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Abstract

A Different (German) Village: Writing Place through Migration

by

Jonathan Cho-Polizzi

Doctor of Philosophy in German and Medieval Studies

and the Designated Emphasis in Folklore

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Deniz Göktürk, Chair

A presentation of village life has long stood in the foreground for projects of nationalism in the German-speaking world. From the noble, agrarian barbarians of Tacitus’ *Germania* to the *Blut und Boden* rhetoric of Nazi propaganda, the aesthetic of an ethnically homogenous and culturally conservative rural idyll has been evoked by generations of nationalist thinkers. This practice remains paradigmatic for claims of homeland [*Heimat*] and belonging today. My research examines literary representations of village life through the lens of so-called “village stories” in their various manifestations from the mid-nineteenth century through the post-Reunification period, with specific, comparative case studies from the mid-19th- and late-20th/early-21st centuries. Concentrating primarily on short literary forms, I place these village stories in conversation with pastoral tropes in nationalist discourses, paying particular attention to the role of the ‘stranger’ or ‘outsider.’

Following an initial theoretical and methodological chapter in which I conceptualize migration and the literary village as the layering of *representational place* through engagement with critiques of space and spatiality derived from the disciplines of sociology and human geography, my research comprises two contextualized case studies. The first examines the literary and critical work of Berthold Auerbach, a prolific popular writer of the mid-19th century whose bestselling Black Forest Village Stories [*Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten*] chronicle the rapid demographic and technological transformations of the time through an imagined series of migrations between the fictionalized town of the author’s birth and a Swabian frontier town on the Ohio River. Engaging with Auerbach’s ample critical writings including his work on both dialect and Jewish-German literature, as well as his correspondences with contemporary writers including Gottfried Keller, I read these migration narratives as thinly veiled attempts to negotiate the role of a diverse population in the formation of nascent discourse on the nature of Germanness.

The second case study is built around the corpus of work by contemporary translingual author José F. A. Oliver, and the development of what he calls his “Andalusian Black Forest village” [*Mein andalusisches Schwarzwaldorf*]. Beginning with the tropes and techniques
developed more than a century before by Auerbach to negotiate layerings of belonging through engagement with concrete social space—techniques derided by some Auerbach critics as “false reconciliation”\(^1\)—I investigate Oliver’s idiosyncratic use of German, Andalusian-Spanish, and Alemannic dialect to suggest the evolution of a poetics of layered place. Using translation theory to supplement my critique of social spaces, I read both the narrative and aesthetic qualities of Oliver’s work, particularly his essays and early poetry, as refining a language of concurrent belonging: eschewing models of in-betweenness in favor of layering multiple affinities through the development of a representational place capable of encapsulating the diversity of the contemporary village experience.

In both case studies, I highlight the use (or non-use) of dialect and foreign language in juxtaposition to both authors’ attempts to preserve and document localized traditions—the omnipresence of Swabian folk song in Auerbach’s migration narratives or the privileging of Southern German Carnival \([\text{Fastnacht}]\) in Oliver’s negotiation of village community. This research represents one push back against the cultural imaginary of rural homogeneity—demonstrating a longstanding pluralist tradition in the literary presentation of village life and expanding the scope of the debate on contemporary German multiculturalism. In doing so, I present the village as a microcosm for larger questions of arrival and belonging in the German-speaking world, arguing for its reevaluation as a place of shared experience: inherently complex and multivalent. My research posits the village story as a representational place of interconnectivity, and the literary village as a porous borderland. In contrast to the prevailing nationalist imaginaries, through examining both the process and practice of migration or displacement in its intersection with representations of ‘everyday’ village life, I posit the literary village as a place of profound intersectionality.

\(^1\) Horch, “Berthold Auerbach,” 2013.
For all of us.

zwischen den Stühlen
lebt die Möglichkeit

in Bewegung
zu bleiben

– José Francisco Agüera Oliver
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1: Introduction – Imagined Villages

“Den Anderen nur als »Anderen« wahrzunehmen ist der Beginn von Gewalt.”
– Ilija Trojanow

“Das Idol dieses Zeitalters ist die Gemeinschaft.”
– Helmuth Plessner

A village imaginary has permeated the discourse around nation and identity in the German-speaking world since the advent of German nationalism in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Herder, the Grimms, and other aspiring folklorists sought to fix notions of Germanness to what they perceived as unadulterated tradition preserved in folksong and fairytales; the most recent rash of 21st-century far-right political propaganda evokes a rural idyll in opposition to heterogenous, urban society. The village community has long served as a cornerstone in an exclusionary definition of German belonging. From the onset, the production of a village imaginary has been tied to the production of literature—early ‘village stories’ [Dorfgeschichten] by German-speaking authors such as the Swiss pedagogue Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi were conceived of as educational devices for the betterment of society—simple lessons mapped onto the comprehensibility of a finite community. A spate of early-Romantic works presents the village as a microcosm for the successful negotiation of wider social issues not dissimilar from those facing the German-speaking world today: forced migration and refugees in Goethe’s 1782 Hermann und Dorothea or crises of socio-economic transformation in Heinrich Zschokke’s 1817 Das Goldmacherdorf. Circulation and reception of the village story developed alongside a conflicting set of aesthetic and narrative components—claims to presenting an unadulterated vision of German tradition frequently fell afoul of story arcs increasingly concerned with questions of mobility, new technologies, urbanization, and industrialization. This contradiction is increasingly apparent in mid-19th-century village stories—from the popular Black Forest village stories [Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten] of Berthold Auerbach to Gottfried Keller’s now classic works of early Realism The People of Seldwyla [Die Leute von Seldwyla]. The development of an increasingly transatlantic (and transnational) consciousness necessitated the contradictory claims these authors’ narrators perform—at once purporting to speak for or on behalf of timeless, rural communities, while at the same time mediating the representation of these places’ inevitable transformation.

This research seeks to unpack the loaded contradictions of this literature—rejecting prevailing visions of village and city, rural and urban, as diametrically opposite poles of human contact, and investigating, instead, the contradictory language at the heart of modern Germany’s obsession with the village idyll to suggest an inherent layering of place. Beginning with an investigation of the theoretical underpinnings of the German-language village story, my study advances through discussion of a number of critical 19th-century village stories before concluding with an analysis of recent 20th- and 21st-century literature which has built upon the contradictions of historical village literature to reconceptualize the German-speaking village as a dynamic space of translation, transition, and transformation. Utilizing a range of conceptual models borrowed from the fields of anthropology, sociology, and human geography, the following study presents a
cultural-historical reading of the layered and at times concurrent representations of place in the literary village—at once grounded in the specificity of rural community, yet also bound to the increasingly mobile and transnational facets of German modernity.

Facilitated by my own work as a literary translator, the current investigation began through engagements with the translingual author José F. A. Oliver, whose essay collection *My Andalusian Black Forest Village* [*Mein andalusisches Schwarzwaldorf*] (2007), provides an interpretive framework for my readings of the author’s more experimental poetry. Oliver’s work remains somewhat of an outlier in the reception of new German-language literary works conceptualized within the multilingual, ‘postmigrant,’¹ urban imaginaries of authors such as Emine Sevgi Özdamar or Yoko Tawada. Transitioning not only between the Spanish and German languages, Oliver’s works also negotiate the highly specific Andalusian and Alemannic dialects of his and his family’s rural communities, reemphasizing the local, village dynamic within the nexus of a linguistically and geospatially mobile new German-language literature. His work also brings to light new questions of mobility for an author whose own lifetime has coincided with radical transformations in mobilities for an increasingly interconnected Europe.

Taken by evocations of the village in Oliver’s work, I searched for historic continuity with his linguistic performances in the broad corpus of 19th-century village stories, seeking other multilingual or multicultural authors whose works might reflect similar engagement with the village from a more pluralist position—a quest which I originally feared might prove quixotic, given the underlying preoccupation with Romantic Nationalism in this period’s literature. What I uncovered, instead, was the aforementioned discrepancies in these works’ conceptualization of social space. I uncovered tensions between their stated settings—often prefaced in precise detail by authorial forewords to short story collections or the opening pages of period novellas—and the progress of these stories’ narratives.

A case in point for these discontinuities can be found in the opening paragraph of Anette von Droste-Hülshoff’s *The Jew’s Beech* [*Die Judenbuche*] (1842), in which the narrator invites the reader into the allegedly fixed and finite world of the story: “one of those secluded corners of the earth without factories or trade, without a royal road, where a strange face would still attract

¹ In a German context, the term *postmigrant* [*postmigrantisch*] has been associated with Shermin Langhoff’s ‘postmigrant theater’ at the Ballhaus Naunynstraße in Berlin Kreuzberg, where the self-conceived label served as an “empowerment strategy of appropriation” in resistance to labels such as ‘migrant theater’ which posited cultural productions among Berlin’s migrant communities as somehow inherently un-German:


The term was also circulated as early as the 1990s in the context of the intersectional activist network *Kanak Attak*. Beginning with the conference “Postmigrant Turkish-German Culture: Transnationalism, Translation, Politics of Representation” organized by Professor Tom Cheesman at the University of Swansea in 1998, the term has also seen wide circulation in academic research. It has since come to be applied to a number of discourses, including concepts such as a ‘postmigrant perspective’ or ‘postmigrant society’ meant to encapsulate the transformative and dialectical nature of migration and its broader societal impacts. For an overview of discussions on the subject, as well as a critique of its over-application, see also:

Göktürk, “Transnational Connections,” 440-44.
attention and a trip of thirty miles would render its undertaker the Odysseus of his area—in short, a place like so many others in Germany, with all the vices and virtues, all the originality and limitation, which thrive only under such circumstances.” ² To refresh the casual reader’s memory: These lines serve as introduction to a multilingual and multiethnic German village which serves as the setting for a novella that concludes with the translation of a Hebrew admonishment commemorating the murder of a Jewish villager at the tree which lends the story its name.

In Droste-Hülshoff’s novella, claims to untarnished German traditionality seem unphased by incongruities within a larger narrative encountering nefarious networks of transregional trade, the activities of secret societies, and a plurality of socio-linguistic communities—complexes which remain notably dissociated from one another in their representation as individual facets of a more complex social network. To reiterate: It is not the encroachment of cultural plurality in this village which facilitates its complex engagements with the outside world—such networks and affiliations already exist regardless of the individual characters’ associations. These are affiliations, one must point out, which diverse members of the village community participate in in Droste-Hülshoff’s novella: affiliations which are not relegated exclusively to outsiders or stranger figures somehow coded as non-German. Instead, the mobility and heterogeneity of the village community are presented as already part and parcel of even the most “secluded corners of the earth,” despite the narrator’s explicit claims to the contrary.

The village is both fixed and fluid at once: subject to familiar tradition, yet shot through with mobility and transformative potential. Its imaginary is, of course, subject to transformation and change itself. The agrarian communities imagined by authors of the 18th and 19th century have little in common with the highly-interconnected commuter communities of 21st-century rural Germany or with the village motifs evoked by urban neighborhood communities such as the Berlin Kiez. Still, a certain continuity remains in the imaginary of a shared space of social cohesion, intimate communal knowledge, and immediate recognition contrasted with more ‘impersonal’ models of shared living spaces like the city. Be that as it may, one need only scratch the polished, ‘German’ surface to uncover the heterogenous social constructs beneath. My observation is supported by a wave of recent German-language scholarship investigating the complex role which villages have played in melding the cultural imaginary of the German-speaking world. In their 2014 essay, “Marginalität und Fürsprache,”³ Michael Neumann and Marcus Twellmann describe

² Unless otherwise noted, all English translations from the German are my own; German originals are provided for reference in brackets or (if longer) as footnotes:

³ A conceptual teaser for Marcus Twellmann’s recent monograph:

Twellmann, Dorfgeschichten, 2019.
the manner in which “Even the most remote rural villages are already caught up in translocal networks which make possible the intercourse between people, things, and signs. Center and periphery are not separated by impermeable borders, but rather by liminal spaces connected to one another and negotiated by intermediaries. These intermediaries appear as local authorities […]”

It became my interest to identify and interpret the roles of these intermediaries—fictional accounts of 19th-century village life coded by informed and intimate narrators as autobiographical confession. Inspired by Die Judenbuche, I became increasingly interested in the roles played by rural Jewish communities in contesting the increasingly homogenizing and antisemitic language of German nationalism over the course of the 19th century.

Of course, 19th-century village stories were certainly not a uniquely German phenomenon, nor was the German-language experience of rural Jewish life completely absent from period literary representation. But in my search for a historic precedent to Oliver’s Andalusian Black Forest village, I was most interested in works which might in some way explicitly negotiate a plurality of concurrent affinities. Almost by chance, I stumbled across the works of the prolific 19th-century critic and author of popular fiction, Berthold Auerbach, in a series of epistolary exchanges between Auerbach and the Swiss author Gottfried Keller—today perhaps the most prominent representative of German-language village stories still widely acknowledged in 21st-century literary scholarship.

I was intrigued by Auerbach’s biography—originally trained as a rabbi, he began his literary career as a critic and biographer, eventually translating Spinoza’s collective works from Latin into German before achieving his popular breakthrough with the publication of his first collection of Black Forest Village Stories in 1843. Despite his considerable body of translations and literary criticism—and the immense period popularity of his short story collections and later novels, Auerbach’s contributions to the development of literary Realism have been largely relegated to footnotes in contemporary studies of this period’s literature, despite a growing body of Auerbach-specific German-language scholarship which has been published in recent years alongside new editions and anthologies of the author’s critical writings.

I was intrigued—both by the apparent shortcomings in English-language scholarship on the author, as well as by the subtle ways in which he codes experiences of both belonging and alienation in his literary works. Here, too, questions of mobility remained a tangible reference point in a world in which questions of Jewish emancipation held immediate consequences for the

4 Auch die entlegenen Bauerndörfer sind immer schon eingebunden in translokale Netzwerke, die den Verkehr von Menschen, Dingen und Zeichen ermöglichen. Zentrum und Peripherie sind nicht durch unpassierbare Grenzen von einander getrennt, sondern durch Schwelleräume, in denen sich Mittler bewegen, miteinander verbunden. Die Mittler erscheinen jeweils als lokale Autoritäten


5 The Bohemian author Leopold Kompert, for example, published a number of short narratives under the title Bohemian Jews [Böhmische Juden] (1851) which also describe life in Jewish settlements in German-speaking Central Europe:

Kompert, Böhmische Juden, 1851.
population’s right to settle, work, and travel in and between the different German-speaking lands of Central Europe. An avowed liberal nationalist, in his political life Auerbach was also an outspoken critic of models of Jewish emancipation in a future German nation-state which would sacrifice religious and cultural freedoms in exchange for increased political agency. Although a vocal supporter of the transformative political potential of the works of authors from the Young Germany Movement \[\text{Junges Deutschland}\] such as Heinrich Heine, Auerbach remains wary, in his letters and critical writings, of models of conversion or forced integration which might deprive him of the many layers of his identity as both German and Jewish—in marked contrast to authors like Heine who famously converted to Christianity. Would this author’s construct of the village ethos represent a historical parallel for the layerings of José F. A. Oliver’s literary worlds?

Given the abundant corpus of politically engaged writings by Auerbach, I was initially surprised in the author’s short stories by the casual, almost passing mentions made of Jewish villagers who otherwise receive only infrequent direct treatment in the bulk of his literary writings. What I was immediately drawn to instead, however, was the way in which Auerbach describes the broader phenomena of migration in the context of transatlantic movements both away from and returning to the village of Nordstetten in the Black Forest—the author’s own biographic hometown, as well as the fictionalized setting for the majority of his \textit{Black Forest Village Stories}. If the author only occasionally introduces specific discussion of the lives of Nordstetten’s many Jewish villagers, his village stories are nonetheless populated by an increasingly mobile and transnational population faced with an ongoing negotiation of their Germanness through experiences of expatriation and repatriation, and their participation in the settlement of new villages in the American (Mid)West. How might the tropes of these two village imaginaries—the Black Forest village behind and the Ohioan village ahead—speak to competing constructs of Germanness at play throughout the 19\textsuperscript{th} century? What role do circular migration and return play in the constructs of both communities and their continuities in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, particularly given the very real restrictions placed on the mobility of German-speaking Jews throughout this century? What might the participatory nature of Auerbach’s Black Forest village community and its performance through language, folklore, and song mean for a more inclusive vision of the German national community?

The literary wellsprings for this research oscillate between two very different imaginaries for the Black Forest village, separated at times by language, dialect, and more than 150 interceding years. Although I try to remain closely engaged in readings of my primary sources, my discussions of the authors José F. A. Oliver and Berthold Auerbach are also interspersed with comparative glimpses into the works of their literary contemporaries, and informed by extant scholarly research on both. The result of this constellative work is the discovery of surprising correlations between

6 For an in-depth discussion of Auerbach and his works, see Chapters Three: “The Jewish German Backdrop” and Four: “The Moveable Village.”

the two authors’ works, as well as the identification of crucial differences in their engagement with and reproduction of locally specific traditions, language, and dialect which flavor the presentation of both Black Forest villages.

Despite the circuitous path of my initial research, my dissertation largely follows a chronological course in its approach to the literature. It begins in Chapter Two, “A Place by Any Other Name,” with a two-part theoretical grounding: first explaining methodology, key terms, and important scholarly antecedents to my work, then providing an introduction to the broader context of village stories and their inherent ties to projects of German nationalism. This second chapter includes discussion of the concepts of both ‘space’ and ‘place’ in a range of social science research, expanding upon my own preferential use of place in the context of related research on mobility and translocality. Drawing from both historical and contemporary theory by a range of authors including Georg Simmel, Henri Lefebvre, Avtar Brah, Bruno Latour, John Urry, and Tim Cresswell, I identify the village as a representational place defined by a participatory vision for community formation characterized through recourse to specific language. In developing this model for analyzing the village, I discuss overlaps between early German folklore research and the literary production of German-language village stories—including popular works by the Brothers Grimm and Johann Gottfried Herder’s writings on language and folk poetry [Volksdichtung]. In doing so, I hope to establish a precedent for the pointed reading of German-language village stories as “imagined communities”8 constituted by facilitated access to place-specific knowledge, yet written primarily for and by an urban milieu, consequently negating the clear delineation between country and city which has long underscored the discourse surrounding this material. Analyses facilitated by my research aim to recast the literary village, in this light, as a place of dynamic and fluid transformation in which participation supersedes other markers of heterogeneity, providing a conceptual place for the negotiation of layers and mobility.

Exploring the historical precedent for both migration as well as alternative formations of community in the village story, Chapters Three, “The Jewish German Backstory,” and Four, “A Movable Village,” present comparative close-readings of Berthold Auerbach’s short stories “Der Tolpatsch” (1842), “Der Vierenckig, oder die amerikanische Kiste” (1853), and “Der Tolpatsch aus Amerika” (1876) in constellation with his critical works and correspondences with other period authors. Chapter Three concentrates on providing the historical context for Auerbach’s positionality, while Chapter Four seeks to ground his short stories within the wider discourse of his critical writings. In the 19th century, my interest lies in investigating the role of perceived ‘outsiders’ in a genre celebrated at the time for its recourse to the experience of ‘Germanness’ and

---

8 In his now canonical work on the relationship between the developments of nationalism, print-culture and mass media, Imagined Communities (1983), Benedict Anderson describes the way in which the circulation of information serves to reinforce concepts of shared culture, language, and values within the imagined community of the nation-state. Drawing upon this foundational model, I investigate the village community through a related interest in the shared corpus of place-specific and often folkloristic knowledge and language circulated through village stories:

Anderson, Imagined Communities, 1983.
I am interested in the ways in which Auerbach’s participatory vision of community formation is coded not only in the author’s narratives, but also in his narrative style—the foregrounding of migration and alienation as a pan-German experience and his changing appropriation of accent, dialect, and folksong. Although a small number of existing scholarly works on the subject have made overtures into exploring the fascinating intersection between outsider figures, Jewish identity, and Auerbach’s literary village, the prevailing models for diversity in the German-speaking world, particularly within literary studies, remain those of a modern, cosmopolitan, urban setting—ignoring the potential of the village story to mediate these experiences. I argue that Auerbach’s careful construct of the Swabian village of Nordstetten in the context of mid-19th century migrations provides an interpretive place for negotiating the layered constructs of his diverse villagers.

That Berthold Auerbach, one the most prolific authors of 19th-century village stories, produced extensive critical writings on Jewish culture receives little more than brief biographical attention in most investigations of the author’s literary work. The scholarly consensus that explicit treatment of antisemitism remains notably absent from Auerbach’s literary works ignores both those instances in which his stories do thematize this subject explicitly, as well as his constant recourse to themes such as shared linguistic identity, community participation, and migration as vehicles for constructing a more inclusive model for Germanness. Auerbach’s works of popular literature are brought back into conversation with contemporaneous village stories such as Gottfried Keller’s celebrated 1856 novella, A Village Romeo and Juliet [Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe]. Although the stakes of his particular literary projects differ from those of Auerbach,

---

9 Most notably:


10 This is notwithstanding interest in the biographical (and fictional) work he produced on important figures in Jewish intellectual history—an aspect of Auerbach’s work commonly regarded as separate from his works of popular fiction.

Contemporary Auerbach scholar Hans Otto Horch is representative of this common scholarly critique through his evocation of the Adornian concept of ‘false reconciliation’ in his reading of Auerbach’s village stories, arguing that these optimistic representations do little to address the very real social discord already experienced by minority communities in the 19th-century German-speaking world:


In her 1998 Können. Mögen. Dürfen. Sollen. Wollen. Müsien. Lassen., Austrian poet Marlene Streeruwitz goes so far as to accuse Auerbach of intentionally manipulating the reality of ethnic violence through production of escapist literature, alleging that he intentionally excludes topics of religion or race in his Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten (123). The negative implications of Auerbach’s escapism as read by Streeruwitz in her work is discussed in some detail in the essay (348-49):


11 Keller’s novella is among the most critically acclaimed German-language village stories, and its reception outside the realm of popular literature has led some scholars to question its inclusion in their research on a genre frequently reduced to works of popular fiction. Here Wild is no exception to this rule. Although she maintains a short chapter on Keller’s work, she, too, critiques its classification as a village story, citing its aesthetic preoccupation with
Keller describes the function of Realism as a sort of beautifying or corrective representation of daily life. In this context, Auerbach’s literary interventions are read as part of a developing trend in early Realism rather than as outliers of this genre. Both his and Keller’s tales circulated alongside those of other popular writers not only in collections of period literature, but also in periodicals and almanacs [Volkskalender] throughout the 19th century—complicating practical representations of daily life with their literary counterparts.

Auerbach’s short stories take a direct approach to representing 19th century migration through thematizing the movement both to and from his fictionalized realization of the village of Nordstetten in present-day Baden-Württemberg. In Auerbach’s writing, the village is never an isolated entity existing independently from the wider social realities of the 19th century, but rather an organic microcosm of wider-developments in the German-speaking world during a period of rapid demographic change. His villagers negotiate a burgeoning transatlantic world of emigration and repatriation, and their social relations are defined against a village backdrop characterized by sustained metamorphosis. These stories offer only partial answers to the underlying questions which drive this research: providing tantalizing glimpses of a complex of language, place, and participatory community (and participatory communication) which defined Auerbach’s construct of Germanness among the competing nationalist discourses of the mid-19th century.

A notable feature of 19th-century village stories is their self-identification as such—the explicit inclusion of place names or words like village in the titles of village stories, a performance of authenticity which continues in more recent works of the 20th and 21st centuries. Chapter Five, “Refuge in Translation,” provides selected close-readings from the prose and poetry of José F. A. Oliver, a contemporary 20th- and 21st-century German- and Spanish-language author. Known primarily for his activism and experimental poetry which brings together elements from German and Spanish, as well as the Alemannic and Andalusian dialects, Oliver is also a prolific writer of essays and short poetic prose. These prose works employ an autobiographical, first-person narrative style, though they make no explicit claims as memoirs or biographies. I posit these writings as contemporary village stories: Their contents negotiate the confluence of traditions the village as secondary to Keller’s aspiration to create a more universally appealing work of world literature—a position evident (among other things) in the obvious literary allusion in the novella’s narrative and title (305-321)—a topic also broached by Auerbach in his communications with Keller.

---


13 Amrein expands upon this notion in her scholarly contribution to the *Gottfried-Keller-Handbuch* she also edited. She writes: “The terms ‘real’ and ‘ideal’ figure not only as leitmotifs in the self-conception of Realism […] they also directly impact its reception history” [Die Vokabeln »real« und »ideal« figurieren nicht nur als Leitbegriffe im Selbstverständnis des Realismus (vgl. Aust 2006, 59–78; Plumpe 1997, 69–89; Plumpe 1996), sondern prägen maßgeblich auch dessen Rezeptionsgeschichte]:

Ibid, 292.

in Hausach, the Black Forest town of Oliver’s birth, through the legacy of the Andalusian guest workers who have defined its recent history.

My analyses draw primarily from one volume of the author’s prose, the essay collection *My Andalusian Black Forest Village* [Mein andalusisches Schwarzwalddorf] (2007), a volume of short narratives which I bring into conversation with readings from his earliest poetry from the late 1980s and early 1990s—much of which has been republished in *HOME LAND: Early Poems* [Heimatt: Frühe Gedichte] (2015), a collection of the author’s early poems edited by Ilija Trojanow. My readings also draw from Oliver’s trilingual poetry collection *Duende* (1997). Together, these works demonstrate the aesthetic development of a layering of languages which I conceptualize as translingual in my exploration of the intersection between multilingual migration narratives and representations of a rural village community. Of particular interest to this chapter is Oliver’s sensitivity to linguistic register, his framing of language and dialect use as both an inclusionary as well as exclusionary act—a process I investigate as both “defiant appropriation”\(^\text{15}\) and linguistic alienation.

Oliver’s writing, particularly his prose, employs a confessional, first-person narrative style, yet the stories speak to larger experiences of migrant heritage, utilizing a mixture of languages and dialects to draw attention to the profound connection between communication and community. No strangers to international travel, Oliver’s lyric speakers often defy a more provincial representation of village life, even in their engagement with time-honored local traditions such as Swabian-Alemannic Carnival (*Fastnacht* or “fasent” in the Hausacher Alemannic dialect). They present stories of mobile citizens whose grounding in the place and specificity of Hausach im Schwarzwald provides a point of reference for layered affinities: a transient lyrical I “[speechless] and one with a place which always bears him further words […]”\(^\text{16}\) If Oliver’s narratives posit migration as integral to the experience of village life, his thematization of the village community also unfolds on a linguistic level. Questions of diaspora, of circular migration, and of conflicting ties to divergent cultures, nationalities, and traditions find concrete representation through Oliver’s lyric speakers—their melding of registers, dialects, and languages frames the experience of modern mobilities on a communicative, linguistic level.

The sixth and final chapter, “Our World Village,” builds off the preceding chapters to argue for the critical role the village imaginary can play in the constructs of an inclusive and plural Germanness in opposition to the current politically-charged re-invigoration of concepts like *Heimat*. Here questions of changing mobilities are brought into conversation with the various iterations of the literary village examined in my different case studies. Following the investigations of the preceding chapters, this chapter presents those narrative and linguistic devices

---

\(^{15}\) Yildiz, *Mother Tongue*, 173-75.

For a detailed discussion of this application, see Chapter Five: “Refuge in Translation.”

\(^{16}\) *Aufgestaunt und eins mit einer Gegend, die ihn immer wieder wortgebiert*

Oliver, *Schwarzwaldorf*, 15.
employed in the representation of a multivalent village imaginary as transcending the topology of the local towards the evaluation of post-national communities grounded in a layered representational place. In doing so, I hope to contribute to the growing discourse of place in the negotiation of local and global, village and city. I ask: How might these interventions contribute to current political preoccupations with the rural, with demographic shifts, and with the millions of new migrants participating in the development of both urban and rural landscapes in contemporary Germany? In an increasingly mobile world, the experience of migration, alienation, homecoming, and belonging—our complex of relations with both the lived and mediated experience of place—demand critical reassessment. A 21st-century Germany recognized as an Einwanderungsland [country of immigration] requires a comprehensive reconfiguration of its aesthetic models for both communication and community—a reevaluation of the rural village which for centuries has helped define traditions of Germanness.
“The migrant condition is a matter of previous home feelings, practices and placements being questioned or even disrupted, but also of a variable potential for retaining, reproducing, or recreating the home experience anew. The separation from what used to be home is paralleled by systematic attempts to establish new home arrangements, or to recover meaningful dimensions of the past ones. Displacement goes along with at least some replacement.”
– Paolo Boccagni

“Ich brauche ein bisschen Schwarzwald. Er braucht mich nicht, aber ich brauche ihn.”
– José Francisco Agüera Oliver

The ‘traditional’ rural village—a fundamental building block of the national community—has long maintained a central role in the popular imaginary of the German nation-state. But literary evocations of the village have rarely been static or unchanging. These stories are populated by diverse inhabitants; traversed by sailors, wandering peddlers, and knights errant; they are driven by tales of those who venture out beyond the confines of village hedgerows and fields. Folkloric representations from the 19th century, even the very collections of fairytales upheld as bastions of German folk culture by Romantic-Nationalists, also demonstrate the ubiquity of minority communities in the cultural memory of rural, German-speaking Europe—albeit, not always in a positive, inclusive manner.

On the other hand, popular literature from the same period frequently presents the experience of German-speaking migrants leaving or returning to a rural homeland after journeys East and West. Historical records also attest to the multiplicity of narratives left behind by those who undertook migrations from the village—either out into the burgeoning industrial cities of 19th-century Germany or away across the ocean for the distant promises of a “New World” (or East, following the colonial ambitions of an expanding Prussian state). The pervasiveness of these experiences has also been memorialized in archival form and in collections of immigration documents and letters, but these narratives were already immortalized in their own time by popular literature. Collections of village stories from this period are often preceded by curiously pedantic introductions arguing for their authenticity and the rootedness of these tales

17 “Der Jude im Dorn” in the Brother Grimms’ Kinder- und Hausmärchen provides a well-known example of the antisemitic tropes employed in their collection of fairy tales, a topic explored in more detail in:

18 The translation of “Letters from America” [Briefe aus Amerika] is, for example, an ongoing project at the Institut für Übersetzen und Dolmetschen at Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg documenting the transatlantic correspondences between migrant families to and from the German-speaking world.
In association with the German Emigrant Letter Collection Gotha [Deutsche Auswandererbiersammlung Gotha] lists of additional collections and their scholarly analyses can also be found at:
http://www.auswandererbriefe.de/publikationen.html
in the traditions and specificities of their corresponding villages—a paradox of sorts, as these self-same narratives often bely ‘rootedness’ in one single, unique place. 19

Already established in the mid-18th century as a device of pedantry and informal education, the literary genre of Dorfgeschichte or village story was invigorated and popularized by nascent projects of Romantic-Nationalism at the beginning of the 19th century. Interest in the practices of rural life as receptacles for a shared German cultural knowledge led to the consumption of village stories as popular entertainment by a burgeoning German middle-class audience already removed from the ‘authentic’ practices of daily life these stories claimed to represent. The stories’ semi-biographical content, familiar first-person narration, or presentation of specific, local language and traditions amplified perceptions of these fictional works’ alleged authenticity. 20 Even in their nascency, these literary representations presented a wide range of experience encapsulated in the village aesthetic, though by the turn of the twentieth century, representation of rural life had become increasingly polarized through the competing lenses of a Life Reform [Lebensreform] movement which championed a turn ‘back to the land’ as answer to the crises of modernity and a more conservative Homeland Art [Heimatkunst] venerating the traditions of an already vanishing way of life. 21 The Nazi propaganda machine invigorated the latter, churning out endless representations of a fetishized rural homeland and tainting its cultural memory with the rhetoric of “blood and soil” [Blut und Boden]. It is this legacy which remains tangible in contemporary projects of German nationalism, even as Postwar and particularly post-Reunification authors have increasingly sought to recontextualize the changing imaginary of the German homeland. 22

The legacy of the literary village is and remains far more complex than any single period or movement in its representation. Through continued engagement with the cultural legacy surrounding German-language village stories, this study hopes to both contextualize and resist the homogenization of rural life along nationalist- and nativist ideological lines. The plurality of cultural experience in the German-speaking world extends far beyond the archetype of the urban cosmopolitan. The village and its rural landscape, tied as they are, fundamentally, with projects of German self-definition, provide an ideal starting point for the reassessment of the role which place plays in constructs of Germanness. In my discussion of both historical and contemporary village stories, I hope to demonstrate that narratives of villages and rural places as sites of mobility and diverse experience also provide a bulwark against their monopolization in nationalist rhetoric.

---

19 As with the opening paragraph of Droste-Hülshoff’s The Jew’s Beech cited in my Introduction, the foreword to the first volume of Keller’s The People of Seldwyla is also emblematic of these self-contradictions in the literary representation of village life (see Chapters Three: “The Jewish German Backdrop” and Four: “The Moveable Village”).

20 Kim, Volkstümlichkeit, 1991; Twellmann, Dorfgeschichten, 2019; Wild Topologie, 2011; et al.

21 Amrein, Keller Handbuch, 273.

22 The 2019 collection, Eure Heimat ist unser Albtraum (Ullstein fünf), edited by Fatma Aydemir and Hengameh Yaghoobifarah, is an exemplary intervention in this discourse.
I begin with more general background information intended to contextualize the parameters of this investigation. In doing so, I also touch upon a number of related literary studies which have inspired my research or contributed to the ongoing negotiation of material: explaining my own use of the term ‘village story’ as well as my reluctance to engage in broader discussions of homeland and so-called homeland literature [Heimatliteratur]. This is followed by a discussion of terminology in which I seek to ground my own investigation through invoking a reading of the literary village as a representational place—a concept I derive through recourse to scholarship from the fields of sociology, anthropology, and human geography concerned with the interrelation between place and constructs of community. I conclude with a discussion of analytical models through which I argue that the vehicle of the village story can provide a discursive third-space between popular binary models of urban vs. rural, global vs. local, modernity vs. traditionality.

2.1 Locating Village Stories
What is the relevance of an investigation into German village stories for an American scholar in the 21st century? On the surface, my choice in engaging primarily with the concept of the ‘village story’ is a practical one, avoiding the more tenuous boundaries of Heimat(literatur) explored in recent studies such as Friederike Eigler’s 2014 Heimat, Space, Narrative, and concentrating specifically on depictions of the village community as one of the underlying foundation stones of this homeland imaginary. Eigler’s argument for increased scrutiny of the spatial representations of the German homeland gives cause to reexamine the prevalence of a rural aesthetic in such discourses, and her own exploration of the changing conceptualizations (and physical boundaries) of homeland in the former German East demonstrates the very tangible link between migration narratives and the place-based specificities through which communities have been represented.

The role which the rural landscape continues to play in contemporary German discourses on homeland cannot be understated. In her 2019 work, Die Gesellschaft des Zorns, Cornelia Koppetsch describes the simultaneously nostalgic and immediate impulses of this idyll: “Tender childhood memories of church bells and fresh-mowed grass resonate in the word ‘Heimat,’ but it is hotwired at the same time to the most urgent problems of the present day: origin, the right of

---

The German term Heimat [homeland] is highly contentious, given its frequent appropriation by the far-right in their projects of nationalism and the association of the word with expansionist yearnings for former German territories lost in the conclusion of the Two World Wars. Despite recent calls from across the political spectrum to reappropriate this discourse (including the founding, in 2018, of a Federal Ministry of Homeland [Heimatministerium]), its use remains highly divisive today. Peter Blickle’s 2002 Heimat: A Critical Theory of the German Idea of Homeland provides an excellent (if now somewhat dated, given the recent resurgence of Germany’s political right) scholarly overview to the discourse surrounding this weighted term:


For a recent overview of German-language literary responses to Heimat discourse, see:

residency, migration and above all the aspirations for belonging, stability, and familiarity.”

It is precisely these contemporary fears and aspirations which lend concepts such as the German homeland their credence—the ability to imagine a timeless traditionality helps alleviate the fears of modern life’s precarity. Paradoxically, Koppetsch ties precisely the desire to establish a German homeland as idyllic and unchanging with the mobilities and transience of global modernity: “The very idea of being rooted in one specific place—in clear differentiation from other places—is, as surprising as this may seem, a genuinely modern experience.”

Without the possibility (or necessity) of mobility and migration engendered through global modernity, the urgency of defining a static tradition of homeland lacks both currency and value.

And so it is, that the German village of literary tradition is seldom far removed from the social and political legacies of real life German villages, a historic reality described by Neumann and Twellmann in their thesis that “both literary and scholarly ‘village stories’ stand in a genetic context with one another which allows for the more immediate determination of the socio-historical and historic-anthropological relevance of literary narrative styles […]”

The development of a literary or artistic aesthetic for the rural landscape is intrinsically tied to contemporary discourses and evaluations of the lived experience. Marxist historian Thomas Brass has investigated the presence and indeed the resilience of what he has deemed this “agrarian myth” in projects of populist nationalism intended to disrupt a historical materialist understanding of rural life. His research presents the village and its peasant populace as an evolving ideological chess piece transformed by a discourse anchoring the rural village to a complex of ‘tradition’ and cultural ‘purity.’ But the persistence of this so-called “agrarian myth” depends on its propagation in the face of a plurality of counternarratives. It is my interest to present a targeted selection of village stories as representative of precisely one such counternarrative: identifying moments in which the literary village serves as a vehicle for redefining a heterogenous Germanness rooted in participatory community.

24  Im Wort ›Heimat‹ schwingen zarte Erinnerungen an Kirchturmglöckchen und gemähtes Gras aus Kindheitstagen mit, zugleich sind darin die drängendsten Probleme der Gegenwart kurzgeschlossen: Herkunft, Bleiberecht, Wanderung und vor allem das Streben nach Zugehörigkeit, Stabilität und Vertrautheit.

Koppetsch, Gesellschaft, 234.

25  Schon die Vorstellung, an einem spezifischen Ort—also in Abgrenzung von anderen Orten—verwurzelt zu sein, ist ja, so überraschend das zunächst klingen mag, eine genuin moderne Erfahrung.

Ibid, 234.

26  Vor dem Hintergrund dieser Gemeinsamkeiten möchten wir der These nachgehen, dass literarische und wissenschaftliche Dorfgeschichten in einem genetischen Zusammenhang stehen, der die sozialgeschichtliche und historisch-anthropologische Relevanz literarischer Erzählweisen genauer zu bestimmen erlaubt

Neumann and Twellmann, “Marginalität und Fürsprache,” 480.

A more comprehensive history of the genre [\textit{Gattungsgeschichte}] of the German village story is beyond the scope or research parameters of the current investigation. My use of this term as a framing device for the current research material is profoundly indebted to the work of Germanist Bettina Wild, whose 2011 study \textit{Topologie des ländlichen Raums} has been indispensable in helping define my own research, as well as emphasizing the role which Auerbach’s village stories have played in defining the broader village imaginary in German-language literature. Wild provides a fluid definition for the village story which builds upon previous research defining the genre more narrowly as popular short fiction set specifically in villages or rural places.\footnote{28} Wild cites Du Gyu Kim’s 1991 \textit{Volkstümlichkeit und Realismus. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte, Motiven und Typologien der Erzählgattung Dorfgeschichte} in the expansion of her own definition to include not only explicitly self-proclaimed village stories and literature set within the spatial confines of rural or provincial places, but also literary works concerning the lives of the inhabitants of such villages: their perspectives or worldviews both inside and outside the context of the village.

This expanded definition maps well onto my research interest in exploring the intersection of migration narratives in the topology of the village story. Citing Kim’s precedent, Wild identifies the village story as a more expansive umbrella term [\textit{Oberbegriff}] encapsulating a number of thematically related literary productions, but not bound, by her definition, to any particular literary form.\footnote{29} With this expanded definition, Wild pushes beyond perceived boundaries of the genre as light fiction to establish continuity with classics of German-language literature such as Gottfried Keller’s \textit{Die Leute von Seldwyla} in topical constellation with broader examples from popular literature and culture. In acknowledging a precedence for this literature’s frequent self-identification as village story, but no longer confining the material solely to works of popular literary production, Wild opens discussions of the village story which establish the basis for my own investigations of contemporary literature. My readings include essays and poetry set in or around the village—also in those instances in which literary characters or lyric speakers transcend the spatial boundaries of the village in which their narratives are set, while maintaining interest in the devices used to anchor the material within a specific, layered understanding of place.

