Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The Faculty of Humanities

German Language and Literature Department

A German-Yiddish *Mayse*: The Influence of Yiddish on the Poetic Language of Paul Celan

Thesis for Master's degree in German Language and Literature

Advisor: Prof Jakob Hessing

Submitted by Ohad Kohn (05308573-4)

Jerusalem, February 24, 2016

האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM

24.02.2016

ט״ו באדר א׳ תשע״ו

לכבוד

מזכירות ועדת הוראה

הפקולטה למדעי הרוח

האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים

א.ג.נ.,

הנדון : עבודת התזה למוסמך של אוהד קאהן 05308573-4 "A German-Yiddish Mayse"

הריני לאשר שהעבודה הזו נכתבה בהדרכתי, והנוסח המוגש בזאת הוא סופי ומוכן למסירה לקורא חיצוני.

בכבוד רב,

יעקב הסינג

פרופ׳ יעקב הסינג

המדור לשפה וספרות גרמנית

Abstract

This thesis examines the influence of Yiddish on the literary work of Paul Celan. More specifically, it strives to show how the complex inter-lingual dynamics between Yiddish and German manifests itselfs in his writing. The thesis argues for such an influence and characterizes its contributing factors throughout Celan's life. It suggests that the Yiddish language and its troubled relationship with the German language, before and after the Holocaust, constitute a significant poetic and poetological concern for Celan, that has been hitherto neglected in the research.

The research is composed of a biographical and a philological part. The former implements the critical tools of cultural and intellectual history in order to re-evaluate Celan's exposure to the Yiddish language and his attitudes towards it. The latter implements the tools of Contact-Linguistics and traditional philology in order to show the influence of Yiddish on Celan's work. For its empirical corpus, the biographical part relies on the data found in the available research on Celan's life and the relevant lingual and cultural conditions in Bukovina and Czernowtiz. The philological part analyses Celan's prose piece *Gespräch im Gebirg* as the object of study.

The philological part suggests a 'hidden relexification' of German thorugh Yiddish in *Gespräch im Gebirg*. It introduces the notion of *Jiddischdeutsch*, a dually-layered language based on German and Yiddish, which is revealed through the application of a multidisciplinary approach. Its poetic and poetoligical implications unfold by exposing the *différance* between Yiddish and German.

Lastly, the thesis illustrates the general productivity of a genuine multidisciplinary approach for the study of German-Jewish literature; that is, both in methodology—combining the tools of Contact-Linguistics with philology and cultural history, and in the theoretical framework—combining both the perspective of German Studies with that of Yiddish and Jewish Studies.

Table of Contents

0. Preface 4
1. Introduction 5
    1.1. Subject, Aim and Methodology 6
    1.2. Structure 7
2. State of the Art 9
    2.1. The Celan-Research on Yiddish 9
    2.2. German-Yiddish Socio-linguistics from the Perspective of Cultural and Intellectual History 14
    2.3. German-Yiddish Socio-linguistics from the Perspective of interwar Bukovina 14
3. Methodology 16
    3.1. The Biographical Part 17
    3.2. The Philological Part 18
4. A Critical Assessment of Yiddish-German Dynamics in Paul Celan's Biography 20
    4.1. Background: The (unheated) Controversy about Celan and Yiddish 20
    4.2. 1920-1933: Childhood and Early Youth 22
    4.3. 1934-1940: Youth up to the Holocaust 39
    4.4. 1941-1943: The Holocaust in Bukovina 50
    4.5. 1944-1970: After the War and in Exile 53
    4.6. Conclusion 62
5. Philological and Hermeneutical Analysis of Yiddsh in Celan's Gespräch im Gebirg 66
    5.1. Background: from Judendetusch to Jiddischdeutsch 66
    5.2. The Question of Language in Gespräch im Gebrirg 73
    5.3. Philological and Linguistic Analysis 85
    5.4. Conclusion 138
    5.5. Oral Orientation and Considerations of Genre and 'Intertext' 141
6. A German-Yiddish Mayse: Celan's Multifaceted Act of Re-appropriation 149
7. Works Cited 153

לנטע

מחקר זה נעשה בסיוע הרשות הלאומית לתרבות היידיש

This research was supported by the National Authority for Yiddish Culture

הרשות הלאומית לתרבות היידיש
נאַציאָנאַלע אינסטאַנץ פֿאַר ייִדישער קולטור

0. Preface

Years after first contemplating the ideas behind this dissertation, in my endless roaming around the internet in search of relevant research materials, I suddenly chanced upon a piece of unpublished information which immediately stroke me as my own *Meridian*:

During the 1970s in Israel, an old and retired Mathematics teacher from Czernowitz with a stubborn penchant for Yiddish and German literature, Hersch Segal, was holding lectures about Paul Celan in front of an ever-dwindling audience.[1] Segal spoke *in* Yiddish,—although as a Czernowiter he could easily have spoken in German or Romanian—, and he spoke *of* Yiddish in Paul Celan's work, long before this became even a remote possibility in the research. Segal was also the one to save Selma Meerbaum-Eisinger's poems from oblivion, by publishing them for the first time in 1976. He died on February 2, 1982, elven days before my birthday.

Segal's nephew, Meinhard (Hardy) Mayer, himself a born and bred Czernowitzr turned American Physics and Mathematics Professor, edited his uncle's lecture notes and translated them into German in 1984, but never published them until his death in 2011. Perhaps they were intended for a lecture, perhaps as an act of commemoration of his deceased uncle. Be it as it may, Mayer closes his introductory notes with the following remark:

> Ich hatte noch 1984 die Absicht etwas über Segals --- und meine eigenen --- Ideen über die jiddischen Elemente in Celan ´s „Gespräch im Gebirg" niederzuschreiben; *leider sind die Skizzen dieser Niederschrift verschwunden*. Aber wenn man Jiddisch spricht und hört, bekommt man leicht den Eindruck dass die zwei Juden untereinander Jiddisch oder „Czernowitzer Deutsch" sprechen.[2]

---

1. For more information about Segal and his relation to Celan, see "Ruth Lackner and the Yiddishist Circle" in the biographical part of this dissertation.
2. Hersch Segal, and Meinhard E Mayer, "Das Jüdische Und Das Jiddische Bei Paul Celan: Vorträge Über Paul Celan Aus Dem Nachlass Von Hersch Segal." *golem.ps.uci.edu* (1984): 2015, http://golem.ps.uci.edu/hardy/Segal-Celan.pdf, 3.

This dissertation is an attempt at fulfilling the unexpressed will of both the uncle and his nephew, an attempt I have begun before ever hearing about Segal's Seventies-lectures and Mayer's lost sketches: an imagined reconstruction of an unasked question—what makes *Gespräch im Gerbirg* sound like Yiddish and what does it mean?

1. Introduction

Paul Celan is now widely considered one of the greatest poets of the German language in the twentieth-century, if not the greatest. However, the single most striking feature about his work is the peculiarity of its German. Using the building blocks and grammatical possibilities offered by the German language, Celan had ingeniously created something that may look like ordinary poetic German, but nonetheless reads like a fundamentally different kind of German. The idiosyncrasy of this language deters and attracts at the same time: it poses a high barrier, even for the native German speaker, whose language forms the primary groundwork for the 'Celanish' language; when skillfully mastered, however, this language opens the reader's horizon to a truly remarkable literary achievement.

No language is created *ex nihilo*. In order to avoid the Romanticist fallacy contained in the assertion, that an incommensurable originality is the one and only factor conditioning the creation of Celan's unique language, the historical-biographical, cultural and indeed lingual circumstances of its creation must be properly weighed and considered. Surly, no extraordinary 'Celanish' would be ever possible without his extraordinary literary genius. But the details of this language, its components, its grammar and vocabulary, are all historically conditioned, first and foremost, by the many languages of his life: German, Romanian, French, Ukrainian and Russian, but also—Yiddish and Hebrew.

When closely examining the immense breadth of research on Paul Celan's œuvre, a consideration of non-German cultural and lingual

influences occupies a significant place qualitatively, albeit not necessarily quantitatively. Such seminal papers as Derrida's "*Schibboleth* for Paul Celan"[3] and Klaus Reichert's "Hebräische Züge in der Sprache Paul Celans"[4], which put the subject of multilingual writing right at their heart, have set the ground for countless papers dealing with cross-lingual references, influence and interpretation in Celan's works. However, this body of research is mainly concerned with the analysis of Hebrew and, to a lesser extent, that of French and Spanish in Celan's poetry.

Yet Yiddish[5], the lingua franca of european Jewry from the middle-ages thorough to its destruction, which also was part and parcel of the lingual and cultural landscape of Bukovina and Czernowitz, is, nevertheless, strikingly missing almost entirely from the considerations of this corpus of cross-lingual study. Despite accumulating evidence of its important role in informing Celan's extraordinary language, the research on Yiddish in his writing remains thin.

1.1. Subject, Aim and Methodology

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the influence of the Yiddish language on the literary work of Paul Celan. More specifically, it strives to show how the complex inter-lingual dynamics between Yiddish and German manifests itselfs in Celan's writing.

This work will argue for such an influence and characterize its contributing factors throughout Celan's life. It will be suggested, furthermore, that the Yiddish language and its complicated relationship with the German language, before and after the Holocaust, constitute a

---

3. Jacques Derrida, *Sovereignties in Question: The Poetics of Paul Celan* (Fordham Univ Press, 2005).
4. Klaus Reichert, "Hebräische Züge in Der Sprache Paul Celans," in *Paul Celan*, ed. Wolfgang Hamacher, and Winfried Menninghaus (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988).
5. As well as Romanian: Edouard Roditi, "Paul Celan and the Cult of Personality," *World Literature Today* 66, no. 1 (1992), 11.

significant poetic and poetological concern for Celan, that has been hitherto neglected in the research. In doing so, the current effort will additionally aim to lay the ground for a more comprehensive research on the subject, encompassing Celan's entire oeuvre.

For this purpose, and owning to the assumption that Celan's unique poetic language is fundamentally conditioned by his upbringing in the multilingual environment of interwar Czernowitz, postulated in the preface, a distinctively multidisciplinary approach is taken by this thesis. The research is thus composed of a biographical and a philological part. The former will use the critical tools of cultural and intellectual history in order to re-evaluate Celan's exposure to the Yiddish language and his attitudes towards it. The latter will use the tools of Contact-Linguistics and traditional philology in order to show the influence of Yiddish on Celan's work. For its empirical corpus, the biographical part relies on the data found in the available research on Celan's life and the relevant lingual and cultural conditions in Bukovina and Czernowtiz. The philological part analyses Celan's prose piece *Gespräch im Gebirg* as the object of study.

Lastly, owing to the productivity of the multidisciplinary approach taken here, the thesis will argue for the general productivity of a genuine multidisciplinary approach for the study of German-Jewish literature; that is, both in methodology—combining the tools of Contact-Linguistics with philology and cultural history, and in the theoretical framework—combining both the perspective of German Studies with that of Yiddish and Jewish Studies.

1.2. Structure

The dissertation is composed of two primary parts preceded by a chapter on methodology and a survey of relevant research.

The first part consists in a critical assessment of German-Yiddish dynamics in Paul Celan's biography. This part follows a chronological periodization with a few necessary historical digressions.

The second part of this dissertation consists in the empirical study of Yiddish influence in Celan's prose piece *Gespräch im Gebirg*. This part is composed of (1) a theoretical background and discussion of the problem of language in the story; (2) a linguistic-philological analysis of the text. The hermeneutical discussion naturally emanates from the analysis and is thus contained in it. For the purpose of clarity and visibility, a full version of the text of *Gespräch im Gebirg* precedes the analysis. This version is color-coded and indexed according to the analyzed phenomena.

2. State of the Art

Almost no direct research on the question of the influence of Yiddish on Celan's writing is available to date. Nevertheless, some scholarly works either touch upon the subject indirectly or point to such an influence. The relatively marginal treatment of Yiddish in the research dedicated to the prose piece *Gespräch im Gebirg*, which serves as the study case for this dissertation, is discussed in detail immediately before the philological analysis.

Although not a direct research on the subject of this thesis, some considerable research has been published on subjects pertaining to the methodology, socio-lingual and historical aspects of the current work. This research will be briefly surveyed with particular attention to questions of methodology.

2.1. The Celan-Research on Yiddish

The issue of the influence of 'foreign' languages, i.e., languages other than German, on Celan's writing, raised in the introduction, has become increasingly central in the research after his death in 1970. Up to that point, Celan's reception, although intimately tied and complicated with his Jewishness and his experience of the Holocaust, followed a predominantly Germano-centric path, utilizing the disciplinary tools of *Germanistik*.

The focus on the 'problem of language' for Celan, as a German-writing Jew after Auschwitz, was a rather natural one, given the abrupt all-encompassing caesura of the Holocaust and the corruption of German through the National Socialistic newspeak. This situation was further exacerbated by the fact that the poem responsible for his fame was the "Todesfuge", thus labeling him not just a poet, but a poet of the Holocaust.

However, Celan asserted himself in response, as a Holocaust survivor

who insists on writing German, a German-Survivor poet.[6] He also seems to have taken the effort of excluding any of his own non-German writing from his poetic work. When it comes to his Romanian language poems, at least, this effacement has worked quite well: despite being considered "truly outstanding" works of poetry, they remain little known and researched.[7] In his response to 'Librairie Flincker' (1961), he insists on his poetic monolingualism, even going as far as associating *Zweisprachigkeit* with *Doppelzüngigkeit*: "An zwei Sprachigkeit in der Dichtung glaube ich nicht. Doppelzüngigkeit—ja das gibt es auch in diversen zeitgenössischen Wortkünsten […]".[8]

This last play on words, associating bilingualism with two-facedness, in fact exposes Celan's own proclivity for inter-lingual wordplay, which conforms with his own multilingual background and expressed interest in etymology and cross-lingual connections, as a recent study of Hebrew intertextuality in Celan's poetry reveals:

> Celans Lyrik zeigt, dass die Beherrschung unterschiedlichster Fremdsprachen eine Außensicht auf die Muttersprache ermöglicht, was ebenfalls in einem Brief an Hans Bender ausgesprochen wird: »Die Lebensumstände, das Leben in fremden Sprachbereich [sic] haben es mit sich gebracht, daß ich mit meiner Sprache viel bewußter umgehe als früher«.
> Diese Fähigkeit zur Distanz führt zu einem exakten und sehr respektvollen Umgang mit Sprache. Zudem war Celan grundsätzlich sehr interessiert an linguistischen Fragestellungen zu Grammatik und Wortetymologien – also am Pluralismus innerhalb einer Sprache durch die historisch-semantische Schichtung. Nach den Berichten Gerhart Baumanns war er nahezu »besessen« von Etymologien […] Celan studierte Wörterbücher, er versuchte damit der Vergesslichkeit der Umgangssprache entgegenzuwirken und arbeitete mit einander ablösenden oder überlagernden Bedeutungen eines Wortes, bemüht, »die vielfältigen Schattierungen und Abwandlungen unverkürzt einzubringen, verjährte, verdeckte und noch unentdeckte.«[9]

---

6. See the detailed discussion in the section "Late 1940s-Late 1950s: The Latent Period" of the biographical part of the dissertation.
7. Ibid. and cf. Heinrich Stiehler, "Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens," in *An Der Zeiten Ränder*, ed. Cécile Cordon, and Helmut Kusdat (Vienna: Theodor Kramer Gesellschaft, 2002), 122-23.
8. Cf. Ibid., 124.
9. Irene Fußl, *"Geschenke an Aufmerksame": Hebräische Intertextualität Und Mystische Weltauffassung in Der Lyrik Paul Celans* (Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 39-40.

These tendencies, testifying to the contrary of his declarations, finally eroded the Germano-centric approach to his poetry. Derrida's published lecture on the '*Schibboleth*' from 1984, as well as Reichert's article from 1988[10] on the Hebrew traces in Celan's poetry spurred a wave of interest in Celan from a multilingual perspective, like the study quoted above. Most of these works, however, either completely ignore the presence of Yiddish in his poetry, or avoid relating to Yiddish in any meaningful way.

This is best exemplified in J.M. van der Laan's article from 1992, "The Problem of Language and National Identity for Holocaust Poet, Paul Celan"[11], which is quite succinct when it comes to problematizing the issue of identity vs. language of Celan, but ignore Yiddish entirely. Van der Laan surveys the unique lingual and cultural landscape in which Celan grew up but is quick to characterize Celan as a German poet living in exile and stubbornly sticking to his German language. Even a more recent contribution, specifically dedicated to the subject of multilingualism and Celan, Heinrich Stiehler's "Der Junge Celan und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina und Rumäniens" (2000), disregards the presence of Yiddish in Celan's life and poetry, while re-iterating past misconceptions.[12]

Another strain of research involving Celan's Jewish identity examines his renewed and intensified interest with Jewish mysticism and Hasidism after the war. Once again, it is the Hebrew language, given its role as the performative tool of the Kabbalah, that occupies the field of inter-lingual discussion. Yiddish is missing almost altogether from this discussion, despite being the primary language through which this tradition was transmitted and upheld to the stage of its re-attachment by Celan, and

10. See footnotes 3-4.
11. James M. van der Laan, "The Problem of Language and National Identity for Holocaust Poet, Paul Celan," *History of European Ideas* 16, no. 1-3 (1993).
12. Cf. Stiehler, „Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens.", 120.

despite being the primary language of Hasidism in every other respect.[13]

Within this ever-widening scholarly framework preoccupied with non-German references in Cela's work, three works merit special consideration (apart from those to be discussed later in the context of *Gespräch im Gebirg*) because they bear on the methodology and conceptual framework of this dissertation.

The first is Na'ama Rokem's article, "German–Hebrew Encounters in the Poetry and Correspondence of Yehuda Amichai and Paul Celan", from 2010.[14] Despite treating Hebrew-German and not Yiddish-German dynamics, the article offers a reading of multilingualism which is also relevant to Yiddish: The German-Hebrew bilingualism is perceived as a "poetic encounter", framed within a socio-lingual context, which encompasses the historical perspective of the Holocaust, but simultaneously diverges into a wider poetical and hermeneutic context of multilingualism:

> Though neither of the two poets lived an active bilingual life in these languages, I propose that reading them both through the lens of the German–Hebrew encounter entails not only a reframing of their works but also a new perspective on some key questions in the theory and historiography of modern Hebrew and Jewish literature. In particular, this reading may expand our understanding of the central and enduring role of bi- and multilingualism within this field.[15]

This leads the author to acknowledge poetic multilingualism as a possible source for language alteration. Thus recalling Yehuda Amichai's supposedly soothing introduction of Celan to the Jerusalem audience:[16]

> [I]n introducing Celan to an audience in Jerusalem, Amichai tried to put the listeners at ease by saying that his language was "neither the German of the Germans nor the language of Bukowina; it is Celan's own German."

---

13. Cf. Fußl, *"Geschenke an Aufmerksame": Hebräische Intertextualität Und Mystische Weltauffassung in Der Lyrik Paul Celans*.; on the importance of Yiddish in the transmission of mystic tradition, see Galili Shahar, "Fragments and Demons: A Strong Reading," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 102, no. 2 (2012), 305-06.
14. Na'ama Rokem, "German–Hebrew Encounters in the Poetry and Correspondence of Yehuda Amichai and Paul Celan," *Prooftexts* 30, no. 1 (2010).
15. Ibid., 98.
16. Ibid., 109.

The second work is John Felstiner's biography of Celan from 1995, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*.[17] Felstiner's unique monograph was the first to show a more consistent influence of Yiddish in Celan's oeuvre, by referring to a few intertextual figures and possible semantic exchanges of meaning between German and Yiddish.[18] Despite raising an important contribution to the study of Yiddish influence on Celan by showing its consistency, these references are only made in passing, lacking any elaboration or conceptual re-framing. One noteworthy exception is the Yiddish reference in the poem "Nah, im Aortenbogen" from Celan's 1968 collection *Fadensonnen*[19]: Felstiner came across a few Yiddish lines Celan jotted down in his copy of Gerschom Scholem's work on the *Shekinah*[20], which stimulated the next study.

This last Yiddish-German intertextual reference paved the way to a recent study by Nitzan Lebovic, "Near the End: Celan, between Scholem and Heidegger"[21], which in essence picks up the Yiddish reference in "Nah, im Aortenbogen" where Felstiner had left, expanding and reframing it within its Yiddish context, by meticulous examination of the cross-lingual exchanges:

> "Nah" shapes a process of semantic expansion, yet one directed towards different, even contradictory ends. Its refusal to accept traditional boundaries is seen in its insistence on unconventional conjunctions and affiliations. I mean here more than the immediate fusion of German and Hebrew into one poetic language, or its supposed byproduct, the Yiddish offspring. Heidegger and Scholem appear on the more immediate surface, under which one comes across the allusion to Halpern's poem and its subversive undercurrent. The message is one of distance/nearness from/to the ur-source of language.[22]

In its juxtaposition of socio-lingual implications (Yiddish, German and Hebrew) along with a poetological (ur-langauge, Celan/Moyshe Leyb

---

17. John Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
18. See for example, Ibid., 63-64, 73-74, 86.
19. Paul Celan, *Gesammelte Werke in Fünf Bänden* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1983), Band 2, 22.; Henceforth qutoed in brackets as follows (GW, 2: 202).
20. Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 238.
21. Nitzan Lebovic, "Near the End: Celan, Between Scholem and Heidegger," *The German Quarterly* 83, no. 4 (2010).
22. Ibid., 471.

Halpern) and thematic point of reference (Jewish/German Mysticism), Leibovic's conclusion sets a methodological example for this dissertation.

2.2. German-Yiddish Socio-linguistics from the Perspective of Cultural and Intellectual History

In the field of cultural and intellectual history the unique socio-lingual dynamics between German and Yiddish was the subject of a few extensive monographs published over the past few decades. Sander Gilman's *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (1986)[23] sets the standard in raising the issue of the anti-Semitic discourse which defines the Jew's Otherness as a function of their lingual difference inside the German-speaking world.

Later works in this vein focus on a specific historical period, such as Jeffrey A. Grossman's monograph, *The Discourse on Yiddish in Germany: From the Enlightenment to the Second Empire* (2000)[24], or Aya Elyada's recent study *A Goy Who Speaks Yiddish: Christians and the Jewish Language in Early Modern Germany* (2012)[25], which also strives to substantiate this discourse and present it more accurately on a firm empirical ground.

The insights gained in the process of these studies guide the discussions on the question of language in the biographical and philological parts of the dissertation.

2.3. German-Yiddish Socio-linguistics from the Perspective of interwar Bukovina

In stark contrast to the interest of the research in the interlingual

---

23. Sander L. Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).
24. Jeffrey A. Grossman, The Discourse on Yiddish in Germany: From the Enlightenment to the Second Empire (Rochester: Camden House, 2000).
25. Aya Elyada, *A Goy Who Speaks Yiddish: Christians and the Jewish Language in Early Modern Germany* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012).

dynamics of German and Yiddish operating within the Haskalah movement, the research on this relationship after the acculturation of the German-Jews is scarce at best. As a rule, the further along the march of acculturation, the scarcer the interest dedicated to the relation between the languages. This temporal rule has a geographical counterpart: the more eastward the territory where German and Yiddish closely interact, the more lacking is the research on this relationship.

The unquestionable cultural dominance of German in Bukovina and especially in Czernowitz, from the nineteenth-century up to the dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy, became an academic platitude over the last few decades. The presence of Yiddish on the streets of Czernowitz was also well-known, and, to a lesser degree, the existence of a Yiddishist community, which was mostly inaccurately relegated to the presence of just one writer, Eliezer Stheynbarg.[26]

However, despite the coexistence of the two sister languages, the dynamics between them is mostly left unexplored. Other than attesting by its mere existence to the diversity and pluralism of Czernowtiz, whether real or imagined, Yiddish in this regard is usually relegated to no more than a hallmark of romantic nostalgia, grown so customary in writing about Czernowitz. Thus, abiding by both the temporal and the geographical rule of scholarly disinterest described above, the German-Yiddish dynamics in Bukovina and Czernowitz of the twentieth century represent an obvious desideratum in the research.

Consequently, even historical research on the Yiddish cultural landscape of interwar Czernowitz and Bukovina is scarce and dispersed within works with differing primary objects of study. David Sha'ari's otherwise comprehensive historical monograph, *The Jews of Bukovina between the two World Wars* (2004), dedicates but a section of his chapter on

26. For further detail see the section "The Interwar Period: Romanization and the Rise of Yiddish" in the biographical part of the dissertation.

the Jewish culture to the subject of Yiddish,[27] which in turn is largely based on Shloyme Bikl's memoir on Romania from 1961.[28] Furthermore, a discussion of inter-lingual dynamics is not a part of that monograph.

Nevertheless, in recent years an increasing interest in the Yiddish landscape of Bukovina with respect to the inter-lingual dynamics with German is starting to manifest itself in a few studies.

The press landscape in Yiddish, which blossomed in the interwar period forms the basis for two articles by Susanne Marten-Finnis, which inquire the socio-lingual conditions constituting the rise in publications and readership in Yiddish, within a comparative perspective in relation to the German-language publications.[29] Lastly, a doctoral dissertation by Ágota Kinga Nagy, *Deutsch-jiddischer Sprachenkontakt am Beispiel der Czernowitzer deutsch-jüdischen Presse der 1930-er Jahre* (2011),[30] examines this journalistic landscape from the perspective of Contact-Linguistics, thus contributing to the understanding of the (mostly inner-Jewish) German-Yiddish dynamics of the period. This last contribution sets a noteworthy example in its productive use of tools of Contact-Linguistics within the field of the German-Yiddish dynamics.

3. Methodology

As evident from the surveyed literature, no research has yet to

---

27. דוד שערי, **יהודי בוקובינה בין שתי מלחמות העולם** (תל אביב: המרכז לחקר התפוצות ע״ש גולדשטיין־גורן—אוניברסיטת תל אביב, 2004), 49-233.

28. שלמה ביקל, **רומעניע: געשיכטע, ליטעראַטור־קריטיק, זכרונות** (בואנאָס אײַרעס: קיום פֿאַרלאַג, 1961).

29. Susanne Marten-Finnis, "Wer Sprach Jiddisch in Czernowitz? Ein Ansatz Zur Erforschung Von Sozialen Und Situativen Faktoren Gemeinsamer Textrezeption," in *Presselandschaft in Der Bukowina Und Den Nachbarregionen*, ed. Markus Winkler (Munich: IKGS Verlag, 2011); Susanne Marten-Finnis, and Markus Winkler, "Location of Memory Versus Space of Communication: Presses, Languages, and Education Among Czernovitz Jews, 1918–1941," *Central Europe* 7, no. 1 (2009).

30. Ágota Kinga Nagy, "Deutsch-Jiddischer Sprachenkontakt Am Beispiel Der Czernowitzer Deutsch-Jüdischen Presse Der 1930-Er Jahre," (Doctoral Thesis diss., Pannonische Universität Veszprém, 2011).

implement the insights gained by the different surveyed branches of inquiry on the subject of Yiddish in the work of Celan. Advancements have indeed been made in the field of German-Yiddish dynamics in interwar Czernowitz using the tools of Contact-Linguistics; however, the object of research was the German-Jewish press, not literature or poetry. Similarly, development has also been made in the research on cross-lingual references in Celan's poetry; however, the studied references were mostly Hebrew, French or Spanish, but not Yiddish.

The methodological aim of the current study, therefore, is to combine these developments in order to locate, characterize and interpret the influence of Yiddish in Celan's writing. In other words, to apply the developments described in the previous section on the research object, using the relevant tools of inquiry from each discipline.

3.1. The Biographical Part

The biographical analysis will synthesize the relevant historical survey together with data primarily taken from Israel Chalfen's[31] and John Felstiner's biographies of Celan. The resulting synthesis of sources aims at a reevaluation of the role of Yiddish in the different stages of Celan's life. A better understanding of its role would form a well-defined conceptual and historical basis for the philological analysis at the heart of this thesis.

The dynamics of Yiddish within Celan's biography must be analyzed on two principal levels, that of the most intimate private sphere of family and friends, which is normally recognized as biography, and that of his surrounding society, which is normally recognized as history. In order to properly asses the presence of Yiddish or the lack thereof in Celan's biography, a critical approach to the existing biographical data must be taken. This approach incorporates the insights gained from the analysis of intellectual and cultural history to allow a critical analysis of the

31. Israel Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend* (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1979).

biographical data.

A critical approach to the biographical data entails the search for contradictions, similarities and dissimilarities in a juxtaposition of the raw biographical data, against its processed-analyzed form and against the historical analysis carried out in the digressions inside the biographical chapter. For example, the plausibility of assumptions made by the biographers as to the extent of Celan's knowledge of Yiddish, in reliance on sporadic or scarce evidence should be weighed against usual suspects, such as biographical raw-data pertaining to his dealings with Yiddish literati and intellectual acquaintances, the presence of Yiddish in the public sphere of Czernowitz and the ritual role it might have played in a tradition-oriented environment, such as the synagogue or Holiday festivities.

3.2. The Philological Part

First, the philological part consists of a general discussion of the chosen text, Celan's prose piece, *Gespräch im Gebirg*, followed by a preliminary discussion of the problem of language in the text. This discussion is based on the insights gained from the socio-linguistic research of Yiddish-German dynamics, the biographical and historical analysis, and research on Celan's text.

Next, the primary empirical section of this dissertation consists in the linguistic-philological analysis of *Gespräch im Gebirg*. The principle tools of linguistics used in the current research include a variety of methods and theoretical frameworks taken from the fields of Contact-Linguistics, Comparative Linguistics and Sociolinguistics (Inter-Cultural Linguistics). More specifically, the conceptual socio-linguistic framework incorporates the historical insights gained in the biographical part, along with the research done in the field of Germanic language contact, Yiddish as a contact language and classical Yiddish Linguistics.

With the use of these tools, the linguistic phenomena responsible for

the extraordinary lingual fabric of the story is uncovered and interpreted, on the morphological, syntactical and semantic levels. In order to allow for a conceptual reframing of the findings within a primary discussion, the analysis predominantly follows the chronology of the story, and is not organized according to linguistic classification. Furthermore, for the sake of brevity, the linguistic-philological analysis does not cover every instance of each discernible phenomenon, but focuses rather on specific cases-in-point for each phenomenon, on which the linguistic-philological discussion rests.

Lastly, a discussion of genre and intertextual references concludes the philological part. This discussion relies on traditional distinctions between literary genres, re-contextualized in lights of previous discussions, which join together a socio-linguistic insight (the oral propensity of Yiddish) with a biographical-historical insight (Celan's exposure to the rising oral tradition of Yiddish in interwar Czernowitz).

4. A Critical Assessment of Yiddish-German Dynamics in Paul Celan's Biography

4.1. Background: The (unheated) Controversy about Celan and Yiddish

From a biographical perspective, the research remains undecided in respect to the thin direct evidence about Celan's knowledge of and attitude toward Yiddish.

The controversy about Celan and Yiddish follows general disciplinary lines pertaining to views of the centrality and importance of Jewishness in his work. In this sense, the disagreement concerning the Jewish 'content' of Celan's oeuvre is similar to the scholarly and hermeneutical controversies concerning Kafka and other modern writers of Jewish descent who wrote in German while generally avoided explicit Jewish characters, themes and motifs. Whether Celan is perceived as a poet of Judaism (or rather, its extermination) writing in German, or conversely, as a German poet of modernity,—to take the two extreme views—, bears directly upon the scholarly attention given to the question of Yiddish.

A case in point: in his *Paul Celan: eine Biographie seiner Jugend* (1979), Israel Chalfen reports that Celan learned a few of Eliezer Shteynbarg's *meshólim*[32] by heart and even recited them on some social occasions.[33] The Czernowitz linguist and teacher, Chaim Ginniger, argues to the contrary, that he had never heard a word of Yiddish coming from Celan's mouth, and doubts whether Celan even liked Shteynbarg's fables.[34] This seems, however, to be the case of an avid Yiddishist talking from the depths of his purist love to the language. Ginniger was the proof-reader of the first edition of the fables, which was handed to Celan as a present for his

---

32. אליעזר שטיינבאַרג, **מעשאָלים** (טשערנאָוויץ: קאָמיטעט אַף אַרויסצוגעבן אליעזר שטיינבאַרגס שריפטן, 1932).

33. Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 47.

34. Ibid., 88.

twelfth birthday by his uncle.[35] Furthermore, Celan's recitation from the fables seems to be confirmed by a few witnesses. Interestingly enough, most witnesses relate to this occurrence as though it were a matter of anecdotal curiosity.[36]

This sort of lighthearted (at best) or superficial (at worst) attitude toward the Yiddish language and its cultural legacy is of course not uncommon among acculturated German-Jews of the time. It is the antithetical image of, and at least partly, the cause for Ginniger's grievance. In short, when asking whether and to what extent Celan knew Yiddish, one immediately enters a cultural minefield laden with starkly-opposing and politically-motivated possible answers. In a perfect yet unsurprising analogy to Marten-Finnis' contention, that the views about the prevalence of Yiddish in interwar Czernowitz range from "Niemand sprach Jiddisch in Czernowitz" to "Jeder sprach Jiddisch in Czernowitz",[37] so does the views regarding Celan and Yiddish range from "Paul sparch niemals jiddisch" to "[er hatte] die Sprache wie alle Bukowiner im Ohr"—only that in the cases of Celan, these two views originate from one and the same sentence.[38]

A critical re-assessment of the sources in this case would conclude that it is hardly conceivable for a person to be able to recite by heart a literary piece in a language so closely related to his mother-tongue, without at least acquiring some rudimentary working knowledge of it, especially when that person is known to have an immense talent for language acquisition,

35. Ibid., 46.
36. Chalfen reports about Celan's reciting from the fabels as a young boy in from of family and friends, and Ruth Lackner tells of his reciting as youn man. Cf. Ibid.
37. Marten-Finnis, „Wer Sprach Jiddisch in Czernowitz? Ein Ansatz Zur Erforschung Von Sozialen Und Situativen Faktoren Gemeinsamer Textrezeption.", 67.
38. Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 46.

like Celan indisputably had.[39]

This is not to say that the question about the place of Yiddish in Celan's life should not be raised; rather, it suggests that the answer should be excavated from and surmised by a comprehensive assessment of the available biographical and historical data and research. These would include such verified multiple reports of his recitation of Shteynbarg's fables; but, more importantly, they will include a consideration of familiar and societal ties affecting Celan in their relation to the rise of Yiddishism in interwar Czernowitz.

An assessment of Celan's familiarity with and attitude toward Yiddish would thus entail the following:

1) Assessment of the biographical data.
2) Assessment of the contemporary historical socio-lingual conditions.
3) Assessment of the relevance of (2) to (1).

This section will therefore follow the chronology of Celan's connection to Yiddish, but digress into the relevant cultural and socio-lingual history to enable a critical assessment of the biographical data.

4.2. 1920-1933: Childhood and Early Youth

4.2.1. The Role of German and Jewish Tradition in Celan's Childhood Years

There is no doubt that German was the *Mother*-tongue of Paul Celan, from more than one perspective. Celan's Mother not only endowed him

39. Consider, for example, the following qutoe from Marten-Finnis, and Winkler, „Location of Memory Versus Space of Communication: Presses, Languages, and Education Among Czernovitz Jews, 1918–1941.“, 40.: “The ethnic German Johann Schlamp reports that, after he had picked up Romanian at school, he had to acquire Polish when, in the mid-1920s, he started an apprenticeship with a Polish carpenter. Thereafter he learnt to speak Yiddish with his friends, as many of them were leftist-leaning Jews.” If acquiring the Yiddish language was possible for a German speaker with no Jewish background, one may assume it was all the more possible for a German speaker he was growing up in a Jewish environment. See the discussion ahead under “The Traditionalism in Religious Rite as an Avenue of Exposure to Yiddish” on page 24.

with the German language and its high appreciation, but also took great care for its cultivation by making sure only correct German was spoken, read and written at home.[40] The German language was unquestionably a motherly project in the Antschel Family.

