

Intercultural Relationships

The Importance of the Study of Cultural Interference
for the Historical Study of Children's Literature.

Test Case: The Relations Between German and
Jewish Children's Literatures During the 18th
and the 19th Centuries.

1. Theoretical Framework

This paper calls for the reorientation of comparative studies. In it, I maintain that instead of using the worn-out traditional paradigm of comparative studies, there is much to be gained from new paradigms offered by various scholars of the semiotics of culture, of which Even-Zohar's polysystem theory seems to be the most relevant for the matter in hand.

This is the case because, to my mind, the study of cultural relations becomes more interesting when the all-too-frequent quest for mere similarities between literatures, typical of «comparative studies», is abandoned in favor of other questions. The more interesting questions in studying cultural relationships concern the way(s) one literature, or a literary system, function(s) in the dynamics and history of another. In other words, I contend that instead of dealing with single texts, it is more fruitful and more interesting to study the way(s) in which text(s), repertoire(s), institutions and systemic patterns of one culture determine the nature of another. In the words of Even-Zohar:

Interference can be defined as a relation(ship) between literatures, whereby a certain literature A (a source literature) may become a source of direct or indirect loans for another literature B (a target literature).

It should once more be emphasized that with «literature», it is the totality of the activities involved with the literary system that is meant. Thus, in contradistinction to traditional views, what may move, be borrowed, taken over from one «literature» to another is not just an

item of repertoire, but also a host of other features/items. Often, it is not even repertoire which is the most decisive component participating in a specific interference relationship. The role and function of literature, the rules of the game of the literary institution, the nature of literary criticism and scholarship, the relations between religious, political, and other activities within culture and literary production – all may be modelled in a given culture in relation to some other system.¹

In fact, I believe, that the study of cultural relations can greatly benefit from basing its case studies on Even-Zohar's path-breaking theory of cultural interference. In order to demonstrate how the study of interference can contribute to the study of the history of a specific children's literature, I have chosen to present as a case study, the question of the interference between German and Jewish children's literature during the Enlightenment period. I will briefly draw on the case of Joachim Heinrich Campe in order to point to potential gains made available to research by such methodology.

2. The Case-Study

An examination of the texts published for Jewish children in Germany suggests that they served as agents of cultural interactions, whereby the relations between the German and the Jewish cultures were made possible and took material form. Hence, they can serve as a first-rate source for studying the way, or ways, in which German culture was understood and interpreted by Jewish culture, and consequently, the ways these understandings and interpretations determined and shaped the nature of Jewish identity in Germany.

The question of the actual agents and channels whereby the relations between the German and the Jewish cultures were made possible and materialized has remained largely untouched, with the exception of a few recent studies.² This, despite the fact that the role played by German culture in the

¹ Itamar EVEN-ZOHAR, «Laws of Literary Interference», in: *Polysystem Studies. Poetics Today* 11:1 (1990), 53-78.

² See for instance: Israel BARTAL, «Mordechai Aaron Günzburg: a Lithuanian Maskil Faces Modernity», in: David SORKIN/Frances MALINO (eds.), *From East And West*, Oxford 1990, 126-147. Shmuel FEINER, *Haskalah and History: the Awareness of the Past and its*

development of modern Jewish thought and culture has indeed been acknowledged. Standard research and numerous recent studies focus extensively on the various phases of contact, interaction, and exchange between the Jewish-Hebrew culture and the German culture, especially from the 18th century on.³

This ostensible lack of interest in the concrete agents and channels involved in these cultural interrelations cannot be explained, as might be assumed, in terms of the marginal roles played by these factors in the process of cultural interference. Research seems to prove quite the opposite. In fact, I contend that within the context of cultural agents, texts for Jewish children and young people played a leading, if not *the* most decisive, role in the process

Functions in the Jewish Enlightenment Movement (1782-1881). Thesis submitted for the degree Doctor of philosophy, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1990, [Hebrew]. Also: Shmuel FEINER, *Haskalah and History. The Emergence of a Modern Jewish Awareness of the Past*, Jerusalem 1995 [Hebrew]. David SORKIN, «Preacher, Teacher, Publicist: Joseph Wolf and the Ideology of Emancipation», in: David SORKIN/Frances MALINO (eds.) *From East and West*, Oxford 1990, 107-125.