As aforementioned, the political implications of defining a village aesthetic have always hovered just beneath the surface of its dissemination. Historian Simon Schama in “\textit{Der Holzweg: The Track through the Woods},”\footnote{30} a chapter in his longer monograph \textit{Landscape and Memory}, has examined the cultural history of German national identity in relation to the domestication of the German forest. His research presents this process of domestication as transforming the German forest into a place of rural utopian imagery—tracing a paradigmatic shift away from the wild and dangerous woods of medieval literature through the dissemination of Tacitus’ \textit{Germania} in its
various historical contexts since its first printing in 1470. For Schama, it is the cultural construct of the forest as the ‘ancestral homeland’ of the German people which sees the gradual transformation of this wild landscape into a domesticized place of refuge: a sanctuary from the threatening outside world.\footnote{Schama, \textit{Landscape and Memory}, 1995.} No longer the untamed Forest of Brocélian from Arthurian Romance, nascent projects of nationalism conflated the wild haunts of Tacitus’ ancestral Germanic tribes with the industrializing landscapes of the 19\textsuperscript{th}-century commercial forest, already the established site of agricultural production and regional forestry management. For Schama, the regulation of public space—including those liminal regions between civilization and nature—were fundamental to the establishment of the modern European state. Historian Jeffrey K. Wilson has pushed this notion further, seeking to locate early Prussian colonial ambitions within the forest management policies of its Eastern territories, explicitly arguing for a link between rural settlement and Prussian cultural hegemony. Village formation, as an administrative act, contributed to the colonial projects of East Prussia, with all their violent implications for indigenous Baltic and Slavic communities. Participation in the communities of German-speaking settlers became a marker of belonging within the emergent (Prussian-)German Empire.\footnote{Wilson, \textit{The German Forest}, 2012.}

But there has also been an enduring, nostalgic-utopian aspect to this politicization. Already in 1903, in his influential sociological work \textit{Die Großstädte und das Geistesleben}, Georg Simmel had posited that urban life—in its prioritization of transactional interactions [\textit{Verkehrsleben}] removed from socialization—was moving away from what he deems “rural life with the slower, more habitual, and consistently flowing rhythm of both sensory and mental representation of its life […]”\footnote{Simmel, \textit{Großstädte}, 188.} This image of a somehow slower, more permanent model for communal interaction continues to define the way rural life has come to be represented in stark contrast to urbanity. When combined with an imaginary of ethno-cultural homogeneity (already present in Tacitus’ \textit{Germania}), it provides a foundation for the vision of an exclusive German cultural tradition embraced by nativist and identitarian nationalism. But the concept of rootedness in place and community has not always been an exclusionary device. Simmel observes the transformations of modernity in their relation to urbanization, yet little in his argument presents rural life as somehow intrinsically bound to one, overarching cultural identity. Rather, it is the investment in a shared communal interest which necessitates inherent levels of cooperation.

Of course, there are other models for (national-)community formation. In \textit{Imagined Communities}, Benedict Anderson begins to trace the development of nationalist ideology through a proposed reading of national monuments—particularly monuments to the unknown war dead. Here Anderson seeks to tie the foundations of nationalism to 18\textsuperscript{th}-century Enlightenment: rationalism and its implications for religion’s discursive monopoly over death and dying. For Anderson, it was in part the collapse of religion as a fundamental ordering system which
necessitated the rise of nationalism, a period which he describes as “a secular transformation of fatality into continuity, contingency into meaning.”  

Absent grand, unifying memorials in the years preceding German unification—if anything, the Prussian wars of unification provided the nascent German nation with tangible reminders of military occupation and intense regionalism—the village story provided for a unifying nod to a landscape of shared Germanness. The perception that such landscapes were under threat of fundamental reorganization through encroaching modernization provided a sense of urgency for the investment in Realist depictions of communal life. Like Anderson’s monuments to fallen national heroes, this investment in village life provided a basis for common nostalgia through the glorification of a vanishing rural idyll as foundation of the German nation.

Schama affirms this notion of the rural German village as a landscape simultaneously conceived of as eternal—the woodlands of the primeval Germanic tribes—as well as one perceived as endangered by the violent process of modernity. The village stories of the 19th century serve in this commemorative process as literary realms of memory [lieux de mémoire], archiving the ‘dying’ rural landscapes and communities for consumption in the process of German nation building.

A quintessential literary example of this phenomenon can be found in the Vorrede to the second edition of the first volume of the Grimm Brothers’ Kinder- und Hausmärchen, ostensibly a scholarly introduction to their collection of fairytales. This short essay replaces the more traditional introduction to the volume’s first edition in which the Brothers describe their collection process, editorial methodology, and aspirations for future undertakings. The second volume opens with a dire description of the erosion of traditional village life, threatened simultaneously by the dual hazards of industrial modernization and foreign occupation. It is the impending dissolution of the rural German landscape which necessitates the Grimms’ project of collecting and preserving cultural artifacts of a vanishing folk consciousness in the form of legends, folk wisdoms, and fairytales. Although this introduction contains explicit overtures toward the nationalist implications of their project, it simultaneously provides a model for the interpretation of the rural space as one of corrective exchange and communal development. Its flowery eloquence also hints toward literary underpinnings which belies a purely oral wellspring for the Brothers’ project:

---

34 Anderson, Imagined Communities, 11.

35 I borrow this term from the works of the nationalist French historian Pierre Nora, whose three-volume collection, Les Lieux de Mémoire develops his use of the terminology. Translated from the French as:

Nora, Realms of Memory, 1996.

For additional discussion of Nora’s concept of realms of memory, see the subsection of this chapter below, 2.2: “Towards a Representational Place.” In a German-language context, the term has been invigorated by the three-volume German-language publication Deutsche Erinnerungsorte [German Places of Memory] (2001), the third volume of which includes an entry on the German forest:

We discover—when storm or other misfortune sent from the heavens has laid low a fresh-sown crop—that yet, by low hedges or tussocks along the waysides, a tiny place establishes itself where single ears of grain remain erect. When the sun again shines amiably, they grow on isolated and unobserved; no early sickle reaps them for the great storerooms, but in late summer, when they have grown ripe and full, there come pious, impoverished hands which seek them out. Laid out ear by ear, diligently bound, and more highly cherished than entire sheaves, these are carried home as nourishment for the winter, indeed perhaps as the only seed for the future.

So it seemed to us, when we observed how naught remained for the folk of that wealth which blossomed in earlier times—indeed, its very memory had all but disappeared—save songs, a few books, legends, and these innocent fairytales. The places at the oven, the kitchen hearth, attic stairways, those as-yet still celebrated holidays, meadows and woods in their solitude, and above all undiluted fantasy have been the hedgerows which preserved and delivered them from one age to another.36

The Grimms’ conceit of the threatened harvest creates a moving pastoral narrative for German culture’s interdependency and fragility—only a precious few surviving “ears of grain” remaining by chance behind tussocks and under the wind shadow of hedge rows. This language of precarity fulfills a targeted function in the Grimms’ and many following claims to authenticity—lending credence to the urgency of their archival work and at the same time positing theirs as a definitive representation for an otherwise illusory cultural imaginary: As sole, surviving record, it can monopolize the discourse.

But perhaps it is the hedgerow (and not the ears of grain) in these opening lines which establishes a more constructive image for the communities the Brothers Grimm seek to describe. Hedges are a fittingly complex metaphor for rural life: bridging the divide as they do, between conceptions of nature and the civilized world and defining a more porous barrier between social configurations of space. Hedges do not form solid walls, they intersect spaces organically—creating fluid boundaries and facilitating limited passage and liminal environments between the spaces they divide.

36 Wir finden es wohl, wenn Sturm oder anderes Unglück, das der Himmel schickt, eine ganze Saat zu Boden geschlagen, daß noch bei niedrigen Hecken oder Sträuchen, die am Wege stehen, ein kleiner Platz sich gesichert, und einzelne Aehren aufrecht geblieben sind. Scheint dann die Sonne wieder günstig, so wachsen sie einsam und unbeachtet fort; keine frühe Sichel schneidet sie für die großen Vorrathskammern, aber im Spätsommer, wenn sie reif und voll geworden, kommen arme, fromme Hände, die sie suchen; und Aehre an Aehre gelegt, sorgfältig gebunden und höher geachtet, als sonst ganze Garben, werden sie heim getragen, und Winterlang sind sie Nahrung, vielleicht auch der einzige Samen für die Zukunft.

So ist es uns vorgekommen, wenn wir gesehen, wie von so vielem, was in früherer Zeit geblüht hatte, nichts mehr übrig geblieben, selbst die Erinnerung daran fast ganz verloren war, als bei dem Volk Lieder, ein paar Bücher, Sagen und diese unschuldigen Hausmärchen. Die Plätze am Ofen, der Küchenheerd, Bodentreppen, Feiertage noch gefeiert, Triften und Wälder in ihrer Stille, vor allem die ungetrübte Phantasie sind die Hecken gewesen, die sie gesichert und einer Zeit aus der andern überliefert haben.

Grimm and Grimm, Kinder und Hausmärchen, v-vi.
The Grimms’ collection follows in the wake of the publication of several other German-language collections of loosely defined *Volkslieder* [folk songs] in the final decades of the 18th-century and the first years of the 19th. Initial collections such as Herder’s (*Alte Volkslieder*) (published in various guises in 1775, 1778-79, and again posthumously under the title *Stimmen der Völker in Liedern*) were less concerned with projects of preservation—presenting, instead, a wide range of material in translation: from excerpts of Shakespearian theatre to Baltic and Slavic folk poetry. For Herder, anthologizing folk song was tied more immediately to the project of exploring language and literature as evidence for the unique cultural and linguistic developments of diverse peoples. However, with the 1805 (and 1808) publication of Achim von Arnim and Clemens Brentano’s *Des Knaben Wunderhorn: Alte deutsche Lieder* the emphasis on recovering the cultural goods of ‘vanishing’ folk traditions initiated by the Ossian debates assumed increased prominence in German-language academia. The Grimm Brothers’ project of fairytale collection in many ways represents a capstone for these earlier forays into the canonization of folklore, providing a literary tour-de-force of German cultural artifacts by two of the period’s most prominent and respected philologists, setting the stage for an explosion in the publication of both folk- and fakelore in the later 19th century.

The transition from folkloric research to literary production is complex. The publication of so-called *Kunstmärchen* [literary fairy tales] in the latter half of the 18th century was a defining feature of early German Romanticism, yet these short literary sojourns into aesthetic folklore production were frequently little more than a formal appropriation of genre, drawing from a range of sources and spatial locations as multivalent as their narrative contents. By the mid-19th century, the village story as a distinct subgenre of literary German realism had developed, fueled by a mixture of post-Romantic nostalgia, enduring nationalism, and a sustained folkloristic interest in the practices of everyday life. In *Topologie des ländlichen Raums*, Germanist Bettina Wild builds

---

37 The publications (1761-1765) of James Macpherson’s alleged translations of the Scottish bard Ossian’s epic poetry from the Gaelic inspired a whirlwind of interest in non-Classical European antiquity. Herder’s 1773 “Auszug aus einem Briefwechsel über Ossian und die Lieder alter Völker” and 1795 “Ossian und Homer,” as well as the prominent role of Macpherson’s text in Goethe’s 1774 *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* helped ensure its lasting significance in German-speaking culture long after the ‘translations’ themselves were proven to be creative amalgamations of Irish legends spliced together by Macpherson as part of his own project of Scottish cultural-nationalism.

Explorations of the texts’ literary and cultural reception continue from Herder through the present day (for a brief if representational overview of more recent literature see:


38 In her 1997 *In Search of Authenticity*, cultural anthropologist Regina Bendix explores the scholarly interest in so-called “fakelore” in mid-20th-century American research. She credits historian Richard Dorson with promoting the idea that the publication of literary works claiming authenticity as folklore often serves to advance the interests of particular groups in-no-way related to the milieus such stories claim to represent:


39 Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs’ *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality* provides a detailed examination of the intersection between folklore and the creation of popular tradition in 18th and 19th century Germany, highlighting the critical role which language and performance play in establishing normative cultural models:
upon the tradition of Uwe Baur, whose 1978 *Dorfgeschichte. Zur Entstehung und gesellschaftlichen Funktion einer literarischen Gattung im Vormärz* provides a comprehensive history of the development of the village story as a literary genre. Wild identifies a transition from early, more instructional village stories\(^\text{40}\) of the late 18\(^{\text{th}}\) century conceived as direct interventions into the unhappy lives of the subordinate working class, to early examples of the emerging literary genre in the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century.\(^\text{41}\) For Wild, the emergence of the literary genre was an evolving process with its roots in socially-progressive bourgeois *Vormärz* literature characterized by an interest in representing members of the lower social milieu with the goal of achieving a “conferring of ‘poetic human rights’” \([\text{Verleihung ‘poetischer Menschenrechte’}]\) through realistic depictions of the hardships of working class reality.\(^\text{42}\) However, within a pattern of larger literary exchange between *Vormärz* and *Biedermeier* cultural production (moving towards the period of German Unification in the latter half of the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century), Wild identifies how “In the course of the century, the village and rural space changed increasingly from a ‘type’ of liberal-bourgeois societal model to a space of nostalgic yearning […]”\(^\text{43}\)

The transformation from progressive, liberal exposé to conservative nostalgia progressing into the racial-national propaganda of the early 20\(^{\text{th}}\) century provides a wide-range of interpretive approaches to the material, and its broad reception as popular literature\(^\text{44}\) invites inquiry into the

\begin{align*}
\text{Bauman and Briggs, *Voices of Modernity*, 2003.}
\text{Hobsbawm and Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*, 1983.}
\end{align*}

\(^\text{40}\) See, for example, the works of Swiss pedagogue Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi including the four-part series, *Leonard und Gertrude* (1781-1787). Though innumerable editions and reprints have been issued since the original publication, copies of the author’s collected works are currently out of print. The four volumes are available from various contemporary publishers, or online (through HathiTrust and Projekt Gutenberg):

\begin{align*}
\end{align*}


\(^\text{42}\) Ibid, 36.

\(^\text{43}\) \text{Im Laufe des Jahrhunderts wird das Dorf und der ländliche Raum zunehmend von einer ’Spielweise’ liberal-bürgerlicher Gesellschaftsentwürfe zu einem nostalgischen Sehnsuchtsraum}

\begin{align*}
\text{Ibid, 39.}
\end{align*}

\(^\text{44}\) Based on sales records for his literature, Hermann Bausinger writes of Berthold Auerbach, author of the immensely popular *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten*: “Around the middle of the 19th century he was, next to Uhland, the most well-known German author” \([\text{Er war um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts neben Uhland der wohl bekannteste deutsche Schriftsteller}]\). The popularity of *Dorfgeschichten* in the mid-19\(^{\text{th}}\) century is also of central import to Bettina Wild’s investigation. Although she contests the reception of this literature among different demographics (citing the conflicting evidence of both period reviews as well as more recent scholarship), she maintains that “In contrast, in the 19th century, the village story belonged in the German-speaking world, among the most popular and widely-read genres” \([\text{Im 19. Jahrhundert dagegen gehört die Dorfgeschichte im deutschsprachigen Raum zu den beliebtesten und meist gelesenen Gattungen}]\):
role of village stories and their dissemination in shaping the popular imaginary on a media-based level. Marketed as both by—as well as for—‘the people,’ many of these village stories found initial serial publication in popular magazines and journals, and were only later to be anthologized in collections of the works of individual authors. Inversely, others were initially published in collections of work by individual authors, only to gain notoriety through republication in popular collections. From the onset, the particular emphasis placed on establishing authenticity as works of a broader, folk-cultural imaginary provided this popular medium with powerful political potential. The deep fascination of Nazi propaganda with imagery of the rural German community has maintained transformative influence on the development of modern folklore studies in the German-speaking world, and continues to impact scholarly reception of folk or folkloric material across related disciplines today.45

In its literary context, the village story was largely the production of and for an urban, bourgeois class. German writers of the early metropolis wrote diatribes and embellished literary productions of an imagined peasant class—helping to commodify its image for easy consumption among their peers, yet their writings also circulated among the mass production of literature shared by other social milieus: popular magazines, newspapers, and Volkskalender. Emerging out of late-18th-century interest in folk customs and the Herderian belief that the practices of the ‘common people’ could be indicative of some collective Volksgeist [national spirit], early village stories were a popular short literary form encapsulating a range of interests and representational frames.46 They burgeoned as a literary genre through the mid-19th century, where their tendency to wax pedantic made pliable political material for early German national stirrings.

Real or imagined, the perceived divide between urban and rural has become a defining feature of social and political modernity. From early constructs of German nationalism to the latest developments of populist nationalism in the post-industrial West, the concept of an enduringly traditional and culturally homogenous rural has been posited in stark contrast to a progressively cosmopolitan and multiethnic urban space. In the introduction to his now classic treatise The Country and the City, Raymond Williams proclaims that the “contrast between country and city, as fundamental ways of life, reaches back into classical times”47 yet in the same argument, Williams begins to hint at the inherent fallacy of this polarity. He goes on to relate that the
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45 Bausinger, “Ein schwäbisches Dorf,” 7; Wild, Topologie, 47.

46 Bausinger, Volkskunde, 1971; Bendix, Authenticity, 1997; Naithani, Folklore, 2014; et al.

47 The influence of Herder’s research on folklore in the development of German nationalism was profound. Although stalwart, himself, in his belief that each cultural-linguistic community is capable of achieving its own invaluable, context-specific range of cultural productions, Herder’s belief in the fundamental interconnection between place, language, and people [Volk] paved the way for exclusionary, race- and identitarian-based nationalist discourses. For an excellent introduction to the connection between Herder’s folkloric work on Ossian and the discourse of populist nationalism, see:


47 Williams, Country and City, 1.
historical fact of both rural and urban dwelling has been as diverse as their corresponding representations in the arts and literature. The comparison highlights the ambiguity of this position: the rural is multivalent, but its representation is nonetheless guided by the persistence of certain “images and associations” which his and other investigations posit as undergirding conceptualizations of the socio-spatial cleft between city and country. It is through closer examination of these presentations, and my own definition of the literary village as a realm of layered representational place, that I hope to work through this polarity—seeking to redefine the village as a place of mobilities and dynamic social interaction.

2.2 Towards a Representational Place

In his seminal 1991 work, The Production of Space, sociologist Henri Lefebvre argues that “(Social) space is a (social) product. […] the space thus produced also serves as a tool of thought and of action; that in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power; yet that, as such, it escapes in part from those who would make use of it.”

The rural village is one such socially construed space—mediated through centuries of representation and reception, where the aesthetic development of village stories has been inherently connected with the performance of both authenticity and German national identity.

Lefebvre classifies conceptualizations of social space into a number of subcategories, two of which are of particular value to the present research on literary representations of the German-speaking village. Of particular interest is Lefebvre’s description of the transition from “representations of space” to “representational space,” prescribing the way in which space gradually imbibes the ideology present in its cultural reproduction—transforming from abstract and fallible conceptualizations to concrete assemblages of culturally charged criteria:

Representations of space are certainly abstract, but they also play a part in social and political practice: established relations between objects and people in represented space are

48 Lefebvre, Production of Space, 26.

49 For an overview on this topic, Dutch historian Joep Leerssen has written extensively on the formation of Central European nationalist ideologies in the long 19th century:


Eric Hobsbawm has described the history of national identity through what he has called “invented tradition,” working along parallel discursive lines to Benedict Anderson’s Imagined Communities (1983) and helping define contemporary research on the subject:


Others, such as Jeffrey Wilson (2012) have written more focused histories identifying key elements in the nation-building process such as (for Wilson) the political development of German forestry practices and its cultural impact on perception of the German rural landscape (see above, footnote 32):

subordinate to a logic which will sooner or later break them up because of their lack of consistency. Representational spaces, on the other hand, need obey no rules of consistency or cohesiveness. Redolent with imaginary and symbolic elements, they have their source in history—in the history of a people as well as in the history of each individual belonging to that people.\(^50\)

While the literary rural village may have existed initially as a representation of space, subject to factual, social, or historical critiques, the tropes of the literary rural village in the German-speaking world have gradually transformed—construed by cultural, political, and aesthetic associations due in no small part to 19\(^{th}\)-century authors’ self-identification as authentic advocates for the unmitigated experience of village life. Yet it is precisely this claim to authenticity, this desire to provide an unfettered representation of everyday life which lends the village story both its utility and danger. The works of some of the most celebrated German Realist authors describe their own belief that their neo-pastoral writings would provide a corrective voice against the turmoil of 19\(^{th}\) century life.\(^51\)

In the following case studies, I read the works of certain multicultural or multilingual authors as re-appropriating the village as a representational place for negotiating layers of divergent localized belongings through a combination of both narrative and linguistic devices. In this vein, I build upon James Clifford’s tradition of challenging us to think past binaries of “native” versus “migrant,” activating these literary village stories—as Clifford’s anthropological work has done with real-life villages—to identify continuities between settlement and mobility.\(^52\) In doing so, I harness and build upon the potential of Lefebvre’s representational space. Space being, by its very definition, a nebulous concept, I employ the work of contemporary historian and human geographer Tim Cresswell, whose updated 2015 study Place: an introduction utilizes Lefebvre’s research on socially constructed spaces to argue that it is precisely the social, participatory dynamic which transforms abstract concepts of space into concrete representations of place. Yet my interest in the interpretive value of these constructs as undetermined, layered, or unstable leads me to conceptualize them as representational places. My interest in their fluidity is influenced in no small way by José F. A. Oliver’s own poetic invigoration of the relationship between language and place and their combined mimetic potential—a concept embodied in his frequent use of the linguistic in(ter)vention \(W:ort\).\(^53\)

\(^{50}\) Lefebvre, Production of Space, 41.

\(^{51}\) Amrein and Dieterle, Keller und Fontane, 2008.

\(^{52}\) Clifford, Routes, 1997; Clifford, Returns, 2013.

At the forefront of this discourse, Doreen Massey’s iconic 1991 essay “A Global Sense of Place” establishes the tone for conceptualizing a multilocal perspective still grounded in the geospatial specificity:


\(^{53}\) A neologism formed which highlights the relationship between word [\(Wort\)] and place [\(Ort\)].
This shift to representational place imbued with layered meaning and social expectations provides the logical progression away from nationalist concepts of space such as Pierre Nora’s model for realms of memory [lieux de mémoire]. In the opening lines of Nora’s “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire” first published in English translation in 1989, Nora cites interest in the disappearance of peasant culture during the Industrial Revolution as a historic precursor to his own investigation in the last decades of the 20th century. Lieux de mémoire, as conceived by Nora, are tangible places of commemoration—monuments, public buildings, spaces of historic significance. The recognition of their function, and indeed, the call for their increased commemoration and preservation serves for Nora as a foundation against the tendencies of the increasingly post-national 20th century Europe he fears. In this way, Nora’s “realms of memory” are fundamentally tied to the centralized commemoration processes of the nation-state, a process which occurred concurrently with the relatively late industrialization of the German countryside in the mid-19th century and the popular interest in documenting its realities for posterity.

Following Nora’s argumentation, proper lieux de mémoire oppose alternative interpretation, serving instead to promote the ideological agendas of their progenitors (the nation-state). But this is precisely not the case with representational spaces, as understood by Lefebvre, or representational places as I conceptualize the stylized literary representations of specific place. Although not always tangibly linked to ‘real’ physical spaces on the globe, village stories nevertheless provide an intangible bridge between real places of historic significance and the imagined spatial communities of the literary world, fabricating alternate memories for the lived experience of village life they claim to signify. As a negotiation of lived experience and learned expectation of communal life, they navigate the discursive boundaries between participation and presentation, biographical and material limitation. They model community.

In his 1913 essay, “Philosophie der Landschaft,” Georg Simmel writes of an inherent process of differentiation necessary in human interaction with the natural world, implying that conceptualizations of a rural idyll are by no means one and the same as those of nature or wilderness. Instead Simmel argues for the existence of a conceptual distinction between Natur [nature] and Landschaft [landscape], reasoning that our fundamental understanding of these concepts is made plausible by the impulse to create boundaries within a natural world conceived of as an inherently inseparable, unified whole. Landscape represents our ability to divide the natural meadows into neat fields of grain divided by hedgerows. It is, for Simmel, the first conceptual differentiation towards a recognition of human interaction with the outside world and the division between an incomprehensible and indivisible “state of totality” [Gesamtsein] and those manageable, conceivable units for aesthetic, political, or practical manipulation. It is fitting within this context to evaluate the literary village in a tangible sense as the interpretive, liminal space between the domesticated and the natural worlds: imagined on the peripheries of civilization and yet representative on a fundamental level of the shift towards both practical and aesthetic domestication.

54 Simmel, “Philosophie der Landschaft,” 8.
Building off Simmel’s historical framework, it is this initial transformation between what contemporary sociologist John Urry similarly deems “land” and “landscape” which determines how the relationships and associations surrounding specific places are “affectively performed.” Urry argues in his 2007 work, *Mobilities*, that it is this differentiation process which allows space to change and develop until it fits within the dynamic conceptualizations of socio-spatial affiliations—place. Sociologist Mimi Sheller’s 2018 *Mobility Justice: The Politics of Movement in an Age of Extremes* further develops this framework to highlight the tremendously “uneven mobility” of a world still defined by the profoundly unequal distribution of information and resources: foregrounding structural impediments on the global flow of both capital and human beings. The rural village—like the hedgerows which form its porous borders—provides for a more nuanced reading of this initial conceptual binary, allowing for the determination of a space between ‘modern’ civilization and a ‘premodern,’ natural (human) world in the popular imaginary, yet this liminality also allows for its appropriation in conceptualizing both.

More recent scholarship on spatiality has also investigated how conceptualizing place corresponds with the lived reality of an ever-more fluid social-construct of temporary migration, telecommunication, and transnational community formation. Deniz Göktürk in “Transit,” her contribution to the 2014 anthology *Das neue Deutschland. Von Migration und Vielfalt*, describes the way in which contemporary migration has increasingly become conceived of as a continual process rather than a simple journey from A to B. This framework allows for broader reflection on the cultural associations not only of both source and destination, but also of the spatial process of migration, itself. Describing this conceptual transformation, she observes:

As opposed to the classic narrative of immigration as departure and arrival, the to and fro of commuter traffic is often much closer to the lived experience of the migrant. Their attachment to multiple locations creates perpetual ambivalence towards making a home in one place and entrapment in provisional arrangements. In our shrunken world of endless cities and airports, it is perhaps the commuter, not the immigrant, who might figure as a prototype for modern mobility.

Geographer Tim Cresswell has similarly critiqued identity constructions based on notions of a wholly unrooted hybridity or transnationality as shortsighted, arguing that a more nuanced understanding of the role of fixed locations within a complex of movement and transformation must not neglect the significance of individual places (nor our networks of affiliations thereto), but rather, that these formations should challenge our fundamental assumptions of prioritization which


privilege notions of cosmopolitan relations between dominant and subordinate spaces. Rather than simply evaluating the experience of migration, we are challenged, instead, to evaluate our framing of the migration process, assessing the aestheticization of those constituent parts which inform our understanding of the whole.

For the current project, the increasing plurality of places in a landscape of globalized mobility only underscores the importance of reevaluating individual place as the site of changing constructs of belonging. As Göktürk relates, the process of migration forms an unending chain of complex associations with the innumerable provisional places encountered along the way: perhaps no singular home, but many havens. The foregrounding of concepts such as Ankunft/Ankommen [arrival] in current German discourse on migration acknowledges the continued conceptual significance of these moments of human geo-spatial interaction, just as it implies the existence of a multitude of specific places within a larger matrix of movement and sedentism.

My investment in situated specificity at times runs against the grain of contemporary scholarship, yet it is precisely this tension which informs my research. Comparatist Ottmar Ette has argued increasingly for a reconceptualization of much of the literary production of the postcolonial period. In a German-language context, he posits “literatures without permanent residence” against previous conceptualizations of multi- or interculturality, instead evoking the use of the prefix trans- to denote a fluid convergence of identities, languages, or locational specificities (Ette ZwischenWeltenSchreiben). For Ette, this “writing between worlds” avoids the potential pitfalls of a cultural-linguistic politics which privileges either the distinct differentiation of languages, cultures, or spaces (multi-) or the constant interplay between aspects of these distinct phenomena (inter-). Ette instead proposes a transcultural (or translingual, translocational) research approach which no longer assumes prioritization but negotiates the fluidity between traditional concepts of affiliation as a legitimate and independent discursive space. Such an approach promises to provide a conceptual framework for Homi Bhabha’s cultural “Third Space,” negotiating the wider application of this discursive model for an engagement with translingual literature which I highlight in my fifth chapter.

While my own research has been receptive to models which seek to destabilize fixed notions or prioritization of cultural or linguistic finitude, I continue to maintain interest in the ways in which intersections with acute spatial specificities inform a fluid understanding of cultural
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58 Cresswell, Place, 81-83.

59 Framing Migration was the title of a Fall 2015 graduate seminar at UC Berkeley, as well as a forthcoming publication by Deniz Göktürk, both of which investigate the processes by which migratory practices are represented in art, literature, and film.

60 Literaturen ohne festen Wohnsitz is the subtitle of the author’s 2005 monograph:

Ette, ZwischenWeltenSchreiben, 2005.


specificity. Although my research proposes a reexamination of the role of the village as a site of place-based specificity, it approaches this project informed by current research on translocality, asking what this understanding of contemporary work can also contribute to historical representations of otherness.

In its employment across disciplines, translocality has been utilized to describe a number of models for negotiating affinity to multiple, conflicting geospatial locations. In their wide-ranging 2013 survey of the term’s development, Greiner and Sakdapolrak define translocality loosely as “phenomena involving mobility, migration, circulation and spatial interconnectedness not necessarily limited to national boundaries.” Their definition here seems to confer with what Ette describes as “transspatial” \(\text{transspatiale}\) structures in a discussion of the various spatial contexts in which the prefix trans- may be applied. These phenomena, too, are defined by Ette as “informed by a pattern of movement, constant crossings and intersections of varying spaces […]” Although the implications of these terms are diverse, I avoid the categorization of my current investigation as ‘translocal’ because my interest lies not in those intersections between overlapping geospatial locations as such, but rather in the techniques employed to demonstrate their unique specificities—the attachment to multiple layerings of location and temporality. A poetics of layered place may (and in my research often does) operate through the translingual, yet my interest remains in the connections maintained to individual place(s).

While focus on spatial specificity may threaten to reinforce nativist discourse on origin-based identity politics (à la Pierre Nora), it can also function to provide a tangible framework for investment in alternative models for community formation. Sociologist and cultural historian Avtar Brah has published extensively on the notion of diaspora as an interpretive model for unpacking the experience of modern migration, and her expansive research on the topic has informed my own approach to spatial representations in German-language literature. In particular, Brah’s 1996 \textit{Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities} construes the notion of diaspora as a complex of movement and border-crossings, while cautioning against employing notions of homelessness or permanent transition which ignore the politics of each locational specificity. Diaspora here is the punctuated experience of perpetual transit between physical and ideological

---

63 In this regard, my research as a whole is indebted to the work of emeritus UC Santa Cruz Professor James Clifford whose interdisciplinary approach to scholarship has had a tremendous impact on my scholarly interests since my own undergraduate work at Santa Cruz (2004-2008). Karoline von Oppen’s citation of Clifford’s concept of “traveling cultures” in her introduction to the volume Local/Global Narratives is emblematic of my own interest in exploring the tension between conflicting representations of what Clifford deems the “hybrid, cosmopolitan” and the “rooted, native”:


64 Greiner and Sakdapolrak, “Translocality,” 374.

65 \text{von ständigen Querungen und Kreuzungen verschiedenartiger Räume und damit von einem Bewegungsmuster geprägt}

Ette, \textit{ZwischenWeltenSchreiben}, 22.
notions of foreignness and domesticity. As the negotiation of multiple experiences of homelessness and home, it provides a fascinating intersection for migration narratives in the context of a fixed location such as the village, with its corresponding transformations over time.

2.3 Locating Authenticity

As a (primarily) short narrative form, many village stories include an element of the biographical which lends credence to their claims of (self-)representation. My interest in the biographical as an emancipatory narrative model is informed by the work of sociologists such as Gabriele Rosenthal whose research on Holocaust memory has investigated the forms and structures of the biographical stretching between lived and narrated experience.\(^\text{66}\) My engagement with the carnivalesque in the fifth chapter is also informed by the work of Kerstin Bronner whose study of the performance of gender in the context of Swabian-Alemannic Fastnacht proposes a more targeted reading of the biographical narrative as constitutive of social experience.\(^\text{67}\) In both instances, the concept of ‘biography’ is removed from its more generic context and reevaluated as a narrative form capable of negotiating and re-presenting memories for targeted communication. This connection is reinforced by the work of Neumann and Twellmann who argue in their aforementioned 2014 essay for the interconnected nature of period village stories with anthropological and socio-historical representations of village life.\(^\text{68}\)

Village stories, rooted in locational specificity (and in many cases, loosely associated with the real-life hometowns of their authors) are intertwined with elements of the biographical—a performance which has long complicated their understanding as representational and not representation. Their familiar narrators and often-first person narrative-style suggest authenticity

---


\(^{67}\) Bronner, \textit{Grenzenlos normal?}, 2011.

\(^{68}\) They argue for example, that the situatedness of the lyric speaker in the village story can be correlated to the biographical claims of the author in her/his ability to speak for the marginalized classes they claim to represent:

Let us first determine the situation of the narrator: essential here is at least a partial affiliation to that ‘warm’ society which is in the process of intervening in the culture of ‘cold’ societies. After all, the institutions of both historiography and literature are part of those ‘warm’ societies which—precisely through consciousness of their historicity—dramatically increase the consequences [of this work] (both for themselves, as well as for other social milieus). Under these conditions, the actual effect of advocacy speech on the village would be worthy of examination. In any case, the narrator must be capable, according to the rules of the given institutional arrangements, to speak on behalf of the subalterns. But she/he must also first be familiar with their world.

\[ \text{Bestimmen wir zunächst die Situation des Erzählers: Wesentlich ist die wenigstens partielle Zugehörigkeit zu jener „warmen“ Gesellschaft, die sich jeweils anschickt, in die Kultur „kalter“ Gesellschaften zu intervenieren. Schließlich sind die Institutionen der Historiographie und der Literatur selbst Teil „warmer“ Gesellschaften, die eben durch das Bewusstsein ihrer Geschichtlichkeit deren „Folgen (für sich selbst und für die anderen Gesellschaften) ins Unermessliche [vergrößern]“. Unter dieser Voraussetzung wäre die tatsächliche Wirkung der advokatorischen Rede vom Dorf eigens zu untersuchen. Jedenfalls muss der Erzähler fähig sein, nach den Regeln der gegebenen institutionellen Arrangements für die Subalternen zu sprechen. Zuvorderst aber muss er mithrer Welt vertraut sein.}\]

Neumann and Twellmann, “Fürsprache,” 488.
in the form of personal memoires: a narrative device which permits the village story to transcend genres, from the short stories and novellas of the 19th century to the poetic essays and experimental narrative forms negotiated in the 20th and 21st.

It is perhaps this link to—or at least this claim of—the biographical, which endows village stories with the ability to negotiate between localized perspectives and more globalized narratives. Assertions of a lived biography function here as a mediation of authenticity: The lyric speakers of these village stories process the specificities of local knowledge for consumption at a superregional or even global level. In her introduction to Local/Global Narratives, Von Oppen references the work of Swedish social anthropologist Ulf Hannerz who proposes in Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places, that just as “the global sometimes has to be brought down to earth, the local has to be brought up to the surface, to be demystified.”69 This call for leveling between the imaginaries of both global and local perspectives anticipates Bruno Latour’s Gaia concept, a narrative space I seek to locate in the layered representational place of literary villages in my third, fourth, and fifth chapters.

In his May 2016 lecture at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, republished as “On a Possible Triangulation of Some Present Political Positions” in the Winter 2018 volume of Critical Inquiry, Latour argues that humans continue to lack a fundamental concept of distance in our perception of the world around us. He locates this divide between what he deems the global, universalizing tendencies of progressive discourse and the nostalgic, land-based specificity of reactionary populism, stating: “all such positions are situated along the single gradient going from Land—what you have left behind or wish to go back to—and Globe—the horizon you wish to reach or try to escape from—and that the cursor is defined by the modernization frontier that allows you to tell progression from regression.”70 Latour argues instead for the utility of what he calls Gaia—an understanding of the Earth as a localized, experiential space separate from ideology. Such an understanding offers a more biographical account of daily life, absent both universalizing projections onto the future and nostalgic yearnings for a vanished past: “Compared to the concept of nature,” Latour writes, “the concept of Gaia is local. It’s a ring of active life forms that have molded their many overlapping niches in such a way that they provide to one another a series of envelopes that can in no way be stretched and smoothed in the form of the res extensa.”71 Gaia, in his model, is the intersection of specificity and shared experience, the microcosm of interrelation, contextualizing the unique through its recognition in a communal whole. In short: the global village—geographic specificity freed from its attachment to reductionist projects of homogeneity: a place of intimately shared experience—the commons, public lands—with all their utility, compromise, and legacy. Within the necessary parameters, the village story as literary narrative


71 Ibid, 222-23.
provides a model for this, recasting Walter Benjamin’s premodern oral storyteller for modernity as both farmer and sailor in one.\textsuperscript{72}

Motivated by a number of recent projects concerned with destabilizing nationalist recourse to German cultural heritage,\textsuperscript{73} this project asks what a grounding in the village story might contribute to a post-national imaginary—how translingual and trans- or even post-national elements intersect with a localized, rural aesthetic in literature—and what is required to develop a poetics for encapsulating this experience. In a cultural and political imaginary which increasingly portrays rural places as backwards, regressive, or reactionary, the following study investigates literary devices employed, both historically and today, to invest village stories with the potential for a more inclusive discourse. It asks: How does grounding in localized place unfold across mobile, global networks, and is there a poetic language which can unify the disparate perspectives of the local and the global through layering of representational place?

The iconography of 21\textsuperscript{st}-century German nationalism is frequently driven by the binary opposition of modern, urban multiculturalism and the rural Heimat idyll. Yet the sheer diversity of 18\textsuperscript{th}, and 19\textsuperscript{th}-century village stories which predate modern Germany’s foundation myth—that it became a multicultural nation through the invitation of foreign Gastarbeiter in the mid-20\textsuperscript{th} century, a historical reality immortalized in Max Frisch’s 1965 proclamation: “Workers were called for, but people are coming”\textsuperscript{74}—provides a counterweight to nativist interpretations of Germanness. As Max Czollek has argued in his recent essay “Instrument or Weapon: Notes on Contemporary Literature”: “The borders of German culture have always been open, it had no center, and was—like the many political states which have comprised it—plural.”\textsuperscript{75} Perhaps, then, it is not surprising that many of the foundational texts depicting “German” rural life are set upon the margins of the German-speaking world—Alemannic Switzerland, the Black Forest, the

\textsuperscript{72} In “The Storyteller,” Benjamin describes the two models of traditional, premodern storytelling as deriving from the rooted experience of the farmer and the wandering experience of the sailor. The layering of representational place I conceptualize through constructs such as José F. A. Oliver’s Andalusian Black Forest Village negotiate between these two spheres, providing a model for experience rooted in concurrent affinities to multiple layers of place-specific knowledge:


\textsuperscript{73} For example, the aforementioned 2019 essay collection \textit{Eure Heimat ist unser Albtraum} edited by Fatma Aydemir und Hengameh Yaghoobifar, or journalist Peter Zudeick’s 2018 exploration of the political employment of loaded cultural commodities in \textit{Heimat. Volk. Vaterland. Eine Kampfansage an Rechts}.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Man hat Arbeitskräfte gerufen und es kommen Menschen}.


The longer reception history and current currency of this iconic statement is recontextualized in the context of recent migration debates in Germany in the June 15, 2016 contribution to the column “Kiyaks Deutschstunde” by Mely Kiyak in the German periodical \textit{Die Zeit}:


\textsuperscript{75} Czollek, “Instrument or Weapon?,” 2019.
Hungarian steppe, or the shores of the North or Baltic Seas: a literary construct of the American dictum *e pluribus unum*—out of many, one.

Recent projects archiving the founding discourses of 20th-century Germany’s public transition into a country of immigration provide the groundwork for an expanded response to the literary record of Germany’s diversity. With established precedent, one can now work backwards from the present, tracing an evolving red thread across a constellation of historical narratives. Conflicting representations of the village ideal evident throughout the literature and cultural record of the German-speaking world provide a powerful counter-narrative to the homogenous and static rural homeland as employed in nationalist politics. They join a host of more recent German-language literary interventions from the late 20th- and early 21st-century to facilitate a critical re-imagining of Germany’s cultural landscapes.

Contemporary politics on both sides of the North Atlantic would have us believe that rural spaces have long been ‘forgotten;’ that their current ascension and indeed centrality within the rise of 21st-century nationalism is a reaction against decades or even centuries of social, political, and economic neglect. As a political signifier, the village has very much been thrust back into the political spotlight, but its cultural legacy has been centuries in the making. Recent scholarship has begun to unpack this complex legacy.

The recent volume *Imaginäre Dörfer: Zur Wiederkehr des Dörflichen in Literatur, Film und Lebenswelt* (2014) contains twenty-six essays each addressing the occurrence and reoccurrence of a rural imaginary in contemporary German-language culture from a cross-disciplinary perspective. It represents one of many contemporary testaments to renewed engagement with the village aesthetic as a focal point for German Studies scholarship. In a complimentary vein, the interdisciplinary 2016 essay collection *Queering the Countryside* presents sixteen recent academic investigations from a primarily American perspective which seek to move beyond representations of queer life as an inherently urban facet of contemporary culture, investigating, instead, the persistence of queer culture in the rural imaginary.

The current investigation follows a similar scholarly path, albeit less comprehensive in scope: problematizing the persistence of a heterogenous rural imaginary through recourse to specific narrative forms and an interest in the use of specific, regionally-defined language. It asks what forms of poetic intervention allow for the performance of a more multivalent village against the backdrop of exclusionary, populist-nationalist imaginaries. While a significant body of research exists in the field of *Germanistik* to address the long legacy of German-language village stories, only recently have scholarly investigations begun seeking to recontextualize representations of rural life in terms of their implications for contemporary cultural studies. To this effect, studies of the intersection between migration narratives and village stories remain in their

---

76 See for example: Ezli and Staupe, *Das neue Deutschland*, 2014.


infancies, with only a handful of recent publications seeking to unpack this critical junction. Yet an investigation of precisely this intersection has wide-ranging implications.