There is also little doubt that in respect to his parents, a more traditional influence may only be found on his father's part. As often is the case with the interwar generation of acculturated Jews, the father marks the disruption in the transmission of the traditional Jewish culture. The rupture in the parent-child relationship regarding Jewish tradition seems almost as a text-book example in the case of Celan and his father. The father desires to equip his son with a considerable amount of tradition, but fails miserably due to his own lack of intimacy with that tradition and his son dislike of it. The strict Leo Antschel sends his 7 years-old son Paul to the Hebrew elementary school "Ssafa Iwriya" in an effort to provide him with some Hebrew and Zionist education; Paul, however, suffers for three whole years until he finally manages to escape.[41] He is completely alienated at this stage from the Jewish tradition, epitomized in his father's figure. At the other end, the figure of his mother stands for the German language and culture:

> [w]as ihm die hebräische Schule nicht gab, fand Paul zuhause bei seinen Kusinen. So lernte er "Die Bürgschaft" und "Das Lied von der Glocke" auswendig, noch bevor er diese Gedichte selbst lesen konnte.[42]

In the end Celan experiences his own 'Kafka-moment', as he breaks with his father at the age of fifteen. Bitter quarrels gradually give way to thundering silence and mutual reticence.[43] Without actually having to write a "Brief-an-den-Vater", the son frees himself from the shackles of the father and his accompanying tradition and—language. That language, if it were up to the will of his Zionism-inclined father, would have been Hebrew; if it were up to his father's own traditional background, that

---

40. Celan, *Gesammelte Werke in Fünf Bänden*, 40-41.
41. Ibid., 40.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid., 62.

language might have been Yiddish.[44] However, the wall of alienation erected by Paul, who by that time had started moving in left-winged circles, hindered any such possible influence. Besides deepening political differences, Chalfen also points out his father's strict educational attitude as a cause for the complete detachment from the father.[45]

These accounts are indeed consistent with the evidence on Celan's early childhood years. Nevertheless, they leave out the social and cultural developments of the period and the realities of Jewish existence in interwar Czernowitz, and their possible influence on Celan.

4.2.2. The Traditionalism in Religious Rite as an Avenue of Exposure to Yiddish

One of the better-known peculiarities of the acculturated middle-class Jews in Bukovian, in comparison to their counterparts in Germany, was their relative religious traditionalism, persisting well into the 20th century.[46] Even the 'secularized' Jews of Czernowitz were not "High Holiday Jews" like their German brethren, who used to visit the synagogue but thrice a year. They observed a considerably wider repertoire of religious practices such as regularly attending customary synagogue service for Thora reading and liturgical concerts. In a paraphrase on Gerschom Scholem's (in)famous anecdote, it was not socially acceptable to light one's finest cigar with fire form the Shabbat candles.

Liturgy and religious service is where an acculturated *Bildungs*-Jew would normally encounter Hebrew. But at the same time it serves as a secondary point of encounter with Yiddish, because traditional Ashkenazi

---

44. Edouard Roditi argues that Celan's father "often spoke Yiddish", however without indicating whether he relies on his private encounters with Celan or on other source. See Roditi, „Paul Celan and the Cult of Personality.", 13.
45. Celan, *Gesammelte Werke in Fünf Bänden*, 36.
46. This phenomena might be motivated by a comparatively tolerant religious environment, in itself a result of the Bukovina's pluralistic ethnic makeup. Such motivations do not exclude each other and by any account they have no bearing on the lingual outcome, which was a greater and more frequent contact with Yiddish.

liturgical texts such, as Chumesh with Rashi and prayer books contain commentaries in Yiddish throughout.[47] Moreover, the non-Germanized Ashkenazi religious ceremony is entirety drenched with Yiddish, most conspicuously with folk songs to signify the beginning and end of the Shabbat and holidays. This form of 'informal' or folk liturgy, now quite fittingly referred to commonly as 'Yiddishkeit', is a persistent component of traditionalism preserving specific lingual traits.

Another contributing factor to the persistence of Yiddish in the province, not unrelated to the former one, was the presence of three important Hasidic courts in northern Bukovina—Vizhnitz, Boyan and Sadagora—the last of which neighboring the capital. These courts exerted their influence on the Jewish lower class, maintaining a strong following for Hasidism in the province.[48] Hasidism championed the use of Yiddish in practically all aspects of life and legitimized it religiously and culturally in many ways and for a host of different reasons, whose detailed discussion is beyond the scope of this chapter. Suffice it to note at this stage that the movement's promotion of Yiddish not only ensured its perseverance as a lingual stronghold in face of Germanization, but also served as a precursor to a fundamental change in language politics that will have been aspired by the Yiddishists at the Czernowitz-Conference of 1908.

Celan had family ties with Hasidism: his mother's side of the family was

---

47. The history of the Jewish Germanization of these texts is of great significance as both a source of change and conservatism. Starting with Mendelssohn's great project of Pentateuch translation, the *B'iur* (1783), the Maskilim tried to "better" their brethern's deprived language introducing them into 'proper' High German, while trying to remain amply accessible for the wide public. This resulted in compromises being made, like printing German using the Hebrew script, which at the time seemed to trade lingual purity in the service of the greater cause of promoting progressiveness. However, since liturgy and religious texts exhibit a natural conservative tendency, resulting in almost identical editions being printed and used over the course more than a century, they end up having an atavistic affect. For an acculturated Czernowitz Jew born in the 1920s, reading Mendelssohn's German in the Hebrew alphabet must have seemed and felt like a encountering relics of a bygone Jewish society. Alternatively, it illustrated the lingual and cultural connection to the Yiddish co-religionists.

48. שערי, **יהודי בוקובינה בין שתי מלחמות העולם**, 30-226.

originally from Sadagura, a fact which will later play a role in his interest in Hasidism after the war. Celan's family exhibited the same religious behavior described above: they were not orthodox, but they attended the synagogue on important event, practiced the dietary rules, lit the Shabbat candles and so on.[49] Celan's grandfathers, however, were both orthodox[50]: His grandfather on the father's side, Wolf Teitler, the more traditional of the two, lived together with the Ancel family until his death in 1924. Although old and sick by that time,[51] it is certainly conceivable that the young Paul was exposed to the Yiddish of his grandfather during those critical years for language acquisition. At his grandfather on the mother's side, Philipp-Schraga, the family used to dine on Shabbat evening and perform the rites of the Havdalah[52], including the traditional singing. Although Chalfen does not state the language of those songs, one can safely assume it was Hebrew and Yiddish, as customary in the eastern European Jewish communities.

These wider family relations to tradition and the conservatism of the Jewish communities of Bukovina and Czernowitz, including his own, were most probably a significant source of exposure to Yiddish for the young Celan. More importantly, this avenue of influence underscores that multilingual exposure in an environment as polyglot as Czernowitz of the time is inevitable. Despite the obvious primacy of a mother-tongue, no language exists in a social void. The next section, therefore characterizes the complex socio-linguistics of interwar Czernowitz and its possible influence on Celan's early upbringing.

4.2.3. The Comlex Socio-linguistics of interwar Czernowtiz

Two conflicting representations concerning language prevail in the historical accounts and memoirs of twentieth-century Czernowitz: on the

---

49. Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 34.
50. Ibid., 31.
51. Ibid., 37.
52. Ibid., 41.

one hand, a naive multi-cultural and multilingual idyll, where the streets are equally filled by the sounds of Romanian, Ruthenian, German and Yiddish; on the other hand, a naive Habsburgian idyll, where all nations and ethnicities are culturally and lingually united under German dominance in a vision of Czernowitz as a *klein Wien*.[53]

4.2.3.1. On the Eve of WW1

In reality, the lingual situation in the province of Bukovina and in its capital, Czernowitz, was already complicated before the First World War, despite continuing efforts of Germanizations on the side of the Austrian authorities; in the interwar period, with the annexation of the province to the Romanian state, that situation became even more complicated. First of all, the huge geographical variation between the city of Czernowitz (and to lesser extent Radautz and Suczawa)[54] and the rest of the province, which was essentially countryside, must be noted: whereas in Czernowitz the German language did attain a certain status of a local lingua franca, in the countryside lingual dominance was varied and mostly dependent on ethnical dominance.[55]

Nevertheless, one can roughly distinguish between a number of lingual groups divided along social and ethnic lines.[56]

1) Jewish urban bourgeoisie, most notably that of Czernowitz—conducted most forms of communication in German, both internally and externally (with the exception of religious rite and liturgy).

2) Ethnic German, composed mostly of rural population—conducted its activities in German but was demographically and economically marginal in the province.

3) Ethnic Romanians—lingual patterns ranged from

---

53. Marianne Hirsch, and Leo Spitzer, *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), XII-XIV.

54. שערי, **יהודי בוקובינה בין שתי מלחמות העולם**, 86-173.

55. Ibid., 54-65.

56. Cf. Stiehler, „Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens.“, 116.

monolingual use of Romanian in the rural areas to diglossic use of Romanian and German in the urban areas (Romanian internally, German externally).

4) Ethnic Ruthenians—lingual patterns ranged from monolingual use of Ruthenian in the rural areas to diglossic use of Ruthenian and German in the urban areas (Ruthenian internally, German externally)

5) Lower class Jewish population—lingual patterns ranged from monolingual use of Yiddish in the rural (mostly Hasidic) areas[57] to diglossic use of Yiddish and German (Ruthenian internally, German externally) in the urban areas (including proletarians and Yiddishists).

On the eve of WW1 German did hold primary sway in the cities as the language of economic activity, most notably that of commerce, which is, after all, the language of the street. This is not surprising, considering the strong necessary ties between the commercial, administrative and legal spheres, all of which were essentially German either by imposition of the Austrian authorities or by the lingual identity of the dominant group active in these activities—the Jewish bourgeoisie.[58] This situation supports the common view that the language Celan was inclined to hear on the streets of urban Czernowitz was in fact German.

Yet even inside Czernowitz the lingual situation was highly complicated. One could indeed hear all four languages, German, Romanian, Ruthenian and Yiddish on the streets, only in varying frequencies on different streets in different parts of town. Generally speaking, the more affluent the neighborhood, the more German is heard. A common distinction draws a lingual boundary between the German-speaking, bourgeois *Oberstadt* and the Yiddish-speaking proletarian

57. Hirsch, and Spitzer, *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory*, 91.
58. See Stiehler, „Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens.“, 116.

Unterstadt.[59]

4.2.3.2. The Interwar Period: Romanization and Rise of Yiddish

After the First World War, with the annexation of the province to the newly-formed Great Romania and with ensuing Romanization, the dominance of German was directly challenged and targeted by the Romanian authorities. The most evident and indeed momentous result was the change of the primary language of teaching in the state education system from German to Romanian. The Romanian authorities also tried to push German out of the public sphere, resorting to the usual course of action in such cases, including imposing regulations of signs and renaming institutions, buildings, streets and public squares.[60]

From a socio-linguistic perspective, the Jews, in particular the wealthier German-speaking bourgeoisie, were most badly influenced from the efforts of Romanization. Many of the older generation of clerks and teachers who were unable to quickly master the Romanian language to a satisfactory degree were relieved of their duties. For the younger generation, that of pupils like Paul Celan, this meant the necessary and mostly successful acquisition of yet another language. Yet any advantage the German-speaking Jews may have thus far enjoyed from their association with the once dominant culture and administration of the Habsburgs was now gone, if not completely turned against them. Of course, inasmuch as the institutions, businesses, press and culture in the city of Czernowitz still remained under the direct ownership or leadership of affluent German-speaking Jews, so did the streets of downtown

---

59. See, for instance, Marten-Finnis, and Winkler, „Location of Memory Versus Space of Communication: Presses, Languages, and Education Among Czernovitz Jews, 1918–1941.“, 44.
60. Other severe measures of coerced Romanization taken by the authorities such as numerus clausus on ethnic base are not discussed here, as they do not pertain directly to the socio-linguistic discussion. See Stiehler, „Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens.“, 118-20.

Czernowitz remain German to a degree, the wishes of the new rulers notwithstanding. However, German was clearly losing ground even among the Jewish community, which had based its entire *Sitz im Leben* on the premises of the German language's superior status as *Kultursprache*.

Ironically, among the Jewish lingual groups, the one to benefit from the decline in the status of German brought on by the new regime was the Yiddish language. Ever since the Czernowitz Yiddish Language Conference in 1908, Yiddishism, that is, the ideology promoting the use of Yiddish among the Jews as a national language in all aspects of life and its literary cultivation, and Yiddish were on the rise in the city. First of all, the Conference had a tangible long-lasting influence on the Yiddishist cause in Czernowitz in the form of families of leading intellectuals of the movement who arrived at the city on the occasion of the conference and settled there, such as the Birnmaum,[61] Schaechter and Taubes[62] families. Such representatives with zealous dedication to the political and cultural promotion of Yiddish began to occupy important space within the intellectual, cultural and lingual landscape of Jewish Czernowtiz, laying the foundation for a Yiddish literary scene in the city. The political turmoil of the interwar period along with the ever increasing stream of Yiddish-speaking Jewish immigrants from Ukraine, Galicia and Moldova and other parts of Great Romania,[63] contributed its share of vitality to the Yiddish scene in Czernowitz, which like elsewhere exhibited a strong leftist leaning, be it Communism, Bundism or Territorialism. This political uproar gave rise to a boom in the ephemeral publishing in Yiddish manifest in a host of political organs as well as the independent press.

As a rule, it is customary for research on journalism and press in Bukovina to state that the Jewish landscape, which was the most widely

---

61. Joshua A Fogel, and Keith Weiser, *Czernowitz At 100: The First Yiddish Language Conference in Historical Perspective* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2010), 182.

62. יחיאל שנײַד, "זכרונות און בריוו—אַ קאפיטעלע גאַליציע." **ייִוואָ בלעטער** 40 (1956), 180.; מתתיהו מינץ, "ציוניסטן און פועלי־ציוניסטן אויף דער טשערנאָוויצער שפּראַך־קאָנפֿערענץ." **ייִוואָ בלעטער** 46 (1991), 96.

63. See Stiehler, „Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens.", 118.

developed among the different ethnic groups in the province, was dominated almost entirely by the German language. However, Marten-Finnis argues that Yiddish played a much more central role in the province, relying on a survey of ephemeral publications and direct evidence by contemporary witnesses.[64] The Yiddish press culminated in 1928 with a record high of Yiddish readership and publications.[65]

The coerced retreat of German in the face of Romanization assisted in the promulgation of Yiddish outside of the traditional Jewish circles such as the Hasidic rural hinterland and the proletarian parts of town. Most notably, however, was the opportunity for Yiddish in the field of education created by the crisis in the state education system, caused by the change in the language of teaching. Institutionally, 1919 saw the establishment of the Tshernovitser Yidisher Shulfareyn (טשערנאָוויצער ייִדישער שולפאַראיין), which was a cultural hub responsible for a host of activities: complementary language instruction of Yiddish and night school as well as literary activities such as lectures, teachers' seminars, printing and stage performances.[66] The Shulfareyn also organized a Yiddish summer-camp held at rural Bukovina.[67] This further diversified the educational opportunities offered as part of the politically laden Jewish *Sprachkampf*. Families could send their children to a Zionist Hebrew school and summer camp, run by the Safa-Ivria school or to a Bundist/Territorialist Yiddish school and camp run by the Shulfareyn. Some families experimented with both.[68]

Consequently, Czernowitz was starting to form a significant center for

---

64. Marten-Finnis, and Winkler, „Location of Memory Versus Space of Communication: Presses, Languages, and Education Among Czernovitz Jews, 1918–1941.", 40.; Marten-Finnis, „Wer Sprach Jiddisch in Czernowitz? Ein Ansatz Zur Erforschung Von Sozialen Und Situativen Faktoren Gemeinsamer Textrezeption.", 67-68.
65. Ibid., 68.
66. On the history and significance of the Shulfareyn, see: שערי, **יהודי בוקובינה בין שתי מלחמות**, **העולם**, 242-44.
67. Hirsch, and Spitzer, *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory*, 46, 83.
68. Ibid., 83.

Yiddish: established and aspiring stars of Yiddish, such as Eliezer Stheynbarg, Itzik Manger, Sholyme Bikl and Shmuel Abe Soifer became involved in the emerging ephemeral, literary and educational Yiddish scene in the city, either by writing, editing, teaching and printing or by moving to Czernowitz. The key figure settling in Czernowitz (in 1919), thus facilitating many of the activities of Shulfareyn and embodying the rise of Yiddish in interwar Czernowitz is indeed Eliezer Stheynbarg, whose influential book of fables, the *mesholim*, will be later discussed in direct reference to Celan.

Finally, it should be noted, that the flourishing of Yiddish in interwar Bukovina was as noticeable in the performing arts as much as it was in the literature and press, if not more. In fact, most memoirists and chroniclers of the period recall their Yiddish experience of the period though the exposure to performance in Yiddish. More specifically, the art of dramatic reading in Yiddish went through a renaissance in interwar Czernowitz, bringing to the fore reciters such as Leibu Levin, Herts Grosbard, Yehuda Eren-Ehrenkranz and Bruno Schrager. Fables and recitations have closely related traditions, especially in the context of Yiddish. This genre will be likewise later discussed in direct reference to Celan.

In fact, Czernowitz, "the city where books and people lived" (to quote Celan famous dictum), produced no less performers and singers than writers and poets. It was Czernowitz, which brought word, voice and tune together in a way that might be called a 'textual-oral meridian' (to paraphrase yet another of Celan's idioms), which produced Josef Schmidt, the man with the song that went around the world, made Sore Birkenthal into Sidi Tal, a world renown star of the Yiddish theater and turned Itzik Manger into a hit-song producer.

All this had the effect of making Yiddish more frequent and more socially acceptable. Yiddish started to be heard more frequently on the street, became more visible on the news stands and heard as well as seen in the concert halls of the *Oberstadt*.

4.2.3.3. "Czernowitzer-Deutsch": The German Idiom of Czernowitz

After establishing the existence of potentially-significant avenues of direct exposure to Yiddish in Celan's early childhood, the indirect influence of Yiddish through the local German idiom of Czernowitz should be examined.

What kind of German, then, Celan heard on streets of Czernowitz in the interwar years?

Despite a clear linguistic awareness to the non-Standard character of the Bukovinian idiom of German, as evident among other things by its endonyms *Buko-Wienerisch*[69] or *Ki(e)gldeutsch*,[70] there is relatively little systematic research on the subject.[71] The main source of reference is still the highly didactic booklet published by Theodor Gartner in 1901, *Bukowiner Deutsch. Fehler und Eigenthümlichkeiten in der deutschen Verkehrs- und Schriftsprache der Bukowina*.[72] As immediately apparent from the title, the booklet adopts a highly critical puristic stance toward the unique characteristics of the idiom, not a scientific one by today's standards. Nonetheless, it records some linguistic information valuable for empirical research, as shown by Kurt Rein in his research on the matter.[73] Rein also conducted empirical field research in the from of eleven interviews with German-speaking Jews from Czernowtiz living in Tel Aviv,[74] which

---

69. Kurt Rein, "Welches Deutsch Spricht Man in Wien, Welches in Czernowitz?," in *Stimmen Aus Jerusalem*, ed. Hermann Zabel (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2006), 114.; Hirsch, and Spitzer, *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory*, 96.

70. אלכסנדר שפיגלבלט, **פינות כחולות: איציק מאנגר - חיים, שיר ובלדה** (ירושלים: כרמל, 2009), 20-24.

71. Nagy, „Deutsch-Jiddischer Sprachenkontakt Am Beispiel Der Czernowitzer Deutsch-Jüdischen Presse Der 1930-Er Jahre.", 21.

72. Theodor Gartner, *Bukowiner Deutsch. Fehler Und Eigenthümlichkeiten in Der Deutschen Verkehrs- Und Schriftsprache Der Bukowina* (Vienna: Deutscher Sprachverein Zweigverein Bukovina, 1901).

73. Nagy, „Deutsch-Jiddischer Sprachenkontakt Am Beispiel Der Czernowitzer Deutsch-Jüdischen Presse Der 1930-Er Jahre.", 23.

74. Kurt Rein, "Das Czernowitzer Deutsch," *Kaindl-Archiv. Zeitschrift des Bukowina- Instituts für den Kulturaustausch mit den Völkern Mittel- und Osteuropas* 23(1995).

affirmed the authenticity of the phenomena described by Gartner.

Three main factors determine the unique characteristics of the German language in the Bukovina: (1) Geographically, its status as a "language island" detached from the German mainland; (2) Dialectologically, its Standard German origin in the official Austrian language (*Amtssprache*) and its colloquial origin in the south-German dialect region; (3) The polyglot surrounding environment.

From the perspective of historical linguistics, the German language in the province is considered a "language island", in that it is an exclave of German surround by other languages and geographically detached from the dialectological continuum of German. The immediate lingual environment is distinctively polyglot, including Romanian, Ruthenian and Yiddish. Furthermore, even the existence of the Bukovinan German as the Standard Language for administration, culture and literature in the Habsburg era is in fact disconnected from the geographical German continuum. This situation culminated after the disintegration of the Habsburg empire in 1914 and the later onset of Romanization, whereby the Bukovinian German continued its existence as a relic now detached from its lingual sources, not only geographically, but also temporally.

Kurt Rein enumerates some of the key linguistic characteristics of the Czernowitz-German originating in the south-German dialect region. Such lingual elements typically found their way into local variants through the influence of the Viennese dialect, so fondly imitated across the entire Habsburg empire. In the case of Bukovina and particularly that of Czernowitz, this lingual imitation was part of a wider cultural imitation, aspiring to reach capital's halo—hence the local endonym *Buko-Wiener* and *Buko-Wieberisch*. Phonetically, this included unrounding of umlauts (~"*Scheenes* Wetter" instead of 'Schön'); Morphologically, relics of the bavarian dual-plural following the pronoun 'ihr' (ö)s ("ihr kennts"); Lexically, 'Austriacisms' of the administrative ("*Jänner", "Feber"*) as well as from the cuisine ("*Paradeiser*") and day-to-day ("Tramway") language

abound.[75]

The influence of co-territorial languages is most evident in the lexicon: many Hebraisms entered the common language through Yiddish, although whether some are unique to Bukovina (*ponem verlieren* as in "Gesicht verlieren" via Yiddish 'פנים') or more frequently used than in other variants of German (as in the case of *mischpoche*) requires further research.[76] What is clearly unique, however, to the local idiom of German spoken in Bukovina is an extensive use of expressive particles and intensifies otherwise unattested in German: the word *táki,* which acts as an intensifier bearing the meaning "really", comes from Ruthenian but is also completely neutralized in Yiddish ('טאַקע');[77] *ahi* is used to express deep wonder and bewilderment;[78] *joi* is used according to context to express surprise or startle, or sympathy, also verbalized as *joijen*;[79] Alexander Shpiglblat adds the interesting *aberwo* to the mix, suggesting it is built on the model of 'aber ja/nein'. He brings an example from Itzik Manger's use of this word with the meaning of 'no way!' or 'God forbid'[80]; Gartner's *Bukowiner Deutsch* also mentions under 'bad words' the (Yiddish) particle *anu* in the sense of German "nun",[81] which is also attested in satiric texts depicting the Bukovinian German idiom.[82] Lastly, Rein also notes the non-Standard extensive use of the reflexive form in certain verbs, usually

---

75. Rein, „Welches Deutsch Spricht Man in Wien, Welches in Czernowitz?", 114.

76. Cf. Ibid. with Heidi Stern, *Wörterbuch Zum Jiddischen Lehnwortschatz in Den Deutschen Dialekten* (Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2000), 163.

77. Rein does not seem to consider the possibility that taki entered the local German through Yiddish. Cf. Rein, „Welches Deutsch Spricht Man in Wien, Welches in Czernowitz?", 114.

78. Ibid., 115. in contrast to the former taki, claims an Yiddish origin for this word, although its originally from Ruthenian. (Cf. Bukowiner Deutsch, 16 and Nagy, „Deutsch-Jiddischer Sprachenkontakt Am Beispiel Der Czernowitzer Deutsch-Jüdischen Presse Der 1930-Er Jahre.", 111-12.

79. Gartner, *Bukowiner Deutsch. Fehler Und Eigenthümlichkeiten in Der Deutschen Verkehrs- Und Schriftsprache Der Bukowina*, 115.; Ibid., 16.

80. שפיגלבלט, **פינות כחולות: איציק מאנגר - חיים, שיר ובלדה**, 22-23.

81. See Gartner, *Bukowiner Deutsch. Fehler Und Eigenthümlichkeiten in Der Deutschen Verkehrs- Und Schriftsprache Der Bukowina*, 16.

82. Quoted by 23-24 ,**פינות כחולות: איציק מאנגר - חיים, שיר ובלדה**, שפיגלבלט.

expressing a semantic change under the influence of co-territorial languages (*sich spielen* Yiddish ~'זיך שפילן').[83]

The contributions by Kurt Rein do not employ, however, a Contact-Linguistics point of view. In her recent Ph.D. dissertation from and ensuing publications, Ágota Kinga Nagy systematically employs exactly this method in analyzing Yiddish-German language-contact on the German-Jewish press in Czernowitz of the 1930s, thus acquiring further linguistic insight into the characteristics of the Bukovinian German.[84] Her findings clearly suggest a much more pervasive presence of Yiddish elements in the German spoken by the Jewish population of Czernowitz, in all branches of linguistic phenomena—be it lexical, semantic or morphological. Consider the following examples taken from the German-Jewish press of the time:

> Der ***Chammer*** hat mich im Stich gelassen, er ist vor zwei Wochen gestorben.[85]
> Wer uns ***benebbicht*** und betrauert[86]
> ich will vom Kelch des ***Kowedʒ*** nippen[87]
> Mädchen aus gutem, ***bekowedten*** Haus[88]

The journalistic nature of these sources indicates it was intelligible to a wide readership. Significant literary evidence recording the local (inner-Jewish) speech, although more stylized in nature, manifests an even more consistent admixture of Yiddishisms, which may amount to a *Mischsprache*, a hybrid language of Standard High German and Yiddish. Ironically, the fault of lingual hybridity is the classic accusation raised against Yiddish by non-Jews and acculturated Jews alike.[89]

Thus, a fourth (4) factor in determining the unique characteristics of

---

83. Rein, „Welches Deutsch Spricht Man in Wien, Welches in Czernowitz?", 115.
84. Nagy, „Deutsch-Jiddischer Sprachenkontakt Am Beispiel Der Czernowitzer Deutsch-Jüdischen Presse Der 1930-Er Jahre."
85. Ibid., 75.
86. Ibid., 86.
87. Ibid., 75.
88. Ibid., 52.
89. Consider, for instance, the works of Otto Seidmann, Menschen, Masken und Marionetten (1957).

the Bukovinian idiom may be added to the three already noted above: the fact that the cultivation and promotion of the German language in the province was first and foremost a Jewish undertaking[90] heavily influenced the character of the idiom. This is crucial because the standard bearers of language at the time, the press and literature, were mostly in Jewish hands. Consequently, this gave rise to a paradox: on the one hand, the didactic-corrective purist drive toward the German language, as known ever since Mendelssohn's time and as clearly reflected in the nature of lingual cultivation experienced by Celan at home, was at work; on the other hand, however, a close affinity to the ever-growing Yiddish-speaking community, conditioned by the traditionalism of the German-speaking Jews, counteracted the lingual purism so typical of the *Bildungsjudentum*. In other words, exactly because Jews were 'in charge' of German in the province, the influence of Yiddish was more leniently legitimized. After all, when a Jew from Czernowitz was talking in German, his interlocutor was probably a Jew as well. If both sides to such a conversation combined many Yiddishisms in their speech, then that speech was to become the standard bearer of the local idiom.

This paradox explains the existence of two different endonyms for the local German idiom: *Buko-Wienerisch* represents the outwardly-looking aspirations of the Jewish bourgeoisie to form a language in the image of their cultural Mecca, Vienna; *Ki(e)geldeutsch*, conversely, represents an inwardly-looking, more realistic but also more reconciling appreciation of that inner-Jewish idiom. Therefore, the name *Ki(e)geldeutsch* is an embodiment of the idiom's hybridity—linguistically, as a hybrid composite of Yiddish *Kiegel* and the German endonym *Deutsch*, and figuratively, because *Kiegel* is a metaphor for Jewishness, being a distinctively Jewish dish, and for lingual hybridity, echoed in the entanglement of the noodles.

To summarize this point: in stark contrast to the hyper-correctness of

90. Stiehler, „Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens.", 116.

his motherly lingual upbringing, which strove for a 'pure' High German, on the streets of Czernowitz Celan heard a German idiom which exhibited the strong influence of co-territorial languages, but most pervasively that of Yiddish, even in the most acculturated bourgeoisie surroundings of the *Oberstadt*.

4.2.4. The Confrontation with the Teacher Zoppa

Finally, a report of an incident from Celan's early youth sheds an interesting, perhaps revealing light on the subject, suggesting a certain early familiarity, at least with the ideals of Yiddishism, if not with Yiddish literature per se.

Chalfen brings a report by one of Celan's classmates, Yitzhak Alpan, recounting a confrontation between the young Celan and his Romanina Geography teacher, Zoppa, that took place in class. Zoppa, who was well-known in Czernowitz as an ardent anti-Semite and pro-fascist political activist, had on one occasion mocked the Jewish 'Jargon' in front of his class. Celan is reported to have stood by the side of the ridiculed language, saying in response that:

> in jiddischer Sprache gibt es eine wertvolle Literatur, und große Werke der Weltliteratur, ja sogar die Shakespeares, sind in diese Sprache übersetzet worden![91]

This reaction implies a certain positive opinion of Yiddish as a language worthy of cultivated literature. It is all the more surprising coming from a thirteen year-old who was raised on the guiding socio-lingual principles of German as the *Kultursprache*.

To summarize, even though Celan was raised in light of the cultural premises of traditional *Bildungsjudentum*, and remained for years under his mother's strong influence, it is quite safe to assume he was amply exposed to Yiddish as a young boy, either by encountering it directly on the streets of Czernowitz, where it had become increasingly more common and

91. Qutoed by Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 52.

socially acceptable in the interwar years, or in wider circles of the family and in liturgical and religious contexts; or by encountering it indirectly, inscribed in the local variant of German, whose 'bad influence' his mother aspired to offset with hyper-corrective High German. The incident in which he defended the cultural value of Yiddish in the face of the teacher's mockery testifies to an early appreciation of the language, inconsistent with traditional derogatory views of the language shared both by anti-Semitic Germans and by German-speaking Jews.

4.3. 1934-1940: Youth up to the Holocaust

The second period to be examined here marks Celan's deeper exposure to Yiddish as a cultivated literary language. While evidence to his youthful preoccupation with other non-German literature abound, particularly with French literature, the reports concerning his dealing with Yiddish literature falter remarkably, especially given his close relations with some of the most prominent promoters and champions of Yiddish culture in Czernowtiz.

4.3.1. The Influence of Bruno Schrager and the Yiddish-Reciters of Czernowitz

The relationship with his uncle Bruno Schrager appears to be one of the most crucial and influential in regard to Yiddish in Celan's life. It is, at any rate, the best documented among such relationships.

Bruno Schrager had aspired to become an actor but due to his father's objection had to settle for artistic recitation in Yiddish and German.[92] The figure of Schrager rises up every time Celan forms a contact with Yiddish: It is Schrager who presented him with the gift of Steinbarg's *meshólim* on the occasion of his twelfth birthday, as well as introduced him to the world of Yiddish theater and the bilingual art of professional literary recitation.[93]

---

92. Ibid., 32.
93. Ibid., 46, 70.

In 1937, at the age of seventeen, Celan encounters a second professional reciter, Jehuda Eren-Ehrenkranz, who used to give recitals in Yiddish and German in the student dormitories, at the same time that Celan's started to show increasing interest in the theater.[94]

Three years later, in 1940, Celan would meet a third professional reciter, Leibu Levin, who also performed in Yiddish as well as German. These literary acquaintances from the world of performance seem to have function as Celan's gateway to the Yiddishist scene in interwar Czernowitz. The predominance of this avant-garde, somewhat unusual literary genre, as well as its salient multilingualism, entail a wider examination of the phenomenon.

4.3.2. The Art of Yiddish-Recitation in interwar Czernowitz

As noticed earlier, the flourishing of Yiddish in interwar Bukovina was as noticeable in the performing arts as much as it was in the literature and press. More specifically, the art of dramatic reading went through a renaissance in interwar Czernowitz, bringing to the fore reciters such as Leibu Levin, Herts Grosbard, Yehuda Eren-Ehrenkranz (himself a descendent of Velvel Zbarzher) and Bruno Schrager.[95]

There is a strong connection between the literary genres that came to represent Czernowitz in the Yiddish tradition, Itzik Manger's ballades and Eliezer Shteynbarg's fables, and its representative art of dramatic reading: Fables and recitations have closely related traditions, especially in the context of Yiddish. This will be later discussed in detail in the philological part of this thesis. However, two observations should be made at this stage: firstly, most, if not all, of these dramatic readers practiced their profession bilingually, in German and in Yiddish, some even trilingually, adding Hebrew to the mix; secondly, the crossing traditions of recitation and fables, that is, of modern and pre-modern parables, come together in

---

94. Ibid., 70.

95. שערי, **יהודי בוקובינה בין שתי מלחמות העולם**, 248.

the biography of Paul Celan to form the most direct and best attested avenue of influence on his persona vis-a-vis Yiddish. Celan's familiarity with Shteynbarg's *meshólim* and with many of the reciters are closely interwoven. This socio-lingual alignment of public and personal cultural spheres requires a historical digression to the roots of this phenomenon.

The modern Yiddish theater is historically related to the region which is now a part of Moldova, Ukraine and Romania, encompassing parts of interwar Bukovina. The theater is probably the only branch of literature in the nineteenth-century Yiddish renaissance that can call Romania its cradle, rather than Poland or Russia.[96] It was in the Romanian town of Iași, some 200km south-east to Czernowitz, that Avrom Goldfadn (1840–1908) established in 1876 what is now widely considered the first modern Yiddish theater. Goldfadn's conversion from short-lived attempts at writing for non-performing purposes into the world of theater is closely and personally related to tradition emanating directly from Czernowitz: his encounter with the leading Yiddish singer-performers of his time, Berl Broder and his 'Singers' group, and with Velvel Zbarzher (1823/26–1883) are considered most decisive in turning Goldfadn's creative energy to the theater, ultimately earning him the title 'father of the Yiddish theater'.

The latter of those singers who re-invented the tradition of *badkhonim*, the wedding jesters, and *meshorerim*, singers in a cantor's choir, Vevel Zbarzher, fondly titled 'the jewish troubadour', won his fame only after moving from the Yiddish hinterland of Galicia to the more liberal and open Czernowitz, where he gained great success among the local Jews. The same Velvel Zbarzher, born Benjamin Wolf Ehrenkranz, became deeply rooted in the local Yiddish tradition and finally mythologized in the works of another Czernowitzer 'troubadour', this time the poet, Itzik Manger. Manger's poem cycle on Zbarzher[97] relates in turn to this

---

96. Elvira Grozinger, "The Socialist Hero of the State Theaters in Poland and Romania? A Chapter in the History of Yiddish Theater, in Memory of Abraham Goldfaden (1840-1908)," *Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia* 7(2009), 79.

97. איציק מאַנגער, **וועלוול זבארזשער שרייבט בריוו צו מלכה׳לע דער שיינער** (ווארשע: א"ב צעראטא, 1937).

tradition in more than one way: it eulogizes the latter's status as a traveling writer-performer and embodies the very same tradition by becoming one of Manger's most popular composed poems — first set to music by a fellow Czernowtizer Yiddishist in 1936, Leibu Levin.[98]

In 1928, on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Czerwnowitz Conference, Herts Grosbard visited Czernowtiz together with other Yiddish cultural figures. Grossbard was a member of the modernist Vilna Yiddish theater group, the famous "Vilna trupe." During his visit to Czernowitz he held a recital celebrating the Conference anniversary in which he recited from Itzik Manger poems and from Shtynbarg's *meschlim*. This event would later bring the successful actor to launch a second career as a dramatic reciter, which included many recordings that made him famous for his "word concerts".[99] As observed, the unique characteristics of the Yiddish cultural landscape in Czernowitz of the time, bore an 'oral orientation,' which produced texts that naturally lend themselves to composing and musical arrangement tied together with an equally strong tendency to vocalize and stage the otherwise less widely-accessible written literary Yiddish. It is almost natural, therefore, that a Yiddish actor would stage the texts of those Czernowitz literati in the very same city where this tradition has had long roots connecting literary texts with music and drama. Just like Velvel Zbarzher at his time, whose singing career flourished only after coming to Czernowitz, so in the case of Herts Grossbard, the otherwise culturally insignificant Czernowtiz for the world of Yiddish served as a launch pad for a literary-stage career befitting its image. This tradition became more and more identified with Czernowitz. Grossbard was joined by Leibu Levin himself a composer, performer and professional reciter, and other reciters like Yehuda Eren-Ehrenkranz and Celan's uncle, Bruno Schrager.

