture. Further, Reinharz and Shavit’s focus upon elites leaves unasked whether European culture and the culture of certain European elites are identical; also left without comment is the decision to include science and technology, but not capitalism and the economy, under “culture.”

Compounding the ambiguity of reference are inconsistencies of style and problems with historical argument and accuracy. Long passages are regularly repeated in different chapters; divergent translations of the same citation are used; citations meant to corroborate but that instead contradict (and vice versa) are employed; summary-like statements are proffered that prove to be paraphrases of particular individuals rather than general authorial conclusions; historical claims are asserted that depend upon material only much later introduced; evidence from one period is used to corroborate conclusions about a significantly different one; events are incorrectly dated (e.g., “on September 25, 1939, two days before the invasion of Poland” [116]), etc. Whether these faults are due to translation problems, press errors, or difficulties often encountered in collaborative works cannot be determined. Still *Glorious, Accursed Europe* offers, as the blurb promises, “a fascinating look at the complex relationship between Jews and Europe,” which may spark its onlookers to shed more needed light on that liaison.

JAY GELLER, *Vanderbilt University*

Marianne Hirsch and Leo Spitzer. *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2010. Pp. xxiv, 362. Cloth \$39.95.

Ghosts of Home is an unusual, although not unique book. In recent years a number of books by children of Holocaust survivors have centered on their parents’ experiences, but framed by their present lives. The best known is *Maus* by Art Spiegelman. These Holocaust narratives are less historical recreations than stories from memory, explicitly shaped by the postwar experiences of both generations. As in Daniel Mendelsohn’s *The Lost*, the book is constructed from the stories of multiple trips to Czernowitz, with and without Marianne Hirsch’s parents, who were born and survived the war there. Hirsch and Leo Spitzer, whose own *Hotel Bolivia: The Culture of Memory in a Refuge from Nazism* tells of his family’s survival, develop a multifaceted portrait of Czernowitz, as it was and as it resides in memories of Jewish Czernowitzers, its “afterlife.” They take the reader along on their investigative