The following chapters investigate the literary and critical works of Berthold Auerbach, a prolific and wildly popular author of the mid-19th century village story best known for his Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten. In his critical writings and correspondences, Auerbach argues fervently for a tangibly dual Jewish and German identity. And yet, although Jewish characters do populate his literary Black Forest village alongside its Christian inhabitants, Auerbach’s collective stories are characterized by a prevailing lack of attention to what he elsewhere deems “confessional” differences within the village community. These stories are instead marked by a striking normalization of migration as central to the village experience. In Auerbach’s stories, mobility, even on a transatlantic scale, is a common facet of 19th-century life transcending other potentially conflicting associations; the various motivating factors behind his characters’ decisions affect rich and poor, Christian and Jew alike. Emigration and immigration form the two extremities of a transregional and at times transnational web of associative spaces, yet the bonds of community participation are preserved through access to specific, place-based knowledge tying together members of an increasingly disparate community. Auerbach’s Nordstetten is an already mobile village where both hero and outcast experience a reality in which “[up] and down the land there is no longer a single house in which one doesn’t have living proof” of migration and its discontents. At times strikingly nuanced representations of 19th-century migration are also accompanied by utopian imaginaries for a New World in which active participation and will suffice to re-forge the broken ties of an increasingly fragmented Europe. In these village stories, the village itself is often one of many competing loci, and its inhabitants are variably natives and strangers according to the arc of their individual narratives. Nevertheless, figures in these literary villages remain profoundly linked to the cycle of their local community and its landscape. In their totality, these stories reinforce the perception that a very real connection with specific place is and has been part of the migrant experience, as well.


80 *Es gibt aber auch landauf und landab kein Haus mehr, in dem man nicht den lebendigen Beweis vom Gegenteil hätte.*

Auerbach, Dorfgeschichten, 97.

With “Gegenteil” the author is referring here to the existence of America as migrant destination for the literary villagers of Nordstetten, see section 4.1 Migration is a Two-Way Street.
3: The Jewish German Backdrop: Once Upon a Time in the Black Forest

“[…] interaction or overdetermination often produces another third space. It does not necessarily produce some higher, more inclusive, or representative reality. Instead, it opens up a space that is sceptical of cultural totalization, of notions of identity which depend for their authority on being ‘originary’, or concepts of culture which depend for their value on being pure, or of tradition, which depends for its effectiveness, on being continuous.”
– Homi Bhabha

“The ‘politics of belonging’ is also an interesting framework precisely because it encompasses both the formal institutional and symbolic dimensions of political tension about these questions. […] But it is also about the informal symbolic, linguistic and cultural processes by which majority groups react to new groups, and by which these newcomers organize and defend their interests.”
– Adrian Favell and Andrew Geddes

In the previous chapters, I have outlined my position that an idyllic and homogenous rural Heimat has been central to constructs of Germanness even before the advent of the German nation-state. I have also proposed that despite centuries of politicization, literary representations of this rural imaginary have rarely been homogenous or static. I have argued, on the contrary, that recent investigations into the imaginary of the rural village suggest—even in its inception—a more pluralist vision of Germanness represented in its human landscapes: proposing the concept of layered representational place as a model for engaging with the often competing impulses of narratives set in and around the German-speaking village. Although the development of rural motifs and Realism have been topics of scholarly debate for centuries, scholarship on the 18th and 19th centuries—mostly rooted in traditional German philological research—is rarely brought into conversation with cultural studies-based research which tends to focus primarily on contemporary Germany. As prototypes for a nascent national consciousness, the Realist works of the mid-19th century provide a fascinating diversity of constructs for national belonging, representing important cultural artifacts for problematizing current constructs of German Leitkultur, as well as for deconstructing their historical development.

Although limited in its scope, the investigation outlined in the coming chapters presents one attempt at decentralizing and destabilizing exclusionary narratives of rural Germanness.

Vicki Spencer’s 2012 Herder’s Political Thought exposes Herder’s emphasis on the plurality of culture and the potential for infinite subcategorization as intrinsic to his definition of community, as well as his belief in the inherent interconnectivity of diverse cultures (70-75). This emphasis on geospatial specificity in establishing cultural idiosyncrasies was increasingly coopted by exclusionary 19th-century discourse:

Spencer, Herder’s Political Thought, 2012.

One exception to this rule is the aforementioned 2019 monograph, Dorfgeschichten: Wie die Welt zur Literatur kommt:

Twellmann, Dorfgeschichten, 2019.
through a re-examination of the scholarship and literature of the 19th-century German-language village story centering around the work of Jewish German author Berthold Auerbach. By highlighting recent trends in scholarship on this material, I hope to establish a basis for comparison between this earlier rural imaginary and that of the present day: investigating the foundation for a pluralist vision of German society through an investment in the nexus of migration narratives and village stories, and providing a historical basis for the multilocational consciousness of contemporary German literature in the topological specificity of the 19th-century literary village.

This research is divided over two chapters related to the works of Auerbach. Given the relative obscurity of the author in English-language scholarship, the first chapter provides historical context for the discussion of this material: framing both author and work in the discourse and materiality of the mid-19th century out of which they arose and tying this discussion back to the ideas of the preceding chapters. The second (Chapter Four) is broken into two subsections providing close-readings of several of the author’s village stories in which I seek to present an understanding of these works of short fiction as emblematic of Auerbach’s conception of a ‘participatory community,’ defined by recourse to local dialect and tradition, yet rooted in a transnational paradigm of migration and return. My close readings begin with a discussion of “Der Viereckig oder die amerikanische Kiste,” a short story concerning the ultimately failed emigration attempts of a prominent Nordstetten villager. In this subsection, I present Auerbach’s critical approach to migration not merely as a critique of 19th-century escapism, but as a renegotiation of the migratory process as central to the burgeoning German national identity. In the following subsection, I discuss the continuities imagined in the various stories contained in the cycle of “Der Tolpatsch,” the first character imagined in Auerbach’s long series of Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten, and one whose migration to found New Nordstetten on the Ohio River provides a continued frame of reference throughout the more than thirty years of subsequent short story production. In particular, I examine Auerbach’s early conceptualizations of a transatlantic continuity, and the recourse to folk knowledge and localized language as layerings of belonging to multiple representational places.

A fervent supporter of German unification and the project of the nation-state, Berthold Auerbach and his works may—at first glance—seem an odd choice for a comparative study in which I seek to unpack a layered and multilocational poetics of place which—in its totality—I argue moves beyond conceptions of the nation-state. Yet not unlike contemporary author José F. A. Oliver’s recent works (with which I bring Auerbach’s corpus into conversation in the subsequent chapters), Auerbach’s vision of the German village revolves around a fundamental defense of Germany’s plurality. This is a vision rooted in mobilities and continued participation in multiple, concurrent lifeworlds—a nexus facilitated on the one hand through recourse to localized traditions, and on the other, through engagement in transatlantic networks of communication. It is both defined and performed through place-specific language written onto rural landscapes in which belongings are subject to the overlapping value systems of divergent communities. Auerbach’s attention to specific language frames his character’s communal participation at home, just as it
provides recourse to their re-integration (or lack there of) in subsequent narratives of inter-German mobilities and transatlantic return.\(^8^3\)

As a Jewish German writer, Auerbach negotiated throughout his life a dual role as insider and outsider within both the communities (German and Jewish) he represented as writer and public intellectual. In the 19\(^{th}\) century, Jewish emancipation remained a contested issue, negotiated on both a regional and superregional level which allowed for varying degrees of mobility and socioeconomic agency, and Auerbach’s work spanned a period of rapid political and demographic transformation. The limitations on and regulation of Jewish mobility provided a profound backdrop for the author’s engagement with topoi of migration in the wider German-speaking world.\(^8^4\) In her 2006 *Erfolgreich gescheitert*, Kerstin Sarnecki maps Auerbach’s use of prominent themes in European Jewish cultural discourse of the time onto her discussions of his aspirations for wider society in the context of German unification. In doing so, she argues that: “In the same way that Jewish questions are transferred in his literature into non-Jewish contexts, this occurs as well, albeit in a less conscious way, in his personal experience and perception […].”\(^8^5\) Inspired by this line of argumentation, the current investigation highlights ‘stranger’ or outsider narratives within the complex of Auerbach’s village stories to explore thematic overlaps between depictions of migrants (both emigrants and immigrants) in the nexus of Auerbach’s literary village and his broader conceptualizations of social justice for Jewish Germans in his personal and critical writings.

Contrary to interpretations that Auerbach’s village stories provide a utopian vision for a social reality marked by blatant social injustices,\(^8^6\) other recent interventions in the scholarship suggest that a deeper investigation into the topic of migration in his stories might provide a relativizing motif for Auerbach’s investment in social justice. They also highlight Auerbach’s critique of migration as a solution to the overarching social problems within the German-speaking

---

\(^8^3\) For context, the fifth chapter of Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs’s 2003 *Voices of Modernity*, “Language, poetry, and Volk in eighteenth-century Germany,” provides excellent framing towards an understanding of the larger debates around language politics and emergent nationalism in the German-speaking world:

Bauman and Briggs, *Voices of Modernity*, 163-96.

\(^8^4\) The storied legacy of Jewish cultural contributions to the German-speaking regions of 19\(^{th}\)-century Europe provide a complex backdrop to any discussion of Auerbach and his works. For a by-needs incomplete overview of important literature on the subject, see:


\(^8^5\) So, wie er in seiner Literatur jüdische Fragen ins nichtjüdische Umfeld überträgt, geschieht dies auch, und offenbar weniger bewusst, in seinem persönlichen Erleben und Empfinden. Nicht nur das Merkmal der Heimatlosigkeit […]”


Examination of the emigration history of southwestern Germany has provided fascinating insight on the particular impact of migration on this region’s Jewish populations from the advent of the 19th century through to the more ubiquitous migrations of the midcentury. Historiography demonstrates the proportionally significant impact of German emigration on rural Jewish communities, particularly in the early years of mass emigration. In Auerbach’s work, the thematization of migration and its impact on the fictionalized village of Nordstetten frame the migrant condition as a universal experience, while the emphasis on the diasporic nature of the collective mid-19th-century German-speaking world resonates with an already global Jewish community, even as it imagines a more unified German cultural landscape through exile.

Schooled as a rabbi and Jewish scholar, and active as a translator throughout his career, Auerbach retained a sensitivity to language which manifests itself in the careful construct of his literary characters’ reported speech. This specificity—be it in the Swabian-accented dialogue of literary villagers, the Swabian dialect employed in their songs, or the attempts to mix American English into the German conversations of returning ‘strangers’—paves the way for a localized representation of village life in which language facilitates both arrival and disenfranchisement. At the same time, writing for a mixed reading audience across the German-speaking world, Auerbach strove to navigate a path of least resistance in his stylized use of the German language: glossing and translating unfamiliar regionalisms or describing the idiosyncrasies of his villagers’ speech patterns in narrative asides. The extension of Auerbach’s literary village of Nordstetten into the colonial sphere of frontier North America, where German-speaking immigrants coalesce in a new and unfamiliar environment, allows for reflection on both the commonalities and differences in their conceptions of a common Germanness.

While a pluralistic rural imaginary becomes increasingly plausible in our contemporary world of high-speed communication, commuting, and transnational migration and travel, I argue that the possibility of rural mobilities was already envisioned during the socio-political upheavals of Auerbach’s mid-19th century. Indeed, this is a vision Auerbach himself could only achieve through comparative representation of the deeply flawed German-speaking lands of his own biography and an imagined, participatory model for national community he envisions in the American Midwest. The characters of Auerbach’s village stories thus themselves negotiate the

---


89 The fourth chapter of Marcus Twellmann’s 2019 *Dorfgeschichten: Wie die Welt zur Literatur kommt* provides an overview of Auerbach’s language use (particularly the written use of Swabian dialect) as an extension of the author’s liberal political view on rural communities vis-à-vis the outside influence of state bureaucrats. Twellmann reads the pointed use of both localized dialect and localized traditions in Auerbach’s literature and critical writings as emblematic of the author’s attempts to define “communal life” [*Gemeindeleben*] through “practices of a communal decision-making process” [Praktiken der kommunalen Willensbildung].

Twellmann, *Dorfgeschichten*, 160.
differences between these two models through networks of displacement and homecoming: leaving from and returning to the village of Nordstetten in the Black Forest informed by the alienation of their migrant experiences.

Berthold Auerbach’s *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten* are collections of short fiction set in a fictionalized provincial landscape in and around the Swabian village of Nordstetten on the southwestern margins of the German-speaking world. The stories portray an idealized configuration of the rural idyll: Through confessional, often first-person narration, they profess to reveal the inner workings of life in a bucolic, agrarian community. On the other hand, the stories provide complex and often conflicting depictions of this rural life: presenting already mobile communities caught up in the processes of transformation in an inescapably globalizing world. The tensions in defining the representational place of Auerbach’s literary village require what Twellmann refers to as a “selective perception” [wählerische Wahrnehmung], a poetic Realism “which attempts a transfiguration of reality” [der eine Verklärung der Wirklichkeit anstrebt].

As aforementioned in preceding chapters, the rural aesthetic in which these stories participate developed in the latter half of the 18th century through intersections of Romantic-Nationalism which combined literary writing with amateur and professional interest in folklore and the customs of daily life in the agrarian class. This literature was produced—by the beginning of the 19th century—for a growing bourgeois readership concerned with their own perceived distance from the ‘natural’ world, and there remains a conscious and explicit effort in these works to represent their narratives as speaking for and of authentic, peripheral communities—a tendency Neumann and Twellmann have investigated in this literature as advocacy or intercession [Fürsprache] in their 2014 essay, “Marginalität und Fürsprache.” The village story provided a conceptual bridge between the so-called folk poetry [Volkspoesie] of the lower classes and the creative writing [Kunstpoesie] of the higher social milieu: Unifying these disparate traditions in the service of a proto-national folk consciousness was often the expressed desire of period authors.

---

90 Ibid, 154.


In his theoretical writings, Auerbach often problematized the concept of the Volk and their representation in period literature. In his earlier theoretical writings, the Volk represent the unity of nature and community. He presents folk life as the ‘unmediated experience of the present’—a problematic commodity for the bourgeois poet who must learn to negotiate the position of the folk through a symbiosis of insider and outsider perspectives: “[with Volk] we understand the large number of humanity whose lives and perspectives are drawn primarily from personal experience and the unmitigated present” [so mögen wir darunter diejenige große Zahl der Menschen verstehen, die ihre Lebens- und Weltanschauung vorherrschend aus selbständiger Erfahrung und der unmittelbaren Gegenwart zieht].

Auerbach, “Schrift und Volk,” 17.
Scholarly investigations into the cultural origin of the early village story reveal a web of competing social, political, and scholarly investments which simultaneously informed the development of the genre. The village story, as literature, negotiated between more scholarly investigations into folklore and the popular interest in a historic Germaness which was becoming increasingly caught up in period attempts to define a nascent national identity.93 In her historiography of folklore research, In Search of Authenticity, Regina Bendix describes a transformative struggle precisely to define the boundaries between artistic expression and authentic folk tradition around the turn of the 19th century.94 To this effect, Bendix observes that “one recognizes the bourgeois discomfort at identifying either with a heritage of high cultural, feudal, and individualistic authorship or a more democratic, but baser folk heritage.”95 As a popular medium, Germanist Bettina Wild defines the early German village story as “self-reflection for a self-emancipatory bourgeoisie […].”96 In the village story, the idealized folk culture of the early Romantic era was increasingly comingled with a growing 19th-century interest in the potential of literary Realism to mitigate the ‘realities’ of the human condition in an effort to evoke social change.97

Although a general investment in social advocacy has been explored by recent scholarship on a number of authors of 19th-century German Realism including Berthold Auerbach, as well as his contemporaries such as Theodor Fontane, Heinrich Heine, and Gottfried Keller,98 it is the position of this chapter that insufficient attention has been given to the role the village story also played in providing a pluralist self-imaginary for early German nationalism. Particularly in English-language research, its multivalent role as representational place has received little scholarly engagement. The village, with its profound interconnectivity and recourse to the discourses of authenticity and tradition—what Gottfried Keller deems “always the same nest” in

93 Twellmann, Dorfgeschichten, 28.
95 Ibid, 47.
96 Medium der Selbsterflexion des sich emanzipierenden Bürgertums

Wild, Topologie, 36.

97 In the essay “Kontingenz als Problem des bürgerlichen Realismus,” Michael Andermatt argues that the German concept of literary “Verklärung” [transfiguration] lies at the heart of 19th-century projects of literary Realism, explaining that “Transfiguration” demands that ‘true’ Realism not only turn one’s attention to reality, but also simultaneously remain subordinate to a central ideal [Verklärung stellt die Forderung auf, dass sich der wahre Realismus nicht nur der Wirklichkeit allein zuwenden dürfe, sondern sich zugleich auch einem zentrierenden Ideal unterzuordnen habe]:

Andermatt, “Kontingenz,” 44.

the preface to his 1856 collection of village stories, *Die Leute von Seldwyla*, remains fertile grounds for exploration. For, in defiance of his own declaration of the village’s static nature, Keller also relates how the trials and tribulations of his fictive villagers have wide-ranging implications in an increasingly mobile society—“one meets Seldwylans in the most disparate parts of the world […] in Australia, in California, in Texas, as in Paris or Constantinople […]” The world of the 19th century depicted here is not yet a global village, but villagers already inhabit an increasingly globalized world. Inspired by the substantial increase, in recent years, of German-language scholarly publications on both authors, this chapter reads works by Auerbach (and Keller) as foregrounding the village not as a nostalgic repertory, nor as poetic escapism, but as a tangible medium for direct intervention in the construct of an early global consciousness, embedded in the ‘national’ characters their stories helped define.

Although Keller’s works remain among the most prominent examples of German-language literary Realism to this day, particularly in the American context, Auerbach’s popular village stories have largely been neglected by recent scholarship, in defiance (or ignorance) of contemporary German-language research increasingly exploring his significant impact on the development of European Realism as a whole. Yet even in the German context, reinvestment in Auerbach scholarship has been a development of recent decades, with the taint of antisemitism and racialized nationalism long overshadowing the Jewish German author’s definitive contributions to the German rural imaginary.

In the English-speaking context, if at all, Auerbach’s legacy lives on in the extant records of his friendships and correspondences with many of the leading writers of the time (Keller included). Vital to my discussion of the author is a

---

99 *immer das gleiche Nest*


100 *in den verschiedensten Weltteilen kann man Seldwyler treffen […] in Australien, in Kalifornien, in Texas, wie in Paris oder Konstantinopel*

Ibid, 12.

101 Keller was Swiss, after all, and his stories are set in the fictive landscape of Alemannic Switzerland. Nevertheless, the author spent much of his young adulthood in Germany, and many of his most memorable works, including *Die Leute von Seldwyla*, were written during his residence in Berlin.

102 The lack of contemporary, English-language scholarly interest in Auerbach’s work stands at odds with his tremendous period popularity in the 19th century on both sides of the English-speaking Atlantic:

Twellmann, *Dorfgeschichten*, 10.

103 Regenbogen, “Kultur Kampf,” 421.

104 The 2016 *Gottfried Keller-Handbuch*, for example, feature’s Auerbach’s critique prominently in the “Entstehungsgeschichte und Publikationen zu Lebzeiten” subsection (4.1) of the chapter on *Die Leute von Seldwyla*: “4: Die Leute von Seldwyla (1856, 1873/74)” by Alexander Honold. Honold goes so far as to assert that “Berthold Auerbach’s essay, “Gottfried Keller of Zurich,” published on April 17, 1856, in the *Ausburger Allgemeine Zeitung* led to Keller’s breakthrough as a novella writer” [Den Durchbruch Kellers als Novellendichter bewirkte Berthold Auerbachs Aufsatz Gottfried Keller von Zürich in der Ausburger Allgemeinen Zeitung vom 17. April 1856]:
reassessment of Auerbach’s work which re-acknowledges his significant presence in 19th-century literary discourse (and contemporary German-language scholarship’s interest therein), reframing his literary contributions through an investigation of his pluralist representations of the rural German-speaking world.

Fig. 1: Auerbach’s works remained tremendously popular through the beginning of the 20th century. Here: “Der letzte Heimatstag eines Auswanderers” by Berthold Auerbach, in Hausbücherei der “frischen Resi,” a popular series of early 20th-century publications by Vereinigte Margerine-Werke of Nuremberg (exact publication dates are not printed on the chapbooks, although tentative dating has been suggested by museum curators). These small volumes contain recipes, helpful household tips, illustrations, as well as literary works by authors such as Jeremias Gotthelf, Edgar Allen Poe, and E.T.A. Hoffmann. The collection helps document the incredibly broad circulation Auerbach’s literary works received throughout the German-speaking world, and the wide range of contexts in which they were received (courtesy of the Berthold-Auerbach-Museum, Horb am Neckar; photo my own).

Despite a complex biography as an author who began his educational trajectory in training to become a rabbi and whose initial publications include a biography of Spinoza, collected German translations of Spinoza’s work, and a monograph of literary criticism entitled *Das Judenthum und die neueste Literatur* [Judaism and Contemporary Literature] (1836), many critics have been quick to dismiss Berthold Auerbach’s alleged lack of literary treatment of the Jewish condition in his popular Black Forest village stories. Others have, however, argued more


105 Spinoza: Ein historischer Roman (Stuttgart 1837); Auerbach also published the first (if now somewhat contested) German-language translation of the philosopher’s collected Latin-language writings, B. V. Spinoza’s sämmtliche Werke: Aus dem Lateinischen mit dem Leben Spinoza’s (Stuttgart 1841). See David J. Wertheim’s “Spinoza's Eyes: The Ideological Motives of German-Jewish Spinoza scholarship” (2006):


106 Reprinted alongside numerous other important contributions by the author to 19th-century literary criticism in the 2014 anthology *Berthold Auerbach: Schriften zur Literatur*:


107 Bettina Wild cites Ralf Georg Bogner’s 2010 essay “Demaskierte ländliche Idylle. Berthold Auerbachs Dorfgeschichte Der Lehnhold,” when she concludes: “As Bogner has already stressed, the confessions of the figures in Auerbach’s village stories play no significant role. This is not only true for Jewish religious affinity, but also for
recently that the apparent lack of attention lent to specific questions of religion or culture in Auerbach’s tales points instead to his attempt to portray a unifying vision for the German nation in its diversity.\textsuperscript{108} It is the latter position which the following chapter seeks to expand upon through a review of recent scholarship and close-readings of several of Auerbach’s village stories.

The Nordstetten of Auerbach’s village stories is not simply a representation of the historical place, but rather a representational place constructed out of many overlapping constituent parts, including its human landscape. Figures of strangers are inherently tied to such constructs of social space—a reality already evident in Georg Simmel’s 1908 essay “The Stranger” ([\textit{Exkurs über den Fremden}] originally published in the 9\textsuperscript{th} chapter of his work \textit{Soziologie} in a chapter titled “Space and the Spatial Orientations of Society” [\textit{Der Raum und die räumlichen Ordnungen der Gesellschaft}]). In this work, Simmel identifies how the figure of the stranger provides for a dialectic understanding of the greater community dynamic; he describes the way in which this figure “constellates the unity of proximity and distance encapsulated in every human relation: the distance within this relationship keeps immediacy remote, but the foreignness draws this remoteness closer.”\textsuperscript{109}

Yet Jews, in Auerbach’s literature, rarely occupy the role of the stranger—though stranger figures do permeate his works. In the chapter, “Dorfgeschichte: The German Village Tale” from her comparative work, \textit{European Local-Color Literature} (2010), Josephine Donovan highlights the different function of those few Jewish supporting characters who do appear in two of Auerbach’s longer \textit{Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten} “Der Lauterbacher” and “Ivo der Hajrle” (1843). These narratives depict the Jewish villagers as inherent members of the community of Nordstetten, capable of exercising crucial influence in communal life, despite (more than) tell-tale signs of their disenfranchisement. On the one hand, “Der Lauterbacher” depicts Nordstetten as a community in which “Jews […] sat here and drank with their fellow Christian citizens; the only difference was that they did not smoke because it was the Sabbath.”\textsuperscript{110} On the other hand, this

affiliation to the various Christian confessions” [\textit{Wie auch Bogner betont, spielt die Konfession der Figuren in Auerbachs Dorfgeschichten eine kaum beachtenswerte Rolle. Dies gilt freilich nicht nur für die jüdische Religionszugehörigkeit, sondern auch für die Zuordnung zu den unterschiedlichen christlichen Konfessionen}]


\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Die Einheit von Nähe und Entferntheit, die jegliches Verhältnis zwischen Menschen enthält, ist hier zu einer, am kürzesten so zu formulierenden Konstellation gelangt: die Distanz innerhalb des Verhältnisses bedeutet, dass der Nahe fern ist, das Fremdsein aber, dass der Ferne nah ist.}

Simmel, “\textit{Exkurs über den Fremden},” 509.

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Die Juden, die großenteils die ganze Woche nicht zu Hause sind, saßen hier unter ihren christlichen Mitbürgern und tranken; nur mit dem einzigen Unterschiede, daß sie, weil Sabbat war, nicht dabei rauchten.}

Citation from the 1855 single-volume publication including both the first and second volumes of Auerbach’s \textit{Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten}:

Auerbach, \textit{Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten} [b], 388.
same mixed company at the local pub can be overheard discussing the obvious differences in their political agency, observing at one point that “the Jews in Alsace would rather let themselves be massacred than become German; over there they’re coequal with the Christian citizens. We [German Jews] pay the same taxes, serve as soldiers alongside Christians, and still only have half their rights.” This is, of course, a very pointed critique of the Jewish German condition which belies the otherwise peaceable coexistence Auerbach paints through the relations depicted in his village stories—but it is not an isolated occurrence.

Later discussions in the stories of the Jewish German condition reinforce these observations in the context of transatlantic migration which portrays a religious equality enjoyed on the American frontier in striking contrast to the conditions in the German-speaking world. Nevertheless, individual characters in the context of the fictionalized village of Nordstetten seem largely to escape the antisemitism they discuss in passing observations—at least during the course of the individual stories’ narratives in which they largely remain integral members of a diverse rural community. Donovan’s reading suggests that throughout his literary corpus, “Auerbach obviates the later stereotyped association of Jews with urban modernity. In his stories Jews are country people and it is the urban-educated avatar of modernity who is anti-Semitic, not the local villagers.” This contrast reinforces my own position that Auerbach’s Nordstetten presents a layering of representational place: revealing the underlying violence of the mid-19th century German-speaking world, while creating an overlay of a participatory village space in which such realities find little place. Through the introduction of a migration narrative, Auerbach’s stories then permit these layers to intersect in the comparative imaginary of a transatlantic community.

Auerbach’s village stories are, in fact, populated by numerous Jewish figures, yet the significance of religious difference itself plays little direct role in his constructs of village life. The conflicts and turmoil of both spatial and cultural displacement play out, instead, in the generic figure of the recent migrant whose observations in transit relate the continuity and disjuncture of

111 Ja, und die vielen Juden im Elsaß ließen sich eher massakrieren, ehe sie deutsch werden thäten; drüben sind sie vollkommen gleich mit den christlichen Bürgern; wir, wir bezahlen alle Steuern gleich, werden Soldaten wie die Christen und haben doch nur die halben Rechte.

Ibid, 389.

112 Donovan, European Local-Color, 111.

Although Donovan references the many altruistic reflections of the protagonist, Ivo, during his encounters with Jewish villagers, the excerpted “Der Brief aus Amerika” presented in Bausinger’s edition also contains additional, explicit references to German-Jewish relations which are examined in more detail below.

Donovan’s analysis of the Jewish figures in these two particular village stories raises additional interest for the modern reception of Auerbach’s village stories: Both stories she cites are conspicuously absent from the Reclam publication of selected Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten (1984), as well as the more recent critical volume edited by folklorist Hermann Bausinger in which only a short excerpt of “Ivo der Hajrle” (as an addendum to the preceding story, “Der Tolpatsch”) is reproduced (2011). Although several comprehensive reprints of the initial volumes of Auerbach’s work have been made available in recent decades, republications of the entire ten-volume collection remain absent from common circulation—a deficiency which has been at least partially assuaged by commendable recent efforts to provide digital or eBook versions of Auerbach’s entire anthology. As of 2017, a Kindle edition of the ten-volume collection is available for download courtesy of Musaicum Books.
Auerbach instead highlights the experience of increasing marginalization through his evocation of pan-German migration and the social constructs of the outsider such mobilities activate. In doing so, Auerbach’s corpus maps an early topology for what contemporary discourse might deem ‘glocal’ perspective—outlining a particularly Swabian-accented vision for German diasporic community, though his writing only hints at establishing a unique poetics for performing this complex positionality.

Particularly in light of period discourse surrounding the social integration of Jewish populations in German-speaking Europe, Auerbach’s emphasis on the migratory figure—at once an informed insider, but simultaneously held at arm’s length from the inner functioning of the community—creates a discursive tension through which to investigate the implications of multiple, at times conflicting, identities and belongings for his protagonists as they negotiate the migratory process. The layered result is a strikingly contemporary representation of social life, an element which Bettina Wild draws upon in her 2012 comparative analysis of Auerbach’s village stories and Edgar Reitz’s film series *Heimat*, “Kollektive Identitätssuche im Mikrokosmos Dorf.” The currency of both narratives, for Wild, hinges on the prevalence of the mobile figure against the topology of the allegedly static village.

This figure of the mobile and informed outsider is central to Auerbach’s larger project of folk literature—on both a symbolic as well as practical concept, his analyses of literature demand the macrocosmic in the microcosm:

Static and self-contained naivety has not surmounted its own world, it has not yet mastered it, but remains rather, inside itself like a product of nature. Only after one has ventured outside oneself—given oneself over or lost oneself to the outside world—can one return with conscious mind to one’s own, just as one understands and employs more poignantly one’s mother tongue after exploring foreign language and expression: Those who do not depart never return home.

From the onset, the large influx of German-speaking migrants created a social and political backlash in North America, facilitating the creation of the so-called “Know Nothing Party”—a U.S. far-right and anti-immigrant political movement, as well as facilitating widespread popular resentment against recent immigrants. It also had profound and far-reaching implications for the development of U.S. political discourse and civil participation in the years leading up to German national unification. For a brief, if illuminating English-language overview of German immigration to the U.S. during this period, see:

Efford: *German Immigrants*, 2013.


Die still in sich ruhende Naivetät hat ihre eigene Welt noch nicht überwunden, sie beherrscht sie nicht; sie steht in sich fest wie ein reines Naturerzeugnis. Erst wenn man sich entäußert, an die Außenwelt hingegeben oder verloren, kehrt man bewußten Geistes wieder zur eigenen Welt zurück, wie man die Muttersprache eindringlicher versteh und gebraucht, nachdem man fremde Sprache und Ausdrucksweise erforscht hat. – Wer nicht hinauskommt, kommt nicht heim.

Emphasis on the utility of the outsider dynamic permeates Auerbach’s critical writings in *Schrift und Volk* (1846). Mobility is intrinsic to even the most grounded understanding of German society, and the successful folk poet [Volksdichter] is one who has transcended physical and social borders, returning to highly specific, localized discourse informed by critical perspectives on both the self and the other. Auerbach demonstrates an investment in defining the cultural parameters of the *Volk* as both people and nation throughout his critical writings, an element which I argue underscores much of his literary corpus, as well.

Writing during the nascent years of German nationalism, this investment in defining *völkisch* tradition was not yet defiled by the subsequent association of this discourse with exclusionary, racialized nationalism. Rather, as a Jewish German writer, Auerbach endeavored to develop a literary platform for representing the commonalities encapsulated in his inclusive vision for German tradition: “Into the new national character both overarching commonality and external national difference must be peacefully absorbed.” From a contemporary perspective, his positions seem surprisingly anachronistic, optimistic in their contributions to the developing discourses of national identity, though such sentiments were not yet excluded from period constructs of the German nation.

In Bettina Wild’s larger contribution to the history of the village story, the 2011 *Topologie des ländlichen Raums*, Wild focuses time and again on the close connection between early German-language village stories and the impetus for social progress championed by many writers of the early *Vormärz* period. This emphasis was not lost on critics of the time. The focus on what Wild deems the acquisition of “poetic human rights” [*poetischer Menschenrechte*] for the lower milieus is also thematized in the work of authors associated with the *Junges Deutschland* movement, including Heinrich Heine, whose own picaresque forays into the rural landscape are punctuated by a somber ethnographic interest in the practices of everyday life among the rural, working poor. Heine’s 1826 *Harzreise*, for all its blistering satire of student life, offers not only a sympathetic portrayal of the villagers who cross its narrator’s path, but interactions with the residents of the Harz Mountains form the basis for many ruminations on the conditions of the larger Prussian state, the origin of its poetry, and the current reception of its cultural and political legacy.

---

118 *In das neuere Volksthum muß das über ihm stehende Allgemeine und das außer ihm stehende national Fremde friedlich aufgenommen werden.*

Auerbach, “Schrift und Volk,” 32.

In his 1836 Das Judenthum und die neueste Literatur, Auerbach voices support for what he sees as Heine’s commitment to combining poetry with his bid for social and political justice. Auerbach writes:

H. Heine provided the initiative for a new artistic epoch. – The poet and philosopher was no longer permitted to hermetically seal his soul against the sorrows and hope of the time, but rather these must—under the prism of a higher intuition—radiate back from their formation when the present turns her eye upon them—tearful with pain and hope.\(^{120}\)

Although the social-political responsibility of literature is tantamount to Auerbach’s vision for poetic Realism, he does not remain without critique for what he views as Heine and his contemporaries’ support for the social emancipation of Jews in the German-speaking world. Das Judenthum contains considerable critique for what Auerbach views as exclusionary practices of integration which would demand the forfeiture of religious autonomy as the price for overtures of equality. For Auerbach, Heine and the Junges Deutschland movement offer only a partial solution to the struggle for Jewish emancipation: promoting social integration while demanding in exchange a renegotiation of Jewish cultural and religious freedom. This is a common critique which Auerbach levels against other movements sympathetic to the struggle for Jewish emancipation, and one informed by Auerbach’s own deeply held convictions concerning his personal identity as both German and Jew.

It is critical to recognize here that at the time of Auerbach’s composition, there was as-yet no German nation-state. There existed, rather, only decentralized clusters of German-speaking political entities whose emphasis on regional and confessional differences relegated all notions of German cultural cohesion to a nebulous cultural imaginary. Given the relatively short span of years in which the burgeoning discourse of German nationalism collapsed into our contemporary understanding of völkisch, antisemitic rhetoric, it was perhaps prescient of Auerbach to adopt this uncompromising position on Jewish cultural autonomy. After all, only a few decades later and well within Auerbach’s lifetime, the nationalist historian Heinrich von Treitschke would also demand of Germany’s Jews that they “should become Germans. They should quite simply feel that they are Germans—unbeschadet ihres Glaubens und ihrer alten heiligen Erinnerungen […] Die Juden sind unser Unglück!”\(^{121}\) In his insistence on negotiating both Jewish and German identity, Auerbach

\(^{120}\) H. Heine gab die Initiative einer neuen Kunstepoche. – Nicht mehr hermetisch verschließen durfte der Dichter und Philosoph seine Seele gegen die Leiden und Hoffnung der Zeit, sondern diese mußten, unter das Prisma der höhern Anschauung gestellt, zurückstrahlen aus ihren Gebilden, wenn die Gegenwart ihr von Hoffnung und Schmerz bethärmtes Auge darauf richten sollte.


\(^{121}\) sie sollen Deutsche werden, sich schlicht und recht als Deutsche fühlen—unbeschadet ihres Glaubens und ihrer alten heiligen Erinnerungen […] Die Juden sind unser Unglück!

Treitschke, “Unsere Aussichten,” 573-75.
presented an early plea for the preservation of precisely the kind of “cultural mix” the architects of an antisemitic German nationalism feared.¹²²

The plurality of German national identity is a position Auerbach defends in many of his correspondences with other politically engaged writers of the time, as well.¹²³ In his 1839 letter to a French contemporary writer, Alexander Weill, Auerbach qualifies his defense of German literature through an exposition on German cultural plurality (and its precarity), describing himself contentiously as a “stepson” of the German fatherland even as he defends literature’s potential to shape the national consciousness:

Your animosity against the divided and unhappy Germany seems to me completely unjust. Those “German activities,” as you call them, among whose thousand fibers we are bound, are stressful and present enough. It is not against German literature, but against those henchmen of its soul that anger must be directed: both official and unofficial. I tell you this to safeguard you against injustice and remorse. It seems strange to me when I, a Jew, a stepson of the fatherland, take up its defense: for you do not know its entirety, you do not know what a stimulating and uniformly diverse cultural [Bildung] climate prevails in Germany; out in the country, in small towns, where one knows nothing of Mundt’s¹²⁴ absurdity and coquetry; there culture [Bildung] has its deepest roots. Political culture [Die politische Bildung]? Well yes, that is now as though one would demand of the Jews that they be free and noble men before they be emancipated […]¹²⁵

Key here is Auerbach’s foregrounding of cultural expressions “out in the country, in small towns” as more diverse than their urban counterparts—not yet tainted by exclusionary discourse he views as originating from urban political culture. The province, particularly in Auerbach’s literary cosmology, is a diverse repository for communal sentiments based on personal, biographic

¹²² What Treitschke calls: ein Zeitalter deutsch-jüdischer Mixcultur

¹²³ Ibid, 573.

¹²³ Despite the official edict of Jewish emancipation enacted by the state of Württemberg in 1828 and the later provisions of the Frankfurt Parliament of 1848, the question of practical Jewish social, political, and religious emancipation in the German-speaking world remained integral to Auerbach’s evaluation of German identity throughout his career as a writer, publisher, and critic.

¹²⁴ Theodor Mundt (1808-1861), literary critic and member of the Junges Deutschland movement.


experience, and not dictated notions of political affiliation—representational place as a measure of the distance between practice and ideology.

In this cosmology, the village represents for Auerbach a discursive space of participatory community. In *Schrift und Volk*, he describes the lived experience of village life as: “A small world, easily negotiated by the mind. One knows people by name and character. In personal interactions, greetings and addresses, one has a word for others, a relationship to them.” Set in a fictionalized version of the real-life village of his birth, Auerbach’s village stories are negotiated with a personal familiarity which belies their literary underpinnings and anticipates Oliver’s concept of *Überschaubarkeit*—a key interpretive factor for the unpacking of community participation in Oliver’s Andalusian Black Forest village.

In recent years, particularly in light of the interest in memory studies in the postwar German context, increasing attention has been paid to the role of the personal narrative in affecting transformations in broader cultural memory. Referring to the conceptualizations of biography in her work on Holocaust memory, Gabriele Rosenthal writes:

> The conception of the biography as a social portrait—constructing both social reality as well as the empirical and experiential world of the subject, standing in dialectic relation to autobiographical experiences, and continually affirming and transforming socially-constructed frameworks—provides the opportunity to approach answers to one of the most fundamental questions of sociology: the relationship between the individual and society.\(^\text{128}\)

Posited as both confessional and self-revelatory, there is a narrative of the autobiographical which lends perceived authenticity to many of Auerbach’s village stories, in which a familiar narrator depicts the fictionalized village of Nordstetten as if populated with long-lost friends.\(^\text{129}\) Indeed,

---

126 *Hier ist eine kleine Welt, die leicht vom Geiste bewältigt werden kann. Mann kennt die Menschen alle bei Namen und selbst in ihren Verhältnissen. Wie man sich beim Begegnen grüßt und anspricht, so hat jeder ein Wort für den andern, eine Beziehung zu ihm.*


127 In its dictionary definition, *Überschaubarkeit* means straightforwardness, candidness; but literally (and in the Oliverian sense, also) the ability to achieve an overview / be seen from above.

128 *Die Konzeption der Biographie als soziales Gebilde, das sowohl soziale Wirklichkeit als auch Erfahrungs- und Erlebniswelten der Subjekte konstruiert und das in dem dialektischen Verhältnis von lebensgeschichtlichen Erlebnissen und Erfahrungen und gesellschaftlich angebotenen Mustern sich ständig neu affirmiert und transformiert, bietet die Chance, den Antworten auf eine der Grundfragen der Soziologie, dem Verhältnis von Individuum und Gesellschaft, näher zu kommen.*


129 In Auerbach’s first village story, “Der Tolpatsch,” discussed below in 4.1: Migration is a Two-Way Street, the first-person narrator introduces its protagonist, in exemplary fashion, with the opening lines: “I see you before me, you old klutz […]” [*Ich sehe dich vor mir, guter Tolpatsch*], continually addressing the character with familiar, second-person asides.
some recent explorations of migration in Auerbach’s writings have concentrated on his personal biography, emphasizing the lived experience of migration and its repercussions as the basis for the skeptical and often harsh representations of America in his writings. Biographical readings of Auerbach’s migration narratives stress the significance of transatlantic migration in his immediate family: His younger brother, cousin, nephew, and eventually his own son relocated to America, and his critical distance from prevailing celebrations of emigration to the New World have been read as negotiations of his own painful familial separations.\footnote{130}

But semi-biographical narration was also an inherent feature of a burgeoning literary movement grounded in representations of everyday life, and the impulse to represent a tangible experience of rural life extends beyond the autobiographical in Auerbach’s extensive corpus of literary works. Neumann and Twellmann describe how “Multiple marginalizations inform the style of Auerbach’s advocacy [Fürsprache]”\footnote{131} while Wild suggests, instead, that “in writing about his (home) village Auerbach developed the topoi for the realistic depiction of rural space.”\footnote{132} It is the position of this chapter that Auerbach’s presentation of Nordstetten as a representational place must be read in the broader context of his writings as a defense of German pluralism, informed by biographic experience, yet recontextualized for a popular readership. In the composition of his village stories, Auerbach provides a blueprint for the individual experience of German life within a developing national consciousness. Such a reading is supported in his personal correspondences, such as the declaration in his 1843 letter to the poet Ferdinand Freiligrath in which Auerbach (following the publication of his initial volume of Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten) proclaims: “It is therefore particularly dear to me, I tell you this freely, that hatefulness can no longer so easily label Jews as strangers [Fremde]. I believe I am a German, and I believe I have proven it […]”\footnote{133} Literary production, for Auerbach, is intertwined with a defense of the diversity of human experience and his unwillingness to define the nascent national community along exclusionary lines. Decentralizing the Jewish inhabitants of his village stories and emphasizing, instead, the struggles of German migrants recast as stranger figures provides the discursive space for Auerbach’s negotiation of Germanness.