---

98. Private correspondece with his daughter, Ruth Levin.
99. David G Roskies, "Call it Jewspeak: On the Evolution of Speech in Modern Yiddish Writing," *Poetics Today* 35, no. 3 (2014), 272-73.

This lineage drawn from Zbarzher over Goldfadn up to Manger and Leibu Levin is an indication for the profound connection between the Yiddish traditions of oral performance and written literature in Czernowitz. When considering interwar Czernowtiz, these cannot be set apart from one another, a fact heavily influential in Celan's contacts with Yiddish and important for the philological discussion in this dissertation. This is manifest in almost every aspect of literary creation and cultural activity pursued in the flourishing times of Yiddish in interwar Bukovina. Every mode of literary production is literally attuned toward oral performance, be it reciting, dramatic staging or singing, in what might be termed here a distinct 'oral orientation'.

Elieser Shteynbarg's *mesholim* are the obvious case in point, both for their immense popularity as well as their effect on Celan. The fables are meant for reciting and indeed were constantly performed in familial as well as public settings, such as the Yiddish summer camps of the Shulferayn. These facilitated a form of accessibility without giving up artistic aspiration—the *mesholim* are a multi-layered, complicated work of modern art. Manger's ballads function in a similar way, sometimes replacing recitation with music: on the one hand, thanks to their pseudo-folkish style they are easily set to music, while on the other hand they are multi-layered and ambitious works of art.

The Shulfareyn's activities in the realm of the performing arts included the Children theater, among whose members one finds the famous singer Josef Schmidt, who toured Europe to a great success during the interwar years. If the dramatic talents were widely cultivated through theater groups, then the singing tradition was clearly cultivated through the cantorial tradition of the synagogues. Josef Schmidt attended the children theater group of the Shulferayn ("Stheynbarg's children theater"), where he developed his dramatic skills, as well as in synagogues, both as a choir boy and as a cantor, where he polished his vocal and musical skills.

Artistic reciting and musical performances were therefore a permanent offering in the Yiddish cultural repertoire of the Shulferayn and other

Yiddishist organizations.

Such inclination toward performance as shown here, improved the amount of exposure Yiddish cultural activity could have hoped to achieve in Czernowtiz of the day. The 'performability' of the Yiddish cultural produce made it accessible not only to the narrow circle of well-versed Yiddishists, but to the greater audience of partly or wholly acculturated Cernowitzer Jews, for whom these events were still very much intelligible.

4.3.3. Ruth Lackner and the Yiddishist Circle

It is into this world of orally-oriented predominantly Yiddish literature that Celan is initiated when he meets his first serious lover, Ruth Lackner (born Kraft). Lackner grew up in a very specific kind of diglossic Yiddishist house: her father, Chaim Kraft, was trained as a Germanisict in the Czernowitz University who worked as a Gymnasium teacher, yet simultaneously an ardent Yiddishist who was one of the chief activists in the Shulferayn, in Yiddish publishing and a close friend of Eliezer Stheynabarg.[100] Ruth was therefore raised bilingually, and like the singer Josef Schmidt, attended Shteybarg's children theater, to become an actress in the Yiddish theater during the Soviet occupation of 1940.

The Soviet occupation of 1940, for all its atrocities, nevertheless allowed a certain outlet to the Yiddishist cause in Czernowitz, which was otherwise impeded by both the Romanian authorities as well as their Austrian predecessors, namely the recognition of Yiddish as a national language resulting in the formation of Yiddish state schools. As a result, the lingual wheel has turned for a short while: many of the Yiddishists in the circle surrounding Chaim Kraft, were now employed as teachers by the state; and, for the lack of any German school system, so were many of the non-Yiddish, German-speaking teachers, formerly employed under the Austrian system, who suddenly had to accommodate to Yiddish.

The circle of Yiddishists who regularly convened at the Krafts' house

---

100. Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 98.

included, among others, the linguist and Yiddish teacher Chaim Ginniger, the Mathematics teacher and publisher of Yiddish literature Hersch Segal and the aforementioned reciter, actor and musician Leibu levin.[101] In this surrounding, Celan was also exposed to the poetry of Itzik Manger, whose brother, Note, he may have possibly encountered in person.[102]

In this regard, it should be first noted that Celan was intensely involved with Ruth Lackner for a significant period of time, extending from 1940 up to his deportation in 1942 and resumed contact with her after his return to Czernowtiz. He is also reported to have stayed in close friendship with both Leibu Levin and Hersch Segal. Given the intensity of these relationships, Celan's own intellectual interests and immense lingual talent, and his counterparts' deep involvement and interests in Yiddish, it may, therefore, be reasonably concluded that Celan was at least amply exposed to the workings of Yiddish modernism at the time.

Consequently, any pejorative views about Yiddish ascribed to Celan, such as the remarks made by Ginniger or Chalfen, should be taken with a grain of salt: for it is hardly convincible that as a thirteen year-old pupil, Celan was able to coherently express such a progressive view of Yiddish, against his teacher's mockery, but as young man of twenty with a materializing poetological worldview, he would suddenly revert to simplistic prejudice. It is all the more unlikely to occur while he found himself in the midst of daily intellectual exchanges with the propagators of that literature.

4.3.4. Multilingualism and Multidisciplinarity as the modous vivendi of Culture in interwar Czernowitz

Furthermore, this assortment of personalities is particularly meaningful in the context of Celan's attitude and exposure to Yiddish. First of all, these individuals, including Chaim Kraft himself and Itzik Manger, were

101. Ibid., 102.
102. Ibid., 101.

themselves great admirers of the German language and culture and well-versed in it. At the same time, they were zealous promoters of the Yiddish language and culture, deeply involved in its educational, literary and artistic undertakings. In other words, they embodied a distinctively *multilingual* cultural modus operandi. Secondly, except for Ginniger, their preoccupation with Yiddish combined written literature with its oral performance—Kraft was involved with the theater, Segal published an anthology of Yiddish folk songs accompanied by their melodies, and Levin embodied this in his profession as a reciter.[103] In other words, they embodied a distinctively *multidisciplinary* cultural modus operandi.

These two characteristics—multilingulism and multidisciplinarity—may arguably define Celan's interest in the circle, according to Chalfen's own account, relying on Ruth Lackner and others.

As in the case of multidisciplinarity, reflected in the artistic synthesis of written and spoken word so conspicuous in the local tradition of recitation, so was the intense preoccupation with multilingualism an inner-Jewish matter, which far exceeded the limited elitist circle of Yiddishists.

As shown by Marten-Finnis in her research of Yiddish press in Czernowtiz, the surge in publications during the interwar period and their political character was common to German and Yiddish alike,[104] although the latter had to overcome a more strict censorship from the side of the Romanian authorities.[105] Nonetheless, no significant political force in the Jewish world was wholly represented without an appropriate vehicle of expression in both 'Jewish' languages of the province. More importantly, there was no clear lingual demarcation between them. Indeed, party organs in both languages kept a vibrant exchange of ideas with each other by reading and reciprocating on articles published in Yiddish and

---

103. Ibid., 102.
104. Marten-Finnis, and Winkler, „Location of Memory Versus Space of Communication: Presses, Languages, and Education Among Czernovitz Jews, 1918–1941.", 36-38.
105. Ibid., 42.

German. The German social-democratic *Vorwärts*, for instance, named the Yiddish Bundist *דאָס נײַע לעבן* 'a sister journal'. Unsurprisingly, sometimes the same figures were involved in the publication of papers in both languages at the same time. Jacob Pistiner, for example, was involved in the Bundist Yiddish publications as well as in the German-languge *Vorwärts*.[106] Lastly, as the research findings by Nagy show, the Yiddish and German Jewish press of the time exchanged not only ideas but also lingual models, making the inner-Jewish multilingualism a subject in its own right.

This sheds a different light on Celan's own multilingualism in the context of the Kraft circle: Chalfen reports in relation to Ginniger that

> Mit ihm setzte er die einst begonnenen Gespräche über Sprachprobleme fort.[107]

Then adds in relation to Lackner:

> Pauls Verhältnis zu den verschiedenen Sprachen, die in Czernowitz gesprochen wurden oder in denen Tageszeitungen und Bücher gedruckt waren, bildetet häufig den Gegenstand seiner Gespräche mit Ruth.[108]

As shown here and in the section dealing with the rise of Yiddishism, the interwar period up to the Nazi invasion signalizes the heyday for Yiddish in Czernowitz, both demographically, as evident by the number of speakers, and culturally, as evident by the surge in publications. Yiddish was now much more widely spoken and printed. In the words of Marten-Finnis:

> "[a]s time went by […] a strong sub-current developed, taking many people into a different direction: the increasing use of Yiddish as a medium of communication in public, private and professional life."[109]

Along with the traditionally strong presence of German-Jewish publications, the press landscape in Czernowitz became clearly dominated

---

106. Ibid., 37.
107. Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 102.
108. Ibid., 101.
109. Marten-Finnis, and Winkler, „Location of Memory Versus Space of Communication: Presses, Languages, and Education Among Czernovitz Jews, 1918–1941.", 41.

by the Jewish communities, therefore making these two sister languages—German and Yiddish—together with Romanian the clear object of Celan's conversations with Ruth. Multilingualism is thus bound together with Yiddish.

This multilingualism, however, bears a very particularist nature, which in turn ties it back to artistic multidisciplinarity.

As a socio-lingual preoccupation of an entire community, the Jewish one, this multilingualism amounts to a spectrum of internal diglossia unique to Czernowtiz: at its Yiddishist end, one finds cultivated, standardized literary Yiddish; at its German end, one finds cultivated standardized literary German; in-between these polars the highly Yiddishized *Kiegeldeutsch* and the more Wienerized *Buko-Wienerisch* span the gap. The literary languages at both ends cover the written and formal ways of communication. The non-Standard idioms are spoken variants, the vernaculars of Czernowtiz, so to speak, which accordingly cover the oral ways of communication.

However, due to the status of German as the cultural and commercial lingua franca in Czernowitz, the internal-diglossia partly overlaps with an external-diglossia: whereas, lexically, *mischpoche* and, morphologically, *sich spielen*, are clearly an integral neutralized part of the 'standard' local German idiom, which may be equally uttered by Jews and non-Jews alike, *bekowedetes Haus* already lingers on the verge of an inner-Jewish ethnolect. In other words, *some* parts of the spectrum of Yiddishized German was neutralized as part of the general colloquial Czernowitz idiom, while other parts remain essentially inner-Jewish; the written form for communicating in German with non-Jews likewise remains Standard High German.

What this double, partly overlapping internal/external diglossia shows (except for the complexity of Yiddish-German sociolinguistics) is that Yiddish comes to serve as an oral marker for the Jewishness of German in Czernowitz. Yiddish becomes a Jewish performance of German, and as

such a markedly oral one. Therefore, the more oral or 'spoken' the situation, the more Yiddishized the German. This brings the discussion back to the question of multidisciplinarity—what happens, therefore, when written literature is made oral?

Celan discusses this exact type of artistic multidisciplinarity with the reciter Levin:

> [...] dessen jiddische Lesungen ihn zum Reflektieren über Wortkunst und über die eigene Art, Gedichte vorzutragen, anregten.

Similarly, Hersch Segal is said to have steered the conversation in the direction of his multidisciplinary preoccupation with bringing word and music together.[110] In light of the fact that Celan was first introduced to Yiddish literature by a professional reciter, his uncle, and that his interest in the theater developed while being exposed to a second professional reciter, Eren-Ehrenkranz, both of which performed their art in Yiddish as well as German, it makes sense to assume Celan contemplated the crossing axis of Yiddish as a form of German speech.

His admiration to Shteybarg's *meshólim* also fits in nicely with an appreciation to the colloquial wisdom expressed in the essential orality of the fable, befitting the nature of Yiddish as an essentially oral idiom: "[Steinbargs Fabel] galt ihm als der Ausdruck einer tiefen Lebensphilosophie".[111] At the same time, it might also explain Celan's ambivalence toward the colloquial and oral character of the Yiddish language, most bluntly expressed in his harsh judgment of Itzik Manger as "keinen echten Dichter, sondern eher [] ein flokloristisches Phänomen".[112] This ambivalence, probably the result of age-old and deeply-rooted self prejudice against Yiddish, mixed together with the high aspirations of an elitist young poet, could also have triggered Ginniger's expressed disbelief in Celan's admiration of the *meshólim*.

At any rate, the seeds of his future poetic treatment of Yiddish-German

---

110. Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 101.
111. Ibid.
112. Ibid.

as a diglossic continuum ranging from the oral to the written, standing at the heart of this thesis, were most probably sawn during those evenings spent in the company of the people whose art and cultural activism embodied this socio-lingual phenomena.

To sum up: Celan's significant contact with Yiddish during the years of adolescence up to the Nazi German invasion, started, most probably, with the exposure to the art of artistic reading in Yiddish of his uncle Bruno Schrager, who also introduced him to Shteynbarg's *meshalim*, which left a mark on Celan for years to come. His acquaintance with other artistic reciters of Yiddish, an art which came to characterize that language in Czernowtiz and culminated in the interwar years, and finally his initiation into the circle of Yiddishists at Kraft house intensified his exposure to the language and its literary and cultural products.

Two adjoining factors characterize his exposure to the language, both with expressed reference to German and its status as the *Kultursprache* of Czernowitz: multilingualism, manifest in the interests, training and profession of the figures involved, which always included German along with Yiddish; and artistic multidisciplinarity, consisting in a combination of literature and its oral performance. This pair of factors mirror the unique socio-linguistics of Jews between German and Yiddish in Czernowitz from the interwar period up to the decimation of its Jewish community.

4.4. 1941-1943: The Holocaust in Bukovina

The period from the summer of 1941 until 1944 marks the German Nazi occupation of Bukovina and the destruction of its centuries-old Jewish communities—German and Yiddish alike. The biographical data regarding Celan at the time becomes vaguer as the situation escalates: the details regarding the Ghetto period and deportation of his parents to

Transnistria are fraught with gaps, contradictions and guess-work;[113] the details of his own incarceration as a forced-laborer, already verge on the obscure—it is still uncertain whether he had stayed at one particular camp or moved between a few of them.[114] Celan himself contributed to this biographical obscurity by relating some dramatic but seemingly fantastical anecdotes as to his whereabouts during those dark days.[115]

Consequently, any attempt at estimating his exposure to Yiddish during that time is problematic, at best. Nevertheless, Felstiner quotes a statement made by Celan to a friend, according to which "he had learned much Yiddish in the camps."[116] Historically, a greater exposure to Yiddish may be explained due to the mixed concentration of Yiddish- and German-speaking Jews from both the *Oberstadt* as well as the *Unterstadt* within the narrow confines of the Ghetto. Similarly, in many camps Yiddish functioned as a quasi inner-Jewish lingua franca, bridging communicative and cultural gaps for Jews from different backgrounds. This function echoes Primo Levi's understanding of Yiddish in the camps, as formulated by Sander Gilman: "Yiddish is, after the 'Lager jargon,' the 'camp's second language'".[117]

Whether Celan had indeed "learned much Yiddish in the camps" may, however, turn out to be less important than the poetological implications attested in such an understanding of Yiddish. To turn to Gilman's words

---

113. Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 13-14.
114. Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 113-34.; Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 16.
115. See Ibid., 15.
116. See Ibid., 16.; Stiehler, based on historical research on the matter, assumes German as the language of communication among the prisoners in the relevant camps. Even if the assumption holds true in the case of Celan, it does not rule out a greater exposure to Yiddish, as the prisoner population was never homogenous. Cf. Stiehler, „Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens.", 126.
117. Sander L Gilman, "To Quote Primo Levi: "Redest Keyn Jiddisch, Bist Nit Kein Jid" ["if You Don't Speak Yiddish, You're Not a Jew"]," *Prooftexts* 9, no. 2 (1989), 142.; this terminology is particularly ironic, since the (Jewish) jargon was a slightly derogatory but nevertheless very common name for Yiddish throughout the nineteenth-century. The term 'Lager jargon', therefore, equates the Lager with Jewishness, inscribed in the Yiddish language.

once more:

> [Yiddish] is the "real" language most intimately associated with the camps. And because of the association between the camps and Yiddish, it is the language which evokes the camps most strongly, since remembering in or of "Lager jargon" is impossible because of the immediacy of the world which it evokes.[118]

Celan may have "learned" Yiddish in the camps, or simply heard it much more frequently. But more importantly, Yiddish acquired a new quality, very much dependent on and resulting from age-old perceptions of the language, yet at the same time completely new: if Yiddish was traditionally perceived as 'verdorbenes Deutsch' or a corrupt Jewish performance of German, in the camps it was suddenly the Germans who corrupted the German language, while Yiddish became the German of the victims, absolved through suffering.

The current state of affairs regarding Yiddish in Celan's oeuvre does not allow for a systematic verification of such a connection. Nevertheless, even a short, partial survey of Celan's literary output, in which according to the limited research a reference to Yiddish, either implicit or explicit, is attested, shows a strong presence of holocaust thematic and motives. Poems like "Benedicta",[119] "Zähle die Mandeln",[120] "Scheitel des Jetzt",[121] "die Winzer",[122] "Nah, im Aortenbogen",[123] clearly deal with the holocaust, some of which (like "die Winzer") directly touch upon the experience of forced concentration with fellow Jews, possibly Yiddish-speaking *Ostjuden*. The prose piece, *Gespräch im Gebirg*, the primary object of this dissertation, and its counterpart poem, "Engfühurung", both contain a poetic recounting of such an experience. Their connection to Yiddish will be clarified in the philological part of this thesis.

---

118. Ibid.
119. Amir Eshel, "Von Kafka Bis Celan: Deutsch-Jüdische Schriftsteller Und Ihr Verhaältnis Zum Hebraïschen Und Jiddischen," in *Jüdische Sprachen in Deutscher Umwelt*, ed. Michael Brenner (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 105-07.
120. Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 63-64.
121. Ibid., 73-74.
122. Ibid., 86.
123. Lebovic, „Near the End: Celan, Between Scholem and Heidegger."

In short, the years of the holocaust in Czernowtiz have in all likelihood increased Celan's contact with Yiddish and perhaps even his knowledge of the language. At any rate, the encounter with Yiddish-speaking Jews as the symbolic victims of Nazi persecution under the extreme circumstances of the camps, had later left a mark on his poetic treatment of the language. As a possible result, an ironically reversed Yiddish-German dynamics ensued, whereby the once corrupt Yiddish could be purified, while the pure German now became contaminated not by Jewish *Mauscheln*, but rather by its own native ethic speakers (read: 'Arian').

4.5. 1944-1970: After the War and in Exile

The last biographical period to be examined here with respect to Yiddish, slightly extends over the duration of the previous three, all put together. In many respects, it also reflects the poetic processing of the former periods. Celan's life may sometimes seem to be roughly divided into two nearly even parts—the first consists in an accumulation of skills, languages, poetic sensitivity, and above all contrasting experiences of *Gemütlichkeit* and utmost wretchedness; the second part consists in the poetic processing of the accumulated material, culminating in outbursts of literary production.

This partition is, of course, simplistic at best. After all, Celan started writing before the war and probably wrote throughout most of its duration.[124] Moreover, the 26 years following the war span a host of different cities, social connections and circumstances and different modes of literary creation in Celan's life. Nevertheless this partition may be given some credence, if only tentatively, for its analytic productivity: as will be suggested, the seeds of poetic and poetological developments relating to Yiddish were all sawn at earlier periods in his life and in direct contact to the language.

---

124. Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 72-74.

4.5.1. 1944-1946: A Short-lived Jewish Renaissance

Chalfen reports in reliance on Ruth Lackner and David Seidmann, that upon his return to Czernowitz from the labour camp(s), Celan unexpectedly started reciting from Shteynbarg's fables or suddenly humming a cantorial melody taken from the New-Year's prayer in the synagogue. In this Jewish context, he is likewise reported to have talked in praise of the beauty of the Hebrew language and started reading the works of Martin Buber intensively.[125]

This seemingly newly-awakened interest in Judaism in the aftermath of the Holocaust, particularly in the Jewish languages, corroborates in fact with the main avenues of Jewish influence attested in his childhood and youth.

First of all, the reciting from the *mesholim* need not by now be further elaborated here. Suffice it to say it echoes both Celan's early enchantment with the fables as a young boy, as well as his higher appreciation for the colloquial wisdom encompassed therein, as a young man in the Kraft circle.

Secondly, the interest in Hebrew relies on the knowledge acquired during his (hateful) years in the "Safa Ivria" elementary school, which were later succeeded by private lessons Hebrew.[126] The synagogue and the family home, where religious customs and liturgy were usually practiced, are cultural spaces where Yiddish and Hebrew traditionally co-existed in the Ashkenazi culture. As was shown earlier, this holds particularly true for conservative Czernwotiz, which in this case did not follow the lingual lead of its German-Jewish role model in fully replacing the language of religious rite.

Lastly, the interest in Buber, especially in his German rendition of Hasidic folktales, echoes Celan's own familial pedigree in the Sadagora

---

125. Ibid., 140.
126. Ibid., 40.

'Wunderrabbi' on his mother's side and his interest in Jewish mysticism, which is deeply seated both in Yiddish, as its natural language of narration, as well as in Hebrew, as its mystic lingual toolbox. It is not a mere coincidence, therefore, that during those years Celan entertained the possibility of emigrating to Jerusalem, fantasizing how he would approach Buber with the words "Onkel Buber, hier bin ich, hier hast Du mich".[127]

4.5.2. Late 1940s-Late 1950s: The Latent Period

It was, nevertheless but an entertaining thought, a *Gedankenspiel*. This awakened interest in Jewish languages seemed to have quickly sunk into a latent period in his subconscious. At first, during his short stay in Vienna and the two years spent in Bucharest, no regard to Yiddish is shown whatsoever, although with the *Todesfuge* and other poems, Celan clearly deals with Holocaust-related Jewish themes. Any poetic regard given to languages other than German over those years is to be found first and foremost in his Romanian puns and translations.[128] Meta-lingual or poetological considerations are practically centered squarely on the problem of German as the language of the perpetrators and, at the same time, of their Jewish victims—the language contaminated by the murderous horror and by fascist newspeak—, and finally, his beloved mother-tongue.

This was the source of the most excruciating pain for him as a poet, which he so adequately formulated in "Nähe der Gräber": "Und duldest du, Mutter, wie einst, ach, daheim, / den leisen, den deutschen, den schmerzlichen Reim?" (GW, 3: 20). Unlike his mother, who by then could no longer answer his question, Celan's own reply regarding himself as a 'German poet and a Jewish survivor', to paraphrase Felstiner's subtitle, is found in a letter written in 1948 to a relative in the newly-established

127. Quoted from a letter to Ruth Lackner by Ibid., 144.
128. Stiehler, „Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens.", 122-23.; Cf. Roditi, „Paul Celan and the Cult of Personality.", 11.

Jewish State of Israel:

> Ihr merkt, dass ich versuche, Euch zu sagen, dass es nichts in der Welt gibt, um dessen willen ein Dichter es aufgibt zu dichten, auch dann nicht, wenn er ein Jude ist und die Sprache seiner Gedichte die deutsche ist.[129]

In a gesture of either determined-resignation or resigned-determination, regarding his state as a poet and a Jew after the holocaust, Celan signs another letter from 1948 to his poet friend, the Romanian Jew Petre Solomon, (with whom he co-translated the *Todesfuge*) with the words "trauriger Dichter teutonischer Sprache".[130] Naturally, the 'latent stage' for the Jewish languages in Celan's overt preoccupations does not imply their disappearance from his poetry. On the contrary, what is driven under into the subconscious would eventually find its way into literature. However, such manifestations require (and await) philological excavation, particularly in comparison to the overt non-German elements in Celan's later work.

4.5.3. 1957: A Second Jewish Renaissance

The latent period seemed to be over by 1957, as Celan's overt interest in Judaism, Jewishness and the Jewish languages re-arises and becomes more and more apparent. In following avenues opened in his past, Celan picks up where he had left—in a display of what latency truly means—and starts reading Martin Buber again, as well as Gershom Scholem, Walter Benjamin, Franz Kafka, Theodor Adorno and other central figures of German-Jewish modernism.[131]

With the publication of the prose piece *Gespräch im Gerbirg* and the counterpart long poem "Engführung", from the volume *Sprachgitter* in 1959, this interest reaches a climax, in terms of its explicit literary reference to Yiddish. On the personal level, these publications are at least

---

129. Bianca Rosenthal, "Quellen Zum Frühen Paul Celan: Der Alfred Margul-Sperber-nachlass in Bukarest," *Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch Stuttgart* 32, no. 3 (1982), 230.
130. Quoted in Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 51.
131. Eshel, „Von Kafka Bis Celan: Deutsch-Jüdische Schriftsteller Und Ihr Verhaältnis Zum Hebraïschen Und Jiddischen.", 103.

partly motivated and conditioned by Celan's correspondences with Theodor Adorno[132] and Ingeborg Bachmann,[133] thus relating them back to his preoccupation with the German-Jewish conundrum. Another contributing factor fueling Celan's renewed preoccupation with 'atavistic' features of Judaism, such as Yiddish, was the publication of a few unflattering reviews of his work. These reviews, some of them written by notable critics, contained references to Celan's Jewish and eastern European origins, which Celan perceived as a clear indication for their anti-Semitic motivation. This was at least partly true. However, Celan, who by then had reached some considerable critical acclaim in Germany, which might otherwise offset such insults, was already deeply drenched in suspicion toward the German literary establishment. This is evident, for instance, from his letters to Nelly Sachs[134], Ingeborg Bachmann[135] and Max Frisch[136]. Celan consequently develops, as if to spite, the form of poetological reasoning which stands behind in *Gespräch im Gerbirg*, bringing anti-Semitic Jewish stereotypes to the fore, most notably, that of the derided Jewish way of speech. More specifically, the Jewish way of talking German, or, of corrupting it—*Mauscheln* and *Jüddeln*.

The prose piece, famously an 'enactment' of a missed planned meeting between Celan and Adorno, is accordingly dedicated to him. In his letter to Adorno containing the text, Celan also brings up some poetological remarks, explicitly touching upon the subject of German and the Jewish-German, or *Judendeutsch* in his words. Later he is reported to have told

---

132. Mirjam Sieber, *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«* (Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 152, 162-163.
133. Marc-Oliver Schuster, "Ingeborg Bachmann Und Paul Celan: Historisch-Poetische Korrelationen," in *Ingeborg Bachmann Und Paul Celan: Historisch-Poetische Korrelationen*, ed. Gernot Wimmer (Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2014), 71-89.
134. Amir Eshel, "Paul Celan's Other: History, Poetics, and Ethics," *New German Critique* 91(2004), 59-60.
135. Schuster, „Ingeborg Bachmann Und Paul Celan: Historisch-Poetische Korrelationen.", 72, 82.
136. Ibid., 75.

Marlies Janz that "Gespräch im Gerbirg sei eigentlich ein Mauscheln zwischen ihm und Adorno".[137] Finally, these observations find their seasoned expression in *Der Meridian. Rede anläßlich der Verleihung des Georg-Büchner-Preises* (held on 1960, published 1961), although this time, in front of the distinguished German audience which he suspected as anti-Semitic, without any explicit reference to Yiddish, or for Jew/ish for that matter. The notes Celan made while preparing the speech clearly show otherwise: they charge his complex poetological construction with the particularistic notion of 'Jewification', *verjuden*:

> Man kann verjuden; das ist zwar, zugegeben, schwer und ist, warum nicht auch das zugeben? — sogar schon manchem jüdisch geborenen Juden mißlungen; gerade deshalb halte ich das für empfehlenswert
> Verjuden: Es ist das Anderswerden, Zum-anderen-und-dessen-Geheimnis-stehn — —
> Liebe zum Menschen ist etwas anderes als Philanthropie[138]

As Amir Eshel eloquently shows, while deliberately avoiding the use of the lexeme 'Jew' in his speech, in what may be considered a Freudian slip, Celan draws the attention of the president of the German Academy of Language and Literature to his 'Jewified' story, *Gespräch im Gerbirg*, in his reply to the letter informing him about the Büchner Prize. The socio-lingual and poetological thus come a full circle, bringing together the notion of the Jew as the poetic Other and Yiddish as the lingual marker of the Other.

This increased preoccupation with Yiddish continues well into his next published volume, *Die Niemandsrose* (1963), which contains two poems with explicit Yiddish references—"Eine Gauner- und Ganovenweise" and "Benedicta"—the former alluding to Hasidism of Sadagora, the latter situated in a distinctively Yiddish liturgical setting, thus evoking two of his childhood avenues to Yiddish. In this volume Celan also precedes a quote

---

137. Sieber, *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«*, 240.

138. Quoted in Mirjam Sieber, "Judendeutsch Und Krummnasig: Ein Kommentar Zu Paul Celans Gespräch Im Gebirg," *Bulletin der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Judaistische Forschung* 12(2003), 25.

in Russian by Marina Tsvetaeva as a motto for the poem "Und mit dem Buch aus Tarussa" (GW, 1: 287), which resonates the poetological principles expressed in the *Meridian*, in *Gespräch im Gerbirg* and in his remarks on that text: "all poets are Yids".[139]

The farthest Celan went to expose this line of thought in the open, without the aid of literary disguise and outside the intimacy of his private notes and correspondence, may be found in another speech he held on the occasion of receiving the Bremen Literature Prize in 1958, some two years prior to the *Meridian* and in the midst of his growing interest in Jewish mysticism:

> [D]ie Landschaft, aus der ich zu Ihnen komme, dürfte den meisten von Ihnen unbekannt sein. Es ist die Landschaft, in der ein nicht unbeträchtlicher Teil jener *chassidischen Geschichten* zu Hause war, die *Martin Buber uns allen auf deutsch wiedererzählt hat*.[140]

No mention of the word Jew in this speech either, but Celan draws a very clear line, albeit thin and delicate, between the fate the Jewish communities of Bukovina had suffered at the hands of the Germans—the Jewish landscape, a *zu Hause* now lost; literature—*chassidische[] Geschichten*; Jewish Mysticism—his own Hasidic Sadagorian roots; and finally, the languages in between—his own German and the Yiddish of Hasidism, all resonate in the seemingly marginal clause *"die Martin Buber uns allen auf deutsch wiedererzählt hat"*. After all, what other language was "retold" in German, if not Yiddish? And who is "uns all[e]" if not German-speakers?[141]

The young Celan, of course, was a Czernowitzer, a city dweller craving for Vienna, quite a far cry from a courtier of the miracle rabbi at Sadagora. *Unterstadt* Yiddish, in comparison, was much more present in

---

139. Eshel, „Von Kafka Bis Celan: Deutsch-Jüdische Schriftsteller Und Ihr Verhaältnis Zum Hebraïschen Und Jiddischen.", 106.; Sieber, *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«*, 153.; Lebovic, „Near the End: Celan, Between Scholem and Heidegger.", 471.
140. Quoted in John Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie,* trans. Holger Fliessbach (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1997), 156.
141. Cf. Ibid., 155-56.

his daily life than the Hasidism of neighboring Sadagora and Vizhnitz. Therefore, if he had resorted to his rudimentary connection with Hasidism, he must have resorted all the more easily to his stronger connection with Yiddish, which is *in absentia* so brilliantly present in this marginal relative clause thorough its German surrogate translation— "[*wiedererzählt*] *auf deutsch*".

Traces of reference to Yiddish have also been exposed in later volumes such as *Fadensonnen* (1968), in the poem "Nah, im Aortenbogen".[142] As discusses earlier, this reference relies on a Yiddish poem Celan remembered and jotted down while reading Gerschom Scholem's work on the *Shekinah*[143].

A thorough and philologically-systemic research may in fact reveal that Yiddish pervades many poems throughout Celan's more recent volumes, published both during his life and posthumously. However, other languages, most prominently French, start to feature more frequently in his later volumes; lastly, while in a final burst of creativity following his 1969 visit to Israel, and up to his suicide a few months later, the explicit referencing to Yiddish and French seem to be retreating in the face of a multitude of Hebrew references.[144]

4.5.4. 1944-1970: Summery

In summary, Celan's interest in Jewish culture and languages went through a short renaissance immediately following his return to Czernowtiz from the labor camp(s). This interest seems to have been primarily driven by the desolation he had found upon his return, namely the effectively full destruction of the Jewish landscape of his hometown, in what may seem as an attempt to hold on to the last scraps of that vanishing landscape. This interest also seems to have been conditioned to

---

142. Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 238.
143. Lebovic, „Near the End: Celan, Between Scholem and Heidegger.", 467.
144. Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 228-243, 264-279.

a degree by his experiences in the camps, first and foremost, the experience of Yiddish as a second 'Lager jargon', to use Gilman's paraphrase on Primo Levi. This was followed by a 'latent' period, in which Celan tried to cope with the problem of writing in German as a Jew after the holocaust, while deliberately refraining from a resort in other languages, thus reasserting his status as a *German*-Jewish poet.

By the late 1950s, however, Celan experienced another renaissance of interest in Jewish culture and languages, most prominently manifest in his readings of seminal works on Jewish mysticism and Hasidism. These readings, (non-)meetings and correspondences, soon translated into literary output in prose (*Gespräch im Gebirg*), poetics (*Die Niemandsrose*) and poetology (*Der Meridian, Bremer-Preisrede*). Within this context, Yiddish resurfaces as a poetical point of reference (the Other's language), a literary device and lingual principle implementing Celan's idea of *verjuden*, the 'Jewification' of poetry as means to attain its coveted Otherness.

During these periods, Celan's preoccupation with Yiddish followed the avenues of influence developed in his formative years, growing up in Czernowitz: the traditional sphere of religion and liturgy, which in Bukovina was conservatively Yiddish and Hebrew, and relatively bereaved of German; the family's Hasidic background and early interest in mysticism mediated by Buber; and lastly, Celan's exposure to the Yiddishist scene in Czernowtiz, most prominently to Shteynbarg and Manger.

4.6. Conclusion

The story of the changing dynamics between Yiddish and German in Celan's life and in twentieth-century Czernowitz could perhaps be told most succinctly by two anecdotes, a public and personal one, joining history and biography together:

The organizers of the Czernowitz Yiddish Language Conference booked in advance the newly-opened Jewish National House in Czerwnotiz as the venue for the Conference. The Conference was ultimately opened, however, in the summer of 1908, in the Ukrainian National House, because the Jewish House "was mysteriously declared unprepared for use by the conference."[145] But the mystery was in all probability man-made: Benno Straucher, the Zionist parliament member and chair of the Jewish community in Czernowitz denied the Conference any access to the building, being a fervent opponent of Yiddish and the Yiddishist cause. In doing so he probably enjoyed the sympathy of many acculturated German-Jews from Czernowitz, who sought to distance themselves from anything associated with the *jargon*.

Some twenty years later, however, the tables have turned. Not only was the *vilner trupe* dignified enough to be allowed access to the *Jüdisches Haus*, the modernist Yiddish theater group staged its performances, to a great success, in the prestigious *Deutsches Haus*, bringing Yiddish theater under a German roof. The collapse of the Habsburg empire, Romanization and inner-Jewish political upheaval all contributed to a change in the status of the once-derided language.[146]

The second anecdote tells a similar story about Celan. Ruth Lackner reported that during the 'Soviet Year' of 1940, when Celan was a regular guest at the Kraft house, he considered Manger "als keinen echten

---

145. Fogel, and Weiser, *Czernowitz At 100: The First Yiddish Language Conference in Historical Perspective*, 34.
146. Hirsch, and Spitzer, *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory*, 59-60.

Dichter, sondern eher als folkloristisches Phänomen".[147] However, by the time he was going through his first, short-lived 'Jewish Renaissance', following his return to Czernowitz in 1944, the Yiddish poet Beyle Schaechter-Gottesman reported that he suddenly approached her, declaring out of the blue that "Manger sei der größte jüdischer Dichter".[148]

Both anecdotes tell a story of a sea-change in German-Jewish attitude toward Yiddish. In the case of Celan, the primary drive was most likely the Holocaust. Nevertheless, a poetic maturation had probably also played a role here.