³ To mention just a few, see: Mordechai BREUER, *Jüdische Orthodoxie im Deutschen Reich 1871-1918*, Frankfurt 1986. (Hebrew translation: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, Jerusalem 1990). Isaac EISENSTEIN-BARZILAY, «The Treatment of the Jewish Religion in the Literature of the Berlin Haskalah», *American Academy for Jewish Research*, xxiv (1955), 39-68, Mordechaie ELIAV, *Jewish Education in Germany in the Period of Enlightenment and Emancipation*, Jerusalem 1960 [Hebrew]. Jacob KATZ, *Die Entstehung der Judenassimilation in Deutschland und deren Ideologie*, Inaugural-Dissertation, Frankfurt a.M. 1935. Jacob KATZ, *Out of the Ghetto*, Cambridge Mass. 1973. (revised Hebrew edition: Tel Aviv 1986). Adolf KOBER, «Jewish Communities in Germany from the Age of Enlightenment to their Destruction by the Nazis», *Jewish Social Studies*, IX:3 (1947), 195-238. Adolf KOBER, «Emancipation's Impact on the Education and Vocational Training of German Jewry», *Jewish Social Studies*, 16 (1954), 3-33. Mordechai LEVIN, *Social and Economic Values. The Idea of Professional Modernization in the Ideology of the Haskalah Movement*, Jerusalem 1975 [Hebrew]. Robert LIBERLES, (1) «Was There a Jewish Movement for Emancipation in Germany». (2) «Emancipation and the Structure of the Jewish Community in the Nineteenth Century», *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book XXXI* (1986), 35-67. Charles L. OZER, «Jewish Education in the Transition from Ghetto to Emancipation», *Historia-Judaica*, 9 (1947), 75-93, 137-157. Dov RAPEL, «Jewish Education in Germany in the Mirror of School Books», in: *Sefer Aviad*, Jerusalem 1986, 205-216 [Hebrew]. Jehuda REINHARZ, Walter SCHATZBERG (eds.), *The Jewish Response to German Culture*, Hannover and London 1985. Ernst SIMON, *Philantropism and Jewish Education*, in: *Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Book*, New-York 1953, 149-187. [Hebrew]. David SORKIN, *The Transformation of German Jewry 1780-1840*, New York, Oxford 1987. Selma STERN-TAEUBLER, «The Jew in the Transition from Ghetto to Emancipation», *Historia-Judaica*, 2:2 (1940), 102-119. Selma STERN-TAEUBLER, «Der literarischen Kampf um die Emanzipation in den Jahren 1816-1820 und seine ideologischen und soziologischen Voraussetzungen», *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 23:part.ii (1950-51), 171-196.

of interference between the German culture and the Jewish-Hebrew culture towards the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th.

Lack of interest in these agents, it seems to me, derives instead from the lack of a sound theoretical framework that will make place for the study of such cultural phenomena. This is the case partially because as texts for children, these texts were not of sufficiently high rank in the hierarchy of either the Jewish or the German cultural system. Subsequently they failed to occupy a significant niche in its cultural consciousness. All the same, because they functioned at a practical, down-to-earth level in the everyday life of German Jewry, they played a major role in the creation of its culture. I believe that using Even-Zohar's theoretical framework will enable us to appropriately gauge the historical roles played by cultural agents, such as Joachim Heinrich Campe or Christian Fürchtegott Gellert.⁴

Books for Jewish children were written and published systematically and regularly over hundreds of years in the German-speaking countries. Thanks to a research project being carried out by Universität Frankfurt, Institut für Jugendbuchforschung and Tel Aviv University, we have been able to reconstruct a large portion of the corpus of books for Jewish children in the German-speaking countries. We have discovered that the corpus is much larger than first expected. At the outset of our research program, we estimated that the total number of titles would amount to a couple of hundred. Now it is clear that we are talking about more than 2400 titles, about two-third of which are German titles and one third are Hebrew and bilingual titles.