The personal, the local, take precedence as inherent building blocks of Auerbach’s German nation, and it is through a web of unique individual relations that his constructs of a participatory

\begin{quote}
Auerbach, Dorfgeschichten, 150.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Die mehrfache Marginalität bedingt auch die Art und Weise der Fürsprache Auerbachs.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Neumann and Twellmann, “Fürsprache,” 490.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
...im Schreiben über sein (Heimat-)Dorf hat Auerbach die Topoi der realistischen Darstellung des ländlichen Raumes entwickelt.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Wild, “Identitätssuche,” 263.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Es ist mir deshalb besonders lieb, Dir sag’ ich es frei, daß die Gehässigkeit die Juden nicht mehr so leicht Fremde heißen kann. Ich glaube, ich bin ein Deutscher, ich glaube es bewiesen zu haben […]\end{quote}
community are formed. The village, as the paradigm of communal engagement, provides—in literary form—the space to negotiate social dynamics. The arbitrariness of disenfranchisement in the literary village of Nordstetten points to those transcendent aspects in the struggle for (Jewish) emancipation. In the dynamic relations between individual characters, Auerbach endeavors to establish a literary basis from which to affect broader social change. Auerbach was not the only Jewish author to compose German-language village stories, but the immense popularity of his Black Forest village stories remains a testament to his ability to transcend the confessional borders of his times, presenting an idealized literary setting in which the religious affinities of its characters remain secondary to their common identity as residents of the fictionalized village of Nordstetten.

Hans Otto Horch also acknowledges that Auerbach’s representation of German society was shaped by a real-life investment in his childhood home: that the perception of his rural upbringing as

Auerbach, “Freiligrath,” 161.

134 In *Schrift und Volk* Auerbach describes the experience of a rural childhood as the basis for inspired engagement with the totality of the human experience: “When we examine the notion that the fulfilled human spirit must have internalized in the individual the experiences and the totality of humanity’s cultural refinement, then we must recognize in the life of a village child a living representation of the first levels of human and humanity’s development” [Wenn wir den Satz im Auge behalten, daß der erfüllte Menschengeist individuell den Bildungsgang der gesamten Menschheit durchlaufen und dessen Ergebnisse in sich verarbeitet haben muß, so mögen wir im Leben des Dorfkindes ein lebendiges Abbild der ersten Stufe menschlicher und menschheitlicher Entwicklung erkennen].

Auerbach, “Schrift und Volk,” 23.

135 Neumann and Twellmann describe this phenomenon as follows:

> “Literary village stories have in common with anthropologically-oriented forms of social historiography a kind of constitution of subject-matter whose focus on the local social context is not exhausted at the margins of historical events. Connected with this orientation towards the village space is a doubled narrative reference to both center and periphery.”

[Mit den literarischen Dorfgeschichten haben anthropologisch orientierte Formen der Sozialgeschichtsschreibung zum anderen eine Weise der Gegenstandskonstitution gemeinsam, die sich nicht in der Fokussierung auf einen lokalen Sozial zusammenhang am Rande des historischen Geschehens erschöpft. Verbunden ist mit der Hinwendung zum dörflichen Raum eine doppelte Bezugsnahme des Erzählens auf das Zentrum und auf die Peripherie.]

Neumann and Twellmann, “Fürsprache,” 479.


137 This representation stands in marked contrast to the efforts of other German-Jewish writers of the time such as Leopold Kompert, whom literary historian Florian Krobb has described in his 2000 monograph *Selbstdarstellungen: Untersuchungen zur deutsch-jüdischen Erzählliteratur im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* as having “freed the literary treatment of the ghetto from historical or satirical distancing and, as a Jewish village story, transformed period taste by a conversion of the literary mainstream” [die literarische Behandlung des Ghettos aus der historischen oder satirischen Distanzierung befreite und als jüdische Dorfgeschichte dem Zeitgeschmack anverwandelt und in den literarischen Mainstream überführte] – an achievement Krobb notes, was lauded by Auerbach in his own literary critique of Kompert’s work:

harmonious was fundamental to Auerbach’s later self-fashioning of the rural idyll in his literature.\footnote{138} This biographical reading of Auerbach’s cosmology begins to work towards a reevaluation of the author’s representation of German-Jewish relations in his Black Forest village stories, though Horch ultimately contends that Auerbach’s (perhaps overly) optimistic representations lead to a failed or at least fallaciously utopian vision of Jewish rural life—a position Horch defines against the Adornian notion of ‘false reconciliation.’\footnote{139} At the same time, one must also recognize that the rural regions of modern-day Baden-Württemberg represent one of the historic centers of Jewish life in Central Europe, providing a broad spectrum of Jewish German experience since at least the end of the eleventh century.\footnote{140}

Pleasant though Auerbach’s memories of his early childhood may have been, in his adult life he was no stranger to vehement, public discrimination. The careful construct of social relations, and the decentralization of Jewish figures in his literary Nordstetten do not, in my reading, negate the experience of displacement, nor the struggle to define commonality present in Auerbach’s village stories. Auerbach’s characters remain conflicted, negotiating various constructs of integration and difference as they strive to inhabit an increasingly mobile construct of village life. Often, their experience is defined by isolation, relocation, and new beginnings. It is this mobile re-imagining of the individual against the backdrop of larger demographic change which defines community throughout Auerbach’s village stories, coupled with his recourse to local customs, shared traditions of folk music and poetry, and the landed habitus of agrarian life.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Fig. 2: Berthold-Auerbach-Straße near its intersection with Heinrich-Heine-Straße in contemporary Nordstetten (2018).}
\end{figure}

\footnote{138}{“Definitive for Auerbach’s self-conception is his origin in the village of Nordstetten, located near Horb in the Swabian Black Forest, a village in which the numerous Jewish inhabitants (approximately 40%) apparently lived under tolerable social and religious relations with the Swabian peasants.” \textit{[Entschiedend für Auerbachs Selbstverständnis ist seine Herkunft aus dem bei Horb im schwäbischen Schwarzwald gelegenen Dorf Nordstetten, in dem die zahlreichen jüdischen Bewohner (etwa 40%) mit den schwäbischen Bauern sozial wie religiös in einem offenbar erträglichen Verhältnis gelebt haben.]}}

\footnote{139}{That is, that art represents a false marriage of the ideal with the reality it claims to represent:}

\footnote{140}{Adorno, “Erpreßte Versöhnung.” 1958.}

My reading argues that Auerbach’s village stories must be read in their totality: against his substantial critical writings, his personal letters, as well as the critiques leveled against his work on the grounds of his Jewish heritage and identity. Auerbach employs this motivation as a rallying point for his own criticism, as well as a means to discuss his own complex relationship with remaining inclusively both Jewish and German. In an assessment of Jewish German identity vis-à-vis other prominent religions of the time, Auerbach writes of sympathetic allies among the German Pietists: “They call us a nation [Volk] and are then just a bit incensed when we counter this with the proper assertion that we have long been no more than a confession.”¹⁴¹ Auerbach’s insistence on confessional difference as external to his construct of national identity reinforces his conviction in an underlying commonality grounded in participatory communal life.

This conviction was tantamount to Auerbach’s lifelong struggle to construct a reconciled sense of belonging through literature in which the social realities of his own place and time could be reimagined. Auerbach’s personal vision for Jewish emancipation existed in the recognition of a fundamental unity between Germany’s diverse populations and a reconfiguration of German Jews as Jewish Germans: an integral component of a shared national community which he conceptualizes through the participatory community of the village. The changing village of the mid-19th century provided a conceptual space for the construct of this narrative, actualized in the form of his interwoven village stories. Motifs of migration in these stories offered a relativizing construct of communal affinity to Auerbach’s contemporary reading audience, with stories of emigrants and the continuity of their relationship to Nordstetten providing a global perspective in serial form. Competing representations of America throughout these stories allow for varied imaginaries of its own nascent national identity, as well: comprised at once of participatory immigrants from the entire world, yet capable of reconstituting the confluence of lives from one single community in the Black Forest.

¹⁴¹ Sie nennen uns „Volk,“ und ärger sich nur ein wenig, wenn wir ihnen die richtige Behauptung entgegenstellen, daß wir schon längst nur Confession sind.

Appearing in numerous forms of publication from individual tales to collected volumes, included in almanacs, and accompanied by the works of other authors in local periodicals and advertisement pamphlets, Auerbach’s work reached a diverse German-reading audience. The omnipresence of his writings positioned Auerbach among the first authors of his time to successfully negotiate a multiplicity of media, yet this savvy also earned him the enmity of other less successful writers of his time.\textsuperscript{142} Simple, if at times didactic, in their serial form, his village stories provide windows into the interconnected lives of their protagonists which increase in complexity through their multiple iterations. Readings of any single story are complicated by the re-emergence of key characters in later village stories, some separated by decades. Despite a certain naivety which the contemporary 21\textsuperscript{st}-century reader might discern in the narrative styles of individual stories, Auerbach himself never conceived of his popular fiction solely as entertainment for his reading audience.\textsuperscript{143} In their entirety they paint a complex and hopeful vision for a community in active negotiation of the structural transformations of impending modernity.

Through their accessibility—both physical and interpretive: the wide-range of subject matters and material contexts—Auerbach presented his readership with what Kit Belgum deems an ultimate “literary goal […] to directly and openly confront the core problems of his century”\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{142} Regenbogen, “Kultur Kampf,” 422.

\textsuperscript{143} In the conclusion to her 2015 essay “»Wie ein Mensch sich selbst bilden kann.« Zur Funktion von Amerika in Auerbachs Landhaus am Rhein,” Belgum cites several of Auerbach’s personal letters in which he addresses critique in his own time of the didactic nature of some of his writing. In these, he argues that the educational aspect of the stories is paramount to his own socio-political goals as a popular writer:

through popular literature.\textsuperscript{144} As a formative writer of the genre of village stories, Auerbach’s constructs of communal life, his negotiations of its tropes, and his attention to socio-linguistic details helped to define poetic Realist constructs of the rural idyll. The investment in social justice at times so present in his critical writings (and at other times subject to vicious self-censorship)\textsuperscript{145} and his personal complex of identities provide an interpretive platform for digesting his stories’ many idiosyncrasies for contemporary 21st-century scholarship.

Despite or perhaps more accurately due to his considerable fame as a writer of village stories, Auerbach was also subject to a particularly vile brand of critique from other writers of his time eager to disavow the literary contributions of a Jewish writer. Although these attacks would only increase with the rise in anti-Semitic discourse in the later decades of the 19th century, such criticism appeared throughout Auerbach’s career as a writer of popular fiction. In his contribution to the 2012 collection \textit{Berthold Auerbach (1812-1882) Werk und Wirkung}, “Dichter in der Tradition von Aufklärung und Volksaufklärung,” Holger Bönig cites a representative critique leveled against Auerbach by Freiburg theologian Alban Stolz in 1853 in which the question of his Jewish heritage is raised as a means to disqualify Auerbach fundamentally from participation in representations of rural community: “Auerbach is not of the Black Forest, he is a Jew. A Jew can never be from the Black Forest, even if his ancestors moved to and settled on the Feldberg or in Todtnau immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem.”\textsuperscript{146} This phrasing of this attack seems shockingly modern (one is immediately reminded of the “send them home” rhetoric used against minority figures with the resurgence of nativist political discourse today), with Stolz attacking Auerbach’s alleged migration history as a Jewish German to preclude his participation in German cultural production.

In addition to his own deeply held convictions concerning the separation between cultural-religious and national identities, one can also locate practical elements of Auerbach’s early resistance to models of Jewish integration which proposed secularism or conversion as models for social cohesion in light of such attacks. Stolz’ position on the intersection of sedentism and identity preclude any attempt at cultural emancipation and effectively negate arguments for Jewish

\textsuperscript{144} Auerbachs literarisches Ziel war es, sich mit Kernproblemen seines Jahrhunderts direct und offen auseinanderzusetzen.

Ibid, 81.

\textsuperscript{145} The afterword to the recent collected volume of his critical writings \textit{Schriften zur Literatur} (2014) demonstrates the systemic way in which Auerbach at times sought to remove what he believed overly-subjective references to the Jewish experience in his critical writing, providing lengthy selections of his previously unpublished analyses of the Jewish role in German national consciousness:


\textsuperscript{146} Auerbach ist kein Schwarzwälder, er ist ein Jude. Ein Jude wird nämlich niemals ein Schwarzwälder, selbst wenn seine Vorfahren gleich nach der Zerstörung Jerusalems an den Feldberg oder nach Todtnau gezogen und sich niedergelassen hätten.

integration: an alleged migration history—no matter how antiquated—is evinced as grounds for his complete exclusion from discussion of Germanness despite (or again, perhaps due to) the recent legal emancipation of the Jewish residents in the Kingdom of Württemberg.

It is no wonder then, that Auerbach’s literary Nordstetten remains so fundamentally mobile in its construct of community. Stolz’s attempt to construe an exclusive identity so concretely from human relations to their landscape epitomizes one of the many competing constructs of German tradition vying for dominance at the time. It might seem paradoxical to posit a fervent advocate of 19th-century German national unification as a precursor to contemporary models for post-national community. Yet in merging a mobile, global topos into his representation of German village life, Auerbach’s literary corpus provides a conceptual counterpoint to static visions of identity and place. The Jewish Diaspora, as quintessential archetype of transnational migration, is formative to the construct of the migrant figure; in Auerbach’s project, its conflicts map onto the pan-German emigrant experience.147 The residents of his literary village inhabit different iterations of communal space, participating in the ongoing saga of a shared community, both despite and due to their mobilities. The question of homeland remains in constant negotiation for an imagination of agrarian life in transition: a representational place informed by transatlantic migration, encroaching railroads, new species, and imported technologies.

If the National Socialist emphasis on the ‘purity’ and timelessness of the agrarian landscape has long dominated German-language depictions of rural life, post-War folklore research in Germany has emphasized precisely this more fluid depiction of traditional folk culture espoused in Auerbach’s village stories. Cultural fluidity and the interplay of technological development in folk tradition has been a preoccupation of late-20th century folklore studies. Bausinger’s 1961 *Volkskultur in der technischen Welt* [Folk Culture in a World of Technology] is representative of this scholarly shift, following the persistence of new technologies as motifs in modern folk tales and songs, the thematization of social-economic change. Yet the Nordstetten of Auerbach’s literary imaginary was already shot-through with mobilities on a global scale from its earliest incarnations, peopled with characters who marvel at the perpetual transformations their communities’ experience.

This particular Weltanschauung ran parallel to the prevailing trends of 19th century nationalism. Contemporary voices in Auerbach’s time such as Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl already proposed a fundamental unity between a people and their situatedness in the rural landscape—their primeval investment in agrarian life.148 Auerbach, too, valued investment in the life of the folk, and their interaction with the natural world, yet he located inspiration, as well, in the transition between the individual, the local community, and the outside world. For Auerbach, it was the experience of separation that confirmed communal ideals: “It was necessary, as well, for the great

---


148 See, for example, *Land und Leute* (1854), the first of a popular four volume series on German social history (*Die Naturgeschichte des Volkes als Grundlage einer deutschen Social-Politik)*:

liberators and saviors of humanity to isolate themselves from their communities for a time and to return to them alone.”

In Auerbach’s writing, emigration is certainly not presented as an all-encompassing solution to Germany’s social problems, yet he thematizes mobilities as a means of negotiation for social ills.

In the chapter “Die Dichtung aus dem Volke, mit besonderer Beziehung auf Hebel” [Folk Poetry with particular Emphasis on Hebel] from his Schrift und Volk (1846), Auerbach sets up a dialectic relationship between alienation and the experience of communal belonging. In doing so, he describes a homecoming perspective which enables the poet to be: “at home among strangers and at once at home and a stranger in his homeland. Foreign and domestic combine in him as a new homeland.” This “new homeland” is precisely the representational place of the literary village of Nordstetten. Riehl’s Boden-based identity politics have very real implications for a Jewish German writer, and Auerbach’s investment in the current social discourse on folk and nation necessitates a different vision for the German national community. For Auerbach, the folk is defined as much by their investment in the physicality of specific place as by a recognition of their communal participation. His stories unfold around movement between social milieus, transatlantic voyages, and domestic outsider figures—redefining the topoi of their shared identity.

This is a position which is not alien to other writers of village stories during the mid-19th-century, a time in which the function of the social outsider in literature often served as catalyst for initiating transformation or highlighting caustic norms. The foreign savior figure of Brigitta from Adalbert Stifter’s eponymous novella (1843, 1847) arrives from afar to revitalize the impoverished rural community she joins. The ostracized schwarzer Geiger [black fiddler] from Keller’s Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe remains the only character in Seldwyla to offer refuge to the ill-fated lovers (despite his eventual inability to reconcile them to an alternative to the fate their community has prescribed). Eva Geulen has read Keller’s novella as a fundamental negotiation of borders and border crossings doomed by the protagonists’ ultimate attempt to transcend conventional limitations, yet it is precisely the figure of the unbounded fiddler who, despite revelations of his systemic disenfranchisement, continues to write and rewrite himself as the story’s narrative axis point.

Auerbach himself praises Keller’s construct of this character in a literary review from April 17, 1856, published in the Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, a review which Keller credits with...

---

149  Die größten Befreier und Erlöser der Menschheit mußten sich eine Weile von ihrer Volksgenossenschaft isolieren und auf sich allein zurückziehen.


150  Er war zum Gegensatze, zur Entzweiung und so zur Vermittlung gelangt; er war in der Fremde zu Hause und ist nun in der Heimat fremd und doch wieder heimisch. Fremde und Heimat verschlingen sich in ihm zu einer neuen Heimat.

Ibid, 29.

having helped launch his literary career.\(^{152}\) In his assessment of the novella, Auerbach highlights the way in which Keller manages to avoid a romanticizing portrayal of this pivotal character through his emphasis on the Romeo and Juliet figures, while acknowledging the fiddler’s centrality to the narrative:

> I have the opportunity here to point out a difference in the treatment of this material which differentiates it from Romanticism. Out of passion for the vagabond nature of the Black Fiddler a Romantic would have made this character into the hero—homeless and robbed of his birthright. The Realist poet instead chooses the lovers who desire to save themselves through bourgeois and comfortable means and yet fall into ruin nonetheless.\(^{153}\)

Additional correspondences between Auerbach and Keller around the period of the novella’s completion demonstrate Auerbach’s enthusiastic reception of Keller’s work and its contribution to period discourse, even as he purportedly cautioned Keller against the explicit evocation of his literary inspiration (Romeo and Juliet) in the novella’s title, a decision which Keller ultimately defends in a letter from June 3, 1856 (Rpt. in *Gottfried Keller Briefe*). For Auerbach, the application of literary tradition should be revealed in its function to the narrative and not through explicit recourse to allusion, lest the reader lose sight of the real-life social implications of the literature.

In this same vein, Auerbach’s praise of Hebel’s Alemannic poetry in *Schrift und Volk* lies in its internalization of ‘world’ narratives, its use of heroic motifs from the Bible or Classical mythology in its depiction of the everyday life of the rural folk. Auerbach is also pointedly cautious of Hebel’s reliance on the Alemannic dialect;\(^{154}\) despite his own prioritization of the local aesthetic, Auerbach perceives the exclusive nature of dialect use as working counter to his own aspirations for a universalizing Realist literature: The linguistic evocation of local specificity troubled Auerbach as a writer of popular literature, fearing that the overuse of dialect could restrict his readership.\(^{155}\)

\(^{152}\) (Stocker, “Literatur Kritik,” 389; rpt. in *Gottfried Keller Briefe*).

\(^{153}\) *Es sey mir gestattet hier noch auf den Unterschied hinzudeuten den diese Behandlung des gewählten Stoffes von der Romantik unterscheidet. Ein Romantiker hätte in der Lust an dem Vagabundarischen den schwarzen Geiger, der als Heimathloser um sein Vatergut betrogen wird, zum Helden gemacht. Der realistische Dichter wählt das Liebespaar, das sich bürgerlich und gemütlich retten will und doch in den Untergang verfällt.*

Ibid, 389.

\(^{154}\) Hebel published extensively in the Alemannic dialect, a tradition still celebrated in the Hebel Prize for German dialect writing today.

\(^{155}\) This was an idea about the limits of language and community which Auerbach shared with earlier pluralist traditions, such as that of Johann Gottfried Herder who lamented disruptions to shared communication engendered by such regional specificity:

> *Spencer, Herder’s Political Thought, 79.*
Despite Auerbach’s resignations, the community-forming potential of dialect remains thematized in his village stories, nonetheless. But dialect use in Auerbach’s literary village often unfolds on an external level: commented upon or glossed in narratorial interventions. Actual use of the Swabian dialect is found almost exclusively in initial exchanges of pleasantries or in communal participation in songs. The concept of endurance of cultural affinity through participation in folk customs features prominently in his emigrant stories. This negotiation of the local for reception on a national or transnational level is key to understanding Auerbach’s work. His collections of village stories offer a medium for encountering what becomes a transcendent vision of folk life. In this mediation, Auerbach’s lyric speakers support his own claims to authentic representation, while providing a readily accessible narrative for consumption by a broad German-speaking readership.

Auerbach’s is a village experience as literary commodity—short, intertextual narratives of individual experiences, each representing one version of a shared communal vision, accessible to a broad audience in serial form. Among other publications, his stories were printed, for example, in Die Gartenlaube, one of the first widely-circulated German language weekly periodicals. Exchangeability as different material items ingrained these stories into daily life for a growing consumer culture well into the early 20th century, where they continued to appear as literary addenda to numerous, short reader’s digests. As individual and collected works, they offer simple narratives of a society marked by transformation no different from those of later bourgeois urban Realism. Yet in their claims to authenticity, their evocation of a specific geospatial community, they remain within the parameters of period socio-political discourse, as well. As popular commodities, they contributed to the definition of a still fluid national character.
The broader function of migration in Auerbach’s *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten* has, to date, received little contemporary critical attention in the English-speaking world. Yet narratives of transit and transformation permeate his stories, from the urban-to-rural transitions highlighted in stories such as “Die Frau Professorin” (1846) and “Der Lauterbacher” (1843) to transnational migrations in “Der Tolpatsch” (1842), “Der Viereckig oder die amerikanische Kiste” (1853), “Der letzte Heimattag eines Auswanderers” (1856), and “Der Tolpatsch aus Amerika” (1876). Auerbach’s first village story, “Der Tolpatsch” (completed in 1841, first published in 1842) tells the story of a local outcast, Aloys, who finds success through emigration to the New World. His character reoccurs throughout the corpus of the *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten*, including in the return of his American-born son to Nordstetten in the final cycle of village stories published more than thirty years after the initial “Tolpatsch” story. These later publications emphasize, as well, the changing technological landscapes of rural communities and their changing mobilities through the construction of rail lines and the import of new agricultural models and technologies. The railroad as an explicit marker of the fluidity of rural life is thematized extensively in the foreword to Auerbach’s final 1876 *Neue Dorfgeschichten*.

The following close-readings provide a smattering of insight into the topoi of Auerbach’s disparate migrant narratives, highlighting the construct of stranger figures in several of his more ‘global’ village stories and exploring the social construct of migration with an eye for both period and contemporary parallels. In the following subsection, I begin with a close-reading of “Der Viereckig,” one of the most direct and comprehensive treatments of (circular) migration in Auerbach’s corpus. This chapter concludes with a review of the “Tolpatsch” cycle, highlighting Auerbach’s attention to language use in his overarching treatment of a transatlantic construct of Germanness.
4.1 Migration is a Two-Way Street: “Der Viereckig”

Christoph Hamann, in his 2013 essay, “Anormales Amerika – Auerbachs Volkskonzept im Kontext des Auswanderungsdiskurses um 1850” provides a compelling analysis of what he reads as an overwhelmingly negative representation of emigration in Auerbach’s work through a case study of the story “Der Viereckig oder die amerikanische Kiste.” Grounded in mid-19th-century discourse on the social repercussions of migration as threat both to projects of German nation-building as well as to wider concepts of German national identity rooted in the idea of a tangible and material German homeland, Hamann declares: “Here the leading thesis must be that—due to the imminent context of (native-)soil and identity or Volk—all migration must be represented as a ‘sickness.’”

In making this declaration, Hamann explores various iterations of the migration motif in Auerbach’s literature, as well as his resistance, as an editor, to publishing works espousing uncritical representations of transatlantic migration in his *Deutscher Volks-Kalender* (1858-1869). For Hamann, representations of the difficulties of migration in Auerbach’s work, the tendency to

---

156 Leitend soll dabei die These sein, dass aufgrund des notwendigen Zusammenhangs von (Heimat-)Boden und Individuum bzw. Volk jegliche Migration als ‘Krankheit’ symbolisiert werden muss.

represent individual emigrant characters as those already threatened or marginalized within their own communities, and the at times comical representations of peasant emigrant dreams underscore Auerbach’s personal resistance to a utopian vision of America as a country of immigration and his investment in the project of German nation building at home.

The primary subject of Christoph Hamann’s extensive 2013 examination of migration in Auerbach’s literature, “Der Viereckig” (1853), indeed begins with a humorous anecdote about an elderly inhabitant of Nordstetten who denies the very existence of America in the face of overwhelming evidence: “I don’t believe in America.” The refrain becomes a sort of extended metaphor for a village story about the failed emigration attempts of its unhappy protagonist, Xaveri. Yet as much as the short story thematizes its protagonist’s dreamed for passage to America, it is defined more by his waiting, the enduring image of the protagonist’s livelihood packed into a wooden crate, awaiting both migration and arrival which ultimately remain elusive despite two transatlantic voyages.

In his recent essay, “Vom Warten,” contemporary author José F. A. Oliver describes the migrant experience as “an eternal waiting for something about which one knows nothing more than that it is awaited.” This assessment seems prescient for the migrant experience depicted in Auerbach’s historical narrative, as well—one characterized by stasis, beginning in disbelief and ending in homecoming as a return to reduced social standing: great expectations diminished. Contrary to narratives which would portray emigration as an emancipatory process, the bitter realities of Xaveri’s experience reveal the complex networks of belonging to a rural community increasingly defined by transformation and the migratory experience. The emphasis in “Der Viereckig” on waiting, and not the processes of emigration and immigration themselves, foregrounds the network of affiliations tested by the protagonist’s attempt to disengage from his communal life.

Hamann cites Auerbach’s humorous comparison of the dream of American immigration and the multipurpose American export, the potato, in the opening lines of “Der Viereckig.”

Ibid, 134.

Ich glaub’ nicht an Amerika.

Auerbach, Dorfgeschichten, 97.

All citations from “Der Viereckig” as well as “Der Tolpatsch” appear according to their recent re-publication in the collected volume Dorfgeschichten, edited by Hermann Bausinger (2011). Other stories from Auerbach’s corpus which are not reprinted in full in Bausinger’s critical edition are cited according to their publication in the original collected volumes of his Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten.

Ein ewiges Warten auf etwas, von dem man nichts anderes gewusst habe, als dass man darauf warte.

This essay was first printed in the anthology Das neue Deutschland. Von Migration und Vielfalt (2014), and later, in slightly altered form, in Oliver’s essay collection Fremdenzimmer (2015); the latter is cited above:

Oliver, Fremdenzimmer, 85.
Despite the protagonist’s many shortcomings, one would be ill-advised to ignore the more complex framing of Xaveri’s migration and dismiss this story as a simple counternarrative to period discourse hailing America as the promised land. Far more, it represents an investigation into the flawed habitus of community participation—posing the protagonist’s social mobility against a framework of village life which precludes his ultimate success. Following the humorous anecdote about the old woman who denies the existence of America despite overwhelming proof (later revealed to be the protagonist Xaveri’s grandmother), the narrator of “Der Viereckig” begins their story with a broad summary of the current expansion in transatlantic migration, explaining as counterpoint to the old woman’s assertion that: “Up and down the land there is no longer a single house in which one doesn’t have living proof of the contrary.” What follows is an extended and often jocular (if at times sobering) critique of transatlantic migration, a rebuke in which the narrator cautions against unqualified and uncritical assessments of this life-altering experience, appraising those as “blissful” who can remain upon “the ground on which birth and destiny placed them.”

Although this sentiment at first seems to support Hamann’s thesis (his reading of the text as providing an overwhelmingly negative representation of the migration experience), such a position is complicated by the assertion in the following paragraph—the final lines of the narrator’s monologue before the introduction of the story’s protagonist:

It would be foolish to wish to underestimate the immeasurable fertilization and the great all-encompassing pull of human history in the emigration urge. That does not prevent, in fact it demands instead that we investigate the hearts of those whose unique fates propel them to join the ranks of the Great Migration, whose global historical mission is immeasurable yet unrecognizable amidst those individuals marching in procession. It is, moreover, of particular significance to observe the transformations such an urge—one which has seized the entire era—brings to those finite circles of the departing and those who remain.

Here the narrator makes clear: It is precisely through investment in the individual and local that one garners an understanding of the global. The narrator explicitly reminds the readers that we, as

160 *Es gibt aber auch landauf und landab kein Haus mehr, in dem man nicht den lebendigen Beweis vom Gegenteil hätte.*

Auerbach, *Dorfgeschichten*, 97.

161 *Glückselig, wer sich bald wieder findet und sich tapfer wehrt auf dem Boden, darauf Geburt und Geschick ihn gestellt.*

Ibid, 99.

162 *Es wäre töricht, die unabsehbare Befruchtung und den großen, alles bewältigenden Zug der Menschheitsgeschichte in dem Auswanderungstrieben verkennen zu wollen. Das hindert aber nicht, ja fordert eher dazu auf, die Herzen derer zu erforschen, die, vom Einzelschicksale gedrängt in die Reihen der Völkerwanderung eintreten, deren weltgeschichtliche Sendung unermessbar und den Einzelnen, die mitten im Zuge gehen, unerkennbar ist. Daneben ist es von besonderem Belang, zu beobachten, welche Wandlung solch ein Trieb, der die ganze Zeit ergriffen, im beschränkten Lebenskreise der Scheidenden und Verbleibenden hervorbringt.*

Ibid, 99-100.
individuals, rarely recognize the significance of our actions, caught up as they are among the
greater drives and demands of society. Yet through investigating the specificities of these actions,
the narrator argues, we come to better understand our significance to the wider world. With
reference to the Great Migration [Völkerwanderung]—that premedieval movement of Germanic
tribes upon which Romantic-Nationalism grounded its historical imaginary of the German
people—163—the narrator reminds the readership as well, that migration and mobility are
fundamental aspects of all human societies, portion of that “great all-encompassing pull of human
history,” producing “immeasurable fertilization” despite the individual hardships endured.
Although significant sympathy is shown for social constructs of rural life rooted in the local
landscape, the narrator also insists with this comparison that, on a long enough scale, connection
to one’s homeland is more a historical coincidence than an inherent birthright.

In Bausinger’s critical edition of the text, the seminal folklorist finds it necessary to
reiterate here (notwithstanding the overwhelming evidence of the text itself) that “Auerbach strove
to provide a more sober image of America, opposing the advertising tricks of enterprising
emigration agencies and also recognizing that the migration of venturesome young men had
negative consequences for the villages of their homeland.”164 Yet Auerbach’s is not so much a
singularly negative representation, as it is a complex and sympathetic one—recognizing the
immense difficulties of displacement from a position which I argue must be weighed in regard to
the author’s numerous non-fiction writings concerning the Jewish German experience. Auerbach’s
tendency to veil the problematics of Jewish life through the lens of contemporary German culture
has become a common theme in recent research on the author’s work.165 Speaking of the cultural-
critical development of Auerbach’s works in perhaps the most wide-ranging and exhaustive recent
exploration of the subject, “Berthold Auerbach als deutsch-jüdischer Schriftsteller,” Hans Otto
Horch argues on behalf of Auerbach’s village stories (in comparison to his earlier writings) that
“While questions of humanity are addressed concurrently among the Jewish milieu of the earlier
novels, inversely, Jewish concerns are now advocated among the non-Jewish milieu.”166 In “Der
Viereckig,” Auerbach’s insistence on the connection between the villagers and “the ground on
which birth and destiny placed them” cannot be read unironically for an author whose life work

163 For a provocative examination of the cultural and political impact of this imaginary see:


164 Auerbach bemühte sich um die Vermittlung eines nüchterneren Amerikabildes, stellte sich den Werbetricks
geschäftstüchtiger Auswanderungsagenten entgegen und erkannte auch, dass der Wegzug risikofreudiger junger
Männer negative Folgen für die heimatlichen Dörfer hatte.

Commentary in:

Auerbach, Dorfgeschichten, 100.


166 Während im jüdischen Milieu der frühen Romane zugleich Menschheitsfragen behandelt wurden, wird nun
umgekehrt im nichtjüdischen Milieu die Sache der Juden mit verfocht.

Horch, “Berthold Auerbach,” 37.
consisted of providing popular representations for a culture-nation which would ultimately reject him and his works.

Framed as a village story, “Der Viereckig” is, nonetheless, more an extended departure narrative, emphasizing the difficulties of disentanglement from a community for which the protagonist believes he maintains few affiliations. This protagonist himself is hardly presented as a sympathetic figure: embittered, misogynistic, and proud to a fault, as the youngest son of an affluent farming family, Xaveri nevertheless remains unable to claim recourse to the same social factors which have shaped his relatively privileged upbringing. His pride drives him, at the beginning of the short story, to make a public display of his intended emigration—parading around the village with the wooden crate of his possessions with which he plans to depart. He, too, makes public display of his official withdrawal [Austritt] from the community, a legally binding departure of pivotal significance to the narrative background of other period literary figures such as the schwarzer Geiger in Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe. 167 Despite the benefits of familial ties to the community’s legal apparatus (his cousin oversees the process as the town’s mayor [Schultheiß]) and repeated warnings that it would be in his best interest to accept a temporary pass to leave rather than withdraw entirely, Xaveri makes each step of his initial emigration attempt as irreversible as they are public.

In her 2012 essay “Law and Literature: Who Owns It?” as well as the 2010 “Habe und Bleibe in Kellers „Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe,“ Eva Geulen thematizes the legal apparatus of communal belonging as catalytic in the exclusion of the homeless schwarzer Geiger in Gottfried Keller’s novella. The physical, legal, and conceptual borders of community are read as underlying subtext for the novella which explores numerous (ultimately unsuccessful) attempts to overcome the sharply delineated boundaries of Seldwyla’s village community. As a member of the homeless [Heimatlos], absent legal proof of birth or kinship, the schwarzer Geiger remains disenfranchised from his inheritance, despite overwhelming circumstantial evidence that his grandfather farmed the land now contested by the protagonists’ two feuding families.

The legal state of placelessness is conceptualized quite differently in “Der Viereckig.” The privilege of familial representation eases an immediate repatriation process for Xaveri who, coerced by his family into marrying a local widow, rejoins the community just days after his formal withdrawal: the first of many stutter-steps in the path of his circular migration. If anything, it is the ease with which Xaveri assumes he can disentangle himself from the community of Nordstetten—a community assured to him by birth—which becomes stigmatized in “Der Viereckig,” just as, inversely, the circumvention of Seldwyla’s many boundaries precipitates the demise of Keller’s village Romeo and Juliet. With grumblings of disenfranchisement, Xaveri’s initial emigration attempt seems more a cry for help—an attempt to wrest respect and further agency from a family and community he views as benefiting at his expense. It is precisely Xaveri’s

---

167 For a discussion of this legal context in Romeo und Julia, see:

position of relative affluence which allows him to take such a flippant attitude towards his impending emigration. After all, his first attempt is eventually overshadowed by nostalgic yearning and a recognition that “over in America he would no longer be Xaveri Lachenbauer, his family’s prestige would no longer hold weight.”

Vanity here leads to the collapse of the protagonist’s façade, forcing his hand (in order to save face and avoid the legal ramifications of his Austritt) into an unhappy marriage.

It is only after the initial, sobering encounter with the realities of displacement that Xaveri finds himself compromised to the extent that he is willing to re-risk this process in earnest. Unable to accept responsibility for his fateful decisions, Xaveri becomes increasingly belligerent, emotionally battering his new wife and severing ties with friends and family alike. The narrator relates that Xaveri endeavors, increasingly, to distance himself from participation in village life, and that his shirking of traditional duties earns him the disapproval of his community. The blue wooden crate intended for his first emigration sits at his bedside, a constant reminder of his failure to mobilize. If place is, as suggested in the preceding chapters, the lived experience of geography—human-inspired landscapes against an idealization of the natural world—then it is fascinating to observe in this story the ways in which Xaveri’s ostracization from the community is reflected in his participation in its public spaces. Previously a popular participant in communal activities, celebrated for his musical abilities on the French horn [Waldhorn], Xaveri becomes both physically and emotionally distanced from the other villagers following his failed emigration. His participation in the public spaces of his community become overshadowed by the threat of impending disconnect.

This transformation takes place explicitly on a spatial level, as well. As member of a prominent local family, Xaveri begins the narrative as a fixture of the village community, participating from pub to field in multiple facets of its daily life. He is teased for his perceived obstinacy, but generally well-received by his neighbors: “It’s just the block-headed stubbornness” his cousin exclaims, after Xaveri insists on finalizing his initial legal withdrawal from the community. But following his coerced marriage and failed emigration, Xaveri broods alone at home beside his crate. Tensions rise with his unlucky spouse. In the absence of a harmonious homelife, he then seeks solace in the company of other villagers, but rather than endeavor towards the collective harvest he spends his time eating, drinking, and gambling in the local pub. The narrator is quick to remind the reader that “The thought of emigrating had weakened him, he had grown used to considering the village as no longer the realm of his occupation.”

---

168  *Jetzt zum ersten Mal kam ihm aber auch der Gedanke, dass er drüben in Amerika nicht mehr des Lachenbauern Xaveri sei, da galt sein Familienansehen nichts mehr.*


169  *Es ist halt der viereckig Hartkopf.*

Ibid, 111.

170  *Der Gedanke der Auswanderung hatte ihn erlahmt, er hatte sich gewöhnt, das Dorf gar nicht mehr als den Kreis seiner Tätigkeit anzusehen [*…*]"
between various phases, including rare moments where he again finds renewed joy in his village—moments where he reconsider his desire to emigrate after experiencing renewed connection to his community facilitated by his participation as farmer in the slow cycles of agrarian life. It is in these moments—grounded in participation in a communal structure larger than his own lifespan—that he questions his motivations, wondering whether the same connection can be reinvented in a new context across the sea. This question remains unanswered in the narrative of “Der Viereckig,” yet it is thematized extensively in the stories “Der Tolpatsch” (1842) and “Der Tolpatsch aus Amerika” (1876).

Rather than investigate constructs of immigrant life, “Der Viereckig” instead provides a spatial blueprint of Xaveri’s slow disentanglement. His lack of participation in communal life is mapped upon the peripheries of his village: “In the midst of high harvest season, when every able finger in the village is at work, he lay out at the edge of the forest and blew his French horn.” The image of this outsider, lurking at the physical margins of the community, yet still exercising musical participation in a populace which shuns him returns with targeted impact in the figure of Keller’s schwarzer Geiger.

For Xaveri here, this spatial withdrawal precedes his physical removal from the village; his inability to conceptualize a new, different iteration of community is embodied in his visceral reaction to the marker stone on the marches of Nordstetten: “Each time, he imagined the gray milestone on the path he knew so well to be a person staring after him. Was it illusion or self-deception?” If this milestone becomes a metaphor for the impending dread of emigration, there is another stone which he carries (quite literally) as permanent reminder, anchoring him throughout his transatlantic journey, to the homeland he’s left behind. Upon his ‘final’ departure from Nordstetten, Xaveri’s jilted and disaffected wife throws a large stone at his wagon, symbolically and effectively scratching his name once more from the wooden emigration crate which has overshadowed their wedding bed from the moment of their ill-fated union. In turn, Xaveri carries this stone with him on his transatlantic journey—a formative experience about which the reader remains conspicuously uninformed—eventually returning home to his wife, family, and

---

171 Mitten in der hohen Erntezeit, wo im Dorfe sozusagen jeder Finger, der sich regen kann, in Arbeit ist, saß Xaveri draußen am Waldrand und blies auf seinem Waldhorn.