More emblematic, however, is the fact, that each of these anecdotes is comprised of two parts, each containing a piece of information oppositional to its counterpart. Originally, they come from different sources, and have thus far never been juxtaposed, to the best of my knowledge. Their juxtaposition exemplifies the deficiency of mono-disciplinary research: in the case of Celan, all pieces of information brought in the anecdote are credible enough; yet the former remark on Magner serves a German-centric point of view, while the latter a Yiddish-centric point of view. A multidisciplinary approach should not adopt a German or a Yiddish point of view. Nor should it profess itself to a neutral point of view. Rather, a 'double' point of view should be adopted, in which both underlying approaches to Yiddish in Celan's world are considered. But before such a point of view can be adopted, the role of Yiddish in Celan's life and work must first be recognized.

The question of Celan's familiarity with and attitude toward Yiddish raised at the beginning of the biographical part of this work may now be adequately answered.

Despite contrasting evidence concerning his attitude toward the language, there can be little doubt as to Celan's knowledge of Yiddish and

---

147. Quoted in Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 101.
148. Quoted in 27 ,**פינות כחולות: איציק מאנגר - חיים, שיר ובלדה**, שפיגלבלט.

sensitivity to its distinguishing factors, which set it apart from German.

Celan exposure to Yiddish followed four main avenues:

1) Liturgy and religious rite in the private sphere of the family as well as in the public sphere of the synagogue. His interest in the Sadagurian Hasidic roots and Jewish mysticism also contributed to this exposure.

2) The local Czernowitz German idiom exhibited an extremely strong influence of Yiddish, especially within the predominately-Jewish urban discourse, a hybrid construction which stood in stark contrast to the 'purity' of his motherly lingual upbringing. The unique socio-lingual conditions of Bukovina in general, and of Czernowitz in particular, presented him with a dual-diglossic paradigm, oscillating from literary Standard High German, through *Buko-Winerrisch* and *Kiegeldeutsch*, all the way to literary Standard Yiddish.

3) The interwar Yiddishist renaissance in Czernowtiz exerted its lingual and cultural influence on Celan in a myriad of ways: in the private sphere, through family (Bruno Schrager) and social contacts (Ruth Lackner); in the public sphere, through the increased presence of Yiddish in the journalistic and political landscape in interwar Czernowitz; lastly, in the literary and cultural sphere, through intense contacts with the Kraft circle, and exposure to its performative manifestations, in particular to the indigenous tradition of artistic reading. In mirroring the diglossic condition discussed above, the oral tendency exhibited in this avenue of influence ties together multilingualism with artistic multidisciplinarity.

4) The experience of the holocaust increased Celan's contact with Yiddish and perhaps even his knowledge of the language. The status of the language as a second 'Lager jargon' juxtaposed with the corruption of the German language through National Socialism reversed the traditional hierarchy between the two languages,

alternating notions of lingual and ethical purity and contamination. This development laid the groundwork for Celan's future treatment of the subject in his poetological principle of *verjuden*, the 'Jewification' of poetry.

As opposed to his undeniable exposure to Yiddish, Celan's expressed attitude to the language oscillated dramatically, according to reports, ranging from typical disdain and patronizing revealing repressed fear of association ("verdorbenes Deutsch"), to expressions of wonder and even admiration (the confrontation with his teacher). This ambivalence seems to change as a function of historical conditions, and of poetic and poetological maturity. At his height of success, it finds its most rigorous and keen expression in a series of interconnected poems, poetological speeches, a prose piece and personal correspondence. That moment forms a Jewish *Meridian*, in Celan's terminology, most evidently manifest in its language. That language, which pervades the most distinctively Yiddishized texts in this 'meridian', the short piece of prose entitled *Gespräch im Gebirg*, is the primary object of the next part of this dissertation.

5. Philological and Hermeneutical Analysis of Yiddsh in Celan's *Gespräch im Gebirg*

5.1. Background: from *Judendetusch* to *Jiddischdeutsch*

5.1.1. Genesis and Reception

In Celan's entire oeuvre, the short piece of prose entitled *Gespräch im Gebirg* presents the problem of the hybridity of the Jewish language and speech at its utmost sharpness and vulnerability.

The roots of this prose piece, first printed in August 1960 in the *neue Rundschau*'s second issue, are found in a planned meeting at Sils-Maria (Engadine) that never took place between Clean and Theodor Adorno in July of 1959. The text tells the story of 'a meeting', an encounter on a mountain path between a certain "Jud Groß" and a certain "Jud Klein", and the ensuing conversation between the two. It is common to see the narrative as a poetic figuration of the meeting that never happened, thus casting Celan as Jud Groß and Adorno as Jud Klein.[149] Other than that, there is not much in the way of narrative in this story; it is about language, poetic and Jewishness, not occurrences.

Two things immediately stand out upon reading this rather short piece: its peculiar language and richness of intertextual allusions. In this sense, it is a dense text, reminiscent of Celan's poetry. Yet as far as language is concerned, the longer breadth of prose allows for a rather consistent and elaborate lingual characterization, which lends itself to a systematic examination, exceeding what is normally attainable for a similar enquiry of his poems.

Among these two salient characteristics, intertextual references and language, the critical and scholarly reception of the text has mainly brought the 'intertext' to the fore. The meeting with Adorno,[150] Celan's

149. According to Adorno's response, he thought that the real "Jud Groß" was Gerschom Scholem. See Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 139-40.
150. Sieber, *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«*.

reading of Heidegger and the connection to the *Meridian* speech[151]—to name but a few examples—, have been the subject of many scholarly works examining *Gespräch im Gebirg*. In most cases, the lingual peculiarities of the text have indeed not gone unnoticed. Nevertheless, these lingual observations have failed to stimulate an exhaustive analysis of the interlingual phenomena and a discussion of their implications. Although Yiddish is undeniably a central element in the fabric of the story, a detailed research of its components and extensive discussion of its implications are missing to date. The following philological analysis and ensuing discussion aims to fill this desideratum.

Before turning to an in-depth examination of the language of the story, a preliminary presentation of the 'intertexts' will be followed by a survey of the state of the art on the language of *Gespräch im Gebirg*.

5.1.2. 'Intertexts'

Gespräch im Gebirg maintains a complex network of intertextual relations, both explicit and implicit, with a number of texts, written by Celan himself and by others:

1) As discussed earlier, *Gespräch im Gebirg* is a realization of the poetological principles laid out by Celan in his *Meridian* speech. This relation is implicitly stated in the speech in a reference to another text:

> Und vor einem Jahr, in Erinnerung an eine versäumte Begegnung im Engadin, brachte ich eine kleine Geschichte zu Papier, in der ich einen Menschen "wie Lenz" durchs Gebirg gehen ließ. (GW, 3: 201)

1) *Lenz* by Georg Büchner (1836) is the influential novella fragment which sets the narrative paradigm for Celan's realization of his own poetological ideas.

2) The monologue *Der Ausflug ins Gebirge* (1904) by Franz Kafka,

151. James K Lyon, *Paul Celan and Martin Heidegger: An Unresolved Conversation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopknis University Press, 2006).; Eshel, „Paul Celan's Other: History, Poetics, and Ethics."

which Celan translated into Romanian, figures a nominalized "Niemand", attributed to God in *Gespräch* and in the poem "Psalm"[152] (see "The Nominalized Enclitic Hörsdu" on page 127).

3) *Gespräch in den bergen* (1913) by Martin Buber constitutes the 'Ich-Du' groundwork for the dialogue in the story.[153]

4) In addition to "Psalm", the poems "Engführung" (GW, 1: 197) and "Sprachgitter" (GW, 1: 166-167) figure an image (respectively: "Der Ort, wo sie lagen, er hat / einen Namen - er hat / keinen."; "Die Fliesen. / Darauf, dicht beieinander") similar to the one resurfacing in an expanded form at the end of *Gespräch im Gebirg*: "Auf dem Stein bin ich gelegen, damals, du weißt, auf den Steinfliesen; und neben mir, da sind sie gelegen, die andern". (GW, 3: 172) This image recalls a traumatic experience from the holocaust, in which Celan found himself detained, possibly deported, together with ("die andern") *Ostjuden*. "Engführung" also features some linguistic characteristics that resembling *Gespräch im Gebirg*.

5) The short fable from Eliezer Shteynbarg's collections of *mesholim*, "דרײַ" (See the last chapter, "Einer ist doch keiner": The Influence of Shteynbarg's Mesholim on page 147).

Owning to constraints of space and scope, and to the breadth of research on the subject, the intertextual references would only be elaborated on when they bear directly on the subject of language in *Gespräch im Gebirg*.

5.1.3. Research on Yiddish in *Gespräch im Gebirg*

Although the presence of Yiddish or pseudo-Yiddish elements in the story have been acknowledged as early as the 1970s, no linguistics-oriented research has been done on the subject that amounts to a

152. Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 140.
153. Cf. Ibid.

systematic analysis of these elements and evaluation of their hermeneutical significance. Nevertheless, a number of contributions refer to an Yiddish element in *Gespräch im Gebirg* and try to characterize it rudimentarily.

As early as 1970, Renata Böschenstein-Schäfer suggested the existence of Yiddish influence on the syntax of *Gespräch im Gebirg* in her commentary on to the text, though only marginally.[154] The first influential contribution to expand this observation was an article form 1987 by Stéphane Mosés: "'Wege auf denen die Sprache stimmhaft wird'. Paul Celans 'Gespräch im Gebirg'".[155]

Mosés argues for the existence of two separate lingual registers in the story "das so gennante Hochdetusch" and a "Dialektform, nämlich das Judendetusch".[156] He further argues for a socio-lingual dichotomy between the two idioms: the *Hochdeutsch* represents an erudite voice, while the *Judendeutsch* represents a colloquial voice. According to the this division, the Standard High German sets a narrational framework for the story, although there is also a narrative layer in *Judendeutsch*, as the article implies.[157] It remains, therefore, unclear where in the story this High German idiom is located, since examples are only given for *Judendeutsch*, and the language in the text is quite uniform in its idiosyncrasies—"schon im Titel *Judendeuthsch"*, to quote Celan.

The article then characterizes the Yiddishized or *Judendeutsch* idiom in the text as follows:

> Morphologische Eigentümlichkeiten wie die Verwendung des Diminutiv ("Häusel") oder der Elision ("Jud","ich bin's" [sic!], "du weißt's" [sic!]), abweichende Syntax wie die regelwidrige Gebrauch der Inversion ("bin ich", "weißt du") oder die Vorziehung der finiten Verbform ("da Gott ihn hat

154. Sieber, „Judendeutsch Und Krummnasig: Ein Kommentar Zu Paul Celans Gespräch Im Gebirg.", 18.
155. Stéphane Mosés, "Wege Auf Denen Die Sprache Stimmhaft Wird ". Paul Celans „gespräch Im Gebirg," in *Argumentum E Silentio*, ed. Amy Diana Colin (Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 1987).
156. Ibid., 47.
157. Ibid., 49.

> einen Juden sein lassen", "wenn der Jud begegnet einem zweiten"), lexikalische Armut ("ist's" [sic!]), nahezu ausschließlich parataktischer Satzbau ("und… und… und"), Vorkommen idiomatischer Wendungen ("Gott sei's geklagt"), Einsatz spezieller Stilmittel wie Wiederholungen ("so frag ich und frag' [sic!] ich") oder rhetorische Frage ("und wer, denkst du, kam ihm entgegen?"),—all diese Züge sind den verschiedenen Idiomen sowie dem Judendeutschen gemeinsam.[158]

This characterization shows the great potential of scholarly fruitfulness in implementing linguistic tools within the philological analysis. A great deal of the described phenomena can indeed be attributed to an Yiddish source model, which participate in constituting the 'Yiddishized' texture of the text.

At the same time, this characterization of the peculiar idiom of *Gespräch im Gebirg,* is lacking from three primary viewpoints: firstly, from a linguistic-philological perspective, the lingual phenomena are either poorly ("ists" is hardly indicative of "lexikalische Armut") or wrongly defined ("ich bins", for instance, demonstrates a clitic, not an elision), or misunderstood (like the meaning of repetitions,[159] confer with the analysis in the next chapter). Additionally, many other significant phenomena characteristic of Yiddish go unnoticed (compare with the comprehensive list of phenomena in the next chapter); secondly, as a result, no socio-lingual distinction is made between the different phenomena in terms of their possible source model and frequency under different lingual, literary and social conditions. All of the described phenomena are thus relegated to a basket-case assortment of German-Jewish idioms, ambiguously termed *Judendeutsch*: "all diese Züge sind den verschiedenen Idiomen sowie dem Judendeutschen gemeinsam"; thirdly, given the lack of a historical analysis of the German-Jewish idiom nomenclature, any discussion of the complex socio-lingual dynamics, both Jewish-German as well as inner-Jewish, becomes impractical.

Despite its shortcomings, Mosés' article offers the most extensive

158. Ibid.
159. Ibid., 48.

treatment of the Yiddish elements or its traces in the story to date. Later contributions dedicated to *Gespräch im Gerbirg* usually reiterate some or all of his analysis, when dealing with the problem of the unusual language of the story, or with Celan's remarks in this respect.

Even John Felstiner, who elsewhere in his seminal Celan biography from 1995 alludes to some direct Yiddish influence, suffices with a remark that the story "tastes of spoken Yiddish", while reiterating in essence the observations made by Mosés:

> The 'Conversation' tastes of spoken Yiddish [...]. Celan reaffirms the Jewish mother tongue by livening up the cognate German tongue. The Yiddishisms and Judeo-German throughout his "Gespräch," the repetitions, run-one, contractions, inversions, diminutives, interrogatives, and idioms [...] merit care in translation precisely because they incurred contempt in Europe [...] and because Yiddish was obliterated along with its speakers.[160]

In 2007, Mirjam Sieber published an extensive monograph dedicated to *Gespräch im Gerbirg*[161] as well as a short article titled "Judendeutsch und krummnasig: Ein Kommentar zu Paul Celans *Gespräch im Gebirg*",[162] which slightly expands on her monograph's treatment of Yiddish. Sieber's treatment of the subject briefly dwells on a few linguistic phenomena already discussed by Mosés and Felstiner, but is mostly limited to a conceptual discussion of the framework which enables the paradoxical use of anti-Semitic notions, the same paradox that underlies Felstiner's remark that "Celan reaffirms the Jewish mother tongue by livening up the cognate German tongue."

One last contribution which dedicates considerable space to socio-lingual considerations in *Gespräch im Gebirg*, is the article by Amir Eshel, "Paul Celan's Other: History, Poetics, and Ethics"[163]. Eshel takes the notion of Jewish re-appropriation of language, which can be found in rudimentary form in Mosés' article, and which is conceptually developed

---

160. Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 145.
161. Sieber, *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«*.
162. Sieber, „Judendeutsch Und Krummnasig: Ein Kommentar Zu Paul Celans Gespräch Im Gebirg."
163. Eshel, „Paul Celan's Other: History, Poetics, and Ethics."

by Felstiner and Sieber, and reframes it within Celan's poetological framework, professed in his *Meridian* speech and accompanying private notes. According to his interpretation of the lingual peculiarities in *Gespräch im Gebirg*,

> Celan's morphological deviations [...] or use of Yiddish syntactic characteristics [...] and Jewish-German stylistic features [...] rewrites anti-Semitic discourse and thus turns it against itself.[164]

By interpreting these lingual phenomena (as defined by Mosés) as Celan's act of Jewification, *verjuden*, which covertly informs the poetology of the *Meridian,* Eshel then moves on to conclude that:

> For Derrida, every monolithic conception of language, every "monolinguism," incorporates terror against those whose language and body "deviate." By encoding the verb *verjuden* against its linguistic and historical source, Celan not only inverted anti-Semitic discourse, but also distinguished poetry as the linguistic realm that sets itself free from the restrictions of hegemonic, communicative discourse—a discourse beset with the inhuman, as the misuse of German during National Socialism proved. [...] Celan defines poetry in terms of what often appears as its unintelligibility, lack of ordinary syntax, and common semantics: just as "the Jew" was said to be marked as the other by his "jabbering" [=*mauscheln*] language, poetry is the radical other to discursive language.[165]

This analysis is rather rigorous from a conceptual perspective. It effectively correlates the 'intertexts'—Celan's story, speech and notes—to one another, utilizing a purposeful and meaningful hermeneutic principle—the act or re-appropriation by undermining lingual hegemony. However, from a poetical perspective, it is unclear how exactly a caricature of a "jabbering" Jew fulfills that act of re-appropriation and, at the same time, an aesthetic ideal. Since Derrida's conception, quoted here, entails that lingual hegemony requires or dictates lingual homogeneity, a simple injection of foreign vocabulary would constitute a much stronger act of re-appropriation. As mentioned earlier, there are poems in Celan's oeuvre that exhibit exactly this kind of vocabulary injection, like the Yiddish phrases in "Benedicta" (GW, 1: 249), or the Hebrew phrases in many other of his poems. However, precisely this kind of foreign "Jewish"

---

164. Ibid., 67.
165. Ibid., 69.

vocabulary is absent from the text. Jewishness is inscribed differently in this text.

Still missing, moreover, is a consideration of the fundamentally different nature of the act of re-appropriation by Hebrew as opposed to re-appropriation by Yiddish. Namely, that the essence of Yiddish consists in its hybridity (as a fusion language), whereas the essence of German and (at least for the Jewish-German) Hebrew consists in its perceived Herderian purity. Likewise missing is a consideration of the unique socio-lingual dynamics between German and Yiddish in terms of perceived hierarchy, purity, originally as well as oral/written proclivity.

Therefore, a detailed analysis of the exact lingual and literary mechanisms that inscribe *Jewishness* into the language of the story is required.

5.2. The Question of Language in *Gespräch im Gebirg*

In the accompanying letter to the story which Celan sent to Adrono in May of 1960, he refers to the story as "Judendeutsch" right from its title.[166] Another remark taken from Celan's *Nachlaß* refers to the "Jüddeln" in the *Conversation*.[167] Lastly, it is reported by Marlies Janz that "Gespräch im Gerbirg sei eigentlich ein Mauscheln zwischen ihm und Adorno".[168]

Given the state of the art and Celan's own observations, the question concerning the language of the text should be raised before plunging into a full-blown and comprehensive philological analysis of the story. A preliminary discussion may consequently prove to be of great use here, both as a detailed problematization and attempt at a solution to the problem of language in *Gespräch*, through a philological analysis of the title

---

166. Quoted in Sieber, *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«*, 152.
167. Qutoed in Eshel, „Paul Celan's Other: History, Poetics, and Ethics.", 66.
168. Sieber, *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«*, 240.

and Celan's remark concerning it. At the same time, the analysis taken here will serve, by its very nature, as an example of the interdisciplinary methodology guiding the philological part of the dissertation.

5.2.1. *Mauscheln, Jüdeln, Judendeutsch* and Yiddish

The nomenclature oscillating between what is widely known today as (Standard High) German and (Standard Eastern) Yiddish has historically constituted a complicated, ethno-politically motivated semantic field, sown with equivocations, ambiguity and confusions, conditioned by linguistic similarities and dissimilarities alike and driven by assimilationist and anti-assimilationist interests. Above all, throughout its centuries-long duration, anti-Semitic conceptions and sentiments have played a decisive role in the perception of the Jewish conduct with the German language, leaving a distinctive mark in the names given to the different Ashkenazic idioms, dialects and languages. When attributed to a text as lingually-marked as *Gespräch im Gebirg*, the use of ethno-lingual designations such as *Judendeutsch*, *Jüdeln* and *Mauscheln*, necessitate an inquiry of the terminology as a prerequisite for an adequate understanding of the lingual conditions shaping the text.

Due to the historical complexity and wide scope of the problem, the following discussion will only focus on issues which are pertinent to the story at hand.[169] Any attempt to elucidate the underlying lingual infrastructure in *Gespräch im Gebirg*, must first establish the lingual makeup of the contributing lingual constituents. For this purpose, Celan's different designations for that language must be distinguished from each other and clarified.

The first designation, *Judendetusch,* taken from Celan's letter to Adorno, is understood (either implicitly or explicitly) by prior research on the

169. For the standard works of research on this subject from a general cultural-historical perspective, see the section "German-Yiddish Socio-linguistics from the Perspective of Cultural and Intellectual History" in the "State of the the Art and Methodology" chapter.

story, almost without discussion,[170] as interchangeable with Yiddish. *Judendetusch* may indeed function as an older term for Yiddish, as assumed by the surveyed research; however, it may also designate either the extinct idiom of German-Jews before acculturation (West-Yiddish), or its 'relics' in the speech of German-Jews, whether real or imagined. In essence, it is cognate, among others, with *Jüdischdeutsch* and *Judaeo-Germanic*.[171] All these designations which are composed of a duality of ethnic elements, German and Jewish, do not reflect the progressiveness of a hyphen culture, of course. Rather, they share a perception of the Jewish idiom as a corruption of the German source language. Not an original lingual creations, but a corrupt imitation. In short, it is what Jews do to the German language when they practice it.

In this sense, *Judendetusch* clearly projects an anti-Semitic perspective, which in turn is attributed to Yiddish, by non-Jews and acculturated German-Jews alike. However, when the acculturated German-Jew says *Judendetusch*, he may not necessarily mean the same as the non-Jew. While the former seeks to distinguish himself from the Yiddish-speaking *Ostjude* by designating his own speech as proper German as opposed to his eastern brethren's *Judendetusch*, the non-Jew remains suspicious of the acculturated Jew's use of German just as much. The ethnic quality of this term, the element *'Juden'*, makes certain of it: for *Judendetusch* is, after all, 'the Jew's German', or simply German when it is spoken by Jews. Its Jewishness is therefore as indelible as the Jewishness of its speakers. As Sander Gilman and a great deal of other scholars have shown, Jews are always marked by their different language in the German-speaking lands,

---

170. Sieber is an exception to this: her short discussion acknowledges the double meaning of Judendeutsch, as Eastern and Western Yiddish and the anti-Semitic echo, but falls short of drawing any interlingual consequences; instead, the discussion concludes Judendeutsch to be synonymous with Yiddish. See, Sieber, „Judendeutsch Und Krummnasig: Ein Kommentar Zu Paul Celans Gespräch Im Gebirg.", 20-21..

171. Nevertheless, Judendeutsch lacks the neutral pretense these two alternatives sometimes enjoy under scientific circumstances.

even if they have purposefully tried to shed any trace of it. In an attempt to distance himself from the anti-Semitic lingual marker of Otherness that is *Judendetusch,* the acculturated Jew re-casts the allegations of the improper use of German in the image of the Yiddish-speaking *Ostjude.*

Eastern Yiddish is the spitting image of the anti-Semitic German stereotype about the Jewish idiom: it is unoriginal because it relies on German and Slavic as its stock languages; and it is impure for mixing these sources. It is as distinctively Jewish because of its Hebrew component, as it is Jewish because of the alleged unoriginality and hybridity, thus using tautological argumentations, like many other hermetic racist notions.

Consequently, Yiddish becomes the perfect bearer for the projected repressed lingual anxiety of the *Bildungsjudentum* about the German language. Thus, when Celan is reading anti-Semitic insinuations, suggesting his German language gives away his Jewish ancestry in Günter Blöcker's review of *Sprachgitter*,[172] what he is reading in fact is an accusation rendering his German as nothing but *Judendetusch*. His mother's meticulous cultivation of correct German was in vain; whether manifestly present in the *Ostjude*'s Yiddish or covertly present in his own German, nothing can efface the *Jud* from *Judendeutsch*.

Judendeutsch therefore retains the full scope of meaning encapsulated in its ethnicity—both contemporary as well as historical: alongside an old designation for Eastern Yiddish (which by the second World War was already outdated and replaced with term *Jiddisch*), it is a marker of Jewishness inscribed in language—whether as salient as in the Czernowitz *Kiegeldeutsch* or in the extinct West-Yiddish, or as carefully hidden as in the language of the Jewish poet, Celan.

Therefore, the term *Judendeutsch* is selected by Celan not only for its anti-Semitic overtones, but for its particular variety of anti-Semitism: the ethnic, indelible, turned-racist in the context of the Holocaust. Indeed,

172. Eshel, „Paul Celan's Other: History, Poetics, and Ethics.", 59.

Yiddish does not lack in designations, many of which unflattering, such as *jargon* or anti-Semitic such as *Judensprache*; Celan insists on *Judendetusch,* even though it is outdated, certainly by the late 1950s, and exactly because it is ambiguous as to the exact nature and extent of Jewishness contained in this German.

More than an indication of a specific language, dialect or idiom, *Judendetusch* indicates a Jewish performance of German, which can be unstable and elusive, all-penetrating as the Wandering Jew himself.

This hypothesis is supported by Celan's two other remarks, suggesting the language of the story to be either *Maucheln* or *Jüdeln.* While *Judendeutsch* can still be taken as a designation for a language, either Eastern Yiddish or extinct Western-Yiddish, *Maucheln* and *Jüdeln* clearly designate a Jewish performance of German, not a language but its performance. *Maucheln* and *Jüdeln* are also much blunter in their anti-Semitism, since they also pertain to economic behavior, equating alleged Jewish reprehensible conduct in commerce with their corrupt conduct with language.[173]

Furthermore, *Jüdeln* and particulalry *Maucheln* represent an oral manifestation of the Jewish corruption of the German language. They express *eo ipso* the act of corruption brought upon German by the act of Jewish speech, a corrupt Jewish way of speaking German: while written German may sometimes conceal the Jewish origin of the writer, spoken German immediately turns him over by exposing his Jewish accent and deficient speech. As with the case of *Judendeutsch*, *Maucheln* and *Jüdeln* date back as far as the seventeenth-century, thus originally attributed to the way Jews used to speak German or Western-Yiddish, not to Jews speaking Eastern-Yiddish. Starting with the efforts of the Haskalah to

---

173. Jacob Grimm, and Wilhelm Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch Von Jacob Und Wilhelm Grimm. 16 Bde. In 32 Teilbänden. Quellenverzeichnis 1971.* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1854). online version: http://woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB/; See the relevant entries in: Hans Peter Althaus, *Kleines Lexikon Deutscher Wörter Jiddischer Herkunft* (C.H.Beck, 2010).; for an extensive discussion: Hans Peter Althaus, *Mauscheln: Ein Wort Als Waffe* (Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2002).

purge the German-Jewish speech from Western-Yiddish elements, *Maucheln*, like *Judendeutsch*, comes to serve acculturated Jews in their attempt to distinguish themselves from their atavistic brethren in the east. With the advancement of these efforts the pejorative terminology travels eastward, being projected on Eastern-Yiddish, instead of its original Western-Yiddish.[174]

However, acculturated German-Jews can never rid themselves of these accusations. Despite giving rise to such eminent and influential writers and poets like Heine, Kafka and Zweig, their language and, in particular, their speech, always remain suspected as *Judendeutsch*, *Maucheln* and *Jüdeln*. This suspicion persists through the centuries, turns into vehement accusation with the rise of modern anti-Semitism, and culminates in the Nazi image of the Jew.

Therefore when Celan speaks of the Jewish victims of the Holocaust, their Jewishness is as much inscribed in their flesh as in their language:

> ... Erst wenn du mit deinem allereigensten Schmerz bei den *Krummnasigen und den mauschelnden und kielkröpfigen Toten von Auschwitz und Treblinka* und anderswo gewesen bist, dann begegnest du auch dem Aug und seiner Mandel. Und dann stehst du mit deinem [...] verstummenden Denken in der Pause, die dich an dein Herz erinnert, und sprichst nicht mehr.[175]

In this atrocious image, *Mauscheln*, which originally designated Jewish-German speech, becomes an ethnic marker with quasi-racial qualities—thus encompassing every form of Jewish speech, whether German or Yiddish. The explicitness of the anti-Semitic semantic load thus comes a full circle: what in Celan's written (but private) description to Adorno as *Judendeutsch,* bears a slightly pejorative connotation, and can even be understood as an archaic designation for Yiddish, is then intensified as *Jüdeln* in his private remarks, which actually conceals the stereotype pejorative per se for Jewish language in German—*Mauscheln.*

---

174. Jeffrey Shandler, *Adventures in Yiddishland* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 131.

175. Eshel, „Von Kafka Bis Celan: Deutsch-Jüdische Schriftsteller Und Ihr Verhaältnis Zum Hebraïschen Und Jiddischen.", 105.

Finally, Celan's dictum "Man kann verjuden [...] Ich halte Verjudung für empfehlenswert—Krummnasigkeit läutert die Seele",[176] which is covertly echoed in the *Meridian*, suggests that an aesthetic ideal can be achieved by connecting the dots between *Verjudung*, *Krummnasigkeit* and *Mauscheln*. The ideal of *Verjudung* must follow by way of *Mauscheln*.

5.2.2. *Judendeutsch* is *Jiddischdeutsch*

As a designation of Western-Yiddish, or its relics, *Judendeutsch*, however, is a specter of the past. An unrelenting, anti-Semitic specter, but lingually extinct just as much. For the lack of any remnant of the original *Judendeutsch*, the idiom spoken by German-Jews before their German acculturation, the negative connotation associated with *Judendeutsch*, *Mauscheln*, *Jüdeln*, as a corrupted Jewish performance of German are projected by acculturated German-Jews unto Yiddish. By the twentieth-century Yiddish has become the standard bearer of the 'Jewified' German.

Therefore, Celan has to re-invent a language which would stay German and at the same time replicate an image of a long-lost idiom, which was once the Jewish performance of German. What is left of this idiom is only its contemporary image of corruption—its next of kin, Yiddish. Celan sets out to form a new German idiom, an idiom unlike any other — that is idiosyncratic as his poetry—which nonetheless stays both Jewish and German.

From a linguistic perspective, the *Jude* in this *Judendeutsch* is clearly Eastern-Yiddish, not the remnants of Western-Yiddish. Even when considering the indirect influence of the Czernowitz *Judendeutsch*, the Jewish component at play is Eastern-Yiddish influence, not Western-Yiddish. The *Judendeutsch* of *Gespräch im Gerbirg* is modeled then after Eastern-Yiddish, not after Western-Yiddish or its nineteenth-century

176. Quoted in Sieber, *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«*, 161.

caricature, as some have suggested.[177] In leaning on Celan and these observations, the language in *Gespräch im Gerbirg* may thus be more adequately called *Jiddischdeutsch*, rather than *Judendetusch*. As the philological analysis reveals, this *Jiddischdeutsch* runs much more deeply and covertly into the grammatical inner-workings of the text, than hitherto realized.

Indeed, on the face of it, the story exhibits all the accepted characteristics of a German text. Its orthography conforms with contemporary conventions, its vocabulary seems German, and even its peculiar sentence structure remains grammatical by and large. In other words, the text is not written in *macaronic* German. Its foreign element is covert. The *Judendeutsch* or *Jiddischdeutsch* in this text must accordingly be sought, unearthed and excavated from within a deeper lingual layer of the text. The key to the idiosyncratic language of *Gespräch im Gerbirg* consists in the sum of its idiosyncratic lingual elements, which are the object of the following linguistic analysis.

5.2.3. The Title and the Oral Orientation of *Jiddischdeutsch*

Celan's remark, "Es ist, schon im Titel, 'Judendeutsch'", calls for both a linguistic and an ethnologic analysis of the title. Linguistically, it presents the morphological phenomena of apocope or elision in the word 'Gebirg'. The omission of the closing -e syllable, is characteristic (though not exclusively) of Yiddish and other forms of Jewish-German speech. In this respect the title is indeed worthy of Celan's *Judendeutsch* epithet, as it typographically mimics a Jewish variant of German. As noted, however, elision is not exclusive to the Jewish variants of German, but is rather common to many dialects. In fact, it is a distinctive characteristic of spoken 'sub-Standard' German, i.e., *Umgangsprache*, e.g., 'ich *hab*' instead of 'ich *habe*'. The linguistic common denominator here, therefore, is the

177. Sieber, „Judendeutsch Und Krummnasig: Ein Kommentar Zu Paul Celans Gespräch Im Gebirg.", 22.

orality of the affected variants of German which exhibit this phenomena.

In other words, apocope or elision is a distinctive phenomena of spoken language as such, in contrast to written language, which deliberately avoids these omissions. As an oral phenomena it is at the same time 'universal', that is ethnologically-neutral within the German frame of reference ('every German *speaks* that way') and 'particular' within a German-Jewish frame of reference ('Jews speak *German* that way'). But Celan omits the last syllable *orthographically*, not orally. If non-Jewish German was to be attested in the title, it would nonetheless still read *Gebirg**e***, even if it was pronounced as *Gebirg*; since *Judendeutsch* is supposedly attested for in the title, it can only write what is being said. There is not even the customary apostrophe to fill in the void orthographically (*Gebirg'*), which is so common in orthographic representation of omitted syllable of spoken language. Celan represents *Judendeutsch* as it is spoken since it is the one and only way to reproduce it, as a Jewish performance of German. This Gebirg is therefore a distinctively Jewish mountain.

As a result, what this small orthographic omission bears on the title to make it undeniably marked here is the orality of *Judendeutsch*, which comes to mean: the Jewish way of performing German is the Jewish way of *speaking* German, that is, Jewish speech, or to use David Roskies' pinpointed terminology—German *Jewspeak*.[178]

The epithet may thus be only understood in full when the title is read once again backwards, from its tail to its head: the innate orality of the *Judendeutsch* represented in its orthographic omission not only reflects upon the ethnicity of its geographic setting, but also on the necessary contents of its narrative, which is a conversation, "ein Gespräch". The title's epithet diverges from its linguistic quality and sways into the realm of the literary device. The story is *Judendeutsch* right from the title because it is a Jewish oral performance of German set in the most oral form of

178. Roskies, „Call it Jewspeak: On the Evolution of Speech in Modern Yiddish Writing."

communication—the informal dialogue—which in itself happens to be very Jewish.

The oral inclination of Yiddish is well-known, as the saying goes—'יִידיש רעדט זיך אליין', that is, Yiddish comes out naturally—, so are the socio-linguistic conditions which have retained this oral preposition well into the twentieth century: belated development of literature, the status of a derided ethnolect, inner diglossia with Hebrew, to name a few. In fact, some of the lingual phenomena in the philological analysis which have become established structures in Yiddish, have less frequent but still attested cognates in spoken German. Furthermore, the 'intertexts' alluded by Felstiner in this context suggest that the orality of the text in *Gespräch* bears the sign of Jewish handling of language. In other words, *Jiddischdeutsch* consists in the oral performance of German, which is modeled after the oral orientation of Yiddish.

However, an oral proclivity does not imply an uncultivated style or an empty chatter; on the contrary, oral literature has distinctive literary vehicles, characterized by distinctive literary devices and formulae. The strong connections between performative arts, specific literary traditions and Yiddish have been discussed in the context of Celan's biography and the rise of Yiddishism in interwar Czernowitz. All these come a full circle in *Gespräch im Gebirg.* The linguistic analysis is therefore followed by a short consideration of genre and intertextual references in relation to the text's oral orientation.

5.2.4. The Present vs. Absent Components of Yiddish in *Jiddischdeutsch*

One last aspect of Celan's *Jiddischdeutsch* to be considered before the philological analysis is the dominant presence of the German component in contrast with the absence of the non-German components of Yiddish in *Gespräch im Gerbirg.*

As suggested earlier, the story exhibits all the accepted characteristics of a German text. Despite its clearly-discernible lingual peculiarity, it

usually conforms to German grammar and is devoid of undisguised 'foreign' vocabulary. From a lexical perspective then, no Hebrew or Slavic lexeme are attested in the text, although they constitute roughly 25%-33% of the Yiddish-lexis.[179] Such non-German elements are highly present but hidden, however, within the underlying syntax and semantics. As a result, the text maintains a dual lingual system: a German outer-layer and a Yiddish inner-layer.[180] Furthermore, Yiddish lexemes can only be inferred from their German cognates, as they never appear transliterated.

This is surely a stylistic choice—in other cases, Celan incorporates non-German elements, for instance the Hebrew lexemes *Kaddisch*, and *Jiskor* in the poem "die Schleuse", (GW, 1: 222) or even transliterated Yiddish in "Benedicta"—"*ʒ muʃ aʃoj ʃajn*" (GW, 1: 249). In these cases, however, the foreign component is highly marked on the lexical level. In "Benedicta" the Yiddish phrase is even typographically marked. The difference is nonetheless more essential than stylistic. For these foreign words retain a degree of alienation within the poetic framework. They are immediately exposed as foreign.

In *Gespräch im Gebirg,* on the other hand, Celan writes a complete story 'in Yiddish' without explicitly uttering a single Yiddish word. Incorporating Hebraisms, Slavicisms or Yiddishisms would not only turn the text into an anti-Semitic caricature, but more importantly, it would also interfere with the consistency of the lingual principle behind *Jiddischdeutsch*: namely, that the act or re-appropriation of the German language after the Holocaust re-constitutes German on the basis of Yiddish, not by replacing German with a macaronic version of Yiddish-German. In other words, the act of re-appropriating German for the Jew is only truly successful when it is informed by a Jewish language, not

179. *The Germanic Languages* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 417-18.
180. Perhaps the grammaticality of the German outer layer is the source for Mosés argument for a High German narrative register alongside Judendeutsch. The lingual distinction, however, should be made between lexis and syntax, not between narration and dialogue. Cf. Mosés, „Wege Auf Denen Die Sprache Stimmhaft Wird ". Paul Celans „gespräch Im Gebirg.", 49..

replaced by it. German must remain *outwardly* German.

5.3. Philological and Linguistic Analysis

5.3.1. Color-Coded Text of Gespräch im Gebirg

Color-Coded Index of the Primary Phenomena

Syntax		Phonology & Morphology
Post-Nominal Constructions [NP-NP]	*vos*-Effect	Apocope/Syncope Clitics
V1-Clause/Verbal Repetition	Distancing-Effect	Semantics & *False-Friends*

Eines Abends, die Sonne, und nicht nur sie, war untergegangen, da ging, trat aus seinem Häusel und ging der Jud, der Jud und Sohn eines Juden, und mit ihm ging sein Name, der unaussprechliche, ging und kam, kam dahergezockelt, ließ sich hören, kam am Stock, kam über den Stein, hörst du mich, du hörst mich, ich bin**s**, ich, ich und der, den du hörst, zu hören vermeinst, ich und der andre, - er ging also, das war zu hören, ging eines Abends, da einiges untergegangen war, ging unter**m** Gewölk, ging im Schatten, dem eignen und dem fremden - denn der Jud, du weißts, was hat er schon, das ihm auch wirklich gehört, das nicht geborgt wär, ausgeliehen und nicht zurückgegeben -, da ging er also und kam, kam daher auf der Straße, der schönen, der unvergleichlichen, ging, wie Lenz, durch**s** Gebirg, er, den man hatte wohnen lassen unten, wo er hingehört, in den Niederungen, er, der Jud, kam und kam.

Kam, ja, auf der Straße daher, der schönen.
Und wer, denkst du, kam ihm entgegen? Entgegen kam ihm sein Vetter, sein Vetter und Geschwisterkind, der um ein Viertel Judenleben ältre, groß kam er daher, kam, auch er, in dem Schatten, dem geborgten - denn welcher, so frag und frag ich, kommt, da Gott ihn hat einen Juden sein lassen, daher mit Eignem? -, kam, kam groß, kam dem andern entgegen, Groß kam auf Klein zu, und Klein, der Jude, hieß seinen Stock schweigen vor dem Stock des Juden Groß.
So schwieg auch der Stein, und es war still im Gebirg, wo sie gingen, der und jener.
Still war**s** also, still dort oben im Gebirg. Nicht lang war**s** still, denn wenn der Jud daherkommt und begegnet einem zweiten, dann ist**s** bald vorbei mit dem Schweigen, auch im Gebirg. Denn der Jud und die Natur, das ist zweierlei, immer noch, auch heute, auch hier. Da stehn sie also, die Geschwisterkinder, links blüht der Türkenbund, blüht wild, blüht wie nirgends, und rechts, da steht die Rapunzel, und Dianthus superbus, die Prachtnelke, steht nicht weit davon. Aber sie, die Geschwisterkinder, sie haben, Gott sei's geklagt, keine Augen.
Genauer: sie haben, auch sie, Augen, aber da hängt ein Schleier davor, nicht davor, nein, dahinter, ein beweglicher Schleier; kaum tritt ein Bild ein, so bleibt**s** hängen im Geweb, und schon ist ein Faden zur Stelle, der sich da spinnt, sich herumspinnt um**s** Bild, ein Schleierfaden; spinnt sich um**s** Bild herum und zeugt ein Kind mit ihm, halb Bild und halb Schleier.
Armer Türkenbund, arme Rapunzel! Da stehn sie, die Geschwisterkinder, auf einer Straße stehn sie im Gebirg, es schweigt der Stock, es schweigt der Stein, und das Schweigen ist kein Schweigen, kein Wort ist da verstummt und kein Satz, eine Pause ist**s** bloß, eine Wortlücke ist**s**, eine Leerstelle ist**s**, du siehst alle Silben umherstehn; Zunge sind sie und Mund, diese beiden wie zuvor, und in den Augen hängt ihnen der Schleier, und ihr, ihr armen, ihr steht nicht und blüht nicht, ihr seid nicht vorhanden, und der Juli ist kein Juli.
Die Geschwätzigen! Haben sich, auch jetzt, da die Zunge blöd gegen die Zähne stößt und die Lippe sich nicht rundet, etwas zu sagen! Gut, laß sie reden ...

»Bist gekommen von weit, bist gekommen hierher...«
»Bin ich. Bin ich gekommen wie du.«

»Weiß ich.«
»Weißt du. Weißt du und siehst: Es hat sich die Erde gefaltet hier oben, hat sich gefaltet einmal und zweimal und dreimal, und hat sich aufgetan in der Mitte, und in der Mitte steht ein Wasser, und das Wasser ist grün, und das Grüne ist weiß, und das Weiße kommt von noch weiter oben, kommt von den Gletschern, man könnte, aber man soll**s** nicht, sagen, das ist die Sprache, die hier gilt, das Grüne mit dem Weißen drin, eine Sprache, nicht für dich und nicht für mich - denn, frag ich, für wen ist sie denn gedacht, die Erde, nicht für dich, sag ich, ist sie gedacht, und nicht für mich -, eine Sprache, je nun, ohne Ich und ohne Du, lauter Er, lauter Es, verstehst du, lauter Sie, und nichts als das.«

»Versteh ich, versteh ich. Bin ja gekommen von weit, bin ja gekommen wie du.«
»Weiß ich.«
»Weißt du und willst mich fragen: Und bist gekommen trotzdem, bist, trotzdem gekommen hierher - warum und wozu?«
»Warum und wozu ... Weil ich hab reden müssen vielleicht, zu mir oder zu dir, reden hab müssen mit dem Mund und mit der Zunge und nicht nur mit dem Stock. Denn zu wem redet er, der Stock? Er redet zum Stein, und der Stein - zu wem redet der?«
»Zu wem, Geschwisterkind, soll er reden? Er redet nicht, er spricht, und wer spricht, Geschwisterkind, der redet zu niemand, der spricht, weil niemand ihn hört, niemand und Niemand, und dann sagt er, er und nicht sein Mund und nicht seine Zunge, sagt er und nur er: Hörst du?« »Hörst du, sagt er - ich weiß, Geschwisterkind, ich weiß ... Hörst du, sagt er, ich bin da. Ich bin da, ich bin hier, ich bin gekommen. Gekommen mit dem Stock, ich und kein andrer, ich und nicht er, ich mit meiner Stunde, der unverdienten, ich, den**'s** getroffen hat, ich, den**'s** nicht getroffen hat, ich mit dem Gedächtnis, ich, der Gedächtnisschwache, ich, ich, ich ...«
»Sagt er, sagt er... Hörst du, sagt er... Und Hörstdu, gewiß, Hörstdu, der sagt nichts, der antwortet nicht, denn Hörstdu, das ist der mit den Gletschern, der, der sich gefaltet hat, dreimal, und nicht für die Menschen ... Der Grün-und-Weiße dort, der mit dem Türkenbund, der mit der Rapunzel... Aber ich, Geschwisterkind, ich, der ich da steh, auf dieser Straße hier, auf die ich nicht hingehör, heute, jetzt, da sie untergegangen ist, sie und ihr Licht, ich hier mit dem Schatten, dem eignen und dem fremden, ich - ich, der ich dir sagen kann:
- Auf dem Stein bin ich gelegen, damals, du weißt, auf den Steinfliesen; und neben mir, da sind sie gelegen, die andern, die wie ich waren, die andern, die anders waren als ich und genauso, die Geschwisterkinder; und sie lagen da und schliefen, schliefen und schliefen nicht, und sie träumten und träumten nicht, und sie liebten mich nicht und ich liebte sie nicht, denn ich war einer, und wer will Einen lieben, und sie waren viele, mehr noch als da herumlagen um mich, und wer will alle lieben können, und, ich verschweig**s** dir nicht, ich liebte sie nicht, sie, die mich nicht lieben konnten, ich liebte die Kerze, die da brannte, links im Winkel, ich liebte sie, weil sie herunterbrannte, nicht weil sie herunterbrannte, denn sie, das war ja seine Kerze, die Kerze, die er, der Vater unsrer Mütter, angezündet hatte, weil an jenem Abend ein Tag begann, ein bestimmter, ein Tag, der der siebte war, der siebte, auf den

der erste folgen sollte, der siebte und nicht der letzte, ich liebte, Geschwisterkind, nicht sie, ich liebte ihr Herunterbrennen, und, weißt du, ich habe nichts mehr geliebt seither;

nichts, nein; oder vielleicht das, was da herunterbrannte wie jene Kerze an jenem Tag, am siebten und nicht am letzten; nicht am letzten, nein, denn da bin ich ja, hier, auf dieser Straße, von der sie sagen, daß sie schön ist, bin ich ja, hier, beim Türkenbund und bei der Rapunzel, und hundert Schritt weiter, da drüben, wo ich hinkann, da geht die Lärche zur Zirbelkiefer hinauf, ich seh**'s**, ich seh es und seh**'s** nicht, und mein Stock, der hat gesprochen, hat gesprochen zum Stein, und mein Stock, der schweigt jetzt still, und der Stein, sagst du, der kann sprechen, und in meinem Aug, da hängt der Schleier, der bewegliche, da hängen die Schleier, die beweglichen, da hast du den einen gelüpft, und da hängt schon der zweite, und der Stern - denn ja, der steht jetzt über**m** Gebirg -, wenn er da hineinwill, so wird er Hochzeit halten müssen und bald nicht mehr er sein, sondern halb Schleier und halb Stern, und ich weiß, ich weiß, Geschwisterkind, ich weiß, ich bin dir begegnet, hier, und geredet haben wir, viel, und die Falten dort, du weißt, nicht für die Menschen sind sie da und nicht für uns, die wir hier gingen und einander trafen, wir hier unter**m** Stern, wir, die Juden, die da kamen, wie Lenz, durch**s** Gebirg, du Groß und ich Klein, du, der Geschwätzige, und ich, der Geschwätzige, wir mit den Stöcken, wir mit unsern Namen, den unaussprechlichen, wir mit unserm Schatten, dem eignen und dem fremden, du hier und ich hier -

- ich hier, ich; ich, der ich dir all das sagen kann, sagen hätt können; der ich dir**s** nicht sag und nicht gesagt hab; ich mit dem Türkenbund links, ich mit der Rapunzel, ich mit der heruntergebrannten, der Kerze, ich mit dem Tag, ich mit den Tagen, ich hier und ich dort, ich, begleitet vielleicht - jetzt! - von der Liebe der Nichtgeliebten, ich auf dem Weg hier zu mir, oben.«

5.3.2. Phonology and Morphology

5.3.2.1. The Apocope as the Lingual Musical Key of the Story

From a purely phonological perspective, the most salient non-Standard phenomenon in the text is indeed that of the elision, which opened the entire analysis, as well as the story itself. Not only does it act as a orthographic musical key-of-absence set right in the title, as if to indicate the Jewish quality of the speech act ahead, but it also repeats itself at specific key points throughout the entire length of the story, thus functioning as an anchor for its Jewish quality. Furthermore, the occurrences of this repeating phenomenon are not just phonologically conditioned but, as will be shown shortly, are lexically-conditioned as well, thus gaining on hermeneutic importance with each recurrence. This calls for a comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon.

The two main forms of elision, the apocope, and to a lesser degree, the syncope are systematically spread across the entire text. In fact, almost every closing -e syllable that might be admissibly omitted in a poetic or colloquial context is indeed omitted in this text.

The apocope which signalizes *Judendeutsch* in the title for Celan, that of "Gebirg", is semantically neutral because there is nothing particularly Jewish about mountains as such, i.e., in lieu of any other lexical marker of Jewishness, such as the lexeme 'temple' in 'temple mount'.

However, this semantic neutrality comes to an abrupt end at the beginning of the story with the first occurrence of the apocope set right at the heart of the first sentence, with the word "Jud" (2).[181]

Narratively, the "Jud" is the protagonist of the story, one of a pair, that is, a proper name which will later be complemented with a last name—Klein and Groß, for each one of the pair, respectively. Lexically and symbolically it is nothing but a proper name for a person, but rather the

181. The numbers inside the brackets refer to line numbers in the color-coded version of *Gespräch im Gebirg* printed above.

(inappropriate) name of an ethnic designation for the Other, an exonym: 'Jud', of course, is the apocopated form of 'Jude', which is standard German for 'Jew'. Therefore, as opposed to "Gebirg", it is far from being semantically neutral since the Jewishness of the apocope 'Jud' is undeniably self-evident in its very lexical function. As if to further emphasize the inevitability of his Jewishness, the name is repeated twice and is declared to be the son of Jew ("der Jud, der Jud und Sohn eines Juden", 2).

However, the way in which this Jewishness is manifest in the apocope is far from neutral. In fact, it is semantically overdetermined in a myriad of coinciding and contradicting ways, culminating in a paradox which renders it overloaded with hermeneutical tension. Such a complicated semantic markedness requires a closer and deeper inspection, since it will lay the groundwork for the entire length of the philological analysis of the text.

First of all from a Standard-German perspective, 'Jud' is a clear-cut anti-Semitic pejorative for a Jew. This is evident to every sensitive native speaker in the post-Auschwitz German language area. Nevertheless, it has a popular history which long predates the rise of modern anti-Semitism. In fact, the shortened version 'Jud' is much more characteristic of popular anti-Semitism than modern, which usually prefers to call the subject by its proper bisyllabic name, 'Jude', for the sake of pseudo-scientific objectivity. 'Jud', for that matter, carries a scent of centuries-old ethnic hostility toward Jews that is simply too clearly prejudiced to be considered suitable for the formal prerequisites of pseudo-science. Its current association with the Holocaust is a result of the eruption of popular anti-Semitism which coincided and reciprocated with the rise of Nazism, bringing this traditional expression of feud back to the fore, as well as the willing subjugation of German folklorists to harness proverbial

traditions to the cause of rampant Nazi anti-Semitism.[182] Long before the rise of modern anti-Semitism and Nazism, the colloquial designation 'Jud'/'Jüd' became so emphatically pejorative that the unabbreviated form 'Jude' acquired an official neutral quality, merely by artificially distancing itself from the colloquialism's sound and its accompanying anti-Semitic overtones.[183]

In other words, historically, the omission of the last syllable from the lexeme 'Jude' connotes the scorn of grass-roots anti-Semitism, not that of its modern counterpart. It is what the 'common wisdom' told the 'common German' about the 'common Jew' for centuries; not what the erudite scholar has come to know about him by way of (pseudo-)scientific research.

For a cultural and literary vehicle to be pervasive enough to be able to carry such a load of loathing—the essential information coded in the lexeme about the most dangerous of Others, the Jew,—for such an extensive period of time—from antiquity to the modern era, —and popular enough to withstand a cultural change as deep as industrialization— it must be continuously transferred predominantly in an oral form, the very same form that naturally inclines toward elision.

Indeed, the frequency of the form 'Jud' is very high in German proverbs and other expressions of popular wisdom about the Jews, most of which make clear anti-Semitic observations. Shortly put in dialectological terms, 'Jud' is either a dialect form or its closely-related colloquial variant of the Standard register 'Jude'. Consequently, it is not surprising that 'Jud', as a clear-cut pejorative designation with a set of specific connotations, is first and foremost the subject of the cultural oral agents of popular wisdom—children songs, proverbs and jokes.

---

182. Wolfgang Mieder, "Proverbs in Nazi Germany: The Promulgation of Anti-Semitism and Stereotypes Through Folklore," *The Journal of American Folklore* 95, no. 378 (1982).
183. Cf. Leo Spitzer's analysis from June 1938: "Es ist noch zu bemerken, dass die Dialekt form *Jud* (*Jüd, Jid*) den Schimpfwortcharakter in sich polarisiert hat [...] ,so dass Jude entlastet war und offiziell wirkte." Leo Spitzer, "Kathole," *Modern Language Notes* 53, no. 6 (1938), 436.

Therefore, one typically finds a plentiful of proverbs with the apocope form 'Jud' in dictionaries of colloquial dialects and in collection of proverbs. Much of this documented proverbial wisdom is anti-Semitic, giving the colloquial designation 'Jud' its distinctive pejorative semantic load. The following few examples are taken from the prominent proverbs collection compiled by the great German folklorist Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Wander[184] in the late nineteenth-century. The proverbs are followed by Wander's explanations, where applicable:

> 47. Jud' bleibt Jud' und wenn er auch Sporen an den Stiefeln trägt. – Gutzkow, Ritter vom Geist, I, 120.
>
> 48. Jud' und Kauwertz (Judenchristen) findet man allerwärts. – Nass. Schulbl., XIV, 5.
>
> 165. Der Jud' kommt.
> Eine Redensart, mit der man in Tirol die Kinder schreckt,wenn sie schreien oder sonst unartig sind.
>
> 102. Bin kein Jud', leck' keine Sau. (Rott-Thal.)

The last and crudest of these examples (albeit not altogether)[185], picks up on the popular anti-Semitic motif which associates the Jews with the animal most despised in the context of their own culture, allegedly exposing their uncleanliness as well as hypocrisy and sacrilege.[186] This distinctively German anti-Semitic motif culminated in the depictions of the Judensau/Saujuden in Germany of the high middle ages, which brought together images of the Jew's obscenity, blasphemy, effeminate nature and

---

184. Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Wander, *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon: Ein Hausschatz Für Das Deutsche Volk* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1880).; online version: http://woerterbuchnetz.de/Wander/

185. Consider the vehement Nazi-era collections, adding 'prverbial' inventions of their own. For a comprehensive survey: Mieder, „Proverbs in Nazi Germany: The Promulgation of Anti-Semitism and Stereotypes Through Folklore.", 454-57.

186. Birgit Wiedl, "Laughing At the Beast: The *Judensau*: Anti-Jewish Propaganda and Humor From the Middle Ages to the Early Modern Period," Albrecht Classen, and Marilyn Sandidge (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 347-48.

dirtiness. Nevertheless, it always remained a permanent favorite theme of popular anti-Semitism in Germany.[187] Its crude graphic vividness combined with the monosyllabic flexibility (Sau/Jud) make it the natural raw material for yet another form of popular oral literature — the children song.

Thus we find in the opening stanza of a poem by Celan's contemporary Czernowitz poet, Alfred Gong, "Kinderlied über 'Jud'" the following verse— "Jud ist Sau / Und Sau ist Jud".[188] Here are many of the main tenets of popular anti-Semitism neatly packed in a catchy and rhythmic two-liner. The multitude of pejorative semantic connotation discussed above contained in equating a Jew with a sow is complemented by the tautological chiastic structure Jud=Sau/Sau=Jud which puts the monosyllabic 'Jud' to 'good' euphonic use. It makes the song as easy to remember as to be shouted after a strolling victim when opportunity awakes.

Gong's stylized mimicry of proverbial children singing about the Jew evolves around the rhythmic core 'Jud' with a prolonging set of monosyllables which clearly echo the monosyllabic core lexeme while reflecting the contents of the proverbial which consist in the 'Jud':

> Ein Wau-Wau, / Der trinkt's Blut. / […] Spitzer Hut, / Gelber Fleck, / Gelb wie Dreck, / Trägt der Jud. / Hakennase, / Feig wie'n Hase, / Füchsenschlau, / Der Wau-Wau

The poem then goes on to give the recommended recipe for dealing with the 'Jud', while keeping with the same rhythmic monosyllabic echoing of 'Jud':

> Fass ein wenig Mut, / Fang dir einen Jud, / Zupf ihn an der Bart, / Hau ihn weich und hart, / Hau ihn blau und rot, / Hau ihn bis zum Tod, / […] Salze seine Wunden […]

Most of this characteristics can be easily traced back to proverbs and other forms of popular depictions of the Jew; the last of these

187. Ibid., 342-47.
188. *Blaueule Leid: Bukowina 1940-1944. Eine Anthologie* (Aachen: Rimbaud, 2003), 41.

recommendation, "Salze seine Wunden," is an exact poetic enactment of how Karl Kraus' defined the twisted Nazi "Aufbruch der Phrase zur Tat", that is, the proverb "Salz in offene Wunden" is stripped out its metaphorical essence and reinstated as actionable law.[189] This heavy semantic load of proverbial, atavistic contempt is condensed and charged unto a single syllable, 'Jud'. Like any other German-speaking Jew in interwar Czernowtiz, Celan must have shared in the experience of his friend and colleague that gave rise to such a heavy semantic burden laid on one's own name in one's own language.

However, the very same German dialectical spectrum which gave rise to the pejorative 'Jud', also gave rise to its Jewish-German counterpart, the endonym 'Jid/Yid' (יִיד). Given that the musical key set at the title of the story, the apocope "Gebirg", signalizes its *Judendeutsch* nature, the apocope 'Jud' should equally be read as a Jewish endonym, a Jewish performance of the very same German lexeme. The semantic implications of such a reading would necessarily lead to a paradox.

Whereas the German exonym 'Jud' signifies a specific set of clear pejorative meaning, the Jewish-German endonym 'Jid' naturally does not carry such a negative connotation at all. In contemporary Yiddish, it can either mean a 'Jew', with no special connotation, that is, semantically neutral; alternatively, it may carry a familiar, endearing and positive overtone; lastly, "in contexts where Jewishness is irrelevant" it comes to mean a person, a human being.[190] Ironically enough, the particularist endonym is completely turned on its head to become universalist. The particular qualities of being a Jew become so deeply identified with the qualities of being a human, that the original endonym is stripped out of its particularism and extended to humanity at large.

---

189. Mieder, „Proverbs in Nazi Germany: The Promulgation of Anti-Semitism and Stereotypes Through Folklore.", 442-43.
190. Uriel Weinreich, *Modern English-Yiddish, Yiddish-English Dictionary* (New York: Schoken, 1977), 587.

The paradox contained in Celan's choice of word here is played out on two separate but related semantic levels, each attached to the different readings of the Jewish-German ייִד when juxtaposed with the German 'Jud' respectively.

The first, more obvious and straightforward paradox consists in the contradictory juxtaposition of a pejorative with a commendatory, when contained in an identical word designating the same subject, i.e., without subject equivocation. That is to say, the lexeme 'Jud' carries an anti-Semitic and endearing overtone at the same time because it is set in colloquial non-Jewish and Jewish German at the same time. This paradox would seem like a natural result of two hostile ethnolinguistic groups using the same lexeme to designate the weaker minority group. One might consider for example the lexeme 'Arab' shared by Israeli-Arabs and Israeli-Jews as an endonym and an exonym respectively, with their (at least partially) contradictory connotations. However, the level of lingual intimacy shared in 'Jud' is much deeper than in this example, because it does not only pertain to the common lexical source, against which the contradicting semantics are most striking; rather, they also share in the register, as attested by their joint phonological phenomenon of elision, which is characteristic of colloquialism.

In other words, the stark contradiction in semantic orientation between the German exonym and the Jewish endonym manifest in the word 'Jud' is exacerbated by their shared orality. The oral propensity that makes the apocope 'Jud' so prevalent in pejorative German colloquial representation of the Jew is the same oral propensity prevalent in endearing Jewish-German colloquial self-representation. Countless Jewish proverbs, anecdotes and jokes use the same basic lexeme, 'Jud', to express a deep and endearing familiarity with the Jew, which is the exact opposite to the threat of the unknown Other contained in the very same word, when used as a German, non-Jewish colloquialism.

The ethnolinguistic power that drives proverbial familiarity and self-endearment with one's own is the same one that drives proverbial hatred

and fear of the Other. Put in cultural or literary terms, it is the informality of 'Jud' as opposed to 'Jude' that legitimizes the resurfacing of the repressed proverbial knowledge of the German about the Jew. It allows the reader to refer back to such proverbs as "Jud' bleibt Jud'" or such children songs as "Jud ist Sau". At the same time, this informality triggers the Jew's contrasting proverbial knowledge of himself, because for the Jewish idiom, at least for Yiddish as an ethno-confessional idiom, the oral-proverbial register is the most natural place of habitat. The proverbial, and the oral in general, are never repressed in Yiddish; they thrive even in its most cultivated and presumptuous of literary forms.[191]

The second level on which the paradox expressed in 'Jud' is played out, derives from the universal meaning of the word 'Jud/Yid' in Yiddish. The phenomenon by which endonyms evolve from words that originally denoted 'a human being' is common in many languages. So is the reversed course by which pejorative exonyms that originally denoted a general, ethnically-unspecific 'mute person' (Slavic languages for 'German') or 'unintelligible person' (Greek barbaric) evolve into the particularist proper name for an ethnic group, which may in turn lose their original negative semantic load. However, the endonym 'Jid', runs a very peculiar course, evolving from a particular endo-/exonym into a universal word for a human being. This could only have evolved under the unique socio-lingual circumstances of the German-Jewish idiom. Namely, that same basic lexical stock is shared by both ethno-lingual groups and treated as each group's own.

The irony lies in the fact that 'Jud' retains both its endonymic, particularist function in addition to its universal function, which is a contradiction in terms. It epitomizes the two extremes of self-naming, because it might suggest that in order to be considered a human being one must be a Jew, and at the same that every human being might be

191. Manger and Shteybarg's literature are excellent examples, as suggested in the discussion on the orality of the prevailing Yiddish literary genres in Czernowitz.

considered a Jew. Hence, it turns humanity into a particularist matter (Jewishness) only to efface its particularity in turn.

Thus, when juxtaposed with the paradoxical semantics of 'Jud' as a pejorative German exonym and as a Jewish endonym, the universalist-particularist semantics of Yiddish ייִד may function as a dialectic synthesis: it suggests that the *Gespräch im Gebirg*, Jewish and German as it may be, carries an ironic universal currency. The only possible mechanism to relieve this ultra-particularist German-Jewish hermeneutic tension would have to universalize it by the paradoxical way of its 'Jewishfication', what Celan elsewhere calls *verjuden*.

The research on Celan's work, especially on his non-lyric writing, i.e., his prose and speeches, often alludes to his published and unpublished remarks on *veruden* and *Judendeutsch*, however without achieving much hermeneutical clarity. The actual mechanism of paradoxical attainment of universalism-through-particularism is nowhere systematically analyzed. Instead it is usually relegated to a mix of one acculturated German-Jew's defiance in the face of murderous Germany and his closely related bad conscience toward his unaccultrated *Ostjuden* brethren.[192] The very meticulous literary devices Celan employs here in the form of delicate dialectical phenomena, forms a paradox which goes further than that.

There is no coincidence here between phonology and semantics, but rather full convergence. In cultural-historical terms, the process which gave rise to the universalist meaning of Jud/Yid within Yiddish, embodies its semantic paradox: the extreme ethnic separatism of the Jews as a religiously and culturally exclusive minority group within the German sphere, combined with the extreme hostility and derision turned against them on the part of the German dominant group, made inner identification so strong and necessary that the endonym came to be synonymous with human existence as such. There simply was no other way for a Jew to

192. Cf. Sieber, *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«*; Eshel, „Paul Celan's Other: History, Poetics, and Ethics."

exist than to be Jewish. This is echoed in the common Yiddish expression ווי איך בין אַ ייִד, (literally "Like I am a Jew") which Weinreich so accurately translates to the American "no kidding".[193] Such obviousness, self-evidence of a particularity can paradoxically neutralize its particularist content—so that ultimately there is nothing particularly Jewish about this "no kidding".

5.3.2.2. The Diminutive *Häusel*

The second non-Standard morphological phenomenon to make an appearance at the beginning of the text is the diminutive form of 'Haus', "Häusel", the Jew's little home or hut, which he leaves to start his journey to the mountains. First, it should be noted that although this form of diminutive deviates from the Standard German diminutive form of 'Häuschen', the 'l' diminutive is characteristic of the southern-German dialects, so it might be considered an Austriasicm. However, it is also the standard diminutive[194] form of Yiddish.

As a diminutive, 'Häuschen' replicates the same semantic ambivalence seen between the pejorative and endearing 'Jud', just by sake of its morphological function, because it can express belittlement and endearment at the same, which reinforces the irony contained in the double-reading of non-Jewish/Jewish 'Jud'. The 'Jud' is exiting his *little* house, which might be *modestly homey* or a *desolate ruin* at the same time.

As in the case of 'Jud', this little half-Jewish, half-southern diminutive declension is not just a stylistic atmospheric device. Once more, a closer examination at the lexeme's Jewish semantic stock, reveals that Yiddish 'Häusel', הײַזל, is far from a neutral diminutive, since it also means a brothel, in addition to its standard diminutive function.[195] The word

193. Weinreich, *Modern English-Yiddish, Yiddish-English Dictionary*, 587.
194. Neil G Jacobs, *Yiddish: A Linguistic Introduction* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 162-63.; It is noteworthy that Slavic diminutives are avoided despite their prevalence in Yiddish, in accordance with the lingual boundaries discussed earlier.
195. Weinreich, *Modern English-Yiddish, Yiddish-English Dictionary*, 639.

"Häusel" is consequently burdened with the exacerbated semantic tension between the wretchedness comprised in the most obscene of houses and the unmistakable fondness of the organic attachment a person has to her intimate home, the *Heimlichkeit*.

In this opening sentence, the phonology (apocope), morphology (diminutive) and semantics (their paradox nature), all function in concert to realize the tension between the Jew, the German and the German-Jew, reflected in the tension between their respective idioms.

The pendulum swings its full course from German through *Judendeutsch* to Yiddish and back again to the distorted German performed by the Jew, even before the 'conversation' starts to unravel.

5.3.2.3. The Unspeakable Name

The Jew who stepped out of his little house of shame and intimacy starts walking, but he does not walk by himself for "mit ihm ging sein Name, der unassprechliche" (2-3). This unspeakable name is a clear reference to the Tetragrammaton, which Jews are strictly forbidden from pronouncing, and whose exact pronunciation is a matter of scholarly dispute and occult preoccupation.[196] The allusion to the name of the Jewish Godhead therefore charges the narrative with mystic tension, which starts to unfold, once again, in tight relation to the protagonist's endonym/proper name, "Jud".

'Jud', in addition to its other functions, is also the name of the tenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet, "י", which the Tetragrammaton begins with and often abbreviates in Jewish texts, either as a standalone initial (י') or doubled as an acronym (י"י). The abbreviation is not only motivated by brevity, but rather by similar theological considerations, which render the Tetragrammaton itself 'unspeakable', that is dangerous to write in an unholy context. In other words, 'Jud' also serves as a typographical

196. Cf. Sieber, *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«*, 17-19.

reproduction of the unspeakableness of the Godhead's name—its unwritability.

Since the 'unspeakable name' is walking along with the "Jud" as if it were an external entity, but at the same time is indelibly inscribed in his own name in the form of the abbreviated 'Jud', it bears the character of the Mark of Cain. The semantic reciprocation between the pejorative burden of "Jud" and the transcendent protective energy of the Tetragrammaton reinforces this allusion, since the Mark of Cain was originally both a mark of disgrace and a protective omen vouched by God himself.[197] Moreover, Cain's punishment of endless wandering is traditionally associated with the image of the uprooted Wandering Jew or *der Ewige Jude*: the mark that is both his disgrace and protection must walk with him, accompanying him wherever he goes.

Semantically, the paradox contained in the apocopation of "Jude" discussed earlier, is once more intrinsically manifest in the *performance* of language per se, because it equates the unspeakable (י"י) with the despicable (Jud). The power that drives the unspeakableness of the Tetragrammaton is theological in nature; however, its manifestation is lingual deficiency—for it cannot be spoken or written; and it is an extremely particular deficiency—for that which cannot be spoken in this case is a particular, proper name.

The lingual deficiency manifest in the ancient and theologically-motivated unspeakableness befittingly finds its modern parallels within the German-Jewish ethno-lingual predicament. Again, as with the semantic overdeterminacy of 'Jud', the similarity between 'the unspeakable' name and the "Jud" is semantically conditioned not only by Jewish theology, but once more by Jewish history: the Jud's unspeakable name is the *Ostjude*'s Slavic-sounding name. This is finally re-affirmed in the closing speech of Jud Klein, when the 'unspeakable name' is ascribed to both of

---

197. בראשית ד׳, יד-טו: [...] וְהָיִיתִי נָע וָנָד, בָּאָרֶץ, וְהָיָה כָּל-מֹצְאִי, יַהַרְגֵנִי. טו וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ יְהוָה, לָכֵן כָּל-הֹרֵג קַיִן, שִׁבְעָתַיִם, יֻקָּם; וַיָּשֶׂם יְהוָה לְקַיִן אוֹת, לְבִלְתִּי הַכּוֹת-אֹתוֹ כָּל-מֹצְאוֹ.

the protagonists' names: "du Groß und ich Klein, du, der Geschwätzige, und ich, der Geschwätzige, wir mit den Stöcken, wir mit unsern Namen, den unaussprechlichen" (95).

Celan's own act of replacing his name immediately comes to mind. 'Celan' is an anagram of the Romanian spelling of his birth name 'Ancel', which Celan reportedly adopted on the advice of Alfred Margul-Sperber's wife.[198] It replaces the Slavic-sounding (though in this case not Slavic in origin) consonant 'tsch' for the more German-sounding 'c' (='z') consonant. Ironically, Ancel or Antschel is actually of a very old German-Jewish origin. Thus, while perhaps attempting to distance himself acoustically from the likes of Slavic Jewish name endings such as '-i(ts)ch' (e.g., Abramovitch etc.), Celan in fact distances himself from the very same German lingual tradition he is supposedly aspiring to. This irony reflects the impossibility of language purity in general and its absurdity in relation to German-Yiddish dynamics in particular, both as a German-Jewish as well as inner-Jewish concern.

5.3.2.4. Clitics

Clitics are only briefly mentioned by Mosés, without any further discussion or even reference as to the nature of their relation to Yiddish/ *Judendeutsch*. This relation is not self evident since, after all, clitics are also normatively employed in Standard German. Nonetheless, Moses' remark can be well understood despite the lack of discussion, given that clitics are much more frequent in Yiddish than in German, especially when the *Schriftsprache* is considered.[199] In other words, as with other lingual peculiarities of this text, it sounds *oddly* Yiddish not merely because clitics are very frequent and pervasive in that language, in comparison to German.

The Yiddish nature of the clitics in the story, however, is by no means

198. Stiehler, „Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens.", 121.
199. Confer the following: Sarah M B Fagan, *German: A Linguistic Introduction* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 64. with Jacobs, *Yiddish: A Linguistic Introduction*, 188-90.

limited to their frequency, but rather pertains to their form and syntactic function: (1) many of the German clitics in the text are, literally, an acoustic resonance of typical Yiddish clitics. Furthermore, they facilitate other aspects of the Yiddishized syntax of *Gespräch im Gebirg*, either by (2) disguising the pronoun to emulate Yiddish subject pro-drop or by (3) a chiastic emulation of an emphatically Yiddish clitic structure.

Frequency and Phonology

Cliticized words composed of a preposition as the host and a definite article as the clitic are common in German and in Yiddish alike. Consider for example German 'zu + dem = ***zum***' and Yiddish 'צו + דעם = **צום**'; Yiddish, nevertheless, cliticizes prepositions much more extensively than German. Consider for example the cognate prepositions of German 'mit' and 'nach' — 'מיט' and 'נאָך', when they occur before the definite article 'דעם' to form 'מיטן' and 'נאָכן', which lack a German cognate.