172 Der graue Meilenstein am Wege, den er doch genau kannte, hielt er jedes Mal beim Aufschauen für einen Menschen, der nach ihm ausblicke. War das Täuschung oder Selbstbetrug?

173 In her various attempts to remove this very physical impediment from their union, Xaveri’s wife twice scratches his name and intended migration address from the front of his box.
village after three years of further disillusionment to sink the stone as peace offering into the pond before his familial home in Nordstetten.  

The first iteration of “Der Viereckig oder die amerikanische Kiste” was published in a periodical in 1853 and subsequently republished with largely minor alterations in 1856 and 1858. Hamann, however, notes one significant transformation between the initial publication and its later iterations: namely, the addition of what Hamann deems a “success story” at the conclusion of the protagonist Xaveri’s double migration. Whereas Hamann reads Xaveri’s satisfaction despite his humbling return to Nordstetten as confirmation of Auerbach’s negative representation of migration (“My grandmother said: I don’t believe in America. I had to believe in it, but now I’ve been converted”), I propose an alternative reading of this story, framed by the context of racialized nativist discourse leveled against Auerbach in the same year as his short story’s initial publication—the assertion that no matter how long Auerbach’s ancestors had lived in the Black Forest, an inherent otherness engendered by his ancestor’s immigration would forever preclude his full participation in German life.

In “Der Viereckig” the reader remains conspicuously unaware of the particulars of Xaveri’s experience abroad. Rather, one is informed initially that migration is an inherent factor of human history, but specific emphasis is leveled, instead, on the particulars of the protagonist’s community participation both before and after his migration attempts. The story seems to suggest, as Auerbach himself does in many of his private correspondences, that individuals cannot be judged by their inheritance, but only by their engagement and participation. The return to Nordstetten provides a narrative arc which indeed reaffirms the social order of village life, yet this return transpires in the context of an unsympathetic and already socially-mobile protagonist. Migration in this story is conceived of as already fundamental to village life and German identity. Disenfranchisement and displacement occur within the context of a community which is actively shunned by the emigrant figure himself. Although Xaveri is eventually ostracized, this transpires as a direct consequence of his own actions, and his exodus and return are thus staged as necessary precursors to an eventual reintegration.

4.2 Migration Histories: “Der Tolpatsch” and Many (un)Happy Returns
As aforementioned, “Der Viereckig” is only one among a larger constellation of Black Forest village stories thematizing migration. “Der Tolpatsch” (1842), the first and perhaps most enduring

176 »Meine Großmutter hat gesagt: Ich glaub’ nicht an Amerika. Aber ich hab’ daran glauben müssen, und jetzt bin ich bekehrt.«

Auerbach, Dorfgeschichten, 149.
177 Böning, “Dichter,” 70.
of Auerbach’s Black Forest village stories, represents the first chapter in a complex of stories which follow the emigration and immigration of two generations of one Nordstettener family. Over the past decades, these stories’ protagonist, the eponymous klutz [Tolpatsch], Aloys Schorer, has begun to receive renewed attention for his representation of village life as a social outsider. As early as 1994, in the Berthold-Auerbach-Museum’s publication celebrating the 150-year anniversary of the first publication of *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten*, Bernd Ballmann conceptualizes the figure of the Tolpatsch as an attempt to negotiate tropes of Jewish German culture for consumption outside what he deems the “literary ghetto” in which Auerbach’s initial work on Jewish culture had circulated. In this reading, the lack of investment in Jewish characters in the story is read as a deliberate device. Ballmann posits Aloys’ character as a potential reworking of the Schlemiel archetype—the bumbling outsider figure already popularized among a German-language readership through the 1814 publication of Adalbert von Chamisso’s *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte*, writing: “Perhaps Auerbach had reached into the stores of Jewish tradition in his conception of the unlucky devil, thinking on the archetype of Schlemiel for this Swabian bumbler.”

Sven-Erik Rose in his 2014 *Jewish Philosophical Politics in Germany, 1789-1849* traces the simultaneous development of Auerbach’s work on both Jewish and German literary culture at the advent of his village stories (of which “Der Tolpatsch” was the first), identifying Auerbach’s transition to German popular writer not so much as an abrupt departure from his prior work on Jewish culture, but also as a parallel track for broadening the reception of his narratives among a non-Jewish readership. This reading follows a more biographic interpretation of “Der Tolpatsch” by Jörg Schönert in his 2007 essay, “Auerbachs ›Nordstetten‹, Kellers ›Seldwyla‹, Franzos' ›Barnow‹; regionentypische Sozialmodelle im Zeichen von Erfahrungen gesellschaftlicher Modernisierung?” that Auerbach as “the Swabian Jew from Nordstetten remained for the educated world a ‘klutz’ despite all recognition: a familiar figure and a stranger at once.”

Schönert’s reading nevertheless discounts a purely allegorical reading of Aloys’ character as representative of wider Jewish German social constructs, acknowledging only broad similarities in the alienation of Aloys’ figure with that of Jewish Germans, and discounting more interpretive reception of the work by highlighting the narrative specificities of the story.

Auerbach’s work is certainly no allegory, yet the central position of outsider figures in Auerbach’s village stories is, as Schönert himself admits, striking. Christoph Deupmann, in his May 5, 2015 presentation for the Berthold-Auerbach-Museum in Nordstetten, “„So gut wie ein

---


Ballmann, “Der Tolpatsch,” 74.

180 Der schwäbische Jude aus Nordstetten bleibt der ›gebildeten Welt‹ – trotz aller Anerkennung – ein ›Tolpatsch‹, ein Wohlbekannter und ein Fremder zugleich.


181 Ibid, 128.
anderer“ – Auerbachs „Tolpatsch,“ returns to an investigation of Aloys’ figure as representative of an early attempt to reconcile the outsider figure of the German Jew in popular literature without demanding a direct allegorical reading of the narrative. Deupmann posits Aloys’ emigration, instead, as a foil for Auerbach’s own republican yearnings for the nascent German nation-state. Aloys’ inability to find acceptance within his own community, despite every attempt to earn their respect through responsible participation in communal life, mirrors the social configuration of integrated Jews who nonetheless found themselves in a constant state of negotiating their belonging within German communities. That Auerbach couches this narrative within a simpler story about unrequited love and finds resolution in what Schönert dismisses as a “utopian vision” for emigration does not preclude a more exploratory reading of “Der Tolpatsch,” particularly in light of more contested interpretations of Auerbach’s overall depiction of transatlantic migration.  

The story of “Der Tolpatsch” revolves around the story of a bumbling but loveable village boy, Aloys, whose misadventures and unrequited love propel him into increasingly desperate measures in order to save face. In addition to the construct of its protagonist, the cycle of “Der Tolpatsch” does, in fact, also contain a fairly prominent Jewish character: Kobbel. Yet as typical for Auerbach’s style, this character’s Jewish identity remains peripheral to the larger narrative arc. Kobbel appears as an accomplice to Jörgli, the dashing competitor in Aloys’ failed attempt to woo the village beauty Marannele, and as such, functions on the one hand in an antagonistic role. Yet on the other hand, Kobbel is depicted as a full-fledged member of a larger community from which the story’s Christian protagonist, Aloys, feels ostracized. Kobbel’s Jewish identity is mentioned as an aside, yet plays little practical role in the narrative, unless it be to reinforce the notion that Christians and Jews alike may participate in or be excluded from the village community. The utility of his Jewish identity to the social construct of Nordstetten is first made apparent when the character resurfaces in later village stories within the cycle of “Tolpatsch” tales.

The initial cycle of this story ends with its protagonist’s emigration; its final lines are a short letter he sends home to Nordstetten from Ohio, inquiring after many of the story’s characters and ending with the cryptic line: “I’d only like to be back in Nordstetten for an hour and show the mayor what a free citizen of America is.” Aloys’ desire to return to Nordstetten is coded in an affirmation that he has created a new life for himself in America following his humiliating heartbreak at home and his fight with the successful suitor, Jörgli (resulting in a lengthy military punishment for Aloys). By purchasing an early release from military service and effectively leaving behind the unhappy social bonds which tied him to Nordstetten, Aloys claims only a bittersweet success in American exile: He is still very much invested in the community from which he has emigrated.

182 Ibid, 135.

183 Ich möcht’ nur auch einmal wieder eine Stund’ in Nordstetten sein, da wollt’ ich auch dem Schultheiß zeigen, was ein freier Bürger von Amerika ist.

Auerbach, Dorfgeschichten, 184.
In the immediate context of the story, one must assume that this letter represents Aloys’ desire to demonstrate his ultimate triumph against the odds. Schönert highlights this passage as “utopian,” yet the fact that this story ends with only partial resolution complicates this reading.184 Aloys’ letter home is filled with nostalgic yearning for the people and the places he has left behind, including the mournful and—factually incorrect—observation (following his encounter with a representation of the world as a globe): “On Sundays it seems most false to me, that it is still Saturday night in Nordstetten. That shouldn’t be: everything should have its day.”185 In this initial correspondence, Aloys reveals his still-conflicted entanglements with the German community, problematizing the geo-spatial realities of his now multilocational consciousness as anything but utopian.

If the village story “Der Tolpatsch” ends on an incomplete note, the narrative of its protagonist extends beyond this single tale, returning in various guises in later village stories by Auerbach and providing, through its endurance, a more layered conceptualization for mobile or multilocational belonging(s). Already within the initial 1843 collection of Black Forest village stories in which “Der Tolpatsch” was published, both Aloys and his one-time enemy Kobbel return in narrated form. The prominence of this marginal character’s role in Aloys’ larger conceptualization of Nordstetten’s community is revealed in a letter from America received by Aloys’ mother which is read aloud in the concluding story of the first collected volume of village stories, “Ivo der Hajrle” (150-358).186 In Chapter 8 of this story, “Die Vacanz” [Vacancy] (231-257), Aloys’ mother produces a letter she has received from “Nordstetten in America on the Ohio River,” introducing a visceral parallel for Aloys’ layered understanding of place.187

The creation of this geospatial parallel remains in its infancy, yet it, too, is shot through with layerings of representational place. In defense of his new conceptualization of home, Aloys relates the following in his letter to his mother: “Did you already notice above that I wrote Nordstetten? Yes, that’s how it is, and that’s how it will remain. I stuck a stake in the ground not...”

---


185 Am Sonntag ist mir’s am ärigesten, dass in Nordstetten jetzt Samstag zu Nacht ist. Das sollt’ nicht sein, es sollt’ alles einen Tag haben.

Auerbach, Dorfgeschichten, 184.

186 The significance of this letter is thematized in Bausinger’s critical edition of Auerbach’s Dorfgeschichten in which it is reproduced in isolation as “Der Brief aus Amerika” (185-200). In the following, I cite from the original 1843 publication from Verlag von Friedrich Bassermann in Mannheim:

Auerbach, Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten [a], 1843.

187 Nordstetten in Amerika am Ohioflusse

far from my house, with a board on which I wrote in capital letters: Nordstetten.\footnote{Habt Ihr nicht schon aufgemerkt, daß ich da oben Nordstetten hingeschrieben hab? Ja, so ist's, und so bleibt's. Ich hab' einen Stock nicht weit von meinem Haus hingesteckt, mit einer Tafel, und darauf hab' ich mit großen Buchstaben hingeschrieben: Nordstetten.} Aloys employs this rather childish attempt at worldmaking to facilitate his dream of one-day reuniting the disparate layers of his own identity. In his letter, he describes the topology and physicality of his new home on the Ohio River, describing the contours of its land in relation to his plans for one-day recreating the village of his childhood. In doing so, he once again reveals the naivety of his understandings of the globe, or indeed, the routes of his own transatlantic migration. For Aloys, the impossible distances separating New Nordstetten from Nordstetten in the Black Forest represent the totality of potential migration and mobility. Describing at one point how he had affixed a letter to the foot of a migratory bird, Aloys reveals his hope that it would carry his message homeward from the Ohio River back to the Black Forest. He goes on to relate his frustration when the bird returns the following year with a message written in a language and script he could not understand. In his confusion and homesickness, Aloys mistakes the Greek greeting χαῖρε [hello] for the Swabian word, Kaib, which the narrator then glosses in a footnote: \footnote{*Kaib, so viel als Lump, Schuft.} "Something like rascal, knave."\footnote{Ibid, 244.} Unable to conceptualize a world beyond the two poles of his own life’s experience, Aloys simply feels insulted and rejected by this interaction with the outside world.

At the same time, the doppelgänger of Nordstetten in America also provides a platform for Auerbach’s exploration of an altered and inclusionary German consciousness—optimistic in its explicit capacity to evoke social change, while still grounded in the memories of a more conflicted Germany. In the opening pages of his letter, Aloys also narrates his views on the unifying potential of migration, and his observations of a united German nation in the New World: \footnote{[…] wir Deutschen sollten auch so zusammenhalten. Ich hab sonst immer als nur die Württemberger für meine Landsleut' gehalten, aber hier heißt man uns alle Deutsche} "[…] we Germans should also stick together. I always thought only of the Württemberger as my countrymen, but here they call us all Germans […]"\footnote{Ibid, 243.} It is only later, that the full social implications of these observations are made manifest.

As aforementioned, Kobbel’s Jewish heritage is of little significance in “Der Tolpatsch” to his role as accomplice to Aloys’ nemesis, Jörgli. The fact is mentioned one time, in the introduction to his character (“a cluster of young men, including Jörgli and his old friend, a Jew, Long Herzel’s Kobbel”\footnote{Ein Rädchen junger Bursche, darunter auch der Jörgli und sein alter Freund, ein Jude, des langen Herzles Kobbel} and thereafter the detail is emitted in his further appearances in the story. John Ward,
in his 2010 *Jews in Business and their Representation in German Literature, 1827-1934* highlights the introduction of Kobbel’s character (in which Kobbel offers to set Aloys up with his unrequited love for a price) as an example of how “Auerbach is clearly treating the supposed ‘Jewish’ propensity for soliciting financial deals in a humorous way”\(^{192}\) though given the general propensity of the villagers in Nordstetten to harass and mock the bumbling protagonist of “Der Tolpatsch,” this hardly seems a conclusive reading of Kobbel’s Jewish character. Here, rather than coded through inherent difference, Kobbel is represented as one of a group of likeminded village boys who take advantage of Aloys’ marginalization to reinforce their own communal ties.

In his letter home, it is, in fact, the moment in which Aloys reveals his most tangible desire to reaffirm his own connections to Nordstetten (commissioning the transcription of its folk songs for preservation in the New World) that immediately precedes the reintroduction of Kobbel’s character.\(^{193}\) After proposing that he will pay someone in Nordstetten to write down and send him a catalogue of village songs, Aloys writes to his mother that he realizes only now the extent to which his participatory belonging in Nordstetten had often remained superficial. He realizes that he no longer remembers more than the starting lines of many folk songs: “Look, when one is so far out in the wide world and must sing for oneself, one realizes for the first time that one only knows the beginning of so many songs, and that one had only ever sung tralala after the others. […] It’s like that with many things, one thinks one knows them until the moment comes: now little man, now do it on your own.”\(^{194}\) Yet at this very moment, Aloys also reveals that he cannot do everything on his own in the New World: Aloys’ desire to reconstitute the community of Nordstetten is incarnated through the process of his one-time enemy’s return, and the processing of his childhood trauma through accepting Kobbel now as one of his own.

It is also not until Kobbel’s reintroduction in Aloys’ letter home that the Jewish aspects of his character receive narrative significance. In the paragraph immediately following Aloys’ request for songs, he recounts an encounter with his old enemy in Ohio, where he, as a now-affluent citizen-farmer, welcomes Kobbel as his guest. Writing home to his mother, Aloys waxes poetic on the potential of new environs to inspire the reassessment of old prejudices and alleviate past grudges:

---

Auerbach, *Dorfgeschichten*, 163.

Like many of the characters in Auerbach’s *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten*, Kobbel is referred to here as his father’s (Herzle) son.

\(^{192}\) Ward, “Jews in Business,” 82.

\(^{193}\) Auerbach, *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten* [a], 250.

\(^{194}\) *Gucket, wenn man so in der weiten Welt draußen ist, und allein für sich singen soll, da merkt man erst, wie man von so viel Lieder blos den Anfang kennt und das andere hat man eben blos so denen andren im Tralateln nachgesungen, und da möcht man sich schier den Kopf ’runter reißen, weil einem das Ding nicht einfallen will, aber man kriegt halt nicht ’raus; es geht einem mit vielen Dingen so, man meint, man kann’s, bis es einmal heißt: jetzt Alterle, jetzt mach’s allein.*

Ibid, 250.
I have to tell you all something else. Think of it, mother, I’m sitting three weeks ago Tuesday on a wagon repairing the tongue—you can’t just pop over to the wainwright here, you’ve got to do it all yourself—as I was sitting there, all of a sudden I hear: “You workin’ hard, Aloys?” I look up, and who’s standing there? Long Herzle’s Kobbel who was with the guard. We weren’t always the best of friends, but I wasn’t thinking of that and flung my arms around his neck; I almost crushed him! I do believe if Jörgli came I’d extend him my hand. He was a Nordstettener, too, you know.

I pulled everything together at home and slaughtered a turkey; Kobbel ate with me like anyone else, those dietary laws are for the Old World, not the New.

Kobbel stayed eight days with me and helped work in the field, he can do it as well as any Christian; honestly, I really liked it. And he agrees: It isn’t proper for a soldier with honor in his body to wander around with a bindlestick. He wants to buy land here in the area, and I want to help him do it. I’ve got to have my dear Nordstetten Jews here, otherwise it isn’t Nordstetten at all. After that he’ll join the national army, too. In time, he can also be an officer. No one asks about religion here, so long as a fellow’s healthy and upright.195

Aloys’ representation of America as land of migration achieves here what Auerbach had already envisioned in his 1836 Judenthum und die neueste Literatur: a unified and inclusive German identity (albeit in exile)—where religious difference is inconsequential and national affinity is constituted by participation in projects of nation building, demanding no sacrifice in individual affiliations, German and Jewish (or otherwise). Kitsch as Aloys’ evocation of “my dear Nordstetten Jews” may appear, it remains a crucial detail in literary construct of Nordstetten (on both sides of the Atlantic). First and foremost, it reinforces Auerbach’s project of establishing Jewish culture as integral to German village life—“otherwise it isn’t Nordstetten at all.” The more critical interjection lies in Aloys’ representation of civil participation. It is hard work, military service, and cooperation that constitute affiliation with his American iteration of Nordstetten. The yearning and homesickness Aloys’ character reveals in the conclusion of “Tolpatsch” is replaced

---


Ich hab Alles im Haus zusammen gerufen und hab einem welschen Hahn den Kragen abgeschnitten; der Kobbel hat mit mir gegessen, wie ein anderer Mensch auch, die Gesetz’ von denen Essensspeisen, die sind für die alt Welt und nicht mehr für die neu.

Der Kobbel ist acht Tag bei mir bleiben und hat mir helfen schaffen im Feld, er kann’s so gut wie ein Christ; das hat mir rechtssachen gefallen, daß er einsieht: für einen Soldaten, der Ehr im Leib hat, schickt sich’s nicht mehr mit dem Zwerchsack ’rumzulaufen; er will sich hier herum Acker kaufen, ich bin ihm dazu behilflich, ich muß auch meine lieben Juden von Nordstetten hier haben, sonst ist es gar kein rechts Nordstetten; darnach wird er auch zur Nazenalmitläs gehen, er kann mit der Zeit auch Offizier warden, hier fragt man keinen nach seinem Glauben, wenn der Mensch nur brav und gesund ist.

Ibid, 250-51.
here by an optimism for a new, participatory community, Nordstetten on the Ohio River: a different village, overcoming the entrenched differences Nordstetten by the Neckar River could not.

It is, however, the final iteration of the “Tolpatsch” cycle which most fully explores the potential of retaining village community through migration practices. Published more than thirty years after Auerbach’s first village story, “Der Tolpatsch aus Amerika” (1876) tells the story of Aloys Jr. who returns to the village of his father after growing up in New Nordstetten in the American Midwest. As in other village tales, the spatial topology of Nordstetten in the Black Forest forms a hub for the diverse narrative threads of its residents, yet it is in this story, more than any other, that the village of Nordstetten is posited simultaneously as simply one among a constellation of overlapping geo-spatial affinities. Its young protagonist has grown up in North America among the narrated memories of his father and other one-time Swabian immigrants, and he ‘returns’ to his familial homeland a stranger. Upon arriving in the Black Forest, Aloys Jr. wanders between the various localities of his father’s narrated memories, visiting ‘old friends’ from his father’s childhood whom he himself has never met.

It is his character, more than any other in Auerbach’s corpus, that anticipates Georg Simmel’s later sociological study of the stranger. His is a figure who embodies many of Auerbach’s own earlier critical writings on the role of the outsider figure in defining community. Aloys Jr.’s familiarity with the environs from his father’s narration is set against a construct of cultural and linguistic difference drawn from his upbringing in America. As aforementioned, his ability to elicit both sympathy and immediate enmity from the villagers “constellates the unity of proximity and distance encapsulated in every human relation: the distance within this relationship keeps immediacy remote, but the foreignness draws this remoteness closer.” The otherness of the newcomer is marked in a number of ways throughout the short story—not only in terms of its various plot elements (exchanging his American [and later Swabian] hat[s], his repetition of the American ‘figure of speech’ [“help yourself”], and his constant critique of Old World social conventions), but also in the formal introduction of his character. A visible typographical feature of the story—common in publications of the time, yet nonetheless of interest here in Auerbach’s construct of a transatlantic identity, is the use of both Courier and Fraktur print in the mixed-language dialogue of Aloys Jr.

When he steps off the train in the neighboring village of Horb to begin his trek into Nordstetten, his first spoken utterance, the English exclamation “Well!” pops notably from the

---

196 Nordstetten, in reality, is not in the Black Forest at all, but lies to the northeast between the Black Forest and the Swabian Alb.

197 See Chapter 3, page 41.

Die Einheit von Nähe und Entferntheit, die jegliches Verhältnis zwischen Menschen enthält, ist hier zu einer, am kürzesten so zu formulierenden Konstellation gelangt: die Distanz innerhalb des Verhältnisses bedeutet, dass der Nahe fern ist, das Fremdsein aber, dass der Ferne nah ist.

signifying with his transition from English (and Courier font) into German (and back to Fraktur script) the immediacy of the linguistic and cultural amalgamation his character represents. Although it is a far cry from the more experimental linguistic distancing employed in contemporary German-language literature, the code-switching of young Aloys throughout the text nonetheless receives a certain prominence. For an author whose selective negotiation of Swabian dialect in the songs, conversations, letters, and reported speech of his many characters has been read to play an important role in highlighting regional specificity to a general audience, the inclusion in this final story of numerous untranslated English expressions creates an additional level of linguistic complexity in the construct of a fictionalized Nordstetten.

Fig. 5: Further examples of mixed typesetting in the dialogue of “Der Tolpatsch aus Amerika” in Band 2 of Berthold Auerbach’s Neue Dorfgeschichten (1876, 87).

As aforementioned, Auerbach’s village stories circulated among a general reading audience, and the use of dialect in his stories occurs only in specific contexts. It appears, most frequently in short verse as song—where the specific meaning of untranslated stanzas has little direct impact on the larger narrative. As a marker of affiliation or social difference it plays a prominent (if always brief) role in stories such as “Ivo der Hajrle” (1843) and “Die Frau Professorin” (1846) in which dialect use (or the cessation thereof) highlights specific markers of socio-economic mobility. In her discussion of “Der Lauterbacher” (1843), Josephine Donovan highlights the way that Auerbach draws deliberate attention to the specificity of dialect (without actually employing its use) through a gloss in his own text in which the reader is informed that the

198 Auerbach, Neue Dorfgeschichten, 2.

199 The use of different typeface was a common feature of Prewar multilingual (primarily) German-language texts. Nevertheless, recent interventions from the field of social semiotics have highlighted variance in typesetting in a broader European context as indicative of coded social belongings through visual cues. For a representative intervention, see:


speaker’s use of dialect has been translated for the reader into High German. Letters from America, such as Aloys’ Sr.’s lengthy correspondences with his family, employ a more casual narrative voice—distinct from that of the short stories’ primary narrators—marked by frequent use of abbreviation and vernacular expressions. But while these instances display a markedly Southern German affect, they remain a far cry from the Swabian dialect represented in Auerbach’s transcriptions of folk song (and the insistence of characters such as Aloys, that the preservation of these songs represents a tangible link to Nordstetten’s village community while in exile).

In his 1846 Schrift und Volk, Bertolt Auerbach discusses the functions of dialect as employed in early Realist literature. As a proponent of folk poetry and an author of popular fiction, Auerbach presents an engagement with spoken language and dialect as a source of inspiration for authors of Realism, praising, for example, Hebel’s Alemannic poetry as a convergence with oral poetic tradition. He muses that “folkloric poetry raises individuals out of milieus of which we are used to think only in terms of their totalities” offering a form of literary intervention through the privileging of individual or localized narratives—a crucial intervention for the literary representation of what he conceives as a decentralized nation of diverse peripheries.

Yet despite lengthy engagement with folk poetry in its various traditions, and a pronounced regard for the poetic nature of oral communication, Auerbach also cautions against an over-reliance on dialect as a tool for contemporary drama or prose, ridiculing the notion that a folk hero like William Tell could hold his monologues in Alemannic dialect in Schiller’s dramatic rendition of the legend. Auerbach reasons, rather, that literature must negotiate a language of communication, arguing that “Oral dialect cannot and will not disappear, but a language must be comprehensible to all unless we desire to bring about its true disintegration.” In this way, Auerbach’s selective use of dialect provides an aesthetic marker of traditionality and communal

---

201 Donovan, European Local-Color, 112.

202 Die volksthümliche Poesie hebt Individuen aus jenen Kreisen heraus, die man sonst nur als Gesammtheit zu fassen gewohnt war.

Auerbach, “Schrift und Volk,” 79.

203 Auerbach writes: “We Germans have no national midpoint, we have no characteristics for a national lifestyle. We are, in this, a worldly people, in that we not only find it easy to adopt the foreign as our own, but also to recognize the tremendous variation within ourselves” [Wir Deutschen haben keinen nationalen Mittelpunkt, wir haben keine Typen des Nationallebens. Wir sind auch darin das Weltvolk, daß wir nicht nur das Fremde leicht in uns aufnehmen, sondern auch in uns selber die größte Mannichfaltigkeit darstellen].

Ibid, 47.

204 Ibid, 74.

205 Die Mundarten können und werden nie verschwinden, aber Eine Sprache muß Allen verständlich sein, wenn wir nicht erst die wahre Zerküpfung herbeiführen wollen.

belonging, with little concern for a broader alienation which might be affected through an over-
reliance on more difficult colloquial registers.

On the other hand, despite its frequency in “Amerika,” the use of English is neither glossed
nor translated—remaining, through typographic convention, a visual marker of otherness for the
reader throughout the text. Conspicuously, Swabian terms, even nicknames of the characters, are
frequently glossed with their High German equivalent (Kobbel, for example, is a diminutive for
Jakob), creating a plurality of linguistic distancing differentiated by the level of their
accessibility. Short and narratively insignificant exchanges (songs or exclamations), like the use
of English, function both as markers of authenticity (linguistic Realism) and narrative markers of
inclusion or exclusion. After Aloys emigration from Nordstetten, he writes home in “Ivo der
Hajrle” to inquire after Swabian song lyrics, seeking to maintain his connection to his home
through continued participation in its dialect and folk customs. Inversely, when Aloys Jr. returns
thirty years later to his father’s hometown, it is he who has retained this cultural knowledge, even
as recourse to the language of folk song has becoming increasingly scarce in the Nordstetten to
which he has ‘returned.’

Use of English also informs the othering of the story’s second American immigrant, Ohlreit. Following his return to Nordstetten from America, this character is unable to renegotiate
his former place in a village life which has moved on without him. Absent his inheritance and
immediate family, Ohlreit finds a new place as the village drunk, squandering his American-made
wealth and surrendering even his own name as stigma of his transformation into stranger. After
previously encountering this character during his initial arrival in Nordstetten, Aloys Jr. inquires
after his curious name: “He always says that in English,” was the reply, and already from outside
they heard him cry: All right.” Like Aloys Jr.’s father, the Tolpatsch, and the schwarzer Geiger
of Keller’s Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe, the coding of Ohlreit’s strangeness requires the
forfeiture of his personal identity and name.

In his 1908 “Exkurs über den Fremden” Georg Simmel describes the archetypical figure
thus:

The stranger is not discussed here in the sense so often touched upon in the past, as
wanderer—arriving today and departing tomorrow—but rather, as one who arrives today
and remains tomorrow. That is to say, as the potential wanderer, one who—although he
has not journeyed onward—is yet to fully overcome the disenfranchisement of arrival and
departure. He remains fixed within a specific spatial environment—or an environment
whose particular boundaries are analogous—but his position within this environment is

\(206\) Auerbach, Dorfgeschichten, 163.

\(207\) „Der Ohlreit kommt.“
„Heißt der Mann denn Ohlreit?“ fragte Aloys.
„Er welscht immer so,“ wurde erwidert, und schon von draußen hörte man ihn rufen: All right.

Auerbach, Neue Dorfgeschichten, 19.
largely determined by the fact that he did not originally belong to it, that he brings with himself qualities which did not and could not originate from there. Simmel’s stranger functions as a foil to their community, highlighting through an outsider’s perspective, those inconsistencies known only to one with privileged inside information. The schwarzer Geiger in Keller’s novella, is in many ways this quintessential stranger: nameless, homeless, and distinguished by perceived physical markers of his outsider status. Yet from the onset of the novella, the reader is presented with information contrary to the Geiger’s established outsider role in his community. The immediate presentation of his disenfranchisement challenges the reader to acknowledge the fictitious narrative ascribed to him by other villagers. The prominence of this outsider figure is evident in the development of the novella’s plot narrative, as well. Although the names of the two farmers (Marti and Manz) are introduced first by Keller’s narrator, it is the figure of the fiddler (under the assumed anonymity of his pseudonym as schwarzer Geiger) which appears next, before either names or identities are ascribed to the farmers’ children whose love affair lends the novella its name; it is also his (the schwarzer Geiger’s) familial history which is discussed and dismissed in the opening pages of the story—setting the stage for the conflict between the two families over land of which the fiddler has been dispossessed.

In Auerbach’s village stories, it is often a familiar stranger who defines the narrative and plot. This figure arrives, departs, or returns informed by various prior commitments to the community, yet marked by increasingly defined tropes of inherent difference. Auerbach was himself no competent representative for an American, English-speaking subjectivity. Although emigration factored considerably into his own family narrative, he did not himself visit America, nor did he experience firsthand the linguistic complications of a post-migrant life. The marked use of English in his “Amerika” story performs a functional role in defining the belongings of its different characters, but it does not yet provide a nuanced insight into cultural specificities of its users. It is foregrounded as a formal component of identity in stranger figures, one which Aloys Jr. struggles to overcome in his initial interactions with the inhabitants of Nordstetten, providing a formal as well as ideological counterweight to Ohlreit’s failed reintegration: “Ohlreit arrived at the table bleary-eyed and blinking, desiring to speak English. Aloys answered him in German.” With his intimate knowledge of the local tradition, ultimately, Aloys Jr.’s ability to affirm the

---

208 *Es ist hier also der Fremde nicht in dem bisher vielfach berührten Sinn gemeint, als der Wandernde, der heute kommt und morgen geht, sondern als der, der heute kommt und morgen bleibt—sozusagen der potentiell Wandernde, der, obgleich er nicht weitergezogen ist, die Gelöstheit des Kommens und Gehens nicht ganz überwunden hat. Er ist innerhalb eines bestimmten räumlichen Umkreises - oder eines, dessen Grenzbestimmtheit der räumlichen analog ist—fixiert, aber seine Position in diesem ist dadurch wesentlich bestimmt, dass er nicht von vornherein in ihn gehört, dass er Qualitäten, die aus ihm nicht stammen und stammen können, in ihn hineinträgt.*


209 *Verschlafen blinzelnd kam Ohlreit an den Tisch und wollte englisch reden. Aloys antwortete ihm deutsch.*

cultural expectations of the villagers facilitates temporary integration—he knows when to highlight his otherness and when to make use of his familiarity.

In the end, the young Aloys remains distanced from the other villagers in his conventions and beliefs. His privileged role as a familiar stranger provides him a platform for critiquing the conservative tendencies of the community, but it also makes him a convenient confidant of the community’s other marginalized figures. If anything, the narrative framing of “Amerika” is highly conservative: Aloys Jr. returns to his father’s home town to seek a wife to bring back to his homestead in America—reaffirming the connection to a perceived homeland despite a generational and (partial) linguistic divide. Yet this negotiation is fraught with conflict—the young Aloys remains critical of what he deems the ‘superstitions’ of the Old World, and he falls in love with the daughter of his father’s old nemesis Jörgli, in defiance of explicit instruction. His interest in life in his father’s village is marked by his admiration for the ways in which traditional life has been reworked to incorporate technological advancements he champions as American.²¹⁰

Although the protagonist, Aloys Jr., often remains aloof, Auerbach’s narrator endeavors more explicitly in this late village story to critique social problems only insinuated in earlier stories. Supercilious and frequently frustrated by his experiences, Aloys Jr. more often than not seems little interested in the cultural comparisons his presence elicits from the other Black Forest villagers. Nonetheless, he is repeatedly subject to monologues from acquaintances desiring to inform him of their progressive social positions and the transformations in German culture since his father’s emigration. In multiple cases, the topic turns to the treatment of the Jewish villagers. The cobbler Hirtz, in a protracted explanation of Ohlreit’s character, holds up the example of Jewish emigrants from Nordstetten who continue to support their remaining family members from afar. He blames Ohlreit’s now reduced social position on his poor ability to maintain relations with his families while living in America, and explicitly holds up the example of the Jewish German diaspora as a model for sustaining family connections from afar. He insists, thereby, several times upon his neutral position vis-à-vis religious difference before finally proclaiming pointedly that Judaism “can’t be a bad religion.”²¹¹

On a separate occasion, memories of Aloys Sr.’s conflict with the Jewish character Kobbel reemerge. Though there is no narrative basis on which to presume that Kobbel’s character was discriminated upon due to his Jewish heritage, another Jewish character in “Amerika” champions Aloys Sr. as an early representative of inclusive values: “The teacher instructed Aloys to inform his father of the advances made in his homeland, for it was well-known how well his father has treated Long Herzle’s Kobbel. Over there in America people no longer greet one another as religious comrades, but simply as fellow countrymen, and the same is finally happening, too, in

---

²¹⁰ A particularly striking moment occurs in his display of admiration for the farming equipment he encounters on his walk to Ivo’s estate:

Auerbach, Neue Dorfgeschichten, 113-14.

²¹¹ Ich mein’, das kann doch keine schlechte Religion sein.

Ibid, 53.
the fatherland.” Here, as before, Aloys Jr. himself seems more preoccupied with negotiating his own current precarity than in acknowledging the struggles of others. The insertion of these multiple asides plays no direct role in advancing the narrative, yet the prevalence with which Aloys Jr. and his father’s migrations are used to inspire discussions of the treatment of German-Jews is notable.

It is in the figure of the returning emigrant more than any other in Auerbach’s Black Forest village stories, that the problematic of integration is considered. To provide a parallel from 21st-century German language literature, I again turn to José F. A. Oliver whose contemporary Black Forest village stories provide a comparative point for this historical discussion. In his 2016 “1 Entwurf, 1 Tristolog,” Oliver’s narrator begins with the revelation: “Every decision is also a renunciation, Spinoza writes, and my father once mused that emigration changes our identity.” This transformation through renunciation is anticipated in the migrant figure of Auerbach’s many village stories, perhaps not coincidentally, given Auerbach’s investment in Spinoza’s philosophy. In each of these cases, the characters who return are no longer the same as those who left—they are welcomed back to the village community as strangers, strangers who must renegotiate altered positions in light of their ‘return.’ The renunciation of divergent spatialities—the physical return of their bodies—can only partially accommodate the transformation of their belonging(s). The cycle of returns made possible by the modern trans-European mobilities Oliver describes in his essay as “dream-commuting” [pendelträumen] can only be broken by the physical return of the body after death.

Biographical readings of Auerbach’s village stories have stressed the significance of transatlantic migration in his own family in the interpretation of his conflicting representations of migration. Yet as these examples demonstrate, the complex network between Nordstetten and the transatlantic world is not defined by a binary of the domestic and the foreign. The lived experience of departure may well have informed Auerbach’s storytelling, but it is the stories themselves which define a more intricate network of transatlantic affinities. In each story, the migrant figure negotiates a new position as stranger within both departing and receiving communities. Their weaving of personal motifs and a familiar narrative voice correspond with the folkloristic interests of a period reading audience and with Auerbach’s deliberately stated personal goals of negotiating the tenuous social divisions of his time through literature. In the context of Auerbach’s body of

---

212 Der Lehrer trug Aloys auf, seinem Vater zu erzählen, welchen Fortschritt man in der Heimat gemacht habe; denn es sei ja bekannt, wie gut sich sein Vater gegen des langen Herzles Kobbel benommen habe; drüben in Amerika begrüßen sich die Menschen nicht mehr als Religionsgenossen, sondern als Heimatgenossen, und das Gleiche mache sich nun endlich auch im Vaterlande geltend.

Ibid, 58.

213 Jede Entscheidung sei auch Verzicht, sagt Spinoza, und die Emigration, sinnierte einst mein Vater, verändere die Identität des Menschen.

Oliver, “1 Entwurf,” 119.

214 Ibid, 123; ibid, 132-33.
critical writings, these village stories can neither be read as personal confessions, nor as wholly abstract reflections. Rather, their intertwining narratives provide a literary imaginary for a society increasingly ill-disposed towards a prominent Jewish German author contributing to the ideological and aesthetic discourses of German nationalism. Auerbach’s foregrounding of migration in the personalized representations of the village of his childhood works to bridge a growing distance—already conspicuous to a 19th-century audience—between impossibly codependent transatlantic communities, as much so as it negotiates divisions between an imagined united Germany and the plurality of Germanness such a union threatened to disavow. The layerings of this Black Forest village, in their global reach, can be understood in the prescient words of another Auerbach scholar whose words anticipate my own return back from 19th-century imaginaries to the intrinsically global realities of the 21st:

We see with Auerbach, that global thinking posed new answers to the central questions of both individuals and societies on both sides of the Atlantic. His texts provide us much regarding the specifically German interests in migration, cultural exchange, and globalization in the run-up to the foundation of the German Reich. For Auerbach, 150 years ago, these problems and their solutions were deeply entwined with America. One can, in the same way, examine global conditions today.

215 Fig. 6: Narraciones de la Selva Negra, Auerbach translation, Barcelona, 1883 (courtesy of the Berthold-Auerbach-Museum, Horb am Neckar).


Belgum, “Wie ein Mensch,” 82.
5: Refuge in Translation


– José Francisco Agüera Oliver

“Alles wurde größer, nicht kleiner, weitete sich, so als atme die Höhe tatsächlich im letzten Licht, während in den Tälern längst der Schatten lag, kein anderes Land, aber eines, das doch anders war.”

– Katharina Hacker

Can one speak of a multilocalational poetics, or perhaps a poetry of layered place? And if so, what role does the village (continue to) play in German-language concepts of belonging vis-à-vis a mobile, global modernity? In the preceding chapters I have endeavored to lay the groundwork for investigating these questions: presenting an overview of contemporary constructs for both place and mobility and acknowledging historical village stories which have contributed towards destabilizing sedentary concepts of Germanness. In doing so, my intention has been to identify moments when German-language literary discourse around the village prepares it as a representational place216 of mobility, and as a reservoir for a pluralistic vision of participatory community. In particular, I have highlighted both the literary and critical works of 19th-century, Jewish German author Berthold Auerbach, whose popular village stories were fundamental to period imaginaries of village life in the 19th century, and whose legacy continues to inform the rural imaginary today.217

The investigation of this chapter leaps forward to the late-20th and early-21st centuries. Its material sources are different—I leave behind the at-times tendential, popular short narratives of the 19th century, turning instead to the poetic essays and experimental poems of contemporary author José F. A. Oliver. Yet disparate and translingual as they may be, Oliver’s works are also German village stories, and his coding of village topology through recourse to specific and often conflicting use of language represents a profound aestheticization of experiences of alienation and belonging anticipated by many 19th century village stories. Though translingual218 writing is

---

216 In the first two chapters of my dissertation I seek to reframe the literary village by working through Henri Lefebvre’s concept of representational space as “Redolent with imaginary and symbolic elements, they have their source in history – in the history of a people as well as in the history of each individual belonging to that people”: Lefebvre, Production of Space, 41.

My interest in the tangibility of the village experience leads me to reinvest in the concept of place through Tim Cresswell’s updated 2015 study Place: an introduction: utilizing Lefebvre’s research on socially constructed spaces to argue that it is precisely the social, participatory dynamic which crystallizes abstract concepts of space into the literary imaginaries of what I call representational places.