Naturally, the restrictions of grammaticality taken by Celan do not allow for such new clitics to be formed, thus one does not simply find in the text ungrammatical forms as **'mitm' or **'nachn' to parallel the Yiddish clitics. His methods of remodeling his new Jewish-German based on Yiddish constructions are nevertheless varied.

In this matter, for instance, the resonance is truly an acoustic one, and once again the key can be found in the more exotic and unusual clitics present in the text: the rather unusual German cliticized and apocopated expression "***überm*** Gebirg" (90) is phonologically close (and genetically related) to the very casual Yiddish 'געבערג **איבערן**'.[200] The unorthodox consonant clusters ('rm', 'chs') in the German enclitics are completely orthodox in their Yiddish counterparts. Similarly constructed and recurring expressions "***unterm*** Stern/Gewölk" (94/6) and "***durchs*** Gebirg"

200. 'm' and 'n' are alternating consonants under certain conditions in Yiddish, such as occurrence after unstressed vowel. Alternations are sometimes orthographically represented, but not always. Consider 'לעבן' pronounced 'lebm', but **דורכן** < **דורך דעם**.

(95) work to the same effect in resonating 'אונטערן' and 'דורכן',[201] respectively.

In other words, the clitics make the text sound more Yiddish-like not only because Yiddish abounds in clitics, but also because they are positioned to behave and sound as natural as in Yiddish. Whether they entail a natural or unnatural feel to the text, becomes again a question of lingual perspective.

Full and Disguised Subject Pro-drop (Pronoun Deletion)

Yiddish exhibits subject pro-drop, i.e., it allows the omission of a "salient" subject from the clause, typically a deletion of a pronoun, as long as the deleted pronoun can be inferred from the context.[202] Subject pro-drop is grammatical in Standard Yiddish and common in colloquial language.[203] The genre of the folktale and anecdote serves once more as a prime example for this phenomenon. Consider, for instance, the following lines from Olsvanger's collection: "וואַרט זשע אויס, זאָגט ער, [⊘] וועסט זען",[204] or "אפֿשר וואָלסט [⊘] מיר לייַען אַ פֿינף רובעל", where ⊘ stands for a dropped pronoun 'דו'.[205]

Now consider the following passage from *Gespräch im Gebirg*:

> kaum tritt ein Bild ein, so bleibt hängen im Geweb, und schon ist ein Faden zur Stelle, der sich da spinnt, sich herumspinnt um Bild, ein Schleierfaden; spinnt sich um Bild herum und zeugt ein Kind mit ihm, halb Bild und halb Schleier. (26-29)

"Bild" requires the pronoun 'es'. However, it does not show up in its

---

201. Prepositions in Yiddish almost always induce the dative case, so that 'איבער' is followed by the dative definite article 'דעם', unlike German, which differentiates meaning according to accusative or dative for certain spatial prepositions, as in 'durch das' (acc.).
202. Ibid., 260.
203. *The Germanic Languages*, 408.
204. Immanuel Olsvanger, *Röyte Pomerantsen: Jewish Folk Humor* (New York: Schocken, 1965), 31.. The digits designate the number of the narrative in Olsvanger's compendium, not the page number.
205. Olsvanger quoted by Jacobs, *Yiddish: A Linguistic Introduction*, 260.

full form, but is consistently truncated instead as an enclitic, first attached to the inflected verb 'bleibt' to form "bleibt*s*"and then to the preposition 'um' to form "um*s*".

The first clause "kaum tritt ein Bild ein, so bleibt*s* hängen im Geweb" clearly resonates Yiddish, both syntactically (word order) and phonologically (the apocope "Geweb"). A canonical German clause would rather read 'kaum tritt ein Bild ein, so bleibt ***es*** im Geweb***e*** hängen'.

Yet the ecnliticized 'es' contributes another layer to the resonance of Yiddish structures in this passage. Beyond word order and phonology, the enclitics facilitate the suppression of the pronoun, while maintaining grammaticality. German grammar simply does not allow full subject pro-drop from the clause, which in this example would mean the omission of the pronoun 'es' referring to the "Bild". Therefore, in order to maintain Grammaticality while still 'disguising' the pronoun, 'es' is not fully dropped but rather minimalistically kept in its encliticized, nearly-invisible form.

This pronoun deletion-in-disguise is supported by other instances in the text, where the pronoun is indeed fully deleted, most notably under different discourse condition: while Standard German grammaticality is generally kept throughout the entire text, there are exceptions. Such an exception is the opening of the second paragraph (11). As previously noted, the word "Kam", which opens that paragraph, reveals the underlying V1-structure of the utterances disguised within the paragraph-long opening sentence, as a clear self-standing instance of a V1-sentence. Similarly, it is also a clear self-standing instance of subject pro-drop ("[∅] Kam, ja, auf der Straße", dropping the pronoun 'Er'), therefore affirming the adoption of this Yiddish ellipsis in the text and revealing its more subtly disguised instances.

The most liberal treatment of grammaticality *per se* in the text consists in the direct conversational exchanges between the protagonists. This is easily explained as result of discourse conditions that dictate a different register, where deviation from grammaticality becomes acceptable. A

quick, direct-speech conversation clearly represents such a case. Therefore, it is not surprising to find most instances of full subject pro-drop within the following brief dialogical exchanges:

> »[⦸] Bist gekommen von weit, [⦸] bist gekommen hierher...«
> »Bin ich. Bin ich gekommen wie du.«
> »Weiß ich.«
> »Weißt du. Weißt du und siehst [⦸] (38-41)
>
> »Versteh ich, versteh ich. [⦸] Bin ja gekommen von weit, [⦸] bin ja gekommen wie du [⦸].«
> »Weiß ich.«
> »Weißt du und willst [⦸] mich fragen: Und [⦸] bist gekommen trotzdem, [⦸] bist, trotzdem gekommen hierher - warum und wozu [⦸]?« (49-52)

Chiastic Enclitic-es/Prolitic-עס

Finally, clitics facilitate another syntactical modification modeled on Yiddish. The systematic end-cliticization of the expletive '*es*' is reminiscent of the pro-cliticization of 'עס', so highly common in Yiddish. This is most emphatically manifest in the concatenated systematic cliticization of the expletive '*es*' found in the following passage: "eine Pause ist*es* bloß, eine Wortlücke ist*es*, eine Leerstelle ist*es*" (32-33). This convoluted construction is excessively redundant as it could easily have been converted to a similar effect as 'Es ist eine Pause bloß, eine Wortlücke, eine Leerstelle'.

However, when considered from a Yiddish perspective, the enclitic 'ist*es*' is replaced with its analogous pro-clitic '**ס**'איז', which is as frequent and popular as it is straightforward. Consider, for example, the following proverbial opening by the forverts' hasidic blogger—'**ס**'איז זייער גרינג צו זאגן וואס **ס**'איז נישט גוט אויף דער וועלט, אבער **ס**'איז נישט גרינג צו זאגן וויאזוי **ס**'דארף יא זיין',[206] or alternatively, the following folk riddle from Bastomski's compendium—"וואו איז זייער פינסטער, בעת **ס**'איז ליכטיק, וואַרים–בעת **ס**'איז קאַלט, קאַלט–בעת **ס**'איז וואַרים?".[207] Both examples

206. "Kave Shtiebel Seeks a Path Out of Negativity." *blogs.yiddish.forward.com* (2015): http://blogs.yiddish.forward.com/yiddish-with-an-aleph/188500/.

207. שלמה באסטאמסקי, **יידישע פאלקסרעטענישן** (וילנה: די נייע יידישע פאלקסשול), 12.

exhibit the proclitic 'ס'איז', repeating within consecutive clauses of a single sentence. The consecutive enclitic 'ist*ə*' in the text follows this Yiddish model, but in order to keep with German grammar, the proclitic 'ס'איז' is inverted to the matching German parallel enclitic to form "eine Pause ist*ə* bloß, eine Wortlücke ist*ə*, eine Leerstelle ist*ə*".

Once again, the Yiddish and German perspectives suggest contrasting views on the same lingual phenomenon. From a German perspective this syntax of *Jiddischdeutsch* would be a crooked, inept *Judendeutsch*, a failed performance of proper German, because the consecutive repetition of main clauses with cliticized pronoun is an extremely awkward way do describe the 'silence'. From the perspective of Yiddish syntax, however, such a concatenation of main clauses with a recurring cliticized pronoun is a straightforward well-established structure, a felicitous 'פראָסט־ייִדיש'.

5.3.3. Syntax

The lion's share of abnormal linguistic phenomena in *Gespräch im Gebirg* with respect to Standard German is comprised by the syntax of *Jiddischdeutsch*. Unusual syntactic constructions inform the entire text extensively.

However, despite this pervasiveness, it is difficult to define deviance from the canonical German syntax and locate its source model for two reasons: Firstly, Celan took great care in maintaining the grammaticality of the text, so that unusual constructions are mostly kept within the boundaries of 'accepted' German grammar. Secondly, by its very nature, syntax works in the background, when compared to non-Standard vocabulary and phonology: unlike 'acoustic' elements, such as unusual vocabulary or phonological phenomena, which immediately stand out as 'foreign', in order for a syntax to echo a different language, the syntax of that foreign language must be a well-recognized possibility. The lack of such availability of the Yiddish syntax may be the reason why the research on *Gespräch im Gebirg* has failed to properly characterize these structures so far.

This syntax must, therefore, be actively sought, excavated and compared with their Yiddish source model.

5.3.3.1. The Yiddish Post-Nominal Adjective [NP-NP Construction]

Instead of the unmarked common construction in German 'ging mit seinem unaussprechlichen Namen', the text reads "und mit ihm ging sein Name, der unaussprechliche" (2-3). The adjective "unaussprechliche" is taken out of its natural place in the sentence preceding the subject and interjected instead between commas after the subject, where it requires a definite article. This construction is uncommon (although grammatically possible under certain conditions)[208] in German, but extremely common and typical in Yiddish. It is widely used in all registers of the language but is nonetheless more prevalent in colloquial registers of Yiddish. Countless jokes, anecdotes and folktales begin with such a post-nominal adjective construction as in "...איינער אַ ייִד איז געפֿאָרן קיין פּאַריז".[209] The post-nominal adjective modification is so typically Yiddish that one regularly finds a concatenation of consecutive post-nominal adjectives (noun-phrase iteration) such as "איינער אַ ייִד, אַ קלוגער, אַ נעבעכדיקער"" and so on.[210] Such hyperbolic potential lends the construction a caricature nature which marks it as typically Yiddish to German ears.[211] Once again, the 'foreign element' is at first subtly inserted—there is only a single post-nominal adjective and the grammaticality is preserved by adding commas, so that the peculiarity of the syntax may be attributed to standard literary

---

208. Cf. Karl der Große, Pippin der Kleine, but not **der König der Große/Kleine.
209. Beatrice Hall, "Accounting for Yiddish Word Order, or What's a Nice Np Like You Doing in a Place Like This?," in *Linear Order and Generative Theory*, ed. J Meisel, and M Pam (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1979), 278.
210. Ellen F Prince, "Yiddish as a Contact Language," in *Creolization and Contact*, ed. Norval Smith, and Tonjes Veenstra (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), 273.; furthermore, not only adjectives be can modified in this manner, but also nouns, as in the this example: "איינער אַ ייִד אַ מלמד אַ קבצן"
211. Cf. Hall, „Accounting for Yiddish Word Order, or What's a Nice Np Like You Doing in a Place Like This?", 254, 282-7.

manipulation, such as emphasis through interjection. Later in the text, however, one already finds a concatenation of consecutive post-nominal adjectives: "[…] kam daher auf der Straße, *der schönen, der unvergleichlichen*" (8-9).

Apart from emphasizing the adjective by its interjection, which well serves its semantic importance, the specificity of the origin for this syntactic model credits it with being more than a mere stylistic disruptiveness, supposedly mimicking the nonlinear Grammar of spoken language. Rather, as a distinctively Yiddish model re-applied on a German text, it repaints the German in Jewish colors, rendering it a new kind of *Judendetusch*, that is, a renewed Jewish performance of German, as well as Yiddish at the same time—*Jiddischdeutsch*.

The comprehensiveness of Yiddish structure can now be re-read and revealed. The phonological and morphological phenomena are but musical keys, typographic-acoustic signals index to reading this text. The way opens up for a myriad of more subtle, however pervasive, syntactical Yiddish patterns to be discerned and interpreted into the textual canvas. Once the focus is turned away from the lexical peculiarities, the light can be shed on the entire scope of the Yiddish structure and its pervasiveness.

5.3.3.2. Verbal Repetitions as *Mauscheln*

The scope of Yiddish syntactic phenomena in the verbal group is even greater and more extensive than in the nominal group. The most noticeable verbal irregularity, even to the reader lacking a working knowledge of Yiddish structures, is the incessant repetitions of verbs throughout the entire text. As early as in the first paragraph/narrative sequence (1-10), the verbs are repeated multiple times and in some cases almost intermittently— "ging"—nine times, "kam"—eight times, different conjugations of "hören"—six times, "untergegangen"—twice. Other parts of speech are likewise repeated in great frequency—"Jud" mainly as a subject, the pronouns "er" and "ich", as well as fixed whole constructions such as "eines Abends" (1, 5). The non-verbal repetitions also play a part

to be discussed later,[212] however, the verbal repetitions exhibit the central driving force behind this phenomenon.

Recurrence is prevalent in oral speech, colloquial language and colloquial literary genres, where it also functions as a folkloric literary device. Repetitions are also a well-known literary rhetoric device, the epistrophe (epiphora), where it usually serves an emphatic function. Yet the structure of repetitions in *Gespräch* does not fit the rhetorical paradigm of an epistrophe, for it is asymmetrical and not well spaced.

Consider, for example, the consecutively recurring pronoun "*ich* bins, *ich*, *ich*" (4), or verbs "*kam*, *kam* groß, *kam*" (15) in juxtaposition to JFK's famous speech "We will never start *a war*. We do not want *a war*. We do not now expect *a war*."[213] The epistrophe "a war" derives its emphatic power from its symmetry and prosodic balance, whereas the "ich" and "kam", rather give the impression of a stutter. The former is *geschickt*, an example of a well-devised speech, whereas the former is evidently *ungeschickt*, unsuccessful failed-speech. In this respect, it is Jewish in as much as the text is set within an oral-colloquial Jewish framework, which from a German, non-Jewish perspective is immanently unsuccessful.

Consequently, the Jewishness of this recurring speech is, again, overdetermined. Not only is it manifest by the very oral nature of the "Conversation", as a dialogue between two Jews, and in the echoing of Yiddish colloquial literary genre associated with it; but it is furthermore a failed oral performance, a corrupting performance of German, in short—a *Mauschel*.

5.3.3.3. Yiddish V1-Clauses as the Guiding Syntactic Principle in the Text

When examined in reliance on punctuation, the text seems to be

---

212. See epiphora under "Ellipsis and Epiphora: Verbal Poverty vs. Verbal Overflow" on page 115.

213. Mammedli Aysel Ilqar, "Artistic Discourse and Rhetoric Means," *International Journal of English Linguistics* 5, no. 6 (2015), 167.

composed of a single, paragraph-long sentence (1-10), followed by a few somewhat shorter paragraph-sentences, leading up to the encounter between the two protagonists (11-37). Then, the rhythm slowly builds up and changes into shorter and more rapid sentences, which lead to the direct exchanges between the protagonists (38-41, 49-64). At first, the dialogue swiftly alternates between the parties' brief utterances, which nonetheless gradually give way to the story's original paragraph-long sentences. These culminate in the last three paragraphs, which, from a punctuation perspective, actually form a single, three-paragraph long sentence (65-102).

Such perspective is not at all worthless when it comes to analyses of the story's structure and rhythm. However, a syntactical analysis must divide the text into more basic, meaningful linguistic units, since a single paragraph-long sentence obviously comprises a great multitude of a canonical sentence made of normative constituents—subjects, verbs, objects and their like. As a result, every such lengthy sentence in fact contains a great many syntactic units that would normally stand alone and be called sentences on their own right. This basic unit of syntactic meaning will be hence termed an *utterance*, for the sake of the current discussion, which closely resembles the concept of a main clause.

The first sentence-paragraph (1-10) may be thus divided into the following utterances:

> Eines Abends, die Sonne, und nicht nur sie, war untergegangen,// da ging, trat aus seinem Häusel und ging der Jud, der Jud und Sohn eines Juden,// und mit ihm ging sein Name, der unaussprechliche,// ging und kam,// kam dahergezockelt,// ließ sich hören,// kam am Stock,// kam über den Stein,// hörst du mich,// du hörst mich,// ich bins,// ich, ich und der, den du hörst, zu hören vermeinst, ich und der andre,// - er ging also, das war zu hören,// ging eines Abends, da einiges untergegangen war,// ging unterm Gewölk,// ging im Schatten, dem eignen und dem fremden// - denn der Jud, du weißts, was hat er schon, das ihm auch wirklich gehört, das nicht geborgt wär, ausgeliehen und nicht zurückgegeben -,// da ging er also und kam,// kam daher auf der Straße, der schönen, der unvergleichlichen,// ging, wie Lenz, durchs Gebirg,// er, den man hatte wohnen lassen unten, wo er hingehört, in den Niederungen, er, der Jud, kam und kam.

The boundary symbol '//', which here marks the division between utterances, may easily be replaced with a simple period under a normal syntactic speech scenario. Varying divisions are also possible to a certain extent; however, what the specific division above illustrates is that recurring verbs have a specific syntactic function exceeding Jewish mannerism, be it a pejorative *Mauscheln* or an authentic tribute to Jewish colloquial performance of German: namely, the recurrence of verbs allow them to begin many of the utterances. This is immediately evident in the very next sentence following the paragraph, which also begins with a verb: "Kam, ja, auf der Straße […]" (11), clearly assigning the recurring verb "kam" with a sentence-initial function. Furthermore, this sentence segmentation into verb-inital utterances is already justified by the fact that "it is fairly widespread in the world's languages that comma intonation is a concomitant of the dislocation of a constituent".[214] That is, the superfluous commas already indicate the dislocation (or *Scrambling*[215]) of the sentence constituents in relation to canonical German syntax. Finally, the v1-construction is even more apparent in the rapid exchanges between the protagonists, which almost invariably begin with the verb.

'Verb-first' declarative sentences, as they are called, are among the better-known, recognized and therefore researched syntactic structures in Yiddish. They are very uncommon in German except for dialogic situations, where they usually represent subject pro-drop, unlike the dialogic exchanges in the text which do not drop the subject ("'Versteh ***ich***, versteh ***ich***'. […], 49; 'Weiß ich.' // 'Weißt du […]'", 40-41). At any rate, they are neither frequent nor grammatical in German.

Both German and Yiddish are largely considered SVO languages, which stands for the standard order of constituents in a sentence, Subject-

---

214. Hall, „Accounting for Yiddish Word Order, or What's a Nice Np Like You Doing in a Place Like This?", 285.
215. Following a typical Yiddish path. See: Molly Diesing, "Yiddish Vp Order and the Typology of Object Movement in Germanic," *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 15, no. 2 (1997), 370-71.

Verb-Object, although there is some disagreement about whether Yiddish retains vestiges of an OV past.[216] Nonetheless, in a canonical, unmarked sentence in either of these languages, the subject occupies the first position while the verb occupies the second, thus:

	Subject	**V**erb	**O**bject
German	Ich	verstehe	dich
Yiddish	ikh	farshtey	dikh

Yiddish, on the other hand, exhibits another structure, whereby the verb occupies the first position. Thus allowing for VSO structure under certain conditions, such as: "בין איך אַוועק".

To the status of V1 sentences as a distinguishing syntactic construction between Yiddish and German testifies Max Weinreich's following remark, from his seminal article about the relationship of modern Yiddish with the German language, "דייטשמעריש טויג ניט":

> [...] איז נאָך פֿאַראַן די מיגליכקייט צו בויען דעם זאַץ אַזוי - דייטש קען דאָס ניט - אַז ער זאָל זיך ניט אָנהייבן מיטן סובייעקט, נאָר מיטן פרעדיקאַט. אַ שטייגער דעם פסוק בראשית ח, יח: "ויצא נח ובניו ואשתו..." זעצט לוטער איבער: Also ging Noah heraus... יהואש אין יידיש קען זיך פֿאַרגינען דאָס צו מאַכן אַנדערש: "איז אַרויסגעגאַנגען נח..."[217].

This structure is given different names in different linguistic accounts, descriptions and Grammars of Yiddish, according to how their syntactical and pragmatical function is perceived.[218] Common to all these, however, is the distinctive narrative function they attribute to v1-sentences. They are often called "consecutive" or "resultative" clause, which relies on Max

---

216. *The Germanic Languages*, 381, 410-411.

217. מאַקס ווַינרײַך, "דײַטשמעריש טויג ניט," **ייִדישע שפּראַך 34 (3-1)**, 27.

218. Consecutive word order or sequence: Jacobs, *Yiddish: A Linguistic Introduction*, 262., Kenneth L Miner, "Yiddish V/1 Declarative Clauses in Discourse," *Papers in Pragmatics* 4, no. 1 (1990), 127.; Narrative word order or sequence: Gertrud Reershemius, "Word Order in Yiddish Narrative Discourse," *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, no. 9 (2000), 1477., Hall, „Accounting for Yiddish Word Order, or What's a Nice Np Like You Doing in a Place Like This?", 275.;

Weinreich's original Yiddish "רעזולטאַט־סדר".[219] The disagreement pertains to the origin of the structure, whether it is a result of an ellipsis of conjunctions, such as דעריבער, דערפֿאַר, or the appositive און. Regardless of this debate, there is a consensus that (1) V1-clauses describe events or actions that follow those in the preceding clause, as a consequence in time or as a result; (2) therefore, they represent a cohesive device in order to be understood in relation to prior material; (3) As a result, V1-clauses are mostly found in narrative discourse.

This narrative discourse, as should be noted, is the natural building blocks of the Jewish anecdote, joke and folktale. In fact, most research on V1-clauses is based on the famous collections of this kind of anecdotes, jokes and folktales compiled by Imanuel Olsvanger.[220] A typical text of this genre starts with a 'normal', unmarked V1-sentence only to be then followed by a ceaseless stream of V1-sentences, by which the narrative is laid out and progresses.[221]

When re-applied on Celan's text, such a syntactic reading of the recurring verbs dramatically changes their literary function as well as fundamental aspects of the narrative sequence. Instead of lyrical repetitions which at times may seem superfluous and perplexing, each utterance beginning with a verb indicates an action or occurrence actually happening within the narrative. For example, the following cluster of utterances appearing in the first sentence and starting with the verb "ging"—"ging und kam,// kam dahergezockelt […]// kam am Stock,// kam

219. Miner, „Yiddish V/1 Declarative Clauses in Discourse.", 127.
220. Gertrud Reershemius successfully validates the observations about the discourse nature of V1 clauses made by others who relied on Olsvanger's collections, by using data from oral narrative accounts by native speakers. See: Reershemius, „Word Order in Yiddish Narrative Discourse.", 1476-80.
221. See the examples in Hall, „Accounting for Yiddish Word Order, or What's a Nice Np Like You Doing in a Place Like This?"; Jacobs, *Yiddish: A Linguistic Introduction*; Miner, „Yiddish V/1 Declarative Clauses in Discourse."; Reershemius, „Word Order in Yiddish Narrative Discourse."

über den Stein (3-4)—, is to be understood as a narrative progression, whereby each 'going' stands for a separate narrative event. In linguistic terms, the recurring verbs are appositive, not restrictive, in respect to the action or occurrence they signify. Therefore, the verb clusters cannot be abbreviated into 'kam dahergezockelt am Stock über den Stein', but rather must be enumerated as follows: (1) der Jud kam dahergezockelt; (2) (Dann) kam er am Stock; (3) (Nachher) kam er über den Stein; etc.

As a result, the narrative not only slows down, but also advances through the reoccurrence of verbs, and it does so by using an unmistakably Yiddish narrative structure. In particular, the recurrence of "kam" and "ging" simultaneously serves the purpose of advancing the narrative as well as creating a feeling of a long journey. The journey through the mountains becomes an Odyssey of wandering—that of a Wandering Jew or better still, given its temporal implications, the German *Ewige Jude*—who advances incessantly but never does arrive anywhere.[222]

This anti-Semitic image is reflected back on the text through its peculiar syntax: the futility of the Jewish attempt to acculturate through language is played out through the futility of its failed attempt at mustering the syntax of German. However, from a Yiddish perspective, the Jewish attempt at acquiring the majority's language end with a new lingual creation, which is emphatically Jewish. This creation is epitomized in the narratively fruitful syntax, here attributed to the very same phenomenon, that from a German perspective is associated with its opposite.

In other words, the Jew does not arrive at his desired end-destination by walking the German path. He is a non-shower epitomized by his *Mauschel*-syntax, the stutter of undivided repetitions. Instead, he paves a wholly new path, a language of his own, epitomized in the fruitful structure of his Yiddish-syntax. Thus what as *Judendeutsch* is *ungeschickt*,

222. This becomes even more apparent in the futility of the dialogue between the protagonists, which again employs the V1 structure.

turns out to be *geschicktes Jiddischdeutsch*.

An additional syntactic structure of repetition, adjacent to the V1 declarative clause, can also be traced back to Yiddish. The structure 'Verb(a) und Verb(a)' emerges in many places in the text. For instance, "kam und kam" (10) and "frag und frag" (14). It is modeled after the Yiddish structure as in the anecdote form Olsvanger collection—"**קוקט און קוקט** דער יִיד",[223] or in this folk riddle from Sholyme Bastomski's collection[224]—"ער **גייט און גייט** און רירט זיך ניט פֿון אָרט (דער זייגער)" or in this line form a poem by Itzik Manger—"גייט דאָס פּאַסטוכל, **גייט און גייט**".[225] The quoted sources clearly testify to the colloquial-folkloric nature of this structure.

5.3.3.4. Ellipsis and Epiphora: Verbal Poverty vs. Verbal Overflow

A direct result of verbal clusters and recurrences expresses itself in ellipsis, namely in the omission of noun phrases, either a subject or an object. For example the entire following section exhibits subject pro-drop, since the subject "Jud" is omitted as well as its pronoun "er":

[…] ging und kam, kam dahergezockelt, ließ sich hören, kam am Stock, kam über den Stein […] ging eines Abends, da einiges untergegangen war, ging unterm Gewölk, ging im Schatten, dem eignen und dem fremden (3-6)

Subject pro-drop is very common and fully grammatical in colloquial and Standard Yiddish. Consider this sentence from an anecdote, which omits the subject 'du': "שפרינג ניט וואָרעם וועסט ארײַנפֿאלן און וועסט זיך

223. Quoted in Hall, „Accounting for Yiddish Word Order, or What's a Nice Np Like You Doing in a Place Like This?", 274.

224. 7 ,**יידישע פאלקסרעטענישן**, באסטאמסקי.; Also see the excellent structural analysis of these riddles as folkloric construction: Rina Lapidus, "A Vilna Folklorist's Collection: Structural Analysis of Yiddish Riddles," in *Politics of Yiddish: Studies in Language, Literature and Society*, ed. Dov-Ber Kerler (London: AltaMira, 2000).

225. איציק מאַנגער, **ליד און באלאדע** (ניו יורק: איציק־מאַנגער־קאָמיטעט, 1952), 98-100.

צערברעכן רוק און הענט".[226] This may perhaps explain what Mosés mistakenly takes for "lexicalische Armut"[227], which is actually a result of the unique syntactics of the story, not an attempt to represent an underdeveloped vocabulary.

The ellipsis, as shown above, is a result of the verbal recurrence, that is a form of epiphora. In other words the verbal redundancy gives rise to a nominal ellipsis. Nonetheless, in order to counteract possible subject equivocation which may result from the omission of noun phrases and their respective pronouns, the ellipsis also generates epiphora at the same time. Furthermore, when the noun phrases are finally repeated after a hiatus, they re-surface as a fixed extended construction which includes their post-nominal adjectives. So that a few clauses after the extended introduction of the mountain path—

"da ging er also und kam, kam daher ***auf der Straße, der schönen, der unvergleichlichen***" (8-9)

one finds at the beginning of the second paragraph a repetition of the entire extended post-nominal construction —

"Kam, ja, ***auf der Straße daher, der schönen***." (11)

In other words, the Yiddishized syntax of the postnominal adjective is replicated many times throughout the text, further integrating Yiddish into the syntactical embroidery of the text's *Jiddischdeutsch*.

5.3.3.5. Relative Clauses: The *vos*-Effect

The German syntactic tendency to pre-nominal construction ('ein *alter* Jude') is contrasted with its Yiddish counterpart's propensity for post-nominal constructions ('אַ ייִד אין **אלטער**'). This contrast is exacerbated by a few additional-closely related attributes, pertaining to the syntax of the relative clause in Yiddish in comparison to German: (1) V2-structure (syntax); (2) the invariability of the marker *vos* (morphology) (3) the

226. Olsvanger, *Röyte Pomerantsen: Jewish Folk Humor*, 4.
227. Mosés, „Wege Auf Denen Die Sprache Stimmhaft Wird ". Paul Celans „gespräch Im Gebirg.", 49.

versatile syntactic productivity of *vos*.

First of all, sub-ordinate clauses in Yiddish retain an SVO structure, or plainly put, they are 'normal' V2-clauses, where the conjugated verb occupies the second place.[228] Consequently, the clause 'Das Kind will essen, ***weil er*** kein Frühstück gegessen ***hat***' will be roughly translated to Yiddish as 'דאָס קינד וויל עסן, **ווײַל ער האָט** קיין פרשיטיק ניט געגעסן'.

Now consider, for example, the following passage from the last but one paragraph:

> und mein Stock, der hat gesprochen, hat gesprochen zum Stein, und mein Stock, der schweigt jetzt still, und der Stein, sagst du, der kann sprechen […] (86-88)

If the determiner "der" functions in fact as a relative pronoun,[229] a grammatical passage in German would have the conjugated verb placed at the end of the relative (sub-ordinate) clauses, as follows:

'und mein Stock, der gesprochen ***hat***, der zum Stein gesprochen ***hat***, und mein Stock, der jetzt still ***schweigt***, und der Stein, [worüber] du ***sagst***, der sprechen ***kann*** [***könne***] […]'

This SVO or V2-construction of the sub-ordinate clause clearly suggests that Celan's so-called *Judendeutsch* is not based in fact on the extinct Judeo-German or Western-Yiddish, but rather on contemporary Eastern-Yiddish, since only the latter exhibits this phenomenon, while the former places the conjugated verb in the last position, just like in German.[230] Similarly, the coordinating (verb-second) conjunction ***denn*** is slightly more frequent in the text than the subordinating (verb-final) conjunction ***weil***, which is usually much more frequent in normal German

228. *The Germanic Languages*, 409.
229. For the alternative (and complementary) reading of the marker determiner "der" in this passage as a demonstrative pronoun, see the following section: "Demonstratives and Subject-Postponing: The Distancing-Effect " on page 121.
230. Henrike Kühnert, and Esther-Miriam Wagner, "The Shift in Positioning of the Finite Verb in Older Yiddish," in *Yiddish Language Structures*, ed. Marion Aptroot, and Björn Hansen (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2014), 126.

usage. Furthermore, the *weil*-clauses that do appear in the text are either (grammatical) verb-second or relatively compact, so that the inflected verb does not stray a long distance to the right. This structure unambiguously distinguishes Celan's source model for the text as Eastern-Yiddish variety, thus justifying the term *Jiddischedeutsch* coined here to describe it.

Secondly, the canonical Yiddish relative pronoun 'וואָס' is invariable, i.e., it does not inflect in order to grammatically agree with its antecedent regardless of gender, number and case, as opposed to German, which uses the declension system of the definite article to achieve the same grammatical goal. The feminine accusative די פֿרוי **וואָס** איך זע uses the same marker as the masculine nominative דער ייִד **וואָס** זיצט דאָרטן where German would alternate between '***die***' for the former marker and '***der***' for the latter. This leaves the impression of a simplified analogy, whereby Yiddish *vos* stands for each and every inflected relative pronoun in German.

Vos, however, differs syntactically, not just morphologically from its German counterparts. Its invariability as a relative pronoun may thus also disguise its true syntactic function: in many instances it may look as a relative pronoun while in fact it functions as a conjunction, cognate with German *dass* and not with *der/die/das*.[231] Consider, for example:

איך בין גליקלעך **וואָס** דו האָסט געקראָגן די סטיפּענדיע
~Ich bin glücklich, ***dass*** du das Stipendium gekriegt hast

In fact, *vos* only functions as a true relative pronoun when referring to a non-human noun, intensifying the syntactical distinction from German. Since *vos* is actually a subordinate conjunction and not a relative pronoun when referring to humans, it can have a resumptive pronoun within the *vos* clause:

231. Jacobs, *Yiddish: A Linguistic Introduction*, 235-37.

Consequently, an omission of the resumptive pronoun makes the syntactical difference much harder to pinpoint, because

(1) די פֿרוי **וואָס** איך זע seems cognate with

(2) die Frau, ***∂ie*** ich sehe

But is in fact syntactically identical with

(3) די פֿרוי **וואָס** איך זע **זי** which would be cognate with the (ungrammatical) German

(4)**die Frau, ***∂aʃʃ*** ich sehe ***ʃie***

Nonetheless, the syntactic deviation of *voʃ* from the relative pronoun into a subordinate conjunction manifest itself in what resembles a resumptive pronoun in the middle of the text:

> Aber ich, Geschwisterkind, ich, der ***ich*** da steh […] ich, der ***ich*** dir sagen kann […] (67-68)

And culminating again toward the end of the last paragraph:

> ich, der ***ich*** dir all das sagen kann, sagen hätt können; der ***ich*** dirs nicht sag und nicht gesagt hab; (98)

The (italicized) pronoun "ich" immediately following the relative pronoun "der", functions as a quasi-resumptive pronoun within the relative clause, thus giving rise to this peculiar construction, from a German perspective, modeled after the *voʃ*-clause.

This relentless repetition of pronouns ("***∂u*** hier und ***ich*** hier -//- ***ich*** hier, ***ich***; ***ich***, ***∂er ich ∂ir***", 97-98) conveys a strong sense of urgency nearing the end of the story. From a German perspective, the speaker (be it now Jud Klein or an amalgam of Klein together with Jud Groß) is turned into an object, referred by a relative pronoun, much like the Godhead before him, which was transposed into the non-replying, cliticized noun "Hörstdu". From a Yiddish perspective, however, the relative pronoun *'∂er'* stands for a *voʃ* marker, opening a clause with a resumptive *'ich'*. In other words, from such a point of view there is nothing ordinary in the grammar of this clause—it is just a 'Yid' speaking plain Yiddish.

The relative marker's syntactical productivity does not end there. As

Moshe Taube shows in a recent article dedicated to this subject, "[…] the degree of grammaticalization of the interrogative pronoun vos in Yiddish, […] by far exceeds what we find in German".[232] Taube distinguishes between five different types of syntactical functions introduced by vos, in addition to the full relative clause (whether as relative pronoun or as a conjunction). Among these, vos can introduce a prepositional clause, such as,"זאָגט יענע **וואָס** מיטן פֿויגעליש פנים", a past participle modifier — "זאַכן **וואָס** נישט געשטויגן, ניט געפֿלויגן" or even introduce a quotation or act instead of the conjunctions 'ווי' (vi) or 'פֿון' (fun). This creates a propensity in Yiddish to build compact relative *vos*-clauses on-the-go, that is, even in a colloquial or an oral setting. German, on the other hand, prefers pronominal adjectives or adjective phrase, especially in a colloquial or an oral setting.