218 The comparatist Ottmar Ette defines the translingual condition as “an interminable process of constant language crossing […] In this way, two or more languages become no longer easily separable from one another, but rather, they permeate each other reciprocally” [Von der multilingualen und interlingualen lässt sich wiederum eine
certainly not new to the contemporary German literary corpus, Oliver’s focus on the local negotiates a particularly complex intersection of language and place, highlighting the intense specificity both across and within linguistic performances. Using his 2007 essay collection Mein andalusisches Schwarzwaldorf [My Andalusian Black Forest Village] as a point of departure, I argue that the villages in Oliver’s literary landscape present a crystallization of the competing translingual and transnational imaginaries which underscore his work, traveling backwards through his corpus of literary works to investigate the experimental, trilingual 1997 collection Duende and some of his earliest poetry from the late 1980s, collected and republished in the 2015 Heimatt: Frühe Gedichte.

The literary corpus of German-born, Andalusian-Spanish author José F. A. Oliver begins in the fraught period immediately preceding and then following German Reunification: a time in which the concept of Germanness was renegotiated not only through the unification of East and West, but also through the continued integration of the European Union and the ongoing transformation of the legal apparatus governing German citizenship laws. Although his first collection of poetry, Auf-Bruch was published in 1987, Oliver had already established himself in the mid-1980s as one of the leading voices of what was, at that time, conceptualized under the nebulous (and often factually incorrect) label of Ausländerliteratur. From 1984 to 1985, he became

translinguale Situation abgrenzen, ein unabschließbarer Prozeß ständiger Sprachenquerung gemeint ist. Zwei oder mehrere Sprachen sind dabei nicht mehr ohne weiteres voneinander zu scheiden, sondern durchdringen sich wechselseitig:\n
Ette, ZwischenWeltenSchreiben, 21.

Ette continues to describe the phenomenon as facilitating rapid jumps [Hin- und Herspringen] between languages (ibid), a concept I problematize in Oliver’s work through the author’s evocation of local and regional dialect. I read Oliver’s sensitivity to variation, instead, as grounding even his most translingual works within a framework of representational place.

The concept of literary translingualism has been described by Steven Kellman as “one in which authors are acutely aware of shared conditions and aspirations.” Here Kellman, too, harkens back to the tradition of James Clifford: evoking Clifford’s notion of the fluidity of ‘traveling cultures’ when he observes that “with language, too, speakers and speech communities are forever in flux, and it becomes futile to try to establish priorities.”

Kellman, Translingual Imagination, ix; ibid, 4.

Of course, not all languages are conceptualized as equal: The privileging (or prioritizing) of languages—particularly as it applies to multilingualism and the activation or appropriation of register—is also discussed below through what I conceptualize as linguistic alienation. For two important recent discussions of mono- versus multilingual language paradigms see:

Gramling, Monolingualism, 2016; Yildiz, Mother Tongue, 2013.

219 The 2011 anthology Transit Deutschland: Debatten zu Nation und Migration presents a critical overview of 20th century migration to Germany, including historical documentation and scholarly analyses of period discourse around labor and migration. The nineth chapter (“Schreiben auf Achse”) provides an excellent overview of multi- and translingual German writers: their stages of recognition, as well as their assigned and assumed identity performances:

Göktürk et al, Transit Deutschland, 567-632.
the first chair of the newly grounded *Polynationale Literatur- und Kunstverein (PoLiKunst)* [Polynational Association for Art and Literature] (Raddatz 1994). He published eight volumes of poetry through various smaller publishing houses between 1987 and 1998; later publishing six volumes with Suhrkamp between 2000 and 2010, including the essay collection *Mein andalusisches Schwarzwaldorf* (2007) upon which much of the research in the current chapter is based. Since 2010, he has published seven additional volumes of prose, poetry, and translation, including his most recent work, *wundgewähr*, published in 2018. His work as organizer and promoter of the arts and literature also continues through to the present day, particularly through the tradition of his Hausacher LeseLenz, a two-week literary festival which will celebrate its 23rd anniversary in 2020. In recent years, Oliver has also utilized his own positionality—including the lived experience of negotiating the integration of the intra-European labor force through international bodies such as the Schengen Zone—to advocate for more recent migrants arriving from outside the boundaries of an increasingly interconnected European Union. This ongoing activism also includes youth outreach programs organizing writing workshops and publishing poetry and translations by refugees.

Although the period in which Oliver began his writing career represented, on the one hand, a time of transformations in mobility, it was also a time in which personal relations to physical locations received intense scrutiny in the struggle to redefine a sense of nationhood. I argue that the invocations of place in Oliver’s writing are inherently comparative phenomena (that is, that each engagement with a specific geospatial location unfolds vis-à-vis that of other specific places).

His evocation of the local sphere—the village—allows this representation to critique a foundation stone of German identity from a position straddling that of both critical insider and informed outsider. This layering of place-based identity was not lost on early critics of the author’s work. Already in 1994, Fritz J. Raddatz had described Oliver’s work as negotiating “two worlds” in his feuilleton on contemporary German-language literature for *Die Zeit*, “In mir zwei Welten.” Describing Oliver’s poetry, he writes: “The torture remains of being a German who is not German. Oliver could, quite obviously, develop his language into an instrument, untremblingly, to capture the trembling of his existence—weightlessly. He had both freedom and danger at once: strong prerequisites for literature (if perhaps, poor ones for life)”.220

My primary focus, too, is on the Alemannic-Andalusian author’s engagement with language and its variations as a vehicle for representing concepts of both movement and sedentism: examining translation and language use as communicative vessels for performing the entanglements of place-based identity. I argue that through translation and the privileging of linguistic variation, the specificities of conflicting reference points serve to prepare the negotiation of a pluralistic community with increasingly multilocational affiliations. In doing so, I also posit that while Oliver’s use of language may touch upon the ‘in-betweenness’ so often highlighted in recent conceptualizations of new German-language literature, his concept of place is very much

---

220 *Es blieb die Qual, Deutscher zu sein, der kein Deutscher ist. Oliver konnte offenbar ohne Zittern seine Sprache zum Instrument bilden, um das Zittern seiner Existenz einzufangen – schwerelos. Er hatte die Freiheit und die Bedrohung zugleich; gute Voraussetzung für Literatur (und vielleicht schlechte fürs Leben).*

anchored in the local, the specific. Through close readings of several works from the author’s 2007 *Mein andalusisches Schwarzwaldorf*, with comparative references both to other essays, as well as to his poetry, this chapter presents Oliver’s poetics as paradigmatic for the negotiation of place-based identities in the context of contemporary, mobile communities. In conclusion, I examine the author’s engagement with the Bakhtinian notion of the carnivalesque in his construct of a multivalent, localized community imaginary grounded in the specificity of the Alemannic village—a continuation of my ongoing secondary focus on the utilization of folk tradition in literary representations of the village sphere.

This chapter also problematizes the representation of transcultural literature as ‘rootless’ or as existing ‘in-between’ fixed place-based identities. Instead, I seek to investigate the ways in which engagement with a layered multitude of local specificities works towards conceptualization of the post-national—writing beyond cultural constructs of the nation-state through a global privileging of conflicting local narratives and recourse to specific place-based language and tradition. This focus is in no-way meant to suggest a tacit rejection of previous scholarly engagements with Oliver’s work, nor a rebuttal for existing comparative research on contemporary transcultural and translingual literature. On the contrary, framing of the “in-betweenness” inherent in so much of contemporary German-language literary production serves as one of the cornerstones of my investigation—albeit one which I feel deserves further unpacking. By necessity, my avoidance of terms like “translocal” does not explicitly represent a disavowal of recent (especially geographic) research on the subject, nor of the common representations of “in-betweenness” inherent in this discourse, as well. Instead, my current research seeks to investigate conceptualizations of village life in mobile narratives by prioritizing representations of local interaction along a layered complex of mobilities. By focusing on moments of concrete engagement with the local through what I read as an increasingly global perspective, I hope to provide a framework for examining a body of German-language literature which transcends current (re)emphasis on the biographical in my own field—moving beyond biographical classifications such as ‘migrant’ or ‘postmigrant’ literature to determine new ways of examining the language and poetics of the written word.

5.1 Growing Pains
Writing of the proliferation of *Heimatkunst* [artwork invoking the concept of the German homeland] in the latter half of the 19th century, Germanist Anne Fuchs describes how “As large-scale population shifts occurred from rural to urban centres, the *Heimat* movement responded to the acute pressures of historical acceleration by way of a provincial imaginary that celebrated the parochial as the real locus of a shared identity and temporal anchorage.” In identifying the stabilizing impetus of the movement, she argues that this engagement provided “a complex and

221 I offer this critique of the term ‘postmigrant’ here only in the very limited sense in which it is employed as an alternative to or subcategory of prior designations such as migrant- or guest worker literature with their specific references to the lived biographies of the authors—referring specifically to the condition of those German-born ‘immigrants’ whose parents or grandparents first migrated to Germany. For a brief history of the term’s more extended use, see Footnote 1 (page 2).

contradictory engagement with the forces of modernity” at odds with contemporary attempts to reify concepts of homeland in the global, digital age.\footnote{Ibid, 125.} In doing so, Fuchs sets the stage for a provocative investigation of two recent novels\footnote{The two novels Fuchs examines at length in this essay are Julia Schoch’s \textit{Mit der Geschwindigkeit des Sommers} and Judith Zander’s \textit{Dinge, die wir heute sagten}.} set in the contested memory-sphere of rural eastern Germany (the former communist German Democratic Republic)—a region for which successive generations maintain incompatible memories of a historical and contemporary homeland. This reading permits Fuchs to maintain her underlying conviction that “More than a century later attachment to place is far more precarious: under an ungovernable condition of “liquid modernity” that is marked by financial volatility, social insecurity, mass migration and massive environmental threats, there are no reliable vectors of how to produce, maintain and protect meaningful localities.”\footnote{Ibid, 127.} The German homeland, she implies, can no longer be defined by recourse to outdated notions of timeless, rural tradition in the face of undeniable spatial and demographic change. In problematizing the vanished homeland of the GDR or formerly German-speaking regions of Central or Eastern Europe, her work joins a growing body of scholarship which investigates the intersection of space and memory in contemporary Germany’s renegotiation of its historical realms.\footnote{Edited by Friederike Eigler and Jens Kugele, the 2012 collection \textit{Heimat}, in which Fuchs’ essay appears, contains a number of representative works of related scholarship. Eigler’s 2014 \textit{Heimat, Space, Narrative} represents, perhaps, the most comprehensive monograph on the subject to date.}

Yet in both popular and political culture, conceptualizations of the German homeland \textit{[Heimat]} continue to revolve around the image of that selfsame, timeless, rural idyll. This is an evocation of what German folklorist Hermann Bausinger has deemed the “village in our heads\textsuperscript{227}”—a construct of conflicting imaginaries for the representational space of the village community tailored to fit a prescribed image and fulfill an ascribed role—posing the rural village either as a model for communal tranquility or a repository for anachronistic barbarism, depending on subjective political persuasion.\footnote{Das Dorf im Kopf\textsuperscript{227} Bausinger, “Das Dorf im Kopf,” 1990.} Despite increasing scholarly attempts to unpack the complex associations of \textit{Heimat} in a globalized context, populist and nationalist representations of Germanness continue to thrive on the commodification of rural identities presented both as synonymous with the German concept of homeland and as the antithesis of an ethnically diverse, urban German elite. Be it in the imagery of the 2018 German state electoral campaign trail which saw, for example, former Bavarian CSU Party Leader Horst Seehofer posing in rural settings with supporters dressed in traditional village garb \textit{[Trachten]}, or the deliberate evocations bandied by the far-right party \textit{Alternative für Deutschland} (AfD) \textit{[Alternative for Germany]} of village

\textsuperscript{223}Ibid, 125.
\textsuperscript{224}The two novels Fuchs examines at length in this essay are Julia Schoch’s \textit{Mit der Geschwindigkeit des Sommers} and Judith Zander’s \textit{Dinge, die wir heute sagten}.
\textsuperscript{225}Ibid, 127.
\textsuperscript{226}Edited by Friederike Eigler and Jens Kugele, the 2012 collection \textit{Heimat}, in which Fuchs’ essay appears, contains a number of representative works of related scholarship. Eigler’s 2014 \textit{Heimat, Space, Narrative} represents, perhaps, the most comprehensive monograph on the subject to date.
\textsuperscript{227}Das Dorf im Kopf
\textsuperscript{228}Ibid, 18.
‘tradition’ in conflict with more socially progressive cultural constructs, a pointed reading of village community continues to dominate popular discourse around the changing demographics of contemporary Germany.

One is reminded, for example, of the AfD’s 2017 advertising campaign in Schleswig-Holstein: “Heimat statt Multi-Kulti” [Homeland instead of Multiculturalism], a rather crude example of their ongoing attempts to posit German landscapes as inherently homogenous spaces. Of course, the imaginaries of contemporary literature and populist political ideology evolve and circulate in very different receptive spheres, but their paths cross to the extent that they engage in the self-same discourses, presenting at times polar opposite perspectives on the same social phenomena. The AfD has, in recent years, become increasingly adept at coopting the language of progressive social activism and repackaging it as völkisch-identitarian thought through a combination of image and written word.

Nevertheless, as popular—particularly political—imaginaries continue to proliferate imagery of a rural landscape characterized by static sedentism, the German-language literary world provides a striking contrast to this paradigm. I posit that, despite the growing diversity of experience which could (or should) preclude exclusionary evocations of the local and regional in contemporary projects of nation-building, the continued circulation of a narrow imaginary for the rural village demands investigation into alternative representations of these places, too. Exploration of local tradition from a position of cultural plurality generates a space in which the
weapons of populist nationalism can be re-tooled into a poetics which transcends or fundamentally destabilizes nationalist discourse. My interest, as such, is not to seek out literary examples which evade or negate popular attempts to maintain the correlation between imagined rural localities and the construct of wider, German national identity. This research, instead, examines the ways in which recent literature has provided models for rethinking and re-presenting these same localities in the context of an increasingly global, transnational consciousness.

If the alleged closeness of the village community facilitates categorizations of belonging, this occurs, by needs, with a certain degree of self-reflection, as well. In Auerbach’s era, restrictions on socioeconomic participation in a given community were drawn along confessional borders—a restriction which also impacted the migration of Christian communities, though it served as a far more tangible barrier to Jewish mobility through the piecemeal emancipation of European Jews throughout the German-speaking lands. As mentioned in preceding chapters, representations of the stranger have always been inherently tied to constructs of social space—as evident in Georg Simmel’s 1908 essay “The Stranger” [Exkurs über den Fremden]. Today, the increased mobility of certain intra-European identities has been facilitated by the exclusion of non-European others along the external borders of an increasingly fortified European Union. In the post-Schengen construct of the European labor market, an intra-European work force moves freely between the wealthy countries of northwestern Europe and developing economies from the European Mediterranean and former Eastern Bloc. Yet only a few decades ago, the integration of different intra-European relations remained in its infancy, characterized by a complex web of porous borders and the pendular motion of labor markets (both from within Europe, as well as from its peripheries in Mediterranean Africa and the Near East) conceptualized as temporary ‘guests.’ In this context, the ways in which these mobile communities have represented their experience present potential models for broader reconfigurations of place in European identity formation—defining a language of alterity through translingual literature for the narration of the tangible experience of migration and (differentiated) mobilities. For first- and second-generation migrants like Oliver from what has now become the integrated Schengen Zone, these narratives represent still-living memories of a new form of diaspora in which the negotiation of border crossings became an increasingly fixed aspect of their collective biographies.

---

229 In problematizing the insular imaginary of the contemporary village, Bausinger proposes the recognition of both Dorfkultur and Dorfkulturen [village culture and village cultures]—the latter representing the subjective experiences of individual members within a community, the former representing the popular imaginary circulated as a collective representation of their sum total:


For prior discussion of Simmel’s concept of the stranger see Chapters 3 (page 41) and 4.2 (page 73).

Language plays an intrinsic role in the definition of what I have previously defined as **representational places**. My interest in this connection has been influenced in no small way by Oliver’s own particular invigoration of the relationship between language and place and their combined mimetic potential—a concept embodied in his frequent use of the linguistic in(ter)vention W:ort. I argue that Oliver’s simultaneous engagement with multiple languages and registers harnesses this potential through acts of linguistic alienation—tying the reception and comprehension of his translingual works with access to multiple, specific, localized linguistic communities.

My work in this chapter at times runs parallel to Germanist Yasemin Yildiz’ research on what she deems the “postmonolingual condition” in her 2012 *Beyond the Mother Tongue*, and my own analysis of Oliver’s work is indebted to this groundbreaking work as both framing device and analytical tool. Particularly in the fifth chapter of *Beyond the Mother Tongue*, Yildiz examines the work of Turkish-German author Feridun Zaimoğlu and his use of what she deems a “defiant appropriation” of the German language.\(^{232}\) This defiant appropriation is characterized by what she describes as “theatrical linguistic performance” and the creation of what Yildiz characterizes as a “synthetic vernacular” which “destabilizes the sanctioned “native speakers'” access and taken-for-granted relationship to the language.\(^{233}\)

Oliver’s work, I argue, takes this “defiant appropriation” a step further—both through his specific stylization of the High German, as well as through the linguistic device of employing highly localized vernacular (the Alemannic dialect) to narrate the migrant experience. Inspired by Yildiz’ discussion of the Adornian concept of “alienation” [Entfremdung] I became fascinated with other, performative understandings of dissociation, eventually drawing upon the related, Brechtian notion of “alienation” [Verfremdung] in my categorization of Oliver’s work. The concept of alienation has a storied history—both in the social sciences, as well in a German-Studies-specific context. The current activation of the term is rooted in the early-20th-century discourse most closely associated with Bertolt Brecht’s epic theater, positing the translational act inherent in Oliver’s works as a literary performance of the alienation [Verfremdung] process. Inspired by Walter Benjamin’s concept of the “kernel of pure language” [Kern der reinen Sprache],\(^{234}\) and the assertion that “all translations are only a provisional manner for coming to terms with the otherness of language”\(^{235}\) I read Oliver’s partial or translingual translations as a poetic device facilitating linguistic alienation, providing a conceptual platform for the simultaneous inside-outside perspective of the stranger.


\[\text{233}\] Ibid, 176-77.


\[\text{235}\] alle Übersetzungen nur eine irgendwie vorläufige Art ist, sich mit der Fremdheit der Sprachen auseinanderzusetzen

Ibid, 14.
Brecht himself defines his own use of the alienation effect in theater as “removing the obvious, the familiar, the intelligible from the event or character and generating from them wonder and curiosity [...]”.\(^{236}\) Benjamin, in his 1934 essay “Was ist das epische Theater?” [What is Epic Theater?], interprets such an intervention as leading to a reckoning among the audience when confronted with this recontextualization of the familiar: a poetic disenfranchisement of daily life. He states:

Presentation here is not reproduction in the sense of theorists of naturalism. Far more important is first to discover the conditions of life. (One could just as well say: to alienate them.) This discovery (alienation) of conditions takes place in the midst of the interruption of sequences of events.\(^{237}\)

The impact of the alienation effect is by no means limited to the performative sphere of the epic theater; it can also be performed upon the reader, as increasingly displayed in works of late-20\(^{th}\)- and early-21\(^{st}\)-century German-language literature. Particularly among multilingual authors, alienation can also function on a purely linguistic level, serving to frustrate the reader and draw attention to the uniqueness of ideas, culture, or context in the language of the German text. Describing the idiosyncrasies in Oliver’s language use, Roberto di Bella identifies precisely this performative element; he writes: “[...] Oliver’s language is simultaneously production and archive, a performative frame for encountering the other and at the same time, according to his 1989 *Heimatt*, ‘a rejection of the official language of a country that was and is unable to accept us.’”\(^{238}\)

5.2 Performing Places
In his 2007 *Mein andalusisches Schwarzwalddorf* [My Andalusian Black Forest Village], José F. A. Oliver describes childhood in the Black Forest as a “house which was two houses [...] One house and two floors, two languages. Open windows and doors [...] The Alemannic dialect on the first floor, the Andalusian on the second. Between them, stairs without grammatical gender [...] Only a pair of steps which separated and bound [...]”\(^{239}\) Already in 2005, comparatist Ottmar Ette

---

\(^{236}\) dem Vorgang oder dem Charakter das Selbstverständliche, Bekannte, Einleuchtende zu nehmen und über ihn Staunen und Neugierde zu erzeugen [...] 

Brecht, “Theater,” 301.

\(^{237}\) Darstellung ist aber hier nicht Wiedergabe im Sinne der naturalistischen Theoretiker. Es handelt sich vielmehr vor allem darum, die Zustände erst einmal zu entdecken. (Man könnte ebensowohl sagen: sie zu verfremden.) Diese Entdeckung (Verfremdung) von Zuständen vollzieht sich mittels der Unterbrechung von Abläufen. 


\(^{238}\) So ist Olivers Sprache Inszenierung und Archiv zugleich, ein performativer Rahmen für die Begegnung mit dem Anderen und zugleich „eine Absage an die offizielle Sprache eines Landes, das uns nicht anzunehmen vermochte und vermag“ (Oliver 1989:11), so 1989 in Heimatt.


had highlighted the complex functions of spatial specificity in a previously published version of this short essay\textsuperscript{240} for his work on transnational literature, \textit{ZwischenWeltenSchreiben}. In his analysis, Ette focuses attention on the image of the open house as metaphor for a new conceptualization of the post-migrant experience:

\begin{quote}
\[\ldots\] an existential (linguistic-)situation, formed by the constant exchange between German and Spanish, Alemannic and Andalusian. The lines of tradition for all of these languages – and their disguises – run (how could it go any other way in this book) together into a single house \[\ldots\] The division of the house in two carries on into the biform lyrical I and his other, providing room for border crossings, precisely in the familiar-unfamiliar of the everyday. \[\ldots\] The staircase steps suggest both room for movement and borderland, that this house does not stand for earth-boundedness, sedentism, territoriality, but is, rather, embedded in the movement of language which is in no way conflict-free.\textsuperscript{241}
\end{quote}

Problematising this conviction—that a multitude of conflicting affiliations (as represented here in Oliver’s lyrical house) precludes so-called “earth-boundedness” \textit{[Erdverbundenheit]} or territoriality—lies at the heart of my current investigation. As in much of the early scholarship on transnational authors, Ette emphasizes motion, the in-betweenness of the migrant process, as inherently disengaged with the spatial reality of the lived experience. More recent scholarship has provoked this notion of placelessness to propose new, potentially “virtual space\[s\]” for digital encounters removed from the physical tangibility of migratory reality,\textsuperscript{242} seeking to move beyond earlier research which separated the literature of migrant communities from traditional readings of place-based identity without fully investigating the potential for writing new relative concepts of space as a negotiation of multiple, concrete affiliations.

\textsuperscript{240} A previous version of this essay was published as “wortaus, wortein” in the anthology:

\textsuperscript{241} \textit{\[\ldots\] eine existenzielle (Sprach-) Situation, die von einem beständigen Wechsel zwischen dem Deutschen und dem Spanischen, dem Alemannischen und dem Andalusischen geprägt ist. Die Traditionslinien all dieser Sprachen – und ihrer Verkleidungen – laufen, wie könnte es im vorliegenden Buch anders sein, in einem Haus zusammen \[\ldots\] Die Zweiteilung des Hauses, die sich im zweigestaltigen Ich und seinem Anderen fortsetzt, bietet Raum für Grenzüberschreitungen, die geradezu heimelig-unheimlicher Alltag sind. \[\ldots\] Die Treppenstufen deuten als Bewegungsraum und Grenzland an, daß das Haus hier nicht für Erdverbundenheit, für Seßhaftigkeit und Territorialität steht, sondern eingelassen ist in Sprachbewegungen, die keineswegs konfliktfrei sind.}

\textsuperscript{242} See for example:
The intersection of multiple disciplines in burgeoning fields like migration studies often provides conflicting data on the same subject matters. Sociologist Paolo Boccagni’s 2017 *Migration and the Search for Home* argues pointedly against recent over-emphasis of theoretical frameworks for migration which posit deterritorialized notions of the migrant experience, positing bluntly: “It is hard to deny that home has material foundations of some sort, whatever the scale of reference. Postmodern-style accounts that suggest otherwise—emphasizing the ‘unprecedented’ immaterial, virtual or deterritorialized bases of the home experience—do not resonate much with empirical findings.” Despite his argumentation that “migration can simply be framed as a way of leaving home behind, and possibly reestablishing it elsewhere” Boccagni maintains in the introduction to his recent work that “the ‘here’ and ‘there’ need not be in opposition with each other.”

In my reading, it is precisely this negotiation of multiple, conflicting commitments and territorialities in Oliver’s writing which underscores his literary re-presentation of mobile community—allowing for the creation of a layered representational place. This is not purely a *translocality* in the literal sense of the word, with implications of a fundamental in-betweenness, but rather the concrete and simultaneous engagement with multiple locations and the identities these engender—grasping towards the ephemeral and universal through grounding in specificities: in Oliver’s cosmology, life in his Andalusian Black Forest village.

Rather than focusing on a hybrid notion of place, my primary interest lies, instead, in the in-betweenness of *language* utilized for negotiating conflicting affinities between specific localized representations of place—the creation of what I have defined as layered representational places. Writers of the guest worker and so-called postmigrant generations of recent German literature have increasingly employed the use of untranslated poetic interventions from their other (non-German) languages in representations of the translingual or transcultural experience, enabling what comparatist Ottmar Ette deems in the subtitle of *ZwischenWeltenSchreiben* as “literatures without permanent residence.” In the case of an author speaking a non-European language or writing in a non-Latin script, the potential exists to further distance and provoke a readership even less likely to possess the necessary tools to access the communicative aspects of the text. A case in point would be Yoko Tawada’s combining of Kanji and Latin scripts in her more experimental poetry such as the “Die Flucht des Mondes” (originally published in *Nur da wo du bist da ist nichts*, 1987) or “TIK,” both of which are published in mixed transcription in her *Abenteuer der deutschen Grammatik* (2010). Here Tawada attempts to bridge the division between

---


244 Ibid, xxiii.

245 Although a number of more recent collections have begun to demonstrate the utility of a “translocal” perspective for defining the interconnectivity between places and communities in a globally mobile context, I continue to eschew the term “translocality” in my study. While I support and am intrigued by the developing investigation of these networks of mobilities, my interest here is to focus on the depiction of those multiple, individual places and communities inhabited and represented during and after the experience of transit:

Japanese and German, demonstrating the compounding potential of both languages through the creation of translingual neologisms composed of both Japanese- and German-language morphemes. Notwithstanding his liberal typographic irritations of the language, Oliver’s poetics, like Tawada’s, extend beyond a multiplicity of languages into the translingual: not only containing traces of many individual languages, but merging grammatical conventions and word forms between languages to achieve a subtler form of alienation without recourse to specific foreign lexica.

Oliver’s linguistic merging does not occur without a certain friction. His 1997, Duende: meine Ballade in drei Versionen provides a study both in the distinction as well as the interrelation between the various idioms the author employs throughout the corpus of his works. It is a testament toward the development of later linguistic theories such as those espoused in Yildiz’ Beyond the Mother Tongue, providing a spatial-local context for what she posits as the “creative use of these often socially unequally situated languages” as an emancipatory mechanism for testing the limitations of language in constructs of belonging. Describing Zaimoğlu’s work, Yildiz explains how, in making creative use of their multiple languages, authors who grew up in a post-migration, multilingual environment, may employ “defiant appropriation as a response to linguistic dispossession, rather than […] depropriation […] as a critical tool.” She cautions, however, that defiant appropriation can also, in excess, reproduce similar structures to a model of linguistic depropriation—something I read as Oliver’s special brand of linguistic alienation.

Duende straddles this line between defiant appropriation of language(s) and their depropriation, providing three concurrent versions of the twenty-one short poems included in the collection, each printed in German, Andalusian-Spanish, and the Alemannic dialect of the author’s hometown, Hausach in the Black Forest. But even a cursory examination of these poems reveals the author’s declared intention—to provide three language-specific ‘interpretations’ of his own works in the three primary languages in which he operates—to be a somewhat arbitrary distinction. The poems are printed on opposing pages—the left-hand page introducing the ‘primary’ High German version in slightly larger print, while the right-hand page provides smaller iterations of the poem—first in what the author deems ‘Andalusian-Spanish’ and then in the primarily oral ‘Husacher Alemannisch’ dialect spoken in Hausach. Nevertheless, many of the poems, even in their ‘primary’ High German form, contain traces of all three idioms with varying emphases. Their presentation in the book Duende, as three constituent parts of a translingual whole, further enforces my conception of the work as emblematic of a poetics of layered place. The blurring of distinctions between source text and ‘translation’—between the writing process and the translational act (or lack thereof)—inherent in this collection of poetry can also be read as an emancipatory act of

---

246 The quintessential example of this is the frequent Oliverian construction W:ort (both Wort [word] and Ort [place]); another would be m:ein (both mein [my] and ein [one]). For brief discussions of Oliver’s use of punctuation marks, see: di Bella, “W:orte,” 2010; Mueller, “Zwischen Heimatt,” 2007.

247 Yildiz, Mother Tongue, 171.

248 Ibid, 173.
defiant appropriation—re-appropriating both language and tradition of the rural village community into a context which remains inseparable from multiple local, regional, and national layers of both author and lyric speaker.

At the same time, this reproduction creates an uneasy tension between lyric speaker and reader—creating three distinct versions of a text, all with limited accessibility to a mono- or even bilingual reader unfamiliar with the specific idiosyncrasies of Oliver’s translingual lyric speakers. If the perspective of Duende’s Andalusian-Alemannic speakers is on the one-hand that of the outsider or stranger figure in the village, this insider-outsider distinction becomes increasingly blurred by the melding of both language and narrative setting place—Wort and Ort in competition to define a layered representational place of concurrent affinities in which the fashioning of an Andalusian Black Forest Village becomes inextricable from the experience of the village itself.

The performance of linguistic alienation can be conceptualized through the act of partial translation. Kwame Anthony Appiah’s describes in his 1993 essay, “Thick Translation,” the validity and indeed importance of non-translation in the circulation of works of postcolonial literature. Speaking more broadly of the practice of literary translation, Appiah observes that “translation aims to produce a new text that matters to one community the way another text matters to another: but it is part of our understanding of why texts matter that this is not a question that convention settles [...]”249 This observation derives from Appiah’s initial hypothesis that “there exists within any community of speakers of a single language a specific structure of mutual expectations about reasons for uttering”—for attempting a communication.250 Following this line of argumentation, he reasons, therefore, that a successful translation may by needs retain much of the original language of a work of literature in order to appropriately convey both literal and cultural/contextual meaning, employing the liberal use of footnotes if needed to provide as much as possible of the original context and meaning of culturally-specific discourse and retaining elements of the original language. But this sensitivity to words can inform both production and reception of a (multi- or perhaps better) translingual original, as well. The deliberate use of untranslated words or irregular grammatical forms inspired by communication between more than one language in an original text (absent or inclusive interpretive notes) alienates the reader from the aesthetic or interpretive value of the communication, providing unexpected context and new possible interpretations. The synchronicity of the familiar and foreign communicated through this linguistic alienation gestures towards what Benjamin famously referred to as a “kernel of pure language” underlying communication: as accessible in its immediacy as it remains painfully remote.


250 Ibid, 419.
Oliver’s prose and poetry form a complex amalgamation of languages—layering German, Spanish, and their variations to foreground the communicable even as these works problematize the very conventions through which experience is shared. In doing so, they provide the basis for a post-national poetics still grounded in representational place, negotiating the limitations of Benjamin’s arduous “Task of the Translator” through exploration of that kernel of pure communication which transcends individual language. By offering three separate iterations of the ‘same’ poem, each with their own associative particularities, Oliver’s act of ‘translation’ serves both to reinforce the universality of the poetic word, but also to highlight those moments in which “pure language” is codified by cultural affiliation.

In Duende, the implicit foreignness within the German-language texts should be ameliorated by the presence of their translations into Spanish and Alemannic dialect, yet the otherness of both language and content are retained through the evocation of divergent layers of place-based belonging: Both Black Forest village and Andalusian coast become inherent component parts in the creation of a three-part poetic experience in which each version of the poem contributes to the comprehension (and alienation) of its corresponding doubles.
To focus in, I would like to draw attention here to the initial lines of the poem “Sang der Ackerfurchen ins Meer” (ln 1). The imaginary of this opening line provides a concrete realization of what will become a reoccurring motif in Oliver’s later poetry and prose: the flowing furrows of Black Forest farmland flowing out into the waves of the Mediterranean—uniting the disparate representational spaces of Oliver’s topology. The proceeding line, “Ist landstreichendes Schleierweiß der Mondin” then recodes this layering onto a linguistic level, as transient in its descriptive potential as it is concrete in its linguistic specificity. This line introduces the Oliverian concept of die Mondin—evoking the grammatical feminine gender of the Spanish substantive la luna in an appropriation of the masculine German substantive der Mond (ln 2). That Oliver’s lyric speaker continues this grammatical intervention in the Alemannic poem, but simply retains the feminine la luna in the Spanish speaks to the implicit Spanish layering within the two Germanic versions of the poem.

The first stanza evokes a complex and mobile vision of rural life at odds with the rural idylls of pastoral tradition, inextricably linking memories of migration and sedentism—the vagabond [landstreichendes] movement of the moon following the motion of ploughed fields to a seaside destination made explicit in the German ins Meer and Spanish hacia el mar [towards the sea], yet left unspecified in the Alemannic dialect rooted in a communal imaginary far from the open sea: ons Wasser [towards the water] (lns 1-2). The motion of human landscapes, sea, and sky becomes suspended in the silver silence [Silberstille] between the domesticity of bedroom sheets [Laken] and the potential for onward motion implied in the window ledge [Fenstersturz] (lns 3-4). But the High German poem also invokes another, more sinister interpretation of Fenstersturz as defenestration—the violent assassination in Prague which triggered the Thirty Years War—an interpretation supported by the later invocation of medieval peasant uprisings and Spanish anti-Fascist resistance in later references to the Bundschuh-Bewegung and Albacete in the final stanza (ln 15)—though this interpretation is unsupported in the Spanish version’s unambiguous alféizar [window ledge]—one of many complications introduced by the three concurrent versions of each poem.

“Sang der Ackerfurchen” continues to blend these conflicting portraits of reality in which landscape, heritage, and specific memory intertwine: “Ist Erinnerung das Muttermal / Bald Andalusien überall / Ein Schwarzwalddorf verzürnt / Aus dem Tau ein Grün zu tasten” (lns 5-8). Memory here is coded as physicality—remembrance as a birthmark, the universal recognition of Andalusian heritage, also reiterated in the anger churning in a Black Forest village whose own dewy green mirrors that of the Andalusian flag—a parallel color trope noted Yvonne Jock’s 2015 treatment of the poem, in which she discusses the color’s use in providing a continuity of descriptors between the Andalusian and Alemannic worlds.

---

251 Oliver, Duende, 1997.

For a translation of this entire poem, see Appendix A.1.

In the penultimate stanza, the inheritance of these layered traditions are reformulated in the furtive glances of a child and measured in syllabic time (perception again coded here through recourse to specific language), and yet these do little more than destabilize what could otherwise serve as securities of belonging or access: “Ist geheimnisvoller Augenwurf des Kindes / Silbenuhr des Kuckucksschreies / Die Geborgenheiten wildern läßt” (Ins 11-13). This instability is again coded in the ambiguity of Oliver’s ‘translated’ language. It is perhaps telling here, that it is the word Geborgenheiten [safety, shelter—presented here in an uncommon plural form] which becomes recoded in markedly spatial terms—on the one hand, as the Spanish lar [hearth, fireplace] and on the other as the Alemannic Hoimet [homeland]. Conflicting visions of hearth and homeland, performed here in the violent divide between Spanish and Alemannic dialect are presented in High German through the unfamiliar plural Geborgenheiten—a German sense of safety split between conflicting visions of homeland and home. The cuckoo as well, on the surface perhaps simply a localizing reference to the ubiquitous Black Forest timepiece, also becomes a metaphor for the postmigrant experience in Oliver’s later prose works, in which his lyric speaker evokes Mayröcker’s concept of Kuckuckskrank [cuckoo’s sickness] to describe the experience of being born into a false or different nest.253

The final stanza of the poem concludes in a multilingual paradigm still rooted in the layered specificity of rural Germany and Andalusian Spain254 even as it invigorates the diasporic nature of the lyric speaker’s experience: “Ist freiheitsstreuendes Exil November / Trägt Albacete Bundschuh Babel / Mein ¡ay! das sich erfüllt im Duende” (Ins 14-16). November in the Alemannic world, which Jock reads as the beginning of the cold winter months, is here also a marker of exile—carrying within it the Andalusian city of Albacete, seat of the International Brigade who led the Communist resistance during the first years of the Spanish Civil War. It also carries with it the Bundschuh movement, unifying rural resistance in the various Peasant Uprisings of the Early Modern. And finally, it carries the legend of Babel and the biblical model for the failure of multilingualism—the belief that linguistic plurality was first and foremost a punishment to impede humanity’s incessant aspirations. The concluding line of the poem encapsulates these experiences and memories in the emotive cry ¡ay! fulfilled in the Andalusian concept of duende which is at once charisma, yearning, creativity, and artistic drive for Andalusian flamenco culture, but also the mischievous house spirits of Iberian lore—melding chaos and creativity, concealment and danger.

In the 2002 treatment of the poem in Hannelore van Ryneveld’s essay in Acta Germanica, the author also notes Oliver’s frequent evocation of the color. Here, however, van Ryneveld reads Oliver’s use of green on a more narrative level as an evocation of springtime and renewal: reflected in the thirst for sensual perception, the touch of skin, the feathery caress of forest ferns in tension with the cold November of the poem’s concluding lines:


253 Oliver, Schwarzwalddorf, 15.

254 Oliver takes frequent recourse in his works to discussions of Andalusia’s unique and multicultural tradition within the broader framework of the Spanish empire—its legacy as a cultural crossroads under the former caliphate during Arab rule and the palimpsestic history of Christian, Jewish, and Muslim Andalusia:

Oliver, “Andalusien,” 2020; Oliver, Schwarzwalddorf, 2007; et al.
As a representational place, the Andalusian Black Forest village of Oliver’s cosmology provides a discursive break between constructs of a homogenous rural idyll in binary opposition to a diverse, cosmopolitan urban. The melding of language and register, and the simultaneous production of multiple translingual iterations of the same poem serve to ground these works in a human landscape which is at once indisputably tied to specific, localized knowledge and communication, yet simultaneously participates in a mobile, global narrative. The coding of the migrant experience into both language and tradition of a highly localized Germanness serves as an emancipatory act of defiant appropriation—claiming both Alemannic dialect and Black Forest village as intrinsic to the construct of Oliver’s mobile lyric speakers.

Although I am resistant to a categorization of Oliver’s work as a negation of in-betweenness, most works in the author’s corpus are inherently what his narrators deem *zwischensprachig* [between languages]: employing a diversity of specific languages and registers which remain in conversation with one another even as they inform and provide structure for the development of specific narratives.255 The complex of languages these narrators employ provides a tangible realm for the negotiation of difference: “A draft in the game of definitions: a word’s body and a word’s soul.”256 Destabilizing rather than inhibiting communication, this plurality of languages provides a model for expressing the diversity of experience in a multilingual, multidimensional society. The high degree of specificity inherent in Oliver’s language use is difficult for me to reconcile with what Ette describes in the introduction to his 2005 work, as “leaping back and forth between different languages.”257 Rather, a *targeted* movement between specific languages and their varieties has been and remains a defining feature of Oliver’s work, representing one of the most prominent idiosyncrasies of his poetic language. It is as present in the title poem of his breakthrough 1989 collection, aptly titled *Auf-Bruch* [DePARTure / Beginning],258 as it remains in his most contemporary works.259 As a communicative act, it distances the German-language reader from the text, performing an act of linguistic alienation:


256 Ibid, 19.

257 *Bezogen auf das literarische Schreiben würde eine translinguale Praxis folglich das Hin- und Herspringen eines Autors zwischen verschiedenen Sprachen ebenso im Rahmen seines gesamten Werkes wie auch innerhalb eines bestimmten Einzeltextes bezeichnen.*


258 Literally: out-break.

259 The poem “Auf-Bruch” describes a crisis of language. Beginning in German, as the poem progresses, it is interspersed with un-glossed lines in Spanish which continue from the German in the preceding lines. The poem concludes with a final stanza completely in Spanish which brings together the previous Spanish lines along with one additional line to form a single, coherent Spanish stanza, see Appendix A.2:

posing reception from the perspective of Oliver’s so-called *Gastling*, a stranger caught between a plurality of language, culture, and community. The negotiation of this plurality through recourse to conflicting imaginaries facilitates Oliver’s negotiation of cultural-specificity. In works such as *Duende*, the use of local dialect further problematizes the boundaries of the culture-nation through destabilizing its language—demonstrating the power of place, with its local specificities, to engender both failed and successful communication and highlighting the complex of barriers both between and within languages.

### 5.3 Schwarzwald or Selva Negra

In “Thick Translation,” Appiah proposes an intervention to Sapir and Whorf’s widely-heralded Eurocentric model for fundamental comprehension-boundaries delineated by the subject’s so-called *mother tongue*. The origin of Appiah’s intervention comes, as he writes, from the personal experience growing up in a postcolonial world of linguistic multiplicity. Appiah’s concept of existing “between several languages” as key to the translational experience lies at the very core of Oliver’s intervention, and is highlighted by his narrator’s self-presentation on the opening page of *Mein andaluisisches Schwarwalddorf* where the lyrical I states, “It was here that I should be born and raised between languages – or something to that effect […]” The use of linguistic irritations serves in Oliver’s writing to disrupt the passive reader, accomplishing through linguistic means what alienation in Brecht’s epic theater achieved on stage.