Now consider the following phrase taken from the beginning of the second paragraph, describing the approaching Jud Groß:

> Und wer, denkst du, kam ihm entgegen? Entgegen kam ihm sein Vetter, sein Vetter und Geschwisterkind, der um ein Viertel Judenleben ältre, groß kam er daher (12-13)

The very last clause *"der um ein Viertel Judenleben ältre"* seems to be missing an inflected verb ('ist') in order to maintain German grammaticality. From a German-grammar perspective, the only way to rectify this (without adding a verb) is to consider the entire clause to be a dislocated pre-nominal prepositional-phrase. A 'corrected' sentence would thus read 'der um ein Viertel Judenleben ältre Vetter'. However, given the versatile syntactic productivity of *vos*, a Yiddish reading of the clause simply complies with a *vos* preceding a prepositional clause.[233] What for German is an awkward hyperbaton is for Yiddish a normal ellipsis. Like with the SVO structure in subordinate clauses, the additional diverging

232. Moshe Taube, "On the Relative Marker Vos and Yiddish Post-Modifiers," in *Leket: Yidddish Studies Today*, ed. Marion Aptroot, *et al.* (Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press, 2012), 479.
233. Ibid., 472-78.; Also cf. *The Germanic Languages*, 409.

syntactic functions introduced by *vos* are typically 'foreign' to contemporary German and a sign of its hybrid nature, as Taube notes: "[s]ome of these developments are clearly related to the influence of the Slavic co-territorial languages".[234]

In a comparative perspective in regards to Yiddish, these syntactic functions should be considered an extension of the post-nominal structure, whereby the relative clause functions as a quasi-post-nominal adjective, which describes the noun-phrase. The prevalence of *vos* and its syntactical flexibility as a postmodifier complement the post-nominal adjective as distinguishing factors from the German propensity for pre-nominal modifiers. These syntactic qualities of 'vos' are projected unto the German inflected relative pronoun, 'der/die/das', thus enabling relative clause structures resembling the Yiddish relative clause. This may be fittingly termed here the *vos*-effect or *vos*-structure.

The post-nominal modifiers based on Yiddish syntactical constructions can be thus far summarized in the following table:

Noun Phrase	Post-Nominal Modifier	Type of Yid. model
mein Stock	der hat gesprochen	*vos*-construction
mein Stock	der schweigt jetzt still	
der Stein	der kann sprechen	
sein Vetter und Geschwisterkind	der um ein Viertel Judenleben ältre	NP-NP construction
[die] Straße	[die] schöne	
	[die] unvergelichliche	
der Name	der unaussprechliche	

5.3.3.6. Demonstratives and Subject-Postponing: The Distancing-Effect

234. Taube, „On the Relative Marker Vos and Yiddish Post-Modifiers.", 479.

The *vos*-effect is complemented by a corresponding morphological effect, owing to the similarity between the Yiddish and German demonstratives. This is best explained by an example. Reconsider the following passage:

> und mein Stock, ***∂er*** hat gesprochen, hat gesprochen zum Stein, und mein Stock, ***∂er*** schweigt jetzt still, und der Stein, sagst du, ***∂er*** kann sprechen […] (86-88)

As noted earlier, this string of relative and main clauses chained to one another in alternating succession—one noun phrase followed by a modifier and then by another noun phrase—, exhibits the characteristics of a *vos*-construction, whereby the determiner *∂er* functions in place of a *vos*-marker. However, since the Yiddish demonstrative pronoun, 'דער/די/דאָס' is morphologically analogous to the German relative pronoun, 'der/die/das', the passage can be alternatively understood appositionally and not restrictively, i.e., as a sequence of main clauses ("mein Stock", "der Stein") followed by interjected non-subordinate clauses introduced by the (stressed) demonstrative marker ("***∂er*** hat gesprochen", "***∂er*** schweigt jetzt still", "***∂er*** kann sprechen"). Such a reading may, for the sake of clarity, be re-written using the personal pronoun instead of the demonstrative:

> und mein Stock, ***er*** hat gesprochen, hat gesprochen zum Stein, und mein Stock, ***er*** schweigt jetzt still, und der Stein, sagst du, ***er*** kann sprechen […]

The status of such clauses introduced with the determiner *∂er* is indeed syntactically ambiguous. They are either considered ungrammatical (verb-second) relative clauses under certain accounts, or grammatical (albeit colloquial) main clauses under different accounts.[235] In the former case, *∂er* is a relative pronoun, in the latter, (stressed) *∂er* is a demonstrative replacing the personal pronoun *er*.

The Yiddish demonstrative pronoun, 'דער/די/דאָס' behaves much in the same way as its German cognates 'der/die/das', when stressed and used as a demonstrative. Nevertheless, such post-nominal information, added 'on-the-go', as inserted by the clauses introduced with *∂er* would be typically

235. Cf. Fagan, *German: A Linguistic Introduction*, 250, 252.

given in Yiddish with *ʋoʃ*-constructions, not with additional main clauses. Therefore, the marked effect of a demonstrative construction in Yiddish may be better illustrated using the second, more stylistically-marked form of proximal demonstrative in German, *ʔieʃer*:

> und mein Stock, ***ʔieʃer*** hat gesprochen, hat gesprochen zum Stein, und mein Stock, ***ʔieʃer*** schweigt jetzt still, und der Stein, sagst du, ***ʔieʃer*** kann sprechen […]

The resulting reciprocal dynamics between the German and Yiddish are summarized in the following table:

'Code'/Syntactical Status	**Canonical, unmarked**	**Marked**
Germanized-Yiddish	***ʔer*** gesprochen hat	***ʔieʃer*** hat gesprochen
Yiddishized-German	'***ʋoʃ***' hat gesprochen	***er*** hat gesprochen

If the Yiddish *ʋoʃ*-effect projects syntactic functions into the German relative pronoun 'der/die/das', then the latter's morphological identity with the Yiddish demonstrative pronoun re-projects yet another syntactic quality into it. The result is a a hybrid form of relative pronoun and demonstrative pronoun, of *ʔer* (as *ʋoʃ*) and *ʔieʃer*, paradoxically mixing what normally 'points' ('from within') directly to its immediate antecedent evidently present within the discourse (*mein Stock*), with what normally points to a constituent not present in the discourse (*ʔieʃer Stock*). Notice the stark contrast formed between the possessive *mein*, indicating Jud Klein's close affinity to the cane, and the distance in the implied demonstrative *ʔieʃer*. A scale ranging from affinity to distance, from the proximal to the distal, is thus formed, allowing the distancing of constituents from their attributes in a constantly intensifying degree.

Proximal, Here, Present, Evident	>>	>>	>>	**Distal, There, Absent, non-Evident**
mein Stock	***ðer*** Stock	***ðer*** (stressed, as ***er***)	***ðieʃer***	***jener***
Possesiv	Nominative	Proximal Demonst.	Marked proximal Demonst.	Distal Demonst.

The resulting functional distancing of the relative pronouns, projected from the demonstrative goes hand in hand with the extraposing of adjective and adverbs in *Gespräch im Gebirg*. Modifiers or Qualifiers, that is, constituents that describe the noun or noun phrase, are syntacticly extraposed rightward beyond the qualified noun or noun phrase, while they are functionally/semantically extraposed by the demonstrative nature of the hybrid relative/demonstrative pronoun.

In other words the physical distance of the post-nominal modifiers from the noun phrases they modify ('describe') as in structures like NP-NP (e.g, "sein Name, *ðer unaussprechliche"*) and in *vos*-constructions (e.g., "mein Stock, *ðer hat gesprochen"*) is analogous to the syntactic distance caused by the movement from the proximal possessive (*mein* Stock) through the demonstrative ([stressed] *ðer* hat gesprochen) and up to the utmost distant marked demonstrative by way of syntactic analogy to Yiddish (**דער** האָט גערדט ~*ðieʃer* hat gesprochen).

Lastly, another syntactic feature contributes to the physical distancing between constituents which are normally adjacent in canonical

construction—subject-postponing.

The primary subject of the first sentence, "der Jud", is extremely postponed rightward beyond all other constituents of the sentence. Instead of 'da ging der Jud, trat aus seinem Häusel' and so on, we find the subject "der Jud" only at the very end of the utterance "da ging, trat aus seinem Häusel und ging *der Jud*" (1-2). The next subject, "sein Name" is likewise postponed, so that instead of the unmarked word order 'und sein unaussprechlicher Name ging mit ihm', one finds both peculiar Yiddish structures, the post-nominal adjective modification as well as subject-postponing.

Subject-postponing, similar to the post-nominal adjective, is a syntactic structure generally prominent in Yiddish, and in its narrative registers in particular. The structure allows the addition of information without disrupting the flow of narrative sequence.[236] Unsurprisingly, it is frequently found in the genre of traditional Jewish anecdote or tale:

איינער אַ ייד איז געפאָרן קיין פאריז צום ערשטן מאָל.
האט אים באגעגנעט אין סטאנציע **זײַן פרײַנט**...

Such a distinctive structure is attested in the text with remarkable exactness:

Und wer, denkst du, kam ihm entgegen?
Entgegen kam ihm sein **Vetter**, sein **Vetter und Geschwisterkind**

5.3.3.7. The Poetological Concept of *Ich-Ferne*

The dynamics of *Jiddischdeutsch* have hitherto played an essentially socio-linguistic role by presenting the felicitous Jewish lingual *creation* of Yiddish in the disguise of *Judendetusch*, the "crooked" Jewish *performance* of German. The main lingual vehicle in achieving this intricate presentation was the tension between the perception of canonical constructions in both languages, their differences and overlaps. However, the specific nature of

236. Hall, „Accounting for Yiddish Word Order, or What's a Nice Np Like You Doing in a Place Like This?", 276.; Prince suggests the source for the prevalence of postponing "discourse new" subjects to the final field in Yiddish may be Semitic or Romance. See Prince, „Yiddish as a Contact Language.", 278.

the hyperbaton attested here in the separation of noun phrases from their modifiers, either by pure syntactic technics such as the unceasing interweaving of main clauses with interjected relative clauses, or by the morphological movement form the proximal to the distal, also serves a poetological purpose explicitly stated by Celan in his *Meridian* speech. In that speech, Celan argues that art demands and, when successful, also creates what he calls "Ich-Ferne", a form of self-distancing:

> Ich denke an Lucile, indem ich das lese: ich lese: ***Er, er selbst***.
> Wer Kunst vor Augen und im Sinn hat, der ist - ich bin hier bei der Lenz-Erzählung -, der ist selbstvergessen. Kunst schafft ***Ich-Ferne***. Kunst fordert hier in einer bestimmten Richtung eine bestimmte Distanz, einen bestimmten Weg. (GW, 3: 193)

Art, and, as Celan later contends, poetry (Dichtung) requires this self-distancing, a sort of self-estrangement to pave its way. However, self-forgetting is a pre-requisite for this process: *ich* must be transformed into *er*. Then he goes on to describe how this process unfolds in Büchner's *Lenz*, the paradigm narrative for *Gespräch im Gebirg*:

> So hatte er *hin*gelebt.
> Er: der wahre, der Büchnersche Lenz, die Büchnersche Gestalt, die Person, die wir auf der ersten Seite der Erzählung wahrnehmen konnten, der Lenz, der »den 20. Jänner durchs Gebirg ging«, er - nicht der Künstler und mit Fragen der Kunst Beschäftigte, ***er als ein Ich***. (GW, 3: 194)

Thus *Ich-Ferne* is achieved through the transformation of *ich* into *er*. Only through this process which starts with self-estrangement, can the poem rejoin the subject into himself, by retransforming *er* into *ich*. One needs to visit the strange, the foreign, the Other in order to free oneself:

> Finden wir jetzt vielleicht den Ort, wo das Fremde war, den Ort, wo die Person sich freizusetzen vermochte, ***als ein - befremdetes - Ich*** ? […] Vielleicht wird hier, mit dem ***Ich*** mit dem hier und solcherart freigesetzten ***befremdeten Ich***, vielleicht wird hier noch ein Anderes frei? (GW, 3: 196)

Gespräch im Gebirg follows the poetological program detailed in the *Meridian*, as implied by Celan himself[237] and demonstrated by scholarly

---

237. "Und vor einem Jahr, in Erinnerung an eine versäumte Begegnung im Engadin, brachte ich eine kleine Geschichte zu Papier, in der ich einen Menschen 'wie Lenz' durchs Gebirg gehen ließ. Ich hatte mich, das eine wie das andere Mal, von einem "20. Jänner", von meinem "20. Jänner", hergeschrieben.
Ich bin ... mir selbst begegnet." (GW, 3: 201)

research. Therefore, this *Ich-Ferne*, as a main pillar of this program, is accordingly manifest on multiple levels in *Gespräch im Gebirg*. First of all, on the level of narrative one finds it quite explicitly stated in the conversation between Groß and Klein:

> eine Sprache, je nun, ohne Ich und ohne Du, lauter Er, lauter Es, verstehst du, lauter Sie, und nichts als das. (47-48)

Secondly, the re-surfacing of ich and du at the end of the story—"du hier und ich hier [...] ich hier, ich; ich, der ich dir all das sagen kann" (97-98)—, also fits in nicely with the rejoining of oneself at the end of the poetic process, as Celan indeed reconstructs in the Meridian regarding Gespräch im Gebirg: "Ich bin ... mir selbst begegnet". Finally, semantically and symbolically, many parallels may easily be drawn between the estrangement process and the narrative details, such as the interplay of speech and silence among the protagonists themselves and between them and inanimate objects like the cane and the stone.

Nevertheless, the most consistent and meaningful practice of the poetological program of *Ich-Ferne*, which implicitly consists in *verjuden*, is found throughout the entire text in the very way its building blocks are put together, namely in the syntax of the story. This is the poetological purpose served by the syntax of *Jiddischdeutsch*. The double distancing effect achieved through the unique mutual projection of syntax and morphology between Yiddish and German, as discussed above in detail, implements the *Ich-Ferne* by informing each and every sentence in the text: Jud Klein becomes estranged from his cane on the syntactical level—"*mein* Stock" becomes '*der* Stock', which in turn reads '*dieser* Stock' under the influence of Yiddish; and on the morphological level, the determiner *der* and the third person pronoun *er* come to dominate the scene: "***er***, den man hatte wohnen lassen unten, wo ***er*** hingehört, in den Niederungen, ***er***, der Jud, kam und kam" (9-10).

5.3.3.8. The Nominalized Enclitic *Hördu*

Estrangement is however most emphatically achieved in the story when these syntactic and morphologic devices converge with semantically laden

symbolism, as in the case of the nominalized *Hörɤtдu.*

The only significant enclitic to be left undiscussed so far, is also the one with a distinct Yiddish appearance: "Hörstdu" (64-65) is a nominalized (hence the capital 'H') cognate of an Yiddish enclitic, which is triggered by second-person interrogative verb, in this case — 'הערסטו'. It is a clear reference to Yiddish morphology by its very imitation of the common Yiddish orthography, which habitually cliticizes the second-person pronoun unto the verb in interrogative direct questions.[238]

In this paragraph, the verbal and nominal groups are switched. The verbal phrase goes through a triple-stage metamorphosis: from the German interrogative "hörst du" thorugh the encliticized Yiddish interrogative "hörstdu" to the nominalized phrase "Hörstdu". At this stage in the story, it is obvious that the nominalized "Hörstdu", is a permutation of the "unaussprechliche[r] Name", i.e., the Jewish God. *Hörɤtдu*, much like the nominalized *Niemanд,* who is also famously attested in the poem "Psalm" from the *Niemanдɤrose* (GW, 1: 225), is the transcendent entity whose existential paradox is inscribed in its nomenclature: *Niemanд* stands for the omnipresence of God who paradoxically never appears; *Hörɤдu* stands for the all-listening quality of God ("אל שומע תפילות ותחנונים"),[239] who paradoxically never answers; These names complete the circle of paradox by alluding to the God who cannot be alluded to, since is name is *unaussprechlich*.

All this semantic and intertextual information is intricately delivered on the syntactic level by an accumulation of relative clauses and appositional or demonstrative main clauses, all of which utilize the determiner "der", thus finally blurring all distinction between the two. Similar to the former passage, the first two clauses starting with the determiner "der"—"***дer*** sagt nichts" (64) and "***дer*** antwortet nicht" (64-65)—, are syntactically

238. Cf. Nagy, „Deutsch-Jiddischer Sprachenkontakt Am Beispiel Der Czernowitzer Deutsch-Jüdischen Presse Der 1930-Er Jahre.", 105.: "zerspringen sollstu, wann gehstdu"
239. And cf. with Felstiner's notion that *Hörstdu* Stands for "שמע ישראל": Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*, 142.

equivocal. They can be understood appositionally as main clauses, i.e., ~'Hörsdu sagt nicht' and ~'Hörsdu antwortet nicht'; alternatively, they can be understood restrictively as relative clauses, i.e., ~'der Hörsdu, der nichts sagt' and ~'der Hörsdu, der nicht antwortet'.

In contrast, the following eight clauses beginning with "der" (65-69) are unambiguously relative. In fact, in order to avoid any ambiguity concerning the new nominalized status of "Hörsdu", it undergoes another nominalization with a *ʃaʃ*-construction— "Hörstdu, **das** ist **der** [...]" (65) and an extra determiner "**der**, **der** sich gefaltet hat" (65). Like *vos*-constructions and post-nominal adjective modifiers (NP-NP) before them, *ʃaʃ*-constructions are common in Yiddish (glossed as *ʃoʃ*-constructions),[240] and likewise they distance the modifier from the modified noun phrase, so that instead of the compact 'der Hörstdu mit den Gletschern' one finds "Hörstdu [...] ***ʃaʃ*** ist der mit den Gletschern" (65). The extent of this effect becomes clearly noticeable when the passage is considered in its entirety:

> Hörstdu, ***ʃer*** sagt nichts, ***ʃer*** antwortet nicht, [...] ***ʃaʃ*** ist ***ʃer*** mit den Gletschern, ***ʃer***, ***ʃer*** sich gefaltet hat, dreimal, und nicht für die Menschen...
> ***Der*** Grün-und-Weiße dort, ***ʃer*** mit dem Türkenbund, ***ʃer*** mit der Rapunzel

Finally, as required per the poetological program of *Ich-Ferne,* the demonstrative is applied on the speaker himself, turning him into an object: "Aber ich, Geschwisterkind, ich, ***ʃer*** ich da steh [...] ich - ich, ***ʃer*** ich dir sagen kann" (67)—this peculiar construction, "ich, ***ʃer*** ich da steh" may only be reasonably accounted for as a calque-construction of Yiddish *vos*-clause with resumptive pronouns[241]. When re-applied in light of this example, the relative pronoun 'der' is analogous to 'vos' and 'ich' to is analogous to 'zi', which would form the following clauses in Yiddish: 'איך, שטיי דאָ **וואָס איך**' and 'איך, קאָן דיר זאָגן **וואָס איך**'.[242]

---

240. *The Germanic Languages*, 415.
241. As discussed earlier in this chapter under: "Realative Clauses: The *vos*-Effect" in this chapter.
242. Cf. Nagy, „Deutsch-Jiddischer Sprachenkontakt Am Beispiel Der Czernowitzer Deutsch-Jüdischen Presse Der 1930-Er Jahre.", 104.

5.3.3.9. Anastrophe, Apposition, Hyperbaton

Once the poetological purpose of *Jiddischdeutsch* is established, other striking anastrophic formulations attested in text can be better understood.

Epiphora of noun phrase with their full extended post-nominal modifiers (repetition of *"der Straße, der schönen, der unvergleichlichen"* for instance) was discussed earlier as a syntactic factor completing forms of ellipsis modeled after common Yiddish construction (subject pro-drop). The text likewise exhibits a milder form of epiphora, which repeats the noun phrase but leaves out the extended modifiers. This form is artificially introduced through interjected third person pronoun forming an appositive. Consider the following examples:

"für wen ist ***sie*** denn gedacht, ***die Erde***" (46)
instead of —
'für wen ist denn ***die Erde*** gedacht'

"Da stehn ***sie*** also, ***die Geschwisterkinder"*** (21-22)
instead of —
'Da stehn also ***die Geschwisterkinder***'

"Aber ***sie***, ***die Geschwisterkinder***, ***sie*** haben" (24)
instead of —
'Aber ***die Geschwisterkinder*** haben'

The last of these three examples quite remarkably interpolates the third-person plural pronoun twice, without even adding any other particle such as 'denn' or 'also' which might marginally justify the convoluted structure. This appositioned syntax clearly serves the poetological *Ich-Ferne* principle.

Finally, it may seem at times that the principle of post-nominal

extraposition, the inversion of natural German syntax, is applied ad absurdum. Consider, for instance, the following example:

"[…] ***ðer***, ***ðer*** sich gefaltet hat, dreimal, und nicht für die Menschen" (65-66)

Instead of the canonical relative-clause construction —

'Hörsdtu, ***ðer*** sich nicht für die Menschen dreimal gefaltet hat'

All constituents are distanced from the noun they describe either by forcing a demonstrative-aspect or by apposition. In this case, the determiner is artificially doubled to create a demonstrative distance which extraposes both the adverb "dreimal" as well as the adverbial "nicht für die Menschen". Moreover, even the adverb "dreimal" is extracted out of its canonical position preceding the verb and interjected between the verbal phrase ("sich gefaltet hat") and the adverbial phrase ("nicht für die Menschen").

The appositions and epiphoras, the doubling of determiners and injection of pronoun, all these amount to an unrelenting pointing, referring, like a chain of consecutive 'der, der, der', 'er, ,er, er' and 'sie, sie, sie'—, as if no element in the discourse is stable enough to be unambiguous, no anaphora is enough to position the "***er*** **als ein** ***ich***" prescribed in the *Meriðian*.

5.3.4. Lexis and Semantics

The opening discussion of the lexeme "Jud" may in many respects guide the current complementary discussion of Semantics. The principle mechanism here is that of *false friends*, that is, of German and Yiddish homonyms or lexical cognates, with differentiating or even contrasting meanings and semantics overtones (as in the case of 'Jud'-'ייִד' and 'Häusel'-'הײַזל').

A prominent example in the text is the expression "Vetter und Geschwisterkind", used to describe the second "Jud"—"Jud Groß"— and his relation to "Jud Klein", with whom he converses:

> Kam, ja, auf der Straße daher, der schönen.
> Und wer, denkst du, kam ihm entgegen? Entgegen kam ihm sein Vetter,

sein Vetter und Geschwisterkind (11-13)

'Vetter' in contemporary German use normally means 'cousin'. It originally derives from Middle High German 'vetere', i.e. 'Father', and used to mean "vatersbruder", which was later expanded to also include the son of a paternal father.[243] Additionally, it was used archaically to refer to distant relatives. However, the Yiddish cognate of the German 'Vetter', 'פֿעטער', means only uncle in formal use. Informally, it is also used as a title of familiarity given to non-relatives—either naively 'פֿעטער שניאור' ('Jack Frost'), or sarcastically 'פֿעטער, מע קען אײַך!' ('you're not fooling anyone!')[244] , in a semantic analogy to German 'Vetter', when it is given as a title for a distant relative.

'Geschwisterkind', in contemporary German use, normally means 'a child who has a sibling'. It can also regionally mean either 'a niece/nephew' or 'a cousin'.[245] Its Yiddish cognate, however, 'געשוועסטערקינד' or 'שוועסטערקינד', unequivocally means cousin,[246] which is the least probable of the German possible meanings.

The semantic variation can be thus summarized in the following table:

	Vetter	***und***	***Geschwisterkind***
German	cousin	and	child with sibling

243. Jacob Grimm, and Wilhelm Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch Von Jacob Und Wilhelm Grimm. 16 Bde. In 32 Teilbänden. Quellenverzeichnis 1971.* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1854).; "Vetter." *DUDEN* DUDEN accessed 20 October, 2015, http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Vetter. http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Vetter

244. Solon Beinfeld, and Harry Bochner, *Comprehensive Yiddish-English Dictionary* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013).; online version: http://www.verterbukh.org/

245. Grimm, and Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch Von Jacob Und Wilhelm Grimm. 16 Bde. In 32 Teilbänden. Quellenverzeichnis 1971.*; "Geschwisterkind." *DUDEN* DUDEN accessed 20 October, 2015, http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Geschwisterkind. http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Geschwisterkind

246. Beinfeld, and Bochner, *Comprehensive Yiddish-English Dictionary*.

Yiddish	uncle	and	cousin
Informal German	distant relative	and	niece/nephew/ cousin
Informal Yiddish	non relative	and	-

While the German semantic field of the discussed lexemes is unstable and ambiguous, the Yiddish semantic field clearly gives rise to a stable paradox, whereby "Jud Groß" is simultaneously an uncle and a cousin of "Jud Klein". If perceived as a German lexeme, "Geschwisterkind" particularly strikes as inappropriate when combined with the possessive pronoun "sein", since one's "Geschwisterkind" is simply one's "Bruder", as opposed to *a* "Geschwisterkind", which only indicates one is not an only-child.

The Yiddish paradox, on the other hand, conveys a co-existing sense of inferiority/superiority and equality within a familiar framework, which adequately conforms to the ambivalent socio-lingual and cultural relationship between German-speaking *Westjuden* and Yiddish-speaking *Ostjuden*. On the one hand, repressed feelings of immediate and deep intimacy resulting from the shared history and ancestry are represented in the "Geschwisterkind" as an equal cousin; while on the other hand, the corresponding yet contradictory feelings of cultural and lingual supremacy are represented in the "Vetter" as an older, culturally-superior uncle.

In this version the Western Jew's dislike of the "Geschwisterkind" is the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass, to paraphrase Oscar Wilde. However, this relationship can be easily reversed: the older "Vetter" can be a source of embarrassment, if his seniority is a sign of atavism. In this version, the Western Jew's dislike of the "Vetter" is the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass. Therefore, although the paradox is semantically stable, it remains ambiguous as to which "Jud"

plays what part in this relationship, which is *Ostjude*, which is *Westjude*. In other words, the paradox is semantically stable but referentially ambiguous.

Just as the Yiddish semantic field must not be neglected, so does the German must be taken into account. The full hermeneutical spectrum in this text can only be revealed in conjunction with all the lingual elements it consists of. Reinterpreted from a German perspective, one should keep in mind that the German of this text is quasi-*Judendetusch*, i.e., it is a Jewish performance of German. This performance of family-naming, in German terms, is a failed one, because it is semantically unstable. It suggests unclarity within the most intimate of human relationships. It suggests that the Jew, when performing German, is alienated to his own kin, for he knows not how to name them.

The semantic elephants in the room are the words not taken—*tate*, *mame*, *bobe*, *zeyde*—the most intimate vocabulary for family relation in Yiddish is Slavic in origin.

More importantly, perhaps, than the semantic variation is the frequency and normality of the cognates: 'פֿעטער', is the normal word for uncle[247] in Yiddish and 'שוועסטערקינד' the normal word for cousin[248], whereas 'Vetter' and 'Geschwisterkind' are infrequent alternatives to the normal words 'Onkel' and 'Nichte/Neffe/Cousin/Cousine', as also attested by their unstable meaning in German.

This is yet another example of the weakness of a German-only approach to the text: although previous analyses observed the semantic peculiarity of these lexemes, they quickly classified them as "archaisms",[249] without further discussion. In Yiddish studies it is well known that so-

---

247. Weinreich, *Modern English-Yiddish, Yiddish-English Dictionary*, 345.
248. Ibid., 70.
249. Cf. Sieber, „Judendeutsch Und Krummnasig: Ein Kommentar Zu Paul Celans Gespräch Im Gebirg.", 20.; פאול צלאן, **סורג־שפה: שירים וקטעי פרוזה**, בתרגום שמעון זנדבנק (תל-אביב: הקיבוץ המאוחד, 1994), 169.

called "archaisms" abound in relation to German; they are, nonetheless, the logical semantic outcome of languages with a shared lingual ancestry which have parted ways. Erika Timm has shown many of these Yiddish archaisms (in comparison to German) to be the work of lingual conservatism originating from the tradition of word-by-word and calque translation of the Hebrew Bible in the Heder (Taytsh-Yiddish).[250]

As was the case with syntax, so is with Semantics: what may seem idiosyncratic, peculiar and unstable from a German-only perspective, seems normative and ordinary from a Yiddish perspective, and revealing from a joint perspective.

Another noteworthy example pertains to the use of the verbs that describe the act of speaking or talking, "sprechen" and "reden". On the narrative level, these naturally play a central part in a text dubbed as a "Conversation". On a meta-lingual text like this, they are even more significant.

The direct references to speech and the corresponding verbs are concentrated in the following passages:

> Die Geschwätzigen! Haben sich, auch jetzt, da die Zunge blöd gegen die Zähne stößt und die Lippe sich nicht rundet, etwas zu sagen! Gut, laß sie reden ... (36-37)

Paving the way to the direct dialogue, which after a few short exchanges takes up the theme of speaking:

> »Warum und wozu ... Weil ich hab reden müssen vielleicht, zu mir oder zu dir, reden hab müssen mit dem Mund und mit der Zunge und nicht nur mit dem Stock. Denn zu wem redet er, der Stock? Er redet zum Stein, und der Stein - zu wem redet der?«
> »Zu wem, Geschwisterkind, soll er reden? Er redet nicht, er spricht, und wer spricht, Geschwisterkind, der redet zu niemand, der spricht, weil niemand ihn hört, niemand und Niemand (53-58) […]
> und der Stein, sagst du, der kann sprechen (87-88)
> ich bin dir begegnet, hier, und geredet haben wir, viel […] (92-93)

250. Erika Timm, *Historische Jiddische Semantik: Die Bibelübersetzungssprache Als Faktor Der Auseinanderentwicklung Des Jiddischen Und Des Deutschen Wortschatzes* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2005).

Upon reading these passages from the perspective of Semantics, it becomes immediately apparent that from the three available verbs denoting the act of speech, only two are fruitful, "reden" and "sagen", while "sprechen" is futile: "wer spricht, Geschwisterkind, der redet zu niemand, der spricht, weil niemand ihn hört, niemand und Niemand" (57-58). Not surprisingly, in Yiddish there are cognates for "reden" and for "sagen", but none for "sprechen". Although the southern German dialects generally show a clear preference for "reden" over "sprechen", the latter verb still remains a viable and usable form in that lingual area. Consequently, unlike in Yiddish, "sprechen" cannot be said to have a fundamentally different meaning in those dialects or to be lacking as a signifier for the act of speech. Semantic variation in this regard amounts to question of register—whereby the more infrequently the verb is used to denote speaking or talking, the higher the register it indicates.[251] For Yiddish, however, "sprechen" is simply not a part of the lexicon and therefore would clearly be a Germanism, a *ʤaytshmeriʒm*.

In other words, "wer spricht [...] der redet zu niemand" (57)—exactly because he is not talking *mame-loshn* and consequently not making any sense, at least not for the Yiddish-speaking *Ostʤue*.

As the saying goes, 'יִידיש רעדט זיך אליין', that is, Yiddish comes out naturally. The literal translation of this saying, 'Yiddish speaks itself on its own', asserts its clear oral predisposition: Yiddish comes out naturally by way of talking or speaking. Talking is at the epicenter of the *Gespräch*. Yiddish, however, 'רעדט זיך', it doesn't 'spricht sich'. "Reden", therefore, stands for a conversation that 'speaks itself', like the sort of exchanges summed up in the decisive contention "geredet haben wir", or for a conversation so natural that is a matter of necessity: "Warum und wozu ... Weil ich hab reden müssen". The German, "sprechen", conversely, does not seem to come out naturally at all, which is once more echoed in the

251. Cf. the entries "Reden" and "Sprechen" in Grimm, and Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch Von Jacob Und Wilhelm Grimm. 16 Bde. In 32 Teilbänden. Quellenverzeichnis 1971.*

adjective "unaussprechlich" and attested in the futility of the stone's failed attempt at "sprechen". In other words, "sprechen" signifies the Jew's failed performance of German. Because the Jew "redt", he does not "spricht" properly. This is finally echoed in what is described in the text as a physical barrier preventing the protagonists from 'sprechen':

> Haben sich, auch jetzt, da die Zunge blöd gegen die Zähne stößt und die Lippe sich nicht rundet, etwas zu sagen (36-37)

This may be a reference hinting at the Jew's deficient pronunciation of the German umlauts, which require the rounding of vowels, in contrast to Yiddish[252], yet another manifestation of *Mauscheln*. However, since they always have something to say and as they cannot 'sprechen', the texts concludes—"Gut, laß sie reden" (37).

By rendering "reden" and "sagen" the only fruitful ways of communication, the futility of an entirely Germanized way of communication, which strips the Jew of his own resourceful lingual creation becomes evident on the semantic level, which in this case is at the same time meta-semantic.

252. Cf. Schuster, „Ingeborg Bachmann Und Paul Celan: Historisch-Poetische Korrelationen.", 79., and consider the unrounding of vowels in the Czernowitz idiom, see Rein, „Welches Deutsch Spricht Man in Wien, Welches in Czernowitz?", 114.

5.4. Conclusion

Gespräch im Gerbirg utilizes a host of morpho-phonologic, syntactic and semantic construction based on Yiddish models and benefitting from the mutual dynamics of linguistic projection of structures between German and Yiddish. Owning to this dually-layered structure, comprising of both German and Yiddish, the lingual fabric was thus termed as *Jiddischdeutsch*, in a critical paraphrase on Celan's own remark designating the language of the text as *Judendeutsch*.

On the morpho-phonological level, the text employs as a literary device (1) non-standard German modifications which are either more frequent, pervasive or canonical in Yiddish. These include: (1.1) widespread apocope and syncope forms; (1.2) non-standard and semantically laden diminutive; (1.3) widespread use of clitics, particularly of Yiddish-sounding unusual preposition-clitics;

On the syntactical level, the text employs (2) *Scrambling*, i.e., the reshuffling of standard canonical word order, while keeping within the boundaries of grammaticality. The scrambled clauses do not follow the customary stylistic varieties for marked German sentences but are modeled instead on Yiddish stylistic varieties, most notably, (2.1) the consecutive word order employed in narratives and (2.2) post-nominal adjective construction (2.3), as well as subject postponing (2.4)

(3) elliptic or (4) epiphoric constructions with respect to canonical German clauses, i.e., constructions that either omit required constituents or incorporate redundant constituents in customary German, which are, in contrast, canonical in Yiddish. These include (3.1) subject pro-drop (pronoun deletion), (3.2) spatial verb ellipsis; (4.1) recurring verbs, (4.2) demonstrative and relative equivocation, (4.3)

On the semantic level, the text employs devices of lexical ambiguity, inter-lingual equivocation and paradoxical intertextual references. These include (5.1) false friends, charged with semantic tension between Yiddish

and German (5.2) and a paradox-semantic effect, achieved by semantic differentiation between lexemes (sprechen/reden), which are synonymous in German but only partly attested in Yiddish, to form a meta-lingual paradox.

It is important to note that the full scope of the linguistic phenomena can only be appropriately analyzed and understood when examined using the help of tools from different branches of philology. The full meaning of the words 'Jud' and 'Häusel', for example, can only become apparent by a combination of morpho-phonological and semantic discussion. The V1-construction can only be consistently implemented thanks to verb-recurrence. Likewise, the syntactic modeling of pseudo 'ס'איז'-clauses is only possible thanks to the morphologic-chiastic trick which echoes the Yiddish proclitic-עס in the German enclitic-*es*.

Celan builds a new syntax through what is known as *Scrambling*, which despite its apparent anomaly usually conforms to German grammar, and despite its apparent quirkiness is not irregular, but rather consistently and systematically modeled on Yiddish syntactical structures, which are peculiar in regard to German.

In the verbal group the syntactic models range from V1-construction ("Kam Ja", "Bist gekommen") and recurrence ("kam und kam", "frag und frag") which are predominantly based on the Yiddish narrative sequence, exhibiting a strong affinity to colloquial genres.

In the nominal group, these models range from post-nominal modifiers construction such as the NP-NP ("auf der Straße, der schönen, der unvergleichlichen") and the *vos*-construction ("der um ein Viertel Judenleben ältre") to induced ambiguity between relative markers and demonstratives (*vos* charges *der/die/das* as a post-modifier, while *der/die/das* charge דער/די/דאס as the marked demonstrative *dieser*). The difference is thus blurred between post-nominal restrictive relative clauses and appositive main clauses, as well as the difference between the pronoun and

the demonstrative, which results in distancing of the subjects from themselves.

Ellipsis ("[∅] Kam, ja, auf der Straße"), modeled on Yiddish subject pro-drop, and the ensuing epiphora (repetition of "auf der Straße daher, der schönen"; "Aber sie, die Geschwisterkinder, sie haben") are prevalent in both groups.

The syntactic elements are the biggest source of estrangement in the lingual fabric of the text: whereas morphophonologic and lexical elements such as elision, apocope and the choice of vocabulary can be relegated to questions of register or localism, or even ignored to a degree, the interference in word-order, constant repetitions and ellipsis, pose an obstacle not easily surmounted. Ellipsis, anaphora and epiphora pierce holes through the referential system, while *Scrambling* ('grammatical' hyperbaton) disrupts it. The reader has no choice but to slow down, re-read back and fro, reposition the constituents in an attempt to reconnect severed references and untangle redundant ones.

The scope, specific nature and the consistency of hyperbaton in the text, consequently indicate that it is far more than a stylistic device or mannerism, but rather the calculated result of systematic application. More specifically, the poetological principle served by the syntax of *Jiddischdeutsch* is the *Ich-Ferne* prescribed by Celan in his *Meridian*. In a paradox of universalism stemming from particularism, *verjuden*, the poetological principle is put into practice by the dual-layered syntax of *Jiddischdeutsch*. This syntactic realization in *Gespräch im Gebirg* relies on the existence of two parallel lingual perspectives, both Yiddish as well as German, whereby what is perceived as *crooked* by the latter is in fact felicitous when perceived by the former.

5.5. Oral Orientation and Considerations of Genre and 'Intertext'

That *Gespräch im Gebirg* exhibits strong affinities with a few models of colloquial, folkloristic or pseudo-folkloristic traditions may have become evident by now. Although a full discussion of genre goes beyond the scope of this thesis, a few observations merit some consideration, albeit in passing, as they arise from the principal philological discussion and complement it.

5.5.1. The *Märchen* and the Hasidic Tale

First of all, as observed earlier, the text opens with a distinctive formula of a fairytale (*Märchen*), "Eines Abendes", situating the narrative in a universal, undefined place and time, "Gebirg", "Häusel", with archetype protagonists "Jud Klein" and "Jud Groß". Other characteristic elements of the fairytale appear but seem to fall short of fulfilling their usual purpose: items of realia, which in the tradition of the fairytale display magical powers, are prompted to do so but fail miserably: the 'talking' cane and stone keep quite instead of talking, the moving veil blocks the view instead of revealing it.

A closer examination shows, that the model of the fairytale is completely turned on its head in this text. The opening formula reads "Eines Abendes", whereas the typical formula would normally signal the break of day "Eines Tages". The archetypical protagonist is overdeterminatly marked in every ethnic, lingual and social perspective, a far cry from a general Everyman. Nevertheless, the ending is optimistic, and from the perspective of Yiddish, the protagonist is in fact, an Everyman.

Secondly, the fantastic elements of the fairytale are imported to a certain type of the Hasidic tales. The magical artifacts are charged with its divine counterpart, mystic energy. It is in this kind of tales, that the Everyman-protagonist is a Jew, אַ יִד. Celan's interest and reading of such

tales is well-known and attested, among other places, in his Bremen-Prize speech. Here one is confronted not only with narrative conventions, but with the question of their language as well. The Hasidic tales, "die Martin Buber uns allen auf deutsch wiedererzählt hat", were, of course, originally told in Yiddish. That is, they were told before they were written. This orality also characterizes the classical *Märchen*, which was orally transferred as a folktale before finally being written and heavily edited. In this very process, for which the Grimm brothers are the clear prototype, the vernacular dialect in which the folktale was originally transmitted for a great many years had to give way to the cultivated literary language.

What is therefore truly remarkable about the affinity displayed by *Gespräch im Gebirg* to the traditions of folktale genres is its lingual adherence to the source model. As suggested in the linguistic analysis, many of the underlying Yiddish syntactic constructions in the text are either typical, more frequent or only possible under the genre of folktale, anecdote or folk riddle. The most conspicuous examples are the V1-clause, which in essence defines the standard narrative word-order in Yiddish folktales, and the post-nominal adjective construction (NP-NP), which constitutes the standard formula for introduction of the protagonist (...אַ ייִד אַ איינער). The dual-structure of *Jiddischdeutsch* enables the transference of a folktale into German while retaining the underlying syntactic structure of the Yiddish 'original'.

First of all, as observed earlier, the text opens with a distinctive formula of a fairytale (*Märchen*), "Eines Abendes", situating the narrative in a universal, undefined place and time, "Gebirg", "Häusel", with archetype protagonists "Jud Klein" and "Jud Groß". Other characteristic elements of the fairytale appear but seem to fall short of fulfilling their usual purpose: items of realia, which in the tradition of the fairytale display magical powers, are prompted to do so but fail miserably: the 'talking' cane and stone keep quite instead of talking, the moving veil blocks the view instead of revealing it.

A closer examination shows, that the model of the fairytale is completely turned on its head in this text. The opening formula reads "Eines Abendes", whereas the typical formula would normally signal the break of day 'Eines Tages'. The archetypical protagonist is marked in every ethnic, lingual and social perspective, a far cry from a general Everyman. Nevertheless, the ending is optimistic, and from the perspective of Yiddish, the protagonist is in fact, for the double meaning of 'יִיד', an Everyman.

Secondly, the fantastic elements of the fairytale are imported to a certain type of the Hasidic tales. The magical artifacts are charged with its divine counterpart, mystic energy. It is in this kind of tales, that the Everyman-protagonist is a Jew, אַ יִיד. Celan's interest and reading of such tales is well-known and attested, among other places, in his Bremen-Prize speech. Here one is confronted not only with narrative conventions, but with the question of their language as well. The Hasidic tales, "die Martin Buber uns allen auf deutsch wiedererzählt hat" (GW, 3: 185), were, of course, originally told in Yiddish. That is, they were told before they were written. This orality also characterizes the classical *Märchen*, which was orally transferred as a folktale before finally being written and heavily edited. In this very process, for which the Grimm brothers are the clear prototype, the vernacular dialect in which the folktale was originally transmitted for a great many years had to give way to the cultivated literary language.

What is therefore truly remarkable about the affinity displayed by *Gespräch im Gebirg* to the traditions of folktale genres is its lingual adherence to the source model. As suggested in the linguistic analysis, many of the underlying Yiddish syntactic constructions in the text are either typical, more frequent or only possible under the genres of the folktale, anecdote or folk riddle. The most conspicuous examples are the V1-clause, which in essence defines the standard narrative word-order in Yiddish folktales, and the postnominal adjective construction (NP-NP), which constitutes the standard formula for introduction of the protagonist

(...אַ ייִד אַ איינער). The dual-structure of *Jiddischdeutsch* enables the transference of a folktale into German while retaining the underlying syntactic structure of the Yiddish 'original'.

5.5.2. The *Kunstmärchen*

Given that there is no 'original', no authentic folktale behind the 'tale' of *Gespräch im Gebirg*, one may speak of a 'fabricated tale'. This puts Celan's text in line with another literary tradition, that of the *Kunstmärchen*. The *Kunstmärchen* basically designates a fabricated fairytale, that is, a text which incorporates typical motifs, structure, themes and other characteristics of a fairytale, but meticulously constructed by an author without any folkloric *Urtext*.[253] This literary genre can be thus attributed to countless texts from different literary epochs in retrospect. Many Hasidic tales may in fact fall under this definition, as they exhibit characteristics of a fairytale without a reference to a specific folkloric narrative; however, in narrower terms, the *Kunstmärchen* was consolidated as a distinctive literary genre while flourishing under German Romanticism. Interestingly enough, the prototypic model is Adalbert von Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte* form 1814, whose title resonates with Yiddish.

Indeed, the *Kunstmärchen* is in itself an amalgam of literary traditions—that of the novella, the fairytale among others—, and in that sense, a modern creation, which incorporates 'traditional' elements with a manipulative intent to unlace tradition from within. Celan certainly manipulates the traditional elements of the fairytale/Hasidic tale, however, his manipulation carries a very specific character—that of the paradox and contradiction: the tale starts in the evening, the mystical artifacts yield no power, the omnipotency and omnipresence of the Godhead is turned into *Niemand* and a deaf *Hörstu*. This specific literary manipulation, which

253. Volker Klotz, *Das Europäische Kunstmärchen: Fünfundzwanzig Kapitel Seiner Geschichte Von Der Renaissance Bis Zur Moderne* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1985), 9.

involves paradox, logical inversions and non-sensical constructions implies lastly, a third literary tradition: that of the parable, the anecdote and the aphorism.

5.5.3. The Aphorism

This last literary tradition may well be the oldest and best enduring, dating back as far as the ancient Greek aphorisms of Hippocrates ("Ars longa, vita brevis"), going through Roman adaptations, as those of Marcus Aurelius, and later the French Moralists of the 17th century (La Rochefoucauld, Pascal). The German aphoristic tradition is particularly productive from the 18th century onward, staring with Lichtenberg, Goethe, Schlegel, Novalis, Schopenhauer and reaching High Modernism with Nietzsche, Kraus and, of course, Franz Kafka. Kafka had taken the brevity and sharpness, the balance and logical artistry so characteristic of the aphorism, and merged it with the narrative structure of yet another well-developed *epische Kleinform*, the anecdote, as performed by Kleist.

One typical result is the short monolog from Kafka's *Betrachtung* (1913), "Der Ausflug ins Gebirge":

> »Ich weiß nicht«, rief ich ohne Klang, »ich weiß ja nicht. Wenn niemand kommt, dann kommt eben niemand. Ich habe niemandem etwas Böses getan, niemand hat mir etwas Böses getan, niemand aber will mir helfen. Lauter niemand. Aber so ist es doch nicht. Nur daß mir niemand hilft -, sonst wäre lauter Niemand hübsch. Ich würde ganz gern — warum denn nicht — einen Ausflug mit einer Gesellschaft von lauter Niemand machen. Natürlich ins Gebirge, wohin denn sonst? Wie sich diese Niemand aneinanderdringen, diese vielen quergestreckten und eingehängten Arme, diese vielen Füße, durch winzige Schritte getrennt! Versteht sich, daß alle in Frack sind. Wir gehen so lala, der Wind fährt durch die Lücken, die wir und unsere Gliedmaßen offen lassen. Die Hälse werden im Gebirge frei! Es ist ein Wunder, daß wir nicht singen.«[254]

This piece is a clear 'intertext' for *Gespräch im Gebirg*, "right from its title", to use Celan expression. In the context of the current discussion, the crucial literary move in the monolog, which Celan instates in his own story (and in the poem "Psalm"), is the paradoxical use of *Niemand*, which

254. Franz Kafka, *Die Erzählungen Und Andere Ausgewählte Prosa* (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1996), 26.

follows through its nominalization and reversed Semantics: for Kafka, the signified nothingness of *Niemand* is reversed in an 'als ob' fantasy of fullness—"Wie sich diese Niemand aneinanderdringen, diese vielen quergestreckten und eingehängten Arme, diese vielen Füße, durch winzige Schritte getrennt!"; for Celan, in contrast, the omnipresence of the Jewish God is reversed into nothingness.

5.5.4. Language as a Surrogate for Mystical Efficacy

Since Celan instates his aphoristic, paradoxical move within a framework of a *Kunstmärchen*/Hasidic tale, the failing transcendent elements—the dysfunctional mystical artifacts, the God turned into nothingness—, point to the futility of theological action. In this sense, they are indeed *Verlorene Gleichnisse*,[255] for they expose this futility by turning the literary tools of the traditional mystical theology against itself.

As Moshe Idel observes in his book *Old Worlds, New Mirrors: On Jewish Mysticism and Twentieth-Century Thought*, Celan does not believe mysticism to be capable of imparting any productive energy for salvation.[256] That is the reason why the magical artifacts, turned-mystical, are futile in the real world, down there, "in den Niederungen" (10).

Celan's complete loss of hope in this world requires little explanation. It is the result of the events that shaped the course of his life, his own *20. Jänner*. What nevertheless slips Idel's sight here, is that for Celan, language remains the only possible productive tool—if not for salvation, then at least for comfort. The fact that the original language of the victims—those who were told and re-told the Hasidic tales again and again, like his Sadagurian neighbors-ancestors—, informs the language of the murderers, his own language, is the only thing that imparts healing.

---

255. Jakob Hessing, *Verlorene Gleichnisse: Heine, Kafka, Celan* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).
256. Moshe Idel, *Old Worlds, New Mirrors: On Jewish Mysticism and Twentieth-Century Thought* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 177-99.

5.5.5. "Einer ist doch keiner": The Influence of Shteynbarg's *Mesholim*

This brings the discussion to its concluding section: a piece of short prose that in many respects brings all these elements together—folkloric literary form, supernatural narrative, logical artistry—and their modernist manipulation through language in a fable by Eliezer Shteynbarg, whose "tiefe[] Lebensphiosophie" Celan much appreciated:[257]

זיצט בײַ זיך אין צימערל ר׳ לייזערל קליינער,
רעדט מיט זיך אליין ער.
פרעגט ער בײַ זײַן אומעט :
״וואָס איז איינער ?״
הערט ער ווי אַ פליג אין אויער זשומעט :
״איינער איז דאָך קיינער !״
זאָגט די שאַרפע ספקות־וויי,
וואָס צעשיידט אים : ״איינער איז גאָר צוויי !״
פרעגט ער : ״וואָס־זשע פיל איך עמעצן אַ ניט־געזעענעם דערבײַ ?״
קלינגט דער זייגער דרײַ.[258]

The cried-out paradox "איינער איז דאָך קיינער!" audibly resonates in the outcry "denn ich war einer, und wer will Einen lieben" (*73-74*) in *Gespräch im Gebirg.*[259] Like Celan with the concept of *Niemand*, so did Shteynbarg charge the traditional carriers of Jewish mystical vitality—the letters and words of the Hebrew language—, with a universal intention reflected in the paradoxes of the modern *conditio humana*. However, this universal intentionality travels through the particularist language of the *conditio judaica*:

> Instead of presenting the gods and mythical figures typical of classical fables, Shteynbarg depicts angels. Especially original is his use of Yiddish letters and vowels as fable heroes—a reflection of the personifications of letters in rabbinic literature (agadah), the Zohar, and folk stories told in

257. Chalfen, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*, 101.

258. שטיינבאַרג, **מעשאָלים**, 246.

259. Cf. Felstiner, *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie*, 396.

heders.[260]

In his fusion of genres, literary traditions and, most importantly, languages in *Gespräch im Gebirg*, Celan accomplishes such a movement from the Jewish to the Human Condition after Auschwitz.

260. Yitskhok Niborski, "Shteynbarg, Eliezer." *YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe* YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe (2010): accessed February 16, 2016, http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Shteynbarg_Eliezer.

6. A German-Yiddish *Mayse*: Celan's Multifaceted Act of Re-appropriation

After establishing and characterizing Celan's complicated, however long-standing and multifaceted relationship with the Yiddish language in the first part of the dissertation, the philological part revealed Celan's multifaceted act of re-appropriation though a lingual-literal creation modeled and structured upon Yiddish. This process of a 'hidden relexification' and creation of a dually-structured *Jiddischdeutsch* is revealed through the application of a multidisciplinary approach. Its poetic and poetoligical implications unfold by exposing the *différance* between Yiddish and German. Finally, Celan not only fuses languages, but also genres and literary traditions, in order to impart comfort to the ailing modern man in a Godless world, through speech, through language which is intended to be spoken.

What may at first sight seem like a tour-de-force of clichéd anti-Semitic views about Jewish corruption of the German language, of inapt Jewish performance of German, of *Mauscheln* and *Jüdeln*, lingual mimicry and plagiarism, turns out to be an original new lingual creation in disguise, meticulously woven from the hybrid ingenuity of Yiddish. In its hybrid structure, the syntax of *Jiddischdetusch* thus defies Herderian (and indeed internal Jewish) notions of lingual purity and contamination, (ab)used by Nazism as well as racist notions of originality, which at the same time bear on accusations of plagiarism directed personally at Celan in the Goll-Affair.

The dynamics of *Jiddischdeutsch* play an essentially socio-linguistic role by presenting the felicitous Jewish lingual *creation* of Yiddish in the disguise of *Judendetusch*, the 'crooked' Jewish *performance* of German. The main lingual vehicle in achieving this intricate presentation was the tension between the perception of canonical constructions in both languages, their differences and overlaps. However, the specific nature of the hyperbaton attested in the separation and distancing of canonically-

adjacent linguistic constituents, either by pure syntactical technics such as the unceasing interweaving of main clauses with interjected relative clauses, or by the morphological movement from the proximal to the distal, also serve a poetological purpose explicitly stated by Celan in his *Meridian* speech.

Inside that principle, the *Ich-Ferne* of the *Meridian*, lies hidden what Celan explicitly calls *verjuden*. As illustrated and analyzed by this dissertation, the principle of *verjuden* is not just a stylistic one, expressed by the 'Yiddish-sounding' performance of German in *Gespräch im Gebirg*, as was assumed so far by the research; rather, it is systematically implemented at every possible level of this literary and lingual creation: the syntax, morphology, Semantics, as well as in its intertextual references and relation to a host of orally-inclined genre traditions.

What makes Celan's act of re-appropriation so strong is not just the particular Jewish origin of influence, but rather its universal act of hybridization, expressed in the very nature of Yiddish as a fusion language. Not only the particular anti-Semitic image turned on its head (*Krummnasig* becomes positive), but language itself is informed by his act of writing. It goes in direct opposition to the (imagined) Herderian principle of lingual purity. A diglossic language, necessitating constant Code-Switching is the epitome of lingual hybridity and the antipode to notions of racial or ethno-lingual purity.

Celan's subtleness in implementing his 'Jewificaiton', his *Jiddishdeutsch*, is truly remarkable for it successfully injects the phenomena which are most saliently different in Yiddish in relation to German, without injecting the foreign elements that informed them. Hebraisms, Aramaisms and Slavicisms are intentionally completely left out. All influence of Yiddish is expressed on the implicit level—Syntactics and covert equivocal Semantics—both requiring 'Code-Switching' into Yiddish in order to be fully discerned and understood. German grammaticality is kept intact. Celan takes the foreign influence on the German component but leaves out the foreign component per se. He avoids using 'tate' in place of 'Vater',

but instead uses "Vetter" in the Yiddish sense in order to express the *differánce* in the intimate field of family nomenclature. Similarly, Celan uses syntactic constructions derived from either Slavic or Semitic source (or both), but leaves outside the explicit presence of the Slavic and Semitic components that gave rise to these constructions. This subtlety is successful exactly because it remains both German and Jewish without becoming a macaronic caricature of Yiddish.

To sum up: the lingual fabric of *Jiddischdeutsch* serves two main purposes, a socio-lingual and poetological one: the first consists in the re-appropriation of German as a Jewish idiom and the second fulfills Celan's own prerequisite of poetic self-estrangement as a requirement for a meaningful artistic creation. Celan employs a multitude of technics to generate paradox energy: oscillating between an awkward Yiddishized German and a natural Germanized Yiddish, between ellipsis and redundancy, the distal and the proximal, the particular and the universal, the derided and the endeared. The contradictory opposites meeting at the heart of the paradox echo Celan's own ambivalence to German, as his mother-tongue and the language of the perpetrators, and to Yiddish, as the once-derided language of the *Ostjuden* and the 'purified' language of the Lager. German and Yiddish are therefore woven together into the lingual fabric of the text, in a way that resonates their close and troubled relationship, played out in the history of the twentieth-century and in Celan's own biography.

Finally, in re-instating the paradox as a surrogate material within the literary framework of the Hasidic folktale in place of lost mystical and theological efficacy, Celan follows the path of Franz Kafka, but also that of Eliezer Shteynbarg, in their modernist renditions of traditional literary forms: their *verlorene Gleichnisse* may have given up the original transcendent mystical energy, but they re-charge the Word with a new creative energy of language formation.

Since Celan's re-invented version of *Judendeutsch*, or *Jiddischdeutsch*, illustrated in this dissertation, not only informs *Gespräch im Gerbirg*, but

also an important part of his poetry, the current modest contribution may hope to serve as a possible springboard for fruitful research in the future.

One can only hope Hersch and Hardy are now content.

7. Works Cited

Blaueule Leid: Bukowina 1940-1944. Eine Anthologie. Aachen: Rimbaud, 2003.

Althaus, Hans Peter. *Mauscheln: Ein Wort Als Waffe*. Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.

Althaus, Hans Peter. *Kleines Lexikon Deutscher Wörter Jiddischer Herkunft*. C.H.Beck, 2010.

Beinfeld, Solon, and Harry Bochner. *Comprehensive Yiddish-English Dictionary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Celan, Paul. *Gesammelte Werke in Fünf Bänden*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1983.

Chalfen, Israel. *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie Seiner Jugend*. Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1979.

Derrida, Jacques. *Sovereignties in Question: The Poetics of Paul Celan*. Fordham Univ Press, 2005.

Diesing, Molly. "Yiddish Vp Order and the Typology of Object Movement in Germanic." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 15, no. 2 (1997): 369–427.

Elyada, Aya. *A Goy Who Speaks Yiddish: Christians and the Jewish Language in Early Modern Germany*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012.

Eshel, Amir. "Von Kafka Bis Celan: Deutsch-Jüdische Schriftsteller Und Ihr Verhaältnis Zum Hebraïschen Und Jiddischen," In *Jüdische Sprachen in Deutscher Umwelt*, edited by Michael Brenner, 96–97. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.

Eshel, Amir. "Paul Celan's Other: History, Poetics, and Ethics." *New German Critique* 91 (2004): 55–77.

Fagan, Sarah M B. *German: A Linguistic Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Felstiner, John. *Paul Celan: Poet, Survivor, Jew*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Felstiner, John. *Paul Celan: Eine Biographie*. Translated by Holger Fliessbach. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1997.

Fogel, Joshua A, and Keith Weiser. *Czernowitz At 100: The First Yiddish Language Conference in Historical Perspective*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2010.

Kafka, Franz. *Die Erzählungen Und Andere Ausgewählte Prosa*. Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1996.

Fußl, Irene. *"Geschenke an Aufmerksame": Hebräische Intertextualität Und Mystische Weltauffassung in Der Lyrik Paul Celans*. Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Gartner, Theodor. *Bukowiner Deutsch. Fehler Und Eigenthümlichkeiten in Der Deutschen Verkehrs- Und Schriftsprache Der Bukowina*. Vienna: Deutscher Sprachverein Zweigverein Bukovina, 1901.

"Geschwisterkind." *DUDEN* DUDEN Accessed 20 October, 2015. http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Geschwisterkind.

Gilman, Sander L. "To Quote Primo Levi: "Redest Keyn Jiddisch, Bist Nit Kein Jid" ["if You Don't Speak Yiddish, You're Not a Jew"]." *Prooftexts* 9, no. 2 (1989): 139–60.

Gilman, Sander L. *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Grimm, Jacob, and Wilhelm Grimm. *Deutsches Wörterbuch Von Jacob Und Wilhelm Grimm. 16 Bde. In 32 Teilbänden. Quellenverzeichnis 1971*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1854.

Grossman, Jeffrey A. *The Discourse on Yiddish in Germany: From the Enlightenment to the Second Empire*. Rochester: Camden House, 2000.

Grozinger, Elvira. "The Socialist Hero of the State Theaters in Poland and Romania? A Chapter in the History of Yiddish Theater, in Memory of Abraham Goldfaden (1840-1908)." *Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia* 7 (2009):

Hall, Beatrice. "Accounting for Yiddish Word Order, or What's a Nice Np Like You Doing in a Place Like This?," In *Linear Order and Generative Theory*, edited by J Meisel, and M Pam, 263–87. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1979.

Hessing, Jakob. *Verlorene Gleichnisse: Heine, Kafka, Celan*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Hirsch, Marianne, and Leo Spitzer. *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.

Idel, Moshe. *Old Worlds, New Mirrors: On Jewish Mysticism and Twentieth-Century Thought*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Ilqar, Mammedli Aysel. "Artistic Discourse and Rhetoric Means." *International Journal of English Linguistics* 5, no. 6 (2015): 164.

Jacobs, Neil G. *Yiddish: A Linguistic Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

"Kave Shtiebel Seeks a Path Out of Negativity." *blogs.yiddish.forward.com* (2015): http://blogs.yiddish.forward.com/yiddish-with-an-aleph/188500/.

Klotz, Volker. *Das Europäische Kunstmärchen: Fünfundzwanzig Kapitel Seiner Geschichte Von Der Renaissance Bis Zur Moderne*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1985.

The Germanic Languages. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Kühnert, Henrike, and Esther-Miriam Wagner. "The Shift in Positioning of the Finite Verb in Older Yiddish," In *Yiddish Language Structures*, edited by Marion Aptroot, and Björn Hansen, Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2014.

Laan, James M. van der. “The Problem of Language and National Identity for Holocaust Poet, Paul Celan.” *History of European Ideas* 16, no. 1-3 (1993): 207–12.

Lapidus, Rina. “A Vilna Folklorist’s Collection: Structural Analysis of Yiddish Riddles,” In *Politics of Yiddish: Studies in Language, Literature and Society*, edited by Dov-Ber Kerler, 193–200. London: AltaMira, 2000.

Lebovic, Nitzan. “Near the End: Celan, Between Scholem and Heidegger.” *The German Quarterly* 83, no. 4 (2010): 465–84.

Lyon, James K. *Paul Celan and Martin Heidegger: An Unresolved Conversation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopknis University Press, 2006.

Marten-Finnis, Susanne. “Wer Sprach Jiddisch in Czernowitz? Ein Ansatz Zur Erforschung Von Sozialen Und Situativen Faktoren Gemeinsamer Textrezeption,” In *Presselandschaft in Der Bukowina Und Den Nachbarregionen*, edited by Markus Winkler, 67–73. Munich: IKGS Verlag, 2011.

Marten-Finnis, Susanne, and Markus Winkler. “Location of Memory Versus Space of Communication: Presses, Languages, and Education Among Czernovitz Jews, 1918–1941.” *Central Europe* 7, no. 1 (2009): 30–55.

“Mauscheln.” Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm http://woerterbuchnetz.de/cgi-bin/WBNetz/wbgui_py?sigle=DWB&lemid=GM02662.

Mieder, Wolfgang. “Proverbs in Nazi Germany: The Promulgation of Anti-Semitism and Stereotypes Through Folklore.” *The Journal of American Folklore* 95, no. 378 (1982): 435–64.

Miner, Kenneth L. “Yiddish V/1 Declarative Clauses in Discourse.” *Papers in Pragmatics* 4, no. 1 (1990):

Mosés, Stéphane. “Wege Auf Denen Die Sprache Stimmhaft Wird “. Paul Celans „gespräch Im Gebirg,” In *Argumentum E Silentio*, edited by Amy Diana Colin, Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 1987.

Nagy, Ágota Kinga. “Deutsch-Jiddischer Sprachenkontakt Am Beispiel Der Czernowitzer Deutsch-Jüdischen Presse Der 1930-Er Jahre,” Doctoral Thesis diss., Pannonische Universität Veszprém, 2011.

Niborski, Yitskhok. “Shteynbarg, Eliezer.” *YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe* YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe (2010): Accessed February 16, 2016. http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Shteynbarg_Eliezer.

Olsvanger, Immanuel. *Röyte Pomerantsen: Jewish Folk Humor*. New York: Schocken, 1965.

Prince, Ellen F. “Yiddish as a Contact Language,” In *Creolization and Contact*, edited by Norval Smith, and Tonjes Veenstra, 263–90. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001.

Reershemius, Gertrud. “Word Order in Yiddish Narrative Discourse.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, no. 9 (2000): 1467–84.

Reichert, Klaus. “Hebräische Züge in Der Sprache Paul Celans,” In *Paul Celan*, edited by Wolfgang Hamacher, and Winfried Menninghaus, 156–69. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988.

Rein, Kurt. “Das Czernowitzer Deutsch.” *Kaindl-Archiv. Zeitschrift des Bukowina- Instituts für den Kulturaustausch mit den Völkern Mittel- und Osteuropas* 23 (1995): 127–36.

Rein, Kurt. “Welches Deutsch Spricht Man in Wien, Welches in Czernowitz?,” In *Stimmen Aus Jerusalem*, edited by Hermann Zabel, 109–22. Münster: LIT Verlag, 2006.

Roditi, Edouard. “Paul Celan and the Cult of Personality.” *World Literature Today* 66, no. 1 (1992): 11–20.

Rokem, Na’ama. “German–Hebrew Encounters in the Poetry and Correspondence of Yehuda Amichai and Paul Celan.” *Prooftexts* 30, no. 1 (2010): 97–127.

Rosenthal, Bianca. “Quellen Zum Frühen Paul Celan: Der Alfred Margul-Sperber-nachlass in Bukarest.” *Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch Stuttgart* 32, no. 3 (1982): 227–31.

Roskies, David G. “Call it Jewspeak: On the Evolution of Speech in Modern Yiddish Writing.” *Poetics Today* 35, no. 3 (2014):

Schuster, Marc-Oliver. “Ingeborg Bachmann Und Paul Celan: Historisch-Poetische Korrelationen,” In *Ingeborg Bachmann Und Paul Celan: Historisch-Poetische Korrelationen*, edited by Gernot Wimmer, 71–92. Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2014.

Segal, Hersch, and Mayer, Meinhard E. “Das Jüdische Und Das Jiddische Bei Paul Celan: Vorträge Über Paul Celan Aus Dem Nachlass Von Hersch Segal.” *golem.ps.uci.edu* (1984): 2015. http://golem.ps.uci.edu/hardy/Segal-Celan.pdf.

Shahar, Galili. “Fragments and Demons: A Strong Reading.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 102, no. 2 (2012): 302–10.

Shandler, Jeffrey. *Adventures in Yiddishland*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

Sieber, Mirjam. “Judendeutsch Und Krummnasig: Ein Kommentar Zu Paul Celans Gespräch Im Gebirg.” *Bulletin der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Judaistische Forschung* 12 (2003): 17–27.

Sieber, Mirjam. *Paul Celans »gespräch Im Gebirg«: Erinnerung an Eine »versäumte Begegnung«*. Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

Spitzer, Leo. “Kathole.” *Modern Language Notes* 53, no. 6 (1938): 433.

Stern, Heidi. *Wörterbuch Zum Jiddischen Lehnwortschatz in Den Deutschen Dialekten*. Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2000.

Stiehler, Heinrich. “Der Junge Celan Und Die Sprachen Der Bukowina Und Rumäniens,” In *An Der Zeiten Ränder*, edited by Cécile Cordon, and Helmut Kusdat, 115–28. Vienna: Theodor Kramer Gesellschaft, 2002.

Taube, Moshe. “On the Relative Marker Vos and Yiddish Post-Modifiers,” In *Leket: Yiddish Studies Today*, edited by Marion Aptroot, Efrat Gal-Ed, Roland Gruschka, and Simon Neuberg, Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press, 2012.

Timm, Erika. *Historische Jiddische Semantik: Die Bibelübersetzungssprache Als Faktor Der Auseinanderentwicklung Des Jiddischen Und Des Deutschen Wortschatzes*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2005.

“Vetter.” *DUDEN* DUDEN Accessed 20 October, 2015. http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Vetter.

Wander, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm. *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon: Ein Hausschatz Für Das Deutsche Volk*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1880.

Weinreich, Uriel. *Modern English-Yiddish, Yiddish-English Dictionary*. New York: Schoken, 1977.

Wiedl, Birgit. “Laughing At the Beast: The *Judensau*: Anti-Jewish Propaganda and Humor From the Middle Ages to the Early Modern Period,” edited by Albrecht Classen, and Marilyn Sandidge, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

באסטאמסקי, שלמה. **יידישע פאלקסרעטענישן**. וילנה: די נייע יידישע פאלקסשול.

ביקל, שלמה. **רומעניע: געשיכטע, ליטעראַטור־קריטיק, זכרונות**. בואנאַס אײַרעס: קיום פאַרלאַג, 1961.

ווײַנרײַך, מאַקס. “דײַטשמעריש טויג ניט.” **ייִדישע שפּראַך 34**, (1-3) 23–32.

מאַנגער, איציק. **וועלוול זבארזשער שרייבט בריוו צו מלכה׳לע דער שיינער**. ווארשע: א״ב צעראטא, 1937.

מאַנגער, איציק. **ליד און באלאדע**. ניו יורק: איציק־מאַנגער־קאָמיטעט, 1952.

מינץ, מתתיהו. “ציוניסטן און פועלי־ציוניסטן אויף דער טשערנאָוויצער שפּראַך־קאָנפערענץ.” **ייִוואָ בלעטער** 46 (1991): 93–108.

צלאן, פאול. **סורג־שפה: שירים וקטעי פרוזה**. תירגם והוסיף הערות שמעון זנדבנק. תל-אביב: הקיבוץ המאוחד, 1994.

שטיינבאַרג, אליעזר. **מעשאָלים**. טשערנאָוויץ: קאָמיטעט אַף אַרויסצוגעבן אליעזר שטיינבאַרגס שריפטן, 1932.

שנײַד, יחיאל. “זכרונות און בריוו—אַ קאפיטעלע גאַליציע.” **ייִוואָ בלעטער** 40 (1956): 175–203.

שערי, דוד. **יהודי בוקובינה בין שתי מלחמות העולם**. תל אביב: המרכז לחקר התפוצות ע״ש גולדשטיין־גורן—אוניברסיטת תל אביב, 2004.

שפיגלבלט, אלכסנדר. **פינות כחולות: איציק מאנגר - חיים, שיר ובלדה**. ירושלים: כרמל, 2009.

תקציר

עבודת המוסמך בוחנת את השפעתה של היידיש על היצירה הספרותית של פאול צלאן. בפרט, העבודה חותרת להראות כיצד מתבטאת הדינמיקה הבין־לשונית המורכבת שבין גרמנית ליידיש ביצירתו של צלאן. העבודה גורסת כי השפה היידית, במערכת יחסיה הסוערת עם השפה הגרמנית, הן לפני השואה והן לאחריה, מהווה ציר התייחסות מרכזי, פואטי וארס־פואטי, עבור צלאן, אשר לא זכה לתשומת לב מחקרית עד עתה.

המחקר מורכב מחלק ביוגרפי וחלק פילולוגי. החלק הראשון משתמש בכלי המחקר הביקורתי של ההיסטוריה האינטלקטואלית והתרבותית על מנת להעריך מחדש את חשיפתו של צלאן ליידיש וגישתו לשפה זו. החלק השני משתמש בכלי המחקר של מגע בין־לשוני (Contact-Linguistics) ושל פילולוגיה מסורתית בכדי להדגים את השפעתה של היידיש על יצירתו של צלאן. מבחינה אמפירית, החלק הביוגרפי נשען על המידע המצוי במחקר על אודות חייו של צלאן ועל התנאים הרלוונטיים התרבותיים והלשוניים בבוקבינה ובצ'רנוביץ. החלק הפילולוגי מנתח את יצירת הפרוזה של צלאן **שיחה בהרים** (*Gespräch im Gebirg*) כאובייקט המחקר.

החלק הפילולוגי גורס כי קיים תהליך של 'רה-לקסיפיקציה חבויה' של גרמנית באמצעות יידיש בסיפור **שיחה בהרים**. הוא מציג מושג חדש בשם יידיש־דויטש (*Jiddischdeutsch*), שפה דו־שכבתית המבוססת על גרמנית ויידיש אשר נחשפת באמצעות יישומה של גישה רב־תחומית במחקר. ה'דפראנס' (*différance*) בין יידיש לגרמנית בסיפור מגולל אט־אט את השלכותיה הפואטיות והארס־פואטיות של שפה זו.

לבסוף, התזה מדגימה את התועלת הכללית שבגישה בין־תחומית של ממש במחקר של ספרות יהודית־גרמנית: דהיינו, הן מבחינה מתודולוגית—בשילוב הכלים המחקריים של מגע בין־לשוני עם פילולוגיה והיסטוריה אינטלקטואלית, הן במסגרת התיאורטית—בשילוב נקודת המבט של לימודים גרמניים עם זו של לימודי יידיש ויהדות.

האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים
הפקולטה למדעי הרוח
המדור לשפה וספרות גרמנית

מעשיה גרמנית-יידישאית:
השפעת היידיש על השפה הפואטית של פאול צלאן

עבודת תיזה לשם קבלת תואר מוסמך בשפה וספרות גרמנית

מדריך: פרופ׳ יעקב הסינג
מוגש על ידי: אוהד קאהן (053085734-4)

ירושלים ט"ו באדר א׳ תשע"ו, 24.2.2016