Much of the current discourse on German multiculturalism remains grounded in the perception that Germany has ‘recently’ become an *Einwanderungsland* [country of immigration]

---

260 The title of (and frequent subject within) Oliver’s *Gastling* (1993), one of the author’s most overtly political works, processing the violent escalation of xenophobia following German Reunification in the early 1990s. The concept of the *Gastling* features prominently in both Oliver’s poetry and prose:

> "angezählt"

> *ins land geboren*

> *zufällig eins*

> *entzweit*

> *angekommen*

> *aufgebrochen*

> *gastling*


For a full translation of *angezählt* see Appendix A.3.

261 Appiah writes: “Perhaps because I was brought up between several languages, not all of these varieties of English, I have never quite believed that this [the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis] could be right” [emphasis mine]:


262 *Hier also sollte ich geboren werden und zwischensprachlich – oder so ähnlich erzogen werden*

with a diverse population. Yet in an increasingly mobile, global economy, the distinctions between competing forms of migration—particularly intra-European migration—become increasingly blurred. As early as 1975, writer and critic John Berger had already declared that “[In Germany […] one out of seven manual workers is an immigrant.” It is from within this complex of limited mobility and landed, labor commitments that Oliver’s Andalusian Black Forest village emerges. For Oliver’s lyric speakers, life is frequently dictated by the seasonal labor market, characterized through transitions between the verdant potential of Central Europe and the desiccation of the Mediterranean world. Thus the lyrical I in the opening essay of Oliver’s *Mein andalusisches Schwarzwalddorf*, “Mein Hausach” [My Hausach] writes of the perpetual spatial commute between his two identities: “Springtime was tadpole labs in every pooling rivulet of rain, and summer was our Southern stories on the journey home.” Rural life here is represented in perpetual metamorphosis, both physically as well as mentally—a “home” dictated through “stories” and the constant transition between divergent concepts of belonging. This is not a deterritorialized vision of migration. Rather, Oliver’s lyric speakers represent the alternate depiction of two conflicting lifeworlds: a negotiation of the spaces and of the biographies built in-between. In many cases, this is also a tacit attempt to write this migratory experience into the landscape.

Controversial AfD party leader Alexander Gauland, in his October 6, 2018 editorial in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeit*, “Warum muss es Populismus sein?” focuses his critique of a multicultural Germany by evoking that stalwart bugaboo of populist nationalism: the global elite. His argumentation strikes out to define any mobile participant in the globalized world as part of this elite, in direct contrast to a landed, German Volk. For Gauland, cosmopolitan elites are those who “live almost exclusively in big cities, speak fluent English […] and are] culturally ‘colorful.’” He continues to underscore his claims through rhetorical division, stating: “this has the result that the connection of this new elite to their respective homeland is weak.” Channeling the wave of new nationalism, Gauland’s words seek to further this perceived cultural divide—


264 *Der Frühling war Kaulquappenlabor im aufgestauten Regenbach, und unsere Südgeschichten auf Heimreise hießen Sommer.*


265 My interest in this specific editorial stems from an informal interview which I conducted with José F. A. Oliver in Berlin on October 13, 2018, in which he highlighted Gauland’s work as exemplary of the nationalist discourse increasingly employed in public statements by figures from the German far-right.

266 *Diese globalisierte Klasse sitzt in den international agierenden Unternehmen, in Organisationen wie der UN, in den Medien, Start-ups, Universitäten, NGOs, Stiftungen, in den Parteien und ihren Apparaten, und weil sie die Informationen kontrolliert, gibt sie kulturell und politisch den Takt vor. Ihre Mitglieder leben fast ausschließlich in Großstädten, sprechen fließend Englisch, und wenn sie zum Jobwechsel von Berlin nach London oder Singapur ziehen, finden sie überall ähnliche Appartements, Häuser, Restaurants, Geschäfte und Privatschulen. Dieses Milieu bleibt sozial unter sich, ist aber kulturell „bunt“.*

present in German (proto-)nationalist discourse since at least the late 18th century—which posits a socially conservative and ethnically homogenous rural against a decadent, heterogenous urban space.

Thus, a vision for rural plurality such as Oliver’s stands in pointed opposition to manifest attempts to dominate the discourse of rural places through recourse to an idealized landscape of cultural stasis—a paradigm propagated in the nationalist political imaginary, but also more often than not supported by the research of leading scholars of populism. In her 2019 critique of contemporary populist nationalisms, Die Gesellschaft des Zorns, sociologist Cornelia Koppetsch describes increased demographic polarization between city and country as an unintended consequence of a globalized workforce. She writes:

These dividing lines between prospering global cities and shrinking peripheries have consequences for cultural self-comprehension: While the colorful juxtaposition of the residents of global cities increasingly no-longer conceptualize themselves as citizens of one nation, but rather as postnational cosmopolitans, the residents of shrinking provincial regions perceive as threat the cosmopolitan values upon which the urban culture of global modernity is based. Their ‘we’ becomes further entrenched in the imaginary of the nation-state, of a common heritage and culture (Krasteve 2017). In depopulating villages from which young families flee and in which shops and infrastructure increasingly vanish, an influx of migrants provides no consolation. The arrival of migrants, instead, only strengthens a sense of demographic melancholy […]

While quantitative data may, indeed, reinforce some claims of populist rhetoric, it is crucial to recognize that these trends do dictate the lived realities of an increasingly diverse Germany, and that city vs. country remains simply one among competing claims for the German national imaginary. The rural German landscape, too, may lay claim to discourses of plurality and heterogeneity—a case in point is the area of present-day Baden-Württemberg, where much of Oliver’s narratives are set. Historian Reinhold Weber argues that, in contrast to commonly held beliefs, the rural places of present-day Baden-Württemberg were long home to culturally diverse populations, though increasing urbanization coupled with Jewish emancipation eventually transferred much of these populations to its cities. In particular, he highlights that until the second half of the 19th century, the vast majority of the region’s sizeable Jewish minority lived in small

---

267 Diese Trennlinien zwischen prosperierenden globalen Städten und schrumpfenden Peripherien haben Auswirkungen auch auf das kulturelle Selbstverständnis: Während sich die bunt zusammengesetzten Bewohner der global cities häufig schon nicht mehr als Bürger einer Nation, sondern als postnationale Kosmopoliten begreifen, empfinden die Bewohner der schrumpfenden Regionen gerade die kosmopolitischen Werte, auf denen die urbane Kultur der globalen Moderne beruht, als Bedrohung. Ihr „Wir“ gründet stärker auf der Vorstellung einer Nation und einer gemeinsamen Abstammung und Kultur (Krasteve 2017). In den entvölkerten Dörfern, aus denen junge Familien fortziehen und in denen Läden und Infrastrukturen zunehmend verschwinden, wird der Zustrom von Migranten daher nicht als Trost empfunden. Die Ankunft von Migranten verstärkt die demografische Melancholie […]

Koppetsch, Gesellschaft, 17-18.
agricultural villages in the countryside—a narrative embodied in the prolific works of Jewish German Realist author Berthold Auerbach. As my research in the previous chapter has sought to highlight, the normalization of a diverse and multivalent village were intrinsic to the development of Auerbach’s literary Black Forest villages on both sides of the Atlantic, with the layering of this diversity not only part of his vision for an ascendant German nation, but also for the preservation of ‘Germanness’ in American exile.

Tim Cresswell has defined “place” as the lived experience of a location: the interaction between humans and an inhabited landscape. In contrast to two-dimensional landscapes which can be observed and commented upon without necessitating engagement, places remain “very much things to be inside of.” As a proponent of German unification, Auerbach posited much of his hopes for the advancement of social cohesion in his vision for the establishment of an inclusive, participatory German national identity. Contemporary scholarship on Auerbach has often critiqued as utopian this vision of a harmonious, German nation removed from what the author deemed “confessional differences”, a vision negated in Auerbach’s own lifetime with the proliferation of antisemitic discourse in the language of German nationalism. Hans Otto Horch is representative of this common scholarly critique through his evocation of the Adornian concept of ‘false reconciliation’ in his reading of Auerbach’s village stories, arguing that these optimistic representations do little to address the very real social discord already experienced by minority communities in the 19th-century German-speaking world.

In his evocation of Auerbach’s Black Forest Village, Oliver identifies a historical parallel in his vision of a multivalent rural Germany, yet his writing sets out to define a poetic voice for a critical imaginary of this landscape divested from projects of nation building. Like Auerbach’s, Oliver’s writings are located in a fictionalized representation of his childhood home. They, too, offer short narrative glimpses often framed by first-person narrators whose familiarity implies reliability. Yet Oliver’s vision is confrontational, uncompromising in its recourse to specificity, even as it destabilizes the traditional borders of the culture-nation: an Andalusian Black Forest Village. It is this complex of intense, at times violent specificity, coupled with a linguistic performance of alienation, which promises a radical model for literary communication: confronting both character and reader alike with the profound crises of nationalism. Oliver’s is a tangibly transcultural, yet intimately local representation of the contemporary German village.

As a writer and public intellectual who remains firmly rooted in the Black Forest village of his birth, Oliver defies Gauland’s categorization as an urban representative of the global elite.

---


Meier-Braun and Weber, Kulturelle Vielfalt, 44.

269 Cresswell, Place, 17.


As poet, Oliver’s work helps to define a poetics of rural resistance. Deeply rooted in the Andalusian customs of his community and the literary inheritance of Spanish Modernism, Oliver’s language and literary style would nevertheless be inconceivable outside the conceptual specificity of Alemannic Germany. In representing the minute details of its diverse communities, Oliver’s literary village achieves a challenging symbiosis between conceptions of local and global—navigating what Bruno Latour has conceptualized through his Gaia narratives as a third discursive space between this particularly frustrating binary.\(^{272}\)

In Oliver’s literary production, the local, the rural, and the village are central to a complex of layered, associative places. Their participatory parameters set these places apart from the urban cosmopolitan imaginary, functioning, as they do, to orient community participants in their respective time and space, and serving as a concrete hub for their many-directional lives—functions coalescing in the frequent evocation of *Fastnacht*, the Southern German Carnival.\(^{273}\) In “Mein Hausach” Oliver’s lyrical I describes his own affinities with place in the context of his hometown, stating:

> This place is landscape clock, deferring to its denizens the scarcity of their time. Life trajectories arisen from seemingly rough-plowed furrows. A valley-shaped fan, cutting ever onward out to the horizons because the forest with its wake of needlework and evergreen darkness invites listening. Predestined for fields. Harkening to days gone by. And light has its own properties here. A realization of light patterns in those faces which carry calendars of their own. Earthbound, woven together, a green which lingers. Some sort of calming force against the knowledge overload of my many journeys.\(^{274}\)

It is precisely its specificity that defines this narrated recollection: “earthbound” and intimate connections between places and persons which constitute community, refuge, home. The landscape of the village is “predestined for fields” and tied to “days gone by”—a clear evocation of the agrarian rural imaginary of German Romanticism. But it is also populated by a diverse citizenry of “faces which carry calendars of their own,” a population which has grown together with the place to beget new and enduring legacies: a “green which lingers.” It is, above all, a fugitive place of sanctuary, providing temporary shelter and perspective to those caught up in a mobility which carries them beyond the confines of the Kinzig Valley.


\(^{273}\) *Fastnacht*—with its conflicting participatory value as carnivalesque masquerade, but also as community-sanctioned and highly-regulated localized tradition—provides an additional conceptual space for the development of Oliver’s representational place, his Andalusian Black Forest Village. For further discussion of the function of *Fastnacht* in his poetics, see Section 2.6 Narri, Narro: The Upside-down World.


Poetry, in the etymological sense of the word, means creation (from the Greek ποίημα). Oliver’s act of alternative history writing in the staging of an “Andalusian Black Forest village” offers a powerful tool for blending the literary, linguistic, historical traditions of Andalusia with those of this German-language experience. By confronting these competing specificities, his work offers to create a space in which the lived experience of migrant community can be both conceptualized and expressed in a language it defines.

Although Oliver belongs—as a 1997 Adelbert-von-Chamisso-Preis laureate—to the growing body of what has at times been deemed postmigrant literature—literature produced in German by immigrants (or in his case, the German-born descendant of recent immigrants), he holds the distinction of also writing prolifically in the Alemannic dialect of the Black Forest, one of Germany’s many highly-regionally specific variations. These conflicting impulses, defined by linguistic entanglement, permit what critic Björn Hayer in his response to Oliver’s most recent publication, the 2018 wundgewähr, has deemed the emergent poetics of a post-national tradition. This distinct aspect of his writing—negotiating both between and within languages—is the most critical element of his poetic style. The negotiation of place-based specificity of language (dialect) offers a poetic voice for transcending the associative confinements as a postmigrant author which continues to define so much of the contemporary German literary scene. Rather than privilege the urban cosmopolitan, he achieves a distinctly post-national voice through privileging the local in the interplay of otherwise transnational narratives. The following case studies provide additional close readings from several key poems and prose works by the author in the context of his Andalusian Black Forest village, demonstrating the manner in which his language foregrounds multiple local specificities in the negotiation of a globally mobile narrative.

5.4 “1934”
In the midst of the essays of Mein andalusisches Schwarzwalddorf is the extended narrative poem “1934” (43-51). It is the longest lyrical interlude in the predominantly prose collection, and an epic spanning the European continent and four generations of family history in pursuit of a final situatedness which defies both national and linguistic conventions. The poem begins as an extended ode to the lyrical I’s ancestral homeland in Andalusia, inspired by a photograph which he describes from his workspace in the Black Forest. The poem also represents an increasingly localized departure from the migratory experiences previous lyric speakers in Oliver’s works have described (for example in the 1989 “Andalusien”) as “startling me with their caress / […] artificial

In 2016, Oliver was distinguished by the Hebelbundes Löffisch als Hebeldankträger, an award given in honor of Johann-Peter Hebel—one of the most prominent historic Alemannic writers (and the author most prominently discussed by Berthold Auerbach in his critique of folk poetry, Schrift und Volk)—to those who carry on his tradition of writing in dialect. Although virtually all of Oliver’s publications contain the use of Alemannic (and Andalusian) dialect and his collections frequently include individual poems or essays in Alemannic, he has also published a trilingual work, Duende (1997), in which he provides three variations of each poem in German, Spanish, and Alemannic.


For a translation of the entire poem, see Appendix A.4.
love / [...] stinking garbage / on the road to Germany [...]”

Although “1934” also begins with the admonishment that Andalusia, as home to the poem’s lyrical I, was always only “‘gelernt und nachgesagt’ [learned and repeated] (ln 4),” the narrative itself is transported repeatedly between geo-spatial (and historical) specificities. It is transported to another village, in fact, and this other village story flows and intertwines with the lyrical I’s present to form the Andalusian Black Forest village imagined in the collection’s title.

Sociologist Avtar Brah provides a complication for the concept of “home” negotiated through the experience of migration. “Where is home?” she muses, responding: “On the one hand, ‘home’ is a mythic place of desire in the diasporic imagination. In this sense it is a place of no return, even if it is possible to visit the geographical territory that is seen as the place of ‘origin’. On the other hand, home is also the lived experience of a locality [...] all this, as mediated by the historically specific everyday of social relations.”

This complication of home in an ontology of layered representational place is addressed directly through Oliver’s “1934.” Through poetic intervention, the text narrates the lyrical I’s relationship to the legacy of his paternal family—his great-grandparents, two Andalusian peasants murdered during the Spanish Civil War; his great uncle who fled into French exile; and his grandfather, a member of the Spanish Fascist Falange culpable in his own parents’ (the lyrical I’s great-grandparents’) murder. The poem employs and complicates a number of the devices already identified in this investigation within the framework

278 “Andalusien”

die Konturen deiner ach so sanften Hügel
sind schlummernde Zyklopen
die mich streichelnd aufschrecken

aus Träumen herausgerissen
reifen meine Gedanken
beim Anblick unserer künstlichen Liebe

der Traum meiner Kindheit
ist der stinkende Abfall
auf dem Weg nach Deutschland

Ich verhandle noch zäh
mit dem Schrotthändler blinder Gefühle
über den Preis unserer Eskapaden

Oliver, Auf-Bruch, 34.

For a translation of the entire poem, see Appendix A.5.

279 Oliver, Schwarzwalddorf, 2007.

Although I customarily refrain from including the German originals in-text when quoting prose, henceforth for the purpose of analyzing poetry, in short citations I will cite the German original followed by the English translation. Longer citations will be given in the German, with the English translation as footnote.

280 Brah, Cartographies, 192.
of spatial specificity, intricately weaving diverse, competing biographical frameworks to create a metanarrative transcending both migration and return.

“Ich stelle mir vor: Andalusien” [I imagine: Andalusia] (ln 1). So begins the narrative poem, “1934,” and the refrain “Ich stelle mir vor [...]” repeats a total of seven times, each repetition drawing new connections across the historical and spatial divide between Andalusia and the Black Forest. The Andalusia of this poem is as much a distant narration of homeland as it is a concrete geographical location “In Strandnähe / Nordafrika im Überschaubaren der Geographie” [Near the shoreline / North Africa in the candor of geography] (In 9-10). The lyrical I’s family histories—his great-grandparents’ murder, his great uncle’s passage to France, his mother’s birth, and his own childhood in the Black Forest—merge here within the greater narrative of the Spanish Civil War, the assassination of the poet and folk hero Federico García Lorca, and a literary awakening through translating works of Spanish Modernism into German. Their convergence in the poem offers a cosmology, as well, for the narrator’s diasporic community.

Much of the Andalusian imagery remains untranslated in “1934.” In particular, it is words of a distinctly homey register which the narrator deploys in Spanish or Andalusian dialect—a technique Oliver employs elsewhere (as in Duende) with similar efficacy in his use of Alemannic German. Words like hogar [hearth], ollas [pots], and mortero [mortar] remind the reader that the ‘home’ language of the lyrical I is Spanish, despite the revelation that his current home is “in Deutschland” [in Germany] (ln 151). The multitude of words used to describe his family’s ancestral house itself—many of them highly idiomatic or dialectal—further reveals the importance of a spatially-grounded specificity of language (casita mata, patio andaluz, casita de campo, choza, cabaña, finca, cortijo, etc.). The seamless weaving of Spanish and German traditions here reinforces the lyrical I’s pursuit in bridging the spatial divide between Andalusia and the Black Forest, extending beyond the linguistic level to a codependence on German and Spanish literary tradition, as well.

Intrinsic to Oliver’s poetics is his intense engagement (in the German language) with Spanish-language poetry. To this end the lyrical I explicitly engages with two poets’ works in “1934”: Miguel Hernández’s “En este campo estuvo el mar” and Frederico García Lorca’s “El Grito” and “El Silencio.” Both authors are alluded to by name, and the poem samples liberally from their aforementioned works. But rather than simply quote these poets, the lyrical I makes the translation of their poems intrinsic to the development not only of his own narrative, but also his linguistic conceptualization of place—pointing to shortcomings in both the Spanish and German languages and their traditions.

In the third stanza of the poem, the lyrical I quotes Hernández in his description of his great-grandparents’ village, writing: “»En éste campo estuvo el mar«—Auf diesem Feld in diesem Feld / war das Meer—dieses Feld war / Meer—schreibt Miguel Hernández” [“En éste campo estuvo el mar”—On this field in this field / was the sea—this field was / sea—wrote Miguel Hernández] (ln 28-31). The ambiguity of the Spanish preposition “en,” equivalent at once to the English “in,” “on,” or “at”—the German “auf,” “an,” or “in” is highlighted through these translative attempts. Ultimately, no translation (neither that with “auf / an” nor that with “in”)
appeals, and the lyrical I concludes his translation by eliminating the preposition entirely (and its ambiguity), yet concluding with a very different statement: “this field was sea.”

Images of undulating grain fields moved by the wind in waves remain one of the most iconic, as well as oft repeated, cuts from Edgar Reitz cinematic epic, Heimat—a nearly 60 hour film series spanning the past three decades which has continued to provide visual cues for Germany’s fraught realization of the landscapes of home through to the present day. The metaphor in “1934” enacts this poignant image, while also corresponding simultaneously to Oliver’s frequent descriptions of the rolling, forested hills of the Black Forest, as well as the conviction he alludes to in other poems and essays of the circular flow between conceptions of the mountains, sea, and home.

The lyrical I engages in like form with his allusions to Lorca’s “El Grito” and “El Silencio,” poems for which Oliver himself has published numerous “unfinished” translations (including two which immediately precede- and two more which follow after “1934” in Mein andalusisches Schwarzwalddorf). Translated allusions to these poems (in particular the refrain “vom Olivendunkel her” [from out the olive darkness]) reoccur throughout “1934” (and the entirety of the Schwarzwalddorf collection), merging with the lyrical I’s own family narrative when he reveals that his mother “mir irgendwann / ein Wiegenlied Lorcas singen würde” [would sing me / one day a lullaby by Lorca] (In 146-147). The translation of these poems becomes a metaphor for the translational experience of his parent’s migration and his own childhood in a diasporic Andalusian community in the German Black Forest, embodying what Brah has deemed the “contested cultural and political terrains where individuals and collective memories collide, reassemble and reconfigure.”

This “reconfiguration” is further embodied in frequent evocations of “cante jondo,” [deep singing], the highly regionally-specific lamentation associated with Andalusian flamenco. The metaphor of cante jondo repeats throughout the essays in negotiations of his different lyric speakers’ memories. Cante jondo in the narration of “1934” becomes synonymous with the mediation of the lyrical I’s family history: “Als Vater davon sprach, hörte ich / den cante jondo zum ersten Mal” [When father spoke of it, I heard / the canto jondo the first time] (In 175-176). His father’s storytelling is conflated with the grifo [cry] and silencio [silence] of the poet Lorca, recast in a familial narrative of flight and redemption and ‘einbuchstabiert’ [spelled in] the legacies of the Spanish Civil War (In 185-214).

The poem concludes with an aside in which the lyrical I reveals that it is neither in the Spanish nor the German language that he now finds solace, but in the French: “Unser Großunkel

---

281 See 5.5 Into Every River Flows a Sea below.
283 The poems are sampled at length within “1934,” but also printed in varying form in later essays in the same collection (Mein andalusisches Schwarzwalddorf 2007) as well as in his collection of translated poetry by Lorca, sorpresa, unverhofft (2015).
284 Brah, Cartographies, 193.
”aus Paris / besuchte uns häufiger im Schwarzwald. El tío, / el francé. Der Franzosenonkel. Das war / in den 60er und 70er Jahren im vorigen Jahrhundert. Seither / trägt die französische Sprache / etwas von Rettendem in sich, wenn ich sie höre” (in 315-321).\textsuperscript{285} In the context of these Black Forest village stories, this final complication only serves to amplify Brah’s assertion that diaspora cannot be conceived of merely as a tension between homeland and exile, lived memory and disconnect, but is the constant negotiated tension between multiple, simultaneous affinities.

5.5 Into Every River Flows a Sea

Despite frequent departures, the physical space of the Black Forest remains the conceptual nexus of Oliver’s cosmology. It is a meeting point in which all departures and returns intersect. In an interview by Mario Osterland conducted following a reading at Burg Ranis in Thüringen on January 17, 2019, Oliver returns to the critical role the Black Forest plays in providing a conceptual framework for his poetry. Responding to the question “What role does the influence of landscape play for your poetry?” Oliver replies:

[…] I need the Black Forest and its candidness [Überschaubarkeit]\textsuperscript{286} to write. I travel the world extensively. And I test what I experience in the world against this candidness: in my Andalusian Black Forest village. […] My mother came from an old seafaring family, and for that reason the sea became explicable to me as a child through my grandfather… and as I sat there in that valley, in Hausach—Hausach lies in a basin—I always imagined and dreamed about the things my mother told me: behind the mountains is the sea. That is—that which is beyond the mountains is sea. And this had a huge impact on my writing. This way of peering out beyond the mountains would not have been possible if I hadn’t had mountains around me.\textsuperscript{287}

\textsuperscript{285} Our great uncle from Paris
often visited us in the Black Forest. El tío, el francé. The French uncle. That was
in the 60s and 70s
of the last century. Since then
when I hear it, the French language carries something
of salvation in its tone.

\textsuperscript{286} As aforementioned in Footnote 127, Überschaubarkeit means straightforwardness or candidness; but also literally (and in the Oliverian sense) the ability to achieve an overview / be seen from above (page 47). In this sense, Oliver’s notion that the Black Forest community of his birth provides him with a sense of overview vis-à-vis his global travel seems to resonate with Auerbach’s notion in Schrift und Volk (1846) that the village provides a sense of continuity due to its intimate nature, even if the successful folk poet must leave and return in order to develop perspective.

\textsuperscript{287} “In den Essays taucht der Schwarzwald immer wieder auf. Und ich brauche diesen Schwarzwald und diese Überschaubarkeit, um schreiben zu können. Ich bin wirklich Weltweit unterwegs. Ich habe... ich prüfe das was ich erfahre weltweit in dieser Überschaubarkeit: in meinem andalusischen Schwarzwalddorf.”

“Also der weite Raum gegen den kleinen Raum?”

For Oliver, it is this material tangibility, the spatial finitude of his hometown in the Black Forest, which unites the disparate strands of his many narratives. What he describes as “candidness” [Überschaubarkeit] contains a second, more literal meaning, hidden within the German word—überschauen. This is the verb to “overlook,” not in the sense of forgetting, but in the physical, spatial sense of the ability to survey and assess everything from an elevated height: to achieve an overview. The concept of Überschaubarkeit is an oft-repeated descriptor for the village in Oliver’s literature, and provides a motif for his mobile construction of community.

In this interview, Oliver reinforces the notion that this rural community is anything but sedentary—evoking the complex heritage of its inhabitants and their multigenerational memories in his reference to the title of his 2007 essay collection as nomenclature for the seat of his biographical experience and inspiration, as well. The referential nature of Oliver’s concept of space, of landscape, becomes clear in the trajectory between Andalusia and the Black Forest, a relationship his lyrical I describes in similar fashion in the essay “In jedem Fluss mündet ein Meer” [Into Every River Flows a Sea]:

I always imagined the big water just beyond the mountains. Behind the woods: the sea. As a child I believed that those balmy summer evenings could carry me over the conifers. Light as powder snow, forever following the olive smell of sun. In those days there were no words yet which could have smelled the rosemary or grasped the weight of the firs. The voices which met in my dreams did not speak. They remain silent today.

The physicality of places—their touch, their smell, their warmth—is complicated by the inability or difficulty in conceptualizing their differences. The language of the ambient “voices which met in my dreams” proves incapable, even in these dream encounters, of providing the necessary blueprint for defining the lyrical I’s diversity of experience. Recourse to personalized language, it becomes clear, would provide the necessary link in Oliver’s cosmology between these reference points. For how better to link the competing referentiality of two places, two cultures, two languages and two dialects, than through the creation of a new communicable realm of in-betweenness which at once acknowledges and complicates the specificities of both?


Oliver, Schwarzwaldorf, 32.
It is fitting that the poem “1934” is followed immediately in Mein andalusisches Schwarzwalddorf by the fragmentary essay “El mar La mar Das Meer Die Meerin Der Meer” (53-55). In this—one of several short sketches concerned with translation and linguistic production—the lyrical I makes the claim that translation ultimately strives not for literal but for referential equivalency—seeking the creation of a second original through a negotiation of cultural (not linguistic) equivalents: “To speak a word and its connotations from the culture of one language into the culture of another.”

In doing so, it becomes clear that the specific connotations of words must be distended—at needs broken and replaced in the target language—to maintain a semblance of authority against the “Sisyphean task of those translating—rolling words of stone […]”

As already suggested in my exploration of “Sang der Ackerfurchen ins Meer,” for an author as ‘at home’ within one language as another, the metaphor of translation becomes a blueprint for the original writing process—the simultaneous negotiation of cultures, of origins, within a single linguistic creation: “Die Meerin Der Meer.” In Oliver’s corpus of poetry, this particular destabilization of the German word for ‘sea’ builds off linguistic constructs in poems from his earlier works, including “emigrante” from the collection Weil ich dieses Land liebe (1991), (republished in Heimatt: frühe Gedichte [2015]), as well as the poem “wassersprache” from the collection austernfischer marinero vogelfrau (1997) which is cited in full at the conclusion of “El mar.” In the former (“emigrante”), Oliver’s lyrical I speaks from the perspective of a
recent emigrant, suggested both in the title as well as in the poem’s content, as belonging to the Spanish-speaking world. Although not explicitly a village narrative, it, negotiates between the specificities of two conflicting cultural experiences. The lyrical I grounds his experience in spatial, regional specificity conveyed through language: characterized by loaded grammatical mistakes in the German, the primary of which speaks to the underlying differences between linguistic conceptualizations of the ‘sea’ not dissimilar from the complications of ‘moon’ in “Ackerfurchen.”

Although the poem itself is staged in the Germany of the lyrical I’s experience of “der alltag” [the grind] (ln 12-13), the title frames it not as a story of immigration—of arrival in Germany—but of emigration: an extended leaving song for a lyrical I trapped in the conflicting perspective of a homeland which has been left behind. The lyrical I’s frequent recourse to the feminine definite article “die” (six times in contrast to the single appearance of the ‘correct’ German neuter definite article “das”) not only stages the experience of Germany from the perspective of a cultural-linguistic other, the use of the feminine article (from the Spanish la mar) is also irregular. It is, however, characteristic of the dialect in the coastal Andalusian tradition which Oliver employs—in Castilian Spanish, the masculine el mar would be the standard form.

Henri Lefebvre describes the difference between “representations of space” and “representational space” as the adherence to preestablished relations. He argues that without the adherence to predetermined codes of logic, simple representations of space breakdown. In contrast, he posits representational spaces as “redolent with imaginary and symbolic elements” bridged by the individual histories and narratives of the people which compose them. In his construct of literary biographies straddling two regional and sometimes local specificities, Oliver prepares a specialized form of representational space in which the destabilization of what Lefebvre deems a

---

die meer sprach er die
meer redet mit mir

die meer sprach er die
meer ist farbenblau
und das meer löste
seine salzigen tränen auf

ich muss sprach er ich
muss nach dem reis schauen

der alltag sprach er der
alltag machen alles kaputt

er ging in die küche
niemand sah aus dem
fenster und der graue
betonklotz im auge
war wieder beton

Oliver, Land, 52.

For the full English translation of this poem, see Appendix A.6.

---

296 Oliver, Schwarzwalddorf, 53.

297 Lefebvre, Production of Space, 41.
‘subordinating logic’ facilitates the conceptualization of the village, too, as a space of permanent border-crossings—a place in which the merging of two systems facilitates their transcendence through individualized, local experience: “dem meermann / die meerin” [for the seaman / the {female} sea].

5.6 Narri, Narro: The Upside-down World

In the opening pages of Mein andalusisches Schwarzwaldorf, in the essay “Mein Hausach” [My Hausach], the lyrical I describes his hometown as a “landscape clock” [Landschaftsuhr], but also as “one with myself in contradiction” [eins mit mir im Widerspruch]. In doing so, he presents this fictionalized iteration of Hausach as a place of perpetuity, but also one of transience—a community formed through negotiation of lived experience and histories: “always those earthbound Alemannic traditions. And those who live here. Yeah, them, too.” This is a vision of village life in which the perpetuation of tradition stands for constant renegotiation. Tradition being what it is, this tension creates an uneasy balance in which all things are not always allotted their proper time and place, necessitating a period of renewal in which new imaginaries can be given shape. In the specificity of the Alemannic experience, there is a time and place for this renegotiation: schwäbisch-alemannische Fastnacht—Fasent in Hausach dialect.

The evocation of this folk tradition is perhaps as fitting as it might be unexpected in the cosmology of an Andalusian Black Forest village. The scholarly reception of Fastnacht has long been tinged with the folkloric, providing fodder for the Romantic-Nationalist and peaking the interest of NS-period scholars determined to identify the ancient, ‘Germanic’ roots of

298 Oliver, Schwarzwalldorf, 55.

Previously published in:

Oliver, austernfischer, 8.

299 The local ‘fool’s cry’ [Narrenruf] associated with Hausacher Fasent. During Carnival events, masked participants frequently call out set phrases (often in local dialect) to observers or other Carnival participants who respond in kind with a pre-established response.

300 Oliver, Schwarzwalldorf, 12.

301 Ibid, 10.

302 Immer wieder alemannisch erdverbundenen Traditionen. Und die, die sonst hier leben, die gibt es auch.

Ibid, 12.

303 Various spellings for the event exist, depending on tradition, region, and dialect with numerous explanations attempting to account for these variations. Fastnacht, Fasnacht, Fasnet, and Fasent all refer to more or less similar carnivalesque events occurring during the week before the Catholic Fast of Lent. For the purposes of continuity, I will employ the more common spelling Fastnacht except when directly referencing the works of Oliver in which the author employs the local dialect of Hausach for which the preferred spelling is Fasent:

Kutter, Fasnacht, 14; Mezger, “Rückwärts,” 124-25; Oliver, Narrencodex, 2014.
contemporary culture. Yet this Southern German Carnival, with its Bakhtinian notions of the upside-down world, plays an equally important role as the dreamed-of “fifth season” [fünfte Jahreszeit] for a migrant community Oliver describes as: “caught in the balancing act of immersed biographies. Strangers who arrived in bits and pieces and became one with the land. A place changed by these strangers, a place which would become migratory address for nearly thirty families from Málaga.” In Mein andalusisches Schwarwalddorf, Fastnacht factors as a critical narrative juncture for reimagining community: a time and space of perpetual border crossings.

In his wide-ranging treatments of folk culture in Rabelais and his World, Mikhail Bakhtin describes the function of carnival as “ritual spectacle” which “[…] does not acknowledge any distinction between actors and spectators […] Carnival is not a spectacle seen by the people; they live in it, and everyone participates because its very idea embraces all.” As a ritual performed largely in masquerade, Fastnacht provides ample space for the imagination, and as a lived experience which is recreated with new participants and new vision each year, it allows for the merging of competing narratives within the auspices of a larger, community-forming tradition. Bakhtin goes on to describe the limited (and liminal) world of the carnivalesque as “[celebrating] temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order; it marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions. Carnival was the true feast

304 Werner Mezger, one of the leading contemporary scholars of the tradition, notes the continued association of Fastnacht with unsubstantiated claims to ancient Germanic origins in the introduction to his 1999 essay, “Rückwärts in die Zukunft.” He writes:

Today, when conversation turns to Swabian-Alemannic Fastnacht somewhere outside Southwest Germany, as spontaneous as it is stubborn, the idea becomes associated with something particularly primeval. Given the majority of related literature, this is in no way surprising. Numerous monographs, essays, and press articles—even more recently—are haunted by catchwords like ‘myth,’ ‘rite,’ or ‘cult,’ categories like ‘since time immemorial,’ ‘pagan,’ or ‘Germanic’ appear; and notions are repeated like the ‘banishing of winter,’ ‘celebration of spring,’ ‘enchanting din,’ ‘exorcism,’ ‘necromancy,’ and many more. […] even the locals are not un receptive to this.

305 Oliver, Schwarwalddorf, 12.

306 Zuneigung der Eigenfremde im Balanceakt eingelebter Biographien. Fremde Menschen, die nach und nach eingereist und Land geworden sind. Ein Ort, der sich durch sie verändert hat und Migrationsadresse wurde für nahezu dreißig Familien aus Málaga, um nur eine der mediterranen Minderheiten zu erwähnen, die eingetroffen wurden oder sind.

307 Bakhtin, Rabelais, 5-7.
of time, the feast of becoming, change, and renewal. It was hostile to all that was immortalized and completed.”308 Within the context of Oliver’s writing, the distinctions between perceived tradition and the performance of its continuities are blurred. The elements of masquerade—the uncertainties and obfuscations—are essential to the experience of emancipation his narrator describes: “that night in January or February is no longer just a cold, exclusive black, but rather an inspired darkness.”309 The inspiration of negotiating this ‘darkness’ through “the summoning of the ‘upside-down world’” provides a testing ground in which border crossings can be understood as essential to the localized experience of community.310

Given the controversial and disputed nature of Fastnacht’s reception over the past half century, I will first provide a brief overview of more recent scholarship on the subject. In doing so, I hope to prepare the reader for my interest in the role it plays for Oliver’s vision of an Andalusian Black Forest village prior to examining its appearance in the context of his literature.

308 Ibid, 10.

309 Und die Nacht im Januar oder Februar ist nicht mehr nur ein unterkühlt abweisendes Schwarz, vielmehr beseeltes Dunkel.

Oliver, Schwarzwaldorf, 14.

310 Klingt nach all dem frohgestimmten Schabernack noch einmal wie ein fideles Lust-Versprechen, diese mitternächtliche Anrufung der »verkehrten Welt«.

Ibid, 66.
Fastnacht is the Swabian-Alemannic version of German Carnival [Karneval / Fasching] which takes place yearly during the week before the Catholic fast of Lent. In contrast to larger, urban celebrations of Carnival in the Rhineland, schwäbisch-alemannische Fastnacht is centered around small rural communities and organized by local fools’ guilds [Narrenzünfte] which regulate and maintain the unique costumes and traditions of each town or village. Although customs vary, many local Fastnacht traditions revolve around the interplay between costumed witches, devils, and wild men—conceptualized by participants as representing winter—and flowery, bell-clad costumes embodying the coming spring. Many (but not all) local Fastnacht traditions conclude with a ceremonial witch burning (in effigy), said to herald the end of wintertime. Most Narrenzünfte repertoires also include masked fools—thought to belong among the oldest of traditional costumes, as well as assorted figures from local history or legends. The re-activation of local figures through costumes and parody, and the retelling of their stories in public settings forms an essential element of Fastnacht’s community-forming experience: what Bakhtin describes

---

311 Some obvious exceptions to this lexicology apply: For example, the much-celebrated Mainzer Fastnacht takes place in the capital city of Rheinland-Palatinate and more closely resembles the carnival traditions of other Rhenish cities such as Cologne.


313 Oliver, Narrencodex, 16-18; Oliver, Schwarzwalddorf, 69.
as “a universal spirit […] a special condition of the entire world, of the world’s revival and renewal, in which all take part.”

But acts of community formation can also include performances of exclusion. Historical registers of local costumes also frequently include the stylized masks of ethnic minorities demonized by the Catholic Church during the Early Modern—“representatives of socially marginalized groups”: Jews, Turks, Roma, and Moors.

During the week of Fastnacht today, participants and observers interact in various events facilitated by ritualized verbal exchanges, affirmations, and punishments carried out through recourse to knowledge in the local dialect. The performative/participatory nature of Fastnacht, the social implications of some of its more questionable practices (such as witch-burning), as well as its high degree of local specificity (and regulation) has rendered it subject to various (often highly politicized) interpretations by researchers since the earliest days of German folklore studies.

For much of the latter half of the 20th century, scholarly research on Fastnacht remained somewhat taboo—tainted with the interests of National Socialist scholarship and relegated along with much of German folklore to the fringes of academic study. If National Socialist researchers had been concerned with identifying the ancient, pre-Christian ‘Germanic’ roots of contemporary folk customs like Fastnacht, the post-68 generation of German researchers on the subject endeavored to do just the opposite: seeking out moments of transformation or evidence for the merging of traditions. Premeditating the research of later historians like Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger whose 1983 The Invention of Tradition establishes the often banal, pragmatic roots of perceived historical traditions, German folklore research from the 1960s on—emerging from the so-called Tübingen School—sought to destabilize the perceived continuities of German folk customs. In doing so, these scholars highlighted, instead, the ongoing transformations of living traditions through recourse to their study of contemporary culture, demographics, and technology.

This has led to competing interpretations of modern Fastnacht. If Catholic Carnival, at large, is often understood as ritualized engagement with the carnal or the carnivalesque intent on (temporarily) upending social norms, Fastnacht scholars such as Utz Jeggle have argued instead for the conservative function of local Narrenzünfte in maintaining village continuities. Jeggle, for example, reads the codification and registration of both participants and costumes for each village’s celebration as maintaining a bulwark against changing socio-demographic structures in

---

314 Bakhtin, Rabelais, 7.

315 Vertreter gesellschaftlicher Randgruppen

Mezger, “Rückwärts,” 128.


For this reason alone, Oliver’s profound interest in the topic, including his 2014 publication of the Hausacher Narrencodex, a non-fiction work chronicling the history of his own community’s tradition—including its recent developments in a postmigrant social context—seems worthy of note.

the 20th century village. In his essay “Spiel und Gesetz: Zum Regelwerk dörflicher Fasnacht,” Jeggle argues that while masked revelry may have functioned in pre-industrial villages to conceal the identity of villagers in what was an otherwise rigid and monotonous community life, the social function of the Narrenzunft in the contemporary German village is to provide a constant of both village and regional identity in an otherwise dynamic world. He reasons that the regulation of each village’s cast of Fastnacht costumes and participants—enforced through mandatory membership in Narrenzünfte—serve to establish continuity of identity in the face of continued demographic change.\textsuperscript{318}

The emphasis on maintaining continuity through regulation in previous academic research makes Fastnacht a fascinating space for the examination of contemporary imaginaries of the German village—imaginaries in which demographic continuity need not be assumed as an inherent facet of communal life. Fasent, Hausach’s variation of the Southern German Carnival, plays an integral role in Oliver’s vision of an Andalusian-Alemannic community, as well. In his literary corpus, participation ensues with or without the explicit recognition of the local Narrenzunft. The perspective his narrators provide represent a striking break from much of the recent scholarly literature (or lack thereof) on the subject which has concentrated (with limited exceptions) on identifying the historical trajectory of Fastnacht and less on the social function of the contemporary event for its participants.\textsuperscript{319} Oliver’s narratives resonate, instead, with the more recent work of sociologist Kerstin Bronner whose 2011 Grenzenlos normal? Aushandlungen von Gender aus handlungspraktischer und biografischer Perspektive provides a critical reading of Fastnacht as offering space for rethinking preexisting social structures, particularly for negotiating heteronormative gender relations between participants in light of the frequent recourse to cross-dressing and the alleged inversion of social norms. As a deconstruction of larger social paradigms, Bronner argues for the validity of individual, biographical narration in her methodology: “through which past occurrences become socially visible and the expectations for future events are grounded. Through self-narration subjects express their perspectives on the world and the evaluations of their experience in order to make themselves both visible and comprehensible.”\textsuperscript{320} Although she concludes her study with the observation that much of the emancipatory potential (in regards to gender norms) of Fastnacht’s ‘border-crossing’ remains implicit rather than explicit among its participants, her rethinking of the broader paradigm provides a fascinating compliment for reading the accounts of Oliver’s fictional narrators.


\textsuperscript{319} Bronner, Grenzenlos normal?, 59-60.

\textsuperscript{320} Narrationen werden beschrieben als ein „grundlegender Modus der sozialen Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit“ (Keupp u.a. 2006: 208), […] indem durch sie vergangene Ereignisse sozial sichtbar und Erwartungen an künftige Ereignisse begründet werden. Durch Selbstnarrationen drücken Subjekte ihre Sicht auf die Welt sowie Bewertungen von Erlebtem aus, wodurch sie sich selbst sichtbar und verständlich machen.

Ibid, 51.
In *Mein andalusisches Schwarzwaldorff*, Oliver’s poetic essays offer representations of the village of Hausach which often overlap with the biographical. Despite their use of first-person narrative styles and recourse to real-life events, they remain literary experiments rather than explicit memoires. But in their attempt to engage with *Fasent* tradition from the perspective of members of a migrant community (still actively negotiating ascribed communal roles), these essays also demonstrate the continuing potential of the carnivalesque as a space for active border crossing in the German-speaking world.\(^{321}\) *Fasent* provides a critical space for the negotiation of competing local memories. On the one hand, it remains inseparable from the local, Alemannic identity of Hausach—the narrator’s frequent recourse to the Alemannic dialect in the context of *Fasent* provides a linguistic realization of this specificity: to participate in the Hausacher *Fasent* means participation in the locally-specific dialect. To participate in the official *Narrenzunft* also necessitates acceptance by members of the local community who regulate and restrict the performance of each village’s traditions. On the other hand, the period of social inversions brought about by the public roasting of well-known community members and long nights in masquerade\(^{322}\) spent in the company of both friends and strangers allows for the renegotiation of roles for those regarded as existing outside the normative space of the community: “A welcome spirit of revelry

---

\(^{321}\) Bakhtin describes, in particular, figures of clowns or fools (perhaps not surprisingly, the most commonly worn mask during the Hausacher *Fasent*) as embodying the experience of the carnivalesque, standing “on the borderline between life and art, in a peculiar midzone as it were; they were neither eccentrics nor dolts, neither were they comic actors. Thus carnival is the people's second life […]”


\(^{322}\) While only members of the official *Narrenzünfte* have recourse to the local village’s specific repertoire of masks and costumes, nearly all residents of the community wear costumes during the *Fastnacht* season—creating, on the one hand, a divide between sanctioned (adult) community members and other informal participants, but also allowing for a more universal experience of so-called ‘upside-down world,’ of the carnivalesque.
threatening to cast itself at any time of day in any given direction. A spirit which by some mysterious art swirled and churned all that remained, returning us our daily routine under an imponderable guise. This pre-celebratory chaos struck us like an unexpected gift. These are not merely fond childhood recollections of Oliver’s lyric speaker, they are a direct invocation of the tremendous social potential behind participation in the carnivalesque.

As such, the incursion of the ‘fifth season’ in Mein andalusisches Schwarzwaldorf is part mythmaking—a participation entangled in the narrated tradition of the wider Hausach community. But it is also part introspection, offering reconstruction of the experience from the perspective of outsider figures caught in “the balancing act of immersed biographies.” In the second of three consecutive Fastnacht-essays in this collection, “[Mask fever or our common love for Spättle,” Oliver’s lyric speaker describes one such specific function of the ritual—the ability to renegotiate oneself:

There are windows to the soul which only open now and then. There is a familiar tenderness to one’s cherished notions of the self and the desire to become one with a place. Or the desire to be someone else. Those innermost secrets on the road to self-discovery: Who one can also be. To admitting, at least with one eye, what one would like to be and whether or not that might be or could be. And so, among other things, comes Fastnacht.

Self-identification is inherently bound up with location, what Oliver’s lyric speaker deems: “the desire to become one with a place,” yet Fastnacht provides the opportunity in the day-to-day for all participants in a community to conceptualize this in multiplicity: “Who one can also be.” The upside-down world of Fastnacht fulfills a specific duty here—providing a concrete time and space in which to test these limitations, to escape assigned biographies (as migrant), and to participate in the anonymous, participatory community of the carnivalesque. Though limited in its chronological scope, it nevertheless carries within it the potential for infinite returns. Thus the centricity for Oliver’s narrators of the Fasent dictum: S goht degeege! S goht schu wider degeege! [a rough

---

323  *Ein willkommener Narrogeist, der sich anschickte, mehrmals am Tag seine Richtung zu wechseln. Der auf rätselhafte Weise alles, was üblich war, durcheinanderwirbelte und dem Alltag ein Unwägbares zurückgab. Dieses vornärrische Chaos traf uns wie ein unverhofftes Geschenk.*

Oliver, Schwarzwaldorf, 81.

324  *Zuneigung der Eigenfremde im Balanceakt eingelebter Biographien.*

Ibid, 10.

325  *Es gibt Seelenfenster, die sich nur hin und wieder öffnen. Es gibt eine vertraute Zartheit ins Eingehegte der Vorstellungen vom Ich und dem Verlangen, sich selber Ort zu warden. Die Sehnsucht, ein anderer zu sein. Den verborgenen Geheimnissen auf der Spur, um auszuloten, wer man ist. Auch ist. Zumindest aber ein Aug voll dessen zuzulassen, was man hin und wieder sein möchte und ob der Verhältnisse nicht sein darf oder kann. Dann ist unter anderem Fastnacht.*

Ibid, 73.
idiomatic translation might be something like “the end is the beginning”]. Every negotiation, every “hopeful oath” [Hoffnungseid]\(^{326}\) is granted the promise of another chance next year.

Within the finitude of Fastnacht there exists the potential to be not simply oneself or the other, but to remain, in masquerade, as both. This position is embodied in the hermaphroditic Hausacher Fasten-figure of Spättle\(^{327}\) who navigates a position of in-betweeness which is at once a negotiation of the familiar and the other in one—establishing a position informed by this simultaneity: “Always a double. Two identities encompassed in one face.”\(^{328}\) A negotiation of complex identities compressed into a finite space of time.

Fastnacht maintains its power over the imaginary of Hausach’s community precisely through its temporality—allowing for the recognition of opposition under the guise of humor and satire. Its revelations need not apply to the default world outside the carnivalesque, yet it provides a testing ground for transformation, nonetheless. For Oliver’s lyric speakers this provides a chance to rewrite continuity, to ‘co-write’ part of the story from which they may feel excluded by the experience of daily life:

And so transformation. Humanity in its contradictions. Its arrogant megalomania. Somewhere between peacock feathers and ass’s ears. The execution of opposition before the humble acceptance of the awaited cross on Ash Wednesday—\textit{Memento mori!} Still remaining true to our thirst for ourselves. Free from constricting schedules and the obligations of repetition and the daily grind, yet conscious that these remain inescapable and that the Fifth Season can only mean a short respite. No more. No less. A flake of harlequinesque time and insanities with depth. A prank upon the pranksters.\(^{329}\)

5.7 “Mein Hausach,” My Home(s)

In his 1990 essay, “Das Dorf im Kopf,” Hermann Bausinger argues for a fundamental reevaluation of the village imaginary which might begin to approach the realities of the modern, mobile community. He posits that: “The real history of villages—which is multilayered and inconsistent enough—is accompanied by a history of village tableaus and evaluations of rural life. These alternate between the poles of deep contempt and quixotic devotion—as such, they rarely locate a

\(^{326}\) Ibid, 66.

\(^{327}\) See Fig. 12.

\(^{328}\) \textit{Immer ein Doppeltes. Immer ein in sich zweifaches Gesicht.}


\(^{329}\) Ibid, 74.
middle ground.”

In the context of a new wave of German nationalism which has decried conceptions of mobility through renewed emphasis on an imagined homogenous and static rural idyll, it is perhaps the very improbability of Oliver’s project—the layering of two seemingly incompatible specificities through a performance of the biographical and a language of simultaneity—which provides space for such negotiation. An Andalusian Black Forest village offers the potential reevaluation of the static village ‘in our heads’ from a post-national perspective—at once deeply invested in the lifeworld of the contemporary village, but preparing an experience of this space defined by both memories and lived experience of migration and diaspora. From among a web of multilocational commitments, Oliver’s translingual lyric speakers return time and again in Mein andalusisches Schwarzwalddorf to the specificity of Hausach—a single point of contact along a trajectory stretching from Boston to Helsinki, Andalusia to the Black Forest. The commitments formed in between provide for a constant renegotiation of what it means to experience life as a perpetual series of border crossings: “…autobiographically on the road from Germany to Germany.” The ‘earthbound’ nature of these returns offers more than a simple search for poetic inspiration, it also provides for an attempt at fundamentally redefining the lived experience of place. In a particularly candid description of his hometown, Oliver’s lyrical I writes:

I don’t suffer the cuckoo’s sickness. Perhaps, but one without a tribe. When possible, I inhabit somewhere in between. A mossy glade. Seeking a nest, packing my bindlestick briefcase. And I am simply the one who returns to this landscape and to this place without ever leaving them—without ever having left. That is comforting. One who

---

330 Die reale Geschichte der Dörfer, die vielschichtig und widersprüchlich genug ist, wird begleitet von einer Geschichte der Dorfbilder und der Einschätzungen des ländlichen Lebens, die sich zwischen den Polen tiefer Verachtung und schwärmerischer Zuneigung bewegt und dabei nur selten die Mitte findet.


331 Wir, autobiographisch unterwegs von Deutschland nach Deutschland” the title of the author’s keynote address in Köln-Deutz on the 40th anniversary of the arrival of the one millionth guest worker in Germany, Armando Rodrigues de Sá. A variant of this speech is included in essay form near the conclusion of Mein andalusisches Schwarzwalddorf, relating the personal cosmology of Oliver’s family’s own migration from fascist Spain to the German Black Forest in 1960:

Oliver, Schwarzwalldorf, 89-113.

332 Kuckucksbrink bin ich nicht: “Cuckoo’s sickness,” a term employed by the contemporary German poet Friederike Mayröcker in her poem “Deinzendorf / grüne Montage oder wo habe ich diese weißen Augen schon mal gesehen” [“Deinzendorf / green montage or where have I already seen these white eyes”] from the collection Das besessene Alter. Gedichte 1986-1991. Here also a reference to the cuckoo bird’s habit of laying its eggs in the nest of another bird.

333 Oliver’s use of this controversial term [Zigeuner] here is not a casual reference, but part of a longer exploration of the word’s etymology in this essay (“Mein Hausach”), beginning with a quote by Hemingway and reaching across several languages and literary allusions in pursuit of what the lyrical I ultimately deems a name which “speaks to migration” [Auf jeden Fall spricht Wanderschaft aus den Bezeichnungen].

Ibid, 9.
arises from and also co-writes part of the story of those human spaces here. Speechless and one with a place which always bears him further words. There is much to unpack in this description. On the one hand, the initial metaphors speak to displacement and outward discrimination—Kuckuckskrank with the fear of being raised as an unwanted surrogate, demonized as ‘gypsy’ by a community seeking to deny one’s very birthright. It is, perhaps, an evocation of the age-old figure of the village stranger, the black fiddler of Gottfried Keller’s 19th-century village recast as European guest worker trapped in perpetual commute—a traveler whose briefcase now facilitates the circular motion of an intra-European diaspora. Yet there is also a transcendence in this vision’s depiction of a permanent state of transit which is nonetheless entangled with the many “life trajectories” it has encountered. The lyrical I retains ephemeral continuity with the specificity of Hausach in the Black Forest, a place to which he “returns […] without ever leaving […] without ever having left.” Instead, it is a fluidity of languages—and recourse to situated linguistic variation—which negotiates the trajectory of the contemporary village story. This is a defining reframing of place for a lyrical I in constant motion between geo-spatial specificities—a current and ancestral home, the narration of familial-cultural belongings, and the lived experience of displacement and the globalizing world. It offers a sense of home mediated by this perennial reconfiguration—“seeking a nest” only to pack and depart again. Yet it remains steadfast in its conviction: There is not only a belief in return, but also a belief in the perpetuity of belonging.

How can one return without ever having left? In its most literal interpretation, this is a physical impossibility. As metaphor, it requires the possibility of simultaneously inhabiting two or more systems of place-based affinity. This negotiation requires further mediation: in Oliver’s work, mediation through recourse to place-specific language, access to the specific language of a place, and participation in the defining communal traditions which give substance to the myths of the community. As the lyrical I explains: “Impelled by language, I suppose my place is conciliatory.” The lyrical I here is recast as mediator, channeling the divergent impulses of the different spaces one can inhabit. In a whirl of motion between locations, between languages, between cultures, grounding in specificity provides the basis for critical investigation, as well as the tools for their negotiation:


Ibid, 15.

335 Ibid, 12.

336 Sprachgetrieben ist dann mein Ort versöhnnend.

A kind of contemplation. Loneliness, that was and is Other. It pulses in this part of the world more slowly than in the ‘big city’. Size makes the difference. For that very reason, Hausach is, for me, always the proximity to origin and the jump off point into an immeasurable sense of belonging. Complacency made clearer when observed in the light-fed slopes of a hilly landscape. Reflection, felt and contemplated—to erupt back out into the contradictions, encounters, and routines. All cast back upon me. A thought, a feeling, that is more delicate than this place and recalcitrant. In familiar defiance: a homeland of rags [Fetzen Heimat]. With a humanity which I understand without comprehending because I belong.337

Hausach here becomes a concrete realization for a pointed reconfiguration of the Heimat myth: “contradictions” grounded in the “light-fed slopes of a hilly landscape.” This “homeland of rags” remains as prescient today as it was more than a decade ago at its publication, and indeed, as prescient as it was nearly three decades ago in its earliest poetic anticipations: Auf-Bruch (1987), HEIMATT und andere FOSSILE TRÄUME (1989), Weil ich dieses Land liebe (1991), and Gastling (1993). The increasing multilingualism of these early works—alternating as they do between the German, Spanish, and Alemannic idioms—find footing in Oliver’s later prose through his translilingual melding of the languages and the histories they carry with them. Their merger is envisioned as his Andalusian Black Forest village, a representational place where the “contradictions, encounters, and routines” of shared humanity can be “understood without comprehending” and negotiated in a language which at once unites and further fragments the disparate elements of its constituent parts.

Within the context of an increasingly robust new German literature which is currently offering unapologetic critique of the entrenched racism in the German-language Heimat-discourse,338 José F. A. Oliver’s work is read here as a forerunner of a burgeoning tradition which mediates between Heimaten,339 between affinities to layerings of cultural legacies—but also as an outlier of this tradition in its insistence on the simultaneous finitude and transience of place. By

---


338 From Noah Sow’s 2009 Deutschland Schwarz weiß: der alltägliche Rassismus to Max Czollek’s more recent 2018 Desintegrat euch! and the 2019 essay collection Eure Heimat ist unser Albtraum edited by Fatma Aydemir and Hengameh Yaghoobifarah, a concerted effort is being staged among some authors in the current generation of German-language literature to present a challenge to the exclusionary rhetoric of the German homeland (see Bibliography, below).

339 Kurt Kemal’s 1995 Was ist die Mehrzahl von Heimat? problematizes this concept from the perspective of a mobile Turkish-German lyric speaker negotiating the experience of a life spent between Germany and Turkey:

directly engaging, rather than circumventing the imaginary of the rural German homeland, Oliver’s work transform the traditional seat of national identity into the testing ground for its deconstruction. His writing stages a performance of the Heimat landscape within the wider context of a multilocational and translingual consciousness.

With this momentum, I return to the opening citation of this chapter: Oliver’s lyrical I cast as a child inhabiting a “house which was two houses [...] two languages [...] stairs without grammatical gender [...] Only a pair of steps which separated and bound.” Harnessing Avtar Brah’s conceptualization of diaspora as signaling “multi-locationality within and across territorial, cultural and psychic boundaries” this study proposes Oliver’s particular negotiation of Andalusian heritage within the context of German-language village stories as one such iteration of this diasporic imaginary. It is steadfast in its multilocationality, inhabiting the physical places as well as the languages of its diverse constituency. The constituent features of Oliver’s poetics—his use of idiomatic translations from the Spanish, self-reflective employment of translated literary allusions, dialect and place-specific language, and structural narrative frames which alternate between distinct spatial locations—provide for the continuing development of a village imaginary.

Allusion to the socially and geospatially mobile village stories of the mid-19th century offers a specific challenge to the current discourse which imagines (or harkens back to prior imaginaries of) cultural diversity as synonymous solely with modern urban life. It also reminds us that the village imaginary has long been a place of contradiction and uncertainties. If early literary presentations of the village alternated between as yet undetermined poles—a world in which “one meets Seldwylans [...] in Australia, in California, in Texas, as in Paris or Constantinople” despite imagining the village as one of “those secluded corners [...] where a strange face would still attract attention and a trip of thirty miles would render its undertaker the Odysseus of his area.” Oliver’s Andalusian Black Forest village inverts these contradictions—preparing a world in which one might meet Californians, Parisians, and undoubtedly Istanbulites in Seldwyla or the Village of B.

340 See Footnote 239 (page 90):
Ibid, 18-19.

341 Brah, Cartographies, 197.

342 See Footnote 100 (page 39):
Keller, Seldwyla, 12.

343 See Footnote 2 (page 3):
6: Conclusion – The (Global) Village in our Heads

“The term ‘belonging’ is a vague one, and this is precisely its usefulness.”
– John Crowley

Little more than a week after the fatal rightwing terror attacks in Hanau claimed the lives of nine people with migration backgrounds living in this small, provincial city, one of the largest German-language periodicals published an online op ed about rural life in Bavaria with the provocative title: “Threatened Country” [Bedrohtes Land].\(^{344}\) Perhaps it should have come with a trigger warning. Or simply a different title. But the online article’s abstract and SEO (complete with a bucolic image of a Bavarian village centered around a prominent church steeple) were even more alarmist still, declaring: “Economically, Bavaria has never seen better days. But the price for this success is high: Villages are losing their identity. Opposition is slowly growing.”\(^{345}\) The click-bait worked; given the context, I bit, expecting another conservative attempt to victim-blame away the growing visibility of rightwing terror in Germany as a reaction to unfettered demographic change. And to some extent, migration certainly does play a role in this article’s self-justification. Yet to its credit, the text itself offers a fairly articulate overview of the changing socio-economic face of contemporary rural Germany, and little to imply that village life is under any kind of fundamental threat at all. Transformation is an intrinsic part of any lived tradition—I came away more confused by the article’s marketing than triggered by its rather banal contents.

What impulse lies behind instrumentalizing ‘threats’ to the imaginary of the German Heimat landscape in the wake of rightwing terror? How does the alleged precarity of the modern village contribute to the discourse of contemporary nationalism, particularly in the face of violent opposition to the country’s growing diversity? The answer for me seems to lie in what I have already described through Hermann Bausinger’s concept of the “village in our heads”:\(^{346}\) The common notion of the village as a site of fixed relations determined by enduring tradition ignores the lived experiences of mobility and change that in fact permeate rural life. My own translation of the term [das Dorf im Kopf] must first be qualified with the recognition that no ‘our’ exists here in the original German, and to imply such in the English already reveals an inherent and misleading bias.\(^{347}\) Bausinger problematizes this notion of the shared village ideal through what he describes


\(^{345}\) Wirtschaftlich geht es Bayern so gut wie nie zuvor. Doch der Preis dafür ist hoch, die Dörfer verlieren ihre Identität. Dagegen wächst langsam der Widerstand.

Ibid.


\(^{347}\) A more literal translation would be: “the village in the head.”
as “village cultures” [Dorfkulturen], recognizing in the plural, the diversity of lived experiences of village life.\textsuperscript{348} As early as 1967, Marshall McLuhan had insisted with his notion of “the global village” that increasing connectivity through globalized modernity does not demand a uniformity of thought—but rather, that the increasingly interconnected lives enabled by our contemporary mediascape “absolutely ensures maximal disagreement on all points” within a given community.\textsuperscript{349} The pastoral imaginary that animates desires for Heimat requires a perpetuation of the myth of homogeneity and the construct of village life as intrinsically and diametrically opposed to other (urban) models of community. From Tacitus to the current Minister of the Interior Horst Seehofer, this harkens back to a long tradition of normalizing racially-charged representations of village life—exclusionary visions for community based on the construct of an illusory vision of the village as prototype for a German ethno-state.

In the preceding chapters, I have presented historical as well as contemporary models for counteracting this longstanding tradition through what I have deemed the layering of representational place. In Chapter Two, through recourse to sociological and social-geographical models, I have defined representational place as stylized literary (or artistic, cinematic…) engagement with specific geospatial locations, real or imagined—coded through language and linguistic variation, as well as through the evocation of place-specific folkloric traditions and topological specificity. I have proposed the genre of the village story in its varying manifestations as an ideal vehicle for this investigation—located, as it is, at the rural nexus of representation and place. In particular, I have been interested in highlighting the overlap between layerings of such representational places inherent in migration narratives—arguing for the potential of concrete, multilocational engagement within this imaginary. I have organized my investigation around two primary authors—Berthold Auerbach in the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century and José F. A. Oliver in the late-20\textsuperscript{th} and early-21\textsuperscript{st} centuries—whose works negotiate visions for concurrent belonging located in their own projections of place, language, and folkloric tradition in an increasingly mobile village.

Chapters Three and Four have engaged with the critical and literary works of Berthold Auerbach, a prolific Jewish-German author who advocated for a German national unification which would be both participatory and intersectional. His village stories mobilize a transatlantic vision for rural community, presenting an early vision of the global village bound together through place-specific knowledge of dialect, folk song, and local traditions which may transcend profound distances—both spatial as well as temporal. I have argued that this literary vision must be read


\textsuperscript{349} McLuhan, \textit{Hot & Cool}, 272.

McLuhan is credited with coining the term “global village” as early as 1964 to describe the transnational network of communication undergirding 20\textsuperscript{th}-century life. With this concept, McLuhan seeks to investigate the profound interconnectivity engendered by the modern, globalized mediascape, while at the same time pushing back against any notion that increased connectivity implies a flattening or homogenization of culture or positionalities. I have argued that the same can be observed in the microcosm of the individual, globalized village.

A collection of the author’s writings on the topic has been published posthumously as \textit{The Global Village: Transformations in World Life and Media in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century}:

against the historical restrictions on Jewish mobility in the German-speaking world of the 19th century, proposing Auerbach’s transatlantic vision for German belonging as a new imaginary of Jewish mobilities in the developing discourse of German nationalism.

Chapter Three has concentrated on the scholarship around and reception of the author’s critical writings: highlighting the current dearth of English-language scholarship and pointing to the growing body of recent German-language research on Auerbach’s influential contributions to the development of literary Realism.350 The 2014 publication of Auerbach’s collected critical writings, assembled and edited by Marcus Twellmann as Schriften zur Literatur, has made some strides in providing context for these apparent discrepancies. The anthology now renders a number of the author’s most valuable critical works readily accessible, including his 1846 Schrift und Volk, as well as the 1836 monograph Judenthum und die neueste Literatur. It is my hope that the re-circulation of this literature in conversation with contemporary interest in the role of multiculturalism in constructs of the German nation-state will provide new insight in the longer trajectory of a more diverse Germany.

Chapter Four has offered an intervention in the reception of Auerbach’s literary works, as brought into conversation with the body of his critical writings. I have highlighted motifs of migration and community participation in a number of the author’s village stories, seeking to investigate the literary representations of diversity and variation in these constructs of rural life. I have pointed to the universalizing manner in which the stories’ lyric speakers—narrators and protagonists alike—represent the migration process, as well as the ways in which civic participation in its many localized forms plays into the construction of a more inclusive sense of Germanness. Despite scholarly readings to the contrary,351 I have chosen to interpret Auerbach’s interest in migration as a potentially emancipatory experience—a reading supported by the analyses of a number of other contemporary Auerbach scholars.352 Given the author’s critical interest in dialect and folk tradition, I have also investigated questions of multilingualism in these stories. Particularly in the aforementioned Schrift und Volk, Auerbach endeavors to map out the important function of linguistic register and dialect in codifying a social community’s relationship with the lived experience of place which might transcend other markers of social or religious belonging, and yet his literary works largely eschew direct representations of such linguistic plurality in favor of glossing, paraphrasing, or otherwise annotating the specificities of his character’s linguistic performances. When present at all, accented language and the occasional use of dialect appear in Auerbach’s literary works in the form of reported speech or song, mobilizing a folkloric representation of these variations as a cornerstone of participatory community. Dialect and knowledge of local ritual and tradition function in this imaginary to provide a sense of continuity between community members in a transatlantic vision of Auerbach’s Black Forest.


village. Emigrants from the village catalog registers of local lore in exile, while returning immigrants perform their knowledge of local identity through recourse to dialect and song. In the author’s later works, codeswitching—in the form of unexpected English loanwords, mixed neologisms, and Anglicisms—forms a secondary component towards the early conceptualization of a multilayered representational place and the evocation of multilocalational belonging.

These chapters argue that Auerbach’s literary vision offers at once a naïve but also highly nuanced version of such belonging, facilitated by access to localized knowledge which supersedes religious or cultural affiliations. The village as model for the nation-state here functions as a participatory model for community in which one’s ability to perform coded markers of locality bridges the distance between layerings of conflicting or concurrent belonging. Although this vision is fundamental to Auerbach’s village stories, it is also one with which the author himself avoids direct engagement: preferring to describe, narrate, or gloss these processes, rather than allow his lyric speakers to participate directly. In regards to their social engagement—particularly vis-à-vis Auerbach’s literary representation of German-speaking Jewish communities, these works have been critiqued as largely disengaged from the violence of the contemporary experience.\(^{353}\) For despite tomes of critical writings on the subject, Auerbach—in his literary representations of Jewish life—indeed decentralizes the precarity of these communities from his stories’ central narratives.

This absence is widely recognized in the current scholarship, despite recent, renewed interest in the role which the author’s own religious positionalities have played in the production and reception of his village tales.\(^ {354}\) For my current investigation, I have sought to recontextualize this absence in respect to the prevalence of migration narratives in Auerbach’s village stories: reading his attempts to redefine a sense of common Germanness in exile as a coded literary engagement with prevailing discourses of belonging in the nascent German state. I argue that the prevalence of Jewish characters in these tales and the frequent background discussions of Jewishness throughout represent an attempt to normalize the diversity of rural Germany in a period of ascendant racialized nationalist discourse. In addition, Auerbach’s foregrounding of migration narratives allows for a universalization of questions of Germanness and German belonging in a newly transatlantic world—expanding the scope of these affinities when projected onto a different language, society, nation, and continent. In Chapter Four, I argued that despite obvious shortcomings, Auerbach’s 19th-century village stories provide a very real early intervention toward the construct of a diverse and mobile village imaginary.

Chapter Five has examined the works of contemporary poet and public intellectual José Francisco Agüera Oliver whose literary production also revolves around the geospatial specificity of a Black Forest village. Steeped in a translingual and transcultural tradition facilitated by the


author’s own lived biography of circular and seasonal migration between Alemannic Germany and Andalusian Spain, Auerbach’s historical model for linguistic representation of communal belonging becomes radicalized in Oliver’s literary production. Contrary to Auerbach, Oliver’s works highlight and mobilize precisely the discontinuities and challenges of linguistic diversity. His narratives entwine a multitude of languages, dialects, and registers: not merely activated by code-switching, but by the creation of a new, mixed idiom. The language of Oliver’s texts is at once grounded in profound geospatial specificity—the Alemannic dialect of his own Black Forest village and the Andalusian Spanish inherited through familial migration history and diasporic community. At the same time, I have described Oliver’s lyric speakers’ translingual performances at times as a form of linguistic alienation, challenging readers to question assumptions of their mastery of any one language. Oliver’s use of linguistic alienation can be framed through the lens of what Germanist Yasemin Yildiz has deemed “defiant appropriation.”

I read Oliver’s targeted presentation of multi- or translingualism as a form of confrontation with the exclusivity of place-specific language from a position of radical diversity facilitated by the changing intra-European mobilities engendered by an increasingly interconnected European Union.

Working closely with a number of the author’s poetic essays and poems, I have sought to identify moments in which the performance of rural, village life becomes inseparable from the projection of cultural and linguistic diversity. In particular, I have highlighted the discontinuity in representation between languages—for example, examining the overlap (and lack thereof) between multiple iterations of the ‘same’ poem in Oliver’s trilingual lyric collection Duende (1997)—in which three versions of each poem (High German, Spanish, and Alemannic dialect) evoke very different sets of association through the coded specificity of their diction. I have also examined individual poems in the author’s collections which mobilize a multilocational village aesthetic through the melding of multiple generations of village life across language, literary tradition, and geospatial location. Poems such as “1934,” which poetize the author’s own familial migration history, map out networks of continuity from the Andalusian village of his great-grandparents through to the present day in the Alemannic Black Forest. This and other narrative poems are further contextualized as village stories through their inclusion in the 2007 collection Mein andalusisches Schwarzwaldorf [My Andalusian Black Forest Village]—a translingual work which negotiates the idylls of a bucolic, Heimat landscape through the activation of Alemannic and Andalusian dialects to narrate stories of circular migration between the lived experience of two very different iterations of village life.

This chapter also acknowledges the prevalence of Swabian-Alemannic carnival [Fastnacht / Fasent] in Oliver’s collected works as a vehicle for the negotiation of belonging within a temporality of dynamic social inversions—reading the author’s storied characterizations of the carnivalesque against the work of folklorists and anthropologists who have begun to reexamine this cornerstone of German folkloristics with an interest in the changing demographics of the rural village. In the context of his wider engagement with the history of migration in Germany,

355 Yildiz, Mother Tongue, 2012.
Oliver’s role as public intellectual demands the re-examination of his own activations of the folkloric—including the publication of numerous volumes on the history and folklore of Hausach, the Alemannic town of his birth—towards the representation of rural diversity.

Set against the historic precedent of Auerbach’s transatlantic Black Forest village, I read Oliver’s defiant appropriation of both dialect and village aesthetic as an attempt to renegotiate the component parts of an exclusionary nationalism through recourse to the language of radically translingual poetry. The Andalusian Black Forest village which emerges is a representational place of convergent belongings—diametrically opposed to the exclusive rhetoric of the German *Heimat* in its imaginary of a village life defined by its mobility yet situated, nonetheless, in the specificities of community and place. The translingual village story Oliver’s divergent narratives weave compose a blueprint for a new understanding of 21st-century village life in Germany—a village in our heads reflective of the villages we see with our eyes. This is a village which is inseparable from the diverse histories which compose it; for Oliver: “The laughter the tears, their stories, the conduct and the return to Spain from Germany to Germany […]”

In my comparison of these two authors’ works, I have uncovered a range of both continuities and disjunctures: both envision a pluralist village imaginary defined by participatory community. Auerbach’s critical writings reveal an impulse to increase the accessibility and reception of his works to as wide a readership as possible, despite their situatedness in a specific, locally-coded lifeworld. This is a proclivity which has been criticized in recent scholarship for its potential to gloss over the very real violence and division which defined his period of ascendant nationalism. At the same time, operating in a pre-unified Germany, Auerbach’s attempts to define a sense of Germanness through commonalities revealed through the catalyst of transatlantic migration present a forward-looking vision for the nascent German nation-state, one in which active participation facilitates a community formation capable of transcending regional, cultural, and religious differences. Contrarily, operating in the context of German Reunification, Oliver’s works are animated by these same disjunctures—his translingual lyric speakers’ defiant appropriation of linguistic variations and localized tradition codify the experience of linguistic alienation—voicing the radical diversity of the contemporary village for an inherently postmigrant and increasingly post-national Germany.

---
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Oliver, *Schwarwalldorf*, 108.
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Appendices

A.1 Translation: “Sang der Ackerfurchen ins Meer”


Song of farm furrows into the sea

Song of farm furrows into the sea
Is vagabond veiled whiteness of the (wo)man moon
Suspended in the silver silence
Between windowsill and sheets

Is memory the birthmark’s call
Soon Andalusia überall
A Black Forest town enraged
From the dew a fumbling green
Where I caress my thirst for skin
Beneath the feather fluff of ferns

Is the furtive glance of the child
Syllabic timepiece of the cuckoo’s cry
Permitting poached securities

Is the freedom strewn exile of November
Carrying Albacete Bundschuh Babel
My ¡ay! fulfilled in duende
A.2 Translation: “Auf-Bruch”


**departure**

where are my words
i still knew yesterday
wordless
in whirling thoughts
i cling
to their world

i forgot
to ask myself

do i still know their words

where is my language
that bound me to them
speechless
in whirling thoughts
i cling
to their world

i forgot
to ask myself

do i still know their speech

a stuttering remains
deafened ears
a paralyzing yesterday:

i see
the flowers
of their language
i no longer pluck

one batted eyelash away
a silent song in the rhythm
de manos que tiemblan

a stuttering remains
lost tongues
subjugated burs:
cultured
candangoentwined
ready to dream the South

one batted eyelash away
a silent song in the rhythm
de manos que tiemblan

and they become a village dawning-white
una luna que se pone

and the roots of the cypress
castrate and beget
the fiending cry

el canto que secuestra la vida
demans que tiemblan
cuando la luna se pone
A.3 Translation: “angezählt”


counted down

born into a country
one by coincidence
divided in two
arrived
departed

little guest
A.4 Translation: “1934”


1934


I avoid the word wretched because scarcity in sanctuary seems more familiar than the nomadic life of transients and I imagine: A valley, (FIELDS SEA), the sea in waves of field extending and emulating. “En éste campo estuvo el mar”—On this field in this field was the sea—this field was sea—wrote Miguel Hernández.

So a sea of fields, only more still. A stiller sea and in the midst of acres

---

358 H:ort the author makes a play on words here by separating the H from the word Hort [refuge] to accentuate a second word within the first: Ort [place].
a scattered awakening against the hunger.

I imagine: dry earth, day-wage
and heavy nighttime air. More viscid
than the air of day. Night air,
from out the olive darkness. Between
those living in caves. Rural
dwellings, housecaves:
1 inhabitation. Perhaps with patio
patio andaluz. Courtyard and residence
into the greater freedom of thought
that in most casitas (“term of endearment”)
brings challenge. To a walled
fireplace. On the fire. A hearth fire
that didn’t always wish to burn.

I see there, almost incidentally, a vase of salt
(amphora-like). Sun-yellow
with hints of green leaf-buds, brushstrokes
hinting at green, a clay vessel, many
pots of tin hanging from nails, grey-white
speckled pans, saucers
and ollas. One which
seems to be enameled,
slightly chipped handles and rust-
stains,
only visible
after sparse mealtimes or before. I see
a braid of garlic on the wall
above the table and all but depleted,
a crucifix or figure of the Christ,
an image of the Madonna, two chairs
of woven reeds. To the right of the fireplace
a mortero. On the pestle remnants
of onions & time.

So una casita de campo. Una choza,
cabaña. Not farmhouse, not barn,
not finca or cortijo.

The abode of day laborers
on the night before the eve of the Civil War,
perhaps also the night before that
and somewhere
in the inaccessibility of mountains
still touched by nighttime sea
the inhabitation
whitened from wind and
lime, a whitewashed *choza*.

In the picture one door can be seen. *Un portal,*
a double door. It opens
the dwelling, more open space. I believe
the door is made of pinewood. On the wooden planks
the thick, green paint
into Andalusia. Layer upon layer. One
Moorish. Before the portals
window bars and years.

I imagine: two people
in Andalusia. Their age
cannot be determined, though it may be guessed.
This, too, is an approximation.
A portrait of the couple, black and white,
two busts.
I will discover some time later
that it is two photographs
two single frames put together
to create one memory. Designed by hand
and forgery in retrospect.

I see a man
in a rough linen shirt, the hair on his head
still full, but yellowing. Like the white
of old photographs. His expressions a part
of the landscape. Of his landscape. The eyes
narrowed in recognition. Staring
into the flash of the photographer
or into the sun, who knows. Surely
a glance into proximity. A look which doesn’t
wish to believe
what will transpire.

She
looks gentler. A haggard kindness. Her skin
still one with his own. As though skin
had traced skin in the routine of the fields.
I see the woman’s apron, a blouse
with stiff collar. Yellowing-white-grey
of years. Her hair knotted. Weathered
expressions
only finer than his.
Sometime three years later
they will both be shot.
At night.

I see a picture. Photography
Becoming record
that remains. At least
the idea of an image and a story,
which can no longer be killed.

Father says it was the Falange.\footnote{Members of the Spanish Fascist party (Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista).}

Looking for my great uncle. Great uncle,
the younger brother of my paternal grandfather.
But he was
already in France. The brother. My great-grandparents
hadn’t known
where France was.

If I don’t pronounce the word Falange, but only
see the letters, then
it rhymes with Schlange, snake. An old motif:
temptation betrayal

In August 1937
Lorca had already been dead a year and mother
was born
a few months before the anniversary of those gunshots,
on the road to Víznar
in Málaga, near the Plaza de la Merced.

My father’s father died
in the 50s.

At that time mother didn’t know
she would sing me
one day a lullaby by Lorca. There was
as yet no indication that the two
white-haired figures in the photo which today
tells its own story from
my bookshelf in Germany
would be the grandparents
of her future husband.
Would have been.

Father was three,
when his grandparents were pulled from their habitation.
In the night.
The *Falange* came by night,
more insatiable by darkness. They say Grandfather
was there. Grandfather
had looked for his brother. By his
own hand.

I only understand the words “brother
war.” *Brother war* comes closer than *civil war*.

I imagine: Andalusia.
The country’s hinterlands and nearshore.
On the margins of history into the interior two dead. Two
corpses lie before a double door. My great-grandparents.
The doors are broken
in my mind’s eye. Grandfather
whom I never knew, and layers of paint.
From out the olive darkness, green and red
and window bars. For long years, these bars
before our mouths.

When father spoke of it, I heard
the *canto jondo*\(^{360}\) the first time. Many years later
and the memory spoke
in rhythm, with a voice
peering inwards and listening inside. Mere
physical ear
of memory seeing,
seeing listening.

I imagine Lorca and how he
turned what he heard to poetry. How he
spelled in the word *grito*\(^{361}\) from what he held inside
and saw. Saw *silencio*. Scream
and silence, pre-
empting, the silence in scream, anticipating. Anticipating
himself. In Granada, perhaps,
perhaps in Fuentevaqueros. Perhaps only
in my mind.

---

\(^{360}\) Andalusian: literally: “deep singing”, an Andalusian style of flamenco vocal accompaniment.

\(^{361}\) *grito*: cry; scream
I wanted to draw both poems into the German language. *El grito* *El silencio*.

*El grito*—scream or a plaintive cry? *El silencio*—the silence or silence kept? From kept silence inner silence? Internalized? Flowing into one another scream and silence?

I still have only rough drafts (RAW VERSION in multiplicity), even though I have written on both poems now for years. Perhaps they will always remain draft. I know this scream is more than scream. It is mute cry and cry of mourning and the intimate complicity of sorrow. Not lament. Scream and cry before lament and after. And I know a song of sorrow is more than the pain the individual experiences, becomes. It is the pain in the silence of the mute because the silenced cry of many, in transmission, in confidence, becomes the voice individuality which binds. (EMERGING).

Our great uncle from Paris often visited us in the Black Forest. *El tío*, *el francé*. The French uncle. That was in the 60s and 70s of the last century. Since then when I hear it, the French language carries something of salvation in its tone.
A.5 Translation: “Andalusien”


Andalusia

the contours of your oh-so tender hills
are slumbering cyclopes
startling me with their caress

torn from dreams
my thoughts ripened
by the sight of our artificial love

the dream of my childhood
is the stinking garbage
on the road to Germany

I still haggle doggedly
with the scrap dealer of blind feelings
over the price of our escapades
A.6 Translation: “emigrante”


emigrante

he looked out the window:

the sea he said she
is my lover
the sea he said she
speaks with me
the sea he said she
is true blue
and the sea it dis-
solved into salty tears

i must he said i
must look to the rice
the grind he said the
grind ruining everything

he went to the kitchen
no one looked out the
window and the gray
concrete block in his eye
was concrete again