A thorough study of this enormous corpus will last many decades. Yet, some burning questions can already be dealt with. For instance: How can the large volume of the books be accounted for? There are periods during which the number of published books is almost equivalent to the number of children who attended Jewish schools. Moreover, it is far from clear whether, at certain periods, there were enough children whose knowledge of Hebrew or German sufficed to make the texts legible. As is well known, the texts were written for children whose mother tongue was neither Hebrew nor German.

The answer to this question is to be found primarily in the relations between the Jewish and the German cultures. Education was one of the main projects of the Jewish Enlightenment movement – the Haskalah. The leaders of the Haskalah, who firmly believed in the importance of rational education,

⁴ See: Gideon TOURY, «An Enlightened Use of Fable: Christian Fürchtegott Gellert in Hebrew Literature», in: Ziva SHAMIR/Avner HOLZMAN (eds.), *Turning Points in Hebrew Literature and Their Relationship to Contacts with other Literatures*, Tel Aviv 1993, 75-86 [Hebrew].

regularly and extensively aired their views on pedagogical matters in various journals (such as *Ha-measef and Shulamit*) often citing Locke, Rousseau, Basedow, Campe, and to a lesser extent, Pestalozzi.⁵

The German philosophy of education, and especially the Philanthropist orientation was adopted by the Jewish Haskalah in line with its overall philosophy of education, and in particular, with its method of language instruction, its approach to the instruction of the sciences, and its partiality to a universal religion. Embracing the new philanthropic philosophy of education implied the necessity for changing the curriculum. This new philosophy was implemented in a new network of schools established throughout Germany by the Haskalah movement, posing an alternative to the traditional Jewish system of education. As a rule, these schools closely followed the Philanthropist model⁶, although the Jewish *maskilim* adjusted it to their needs. Thus for instance, the Philanthropist proposal to do away with traditional elements in the curriculum was embraced, with the result that omitting the traditional instruction of Greek was paralleled in the Jewish program by giving up the traditional teaching of the Talmud. Replacing Greek with Latin was paralleled by the introduction of instruction in Hebrew, another classical language, in what amounted to a Jewish variation on the Philanthropist method.

There is no need here to go into the well documented history of interference between the German and the Jewish philosophy of education.⁷ I would just like to emphasize that the newly established schools created a new demand for books, which were regarded by the Haskalah as a primary means for achieving its social, cultural and educational goals.

The intended addressees of these books were children who came to study in the new school network the Enlightenment movement had established in Germany between the years 1780-1850. (Several schools continued to exist even later, some remaining active until the Second World War.) The number of Jewish pupils never exceeded a few thousand during the entire period. According to Eliav, the average number of pupils in the Berlin school, between the years 1800-1813, did not exceed 55. The school in Breslau which was opened in 1791 had 120 pupils in its first year, but this number declined to 90 in the second year and never went up again. The entire number of pupils in

⁵ Tsemah TSAMRIYON, *Haskalah-Meassef, the first modern periodical in Hebrew*, Tel Aviv 1988, 175-183 [Hebrew].

⁶ ELIAV (1960), *op. cit.*; SIMON (1953) *op. cit.*

⁷ SIMON (1953), *op. cit.*; ELIAV (1960), *op. cit.* Nizta BEN ARI, *Historical Images and the Emergence of a new literary System*. (Thesis submitted for the degree Doctor of philosophy) Tel Aviv University 1993 [Hebrew].

Jewish schools in 1807 (including girls) was around 440, and in 1812, about 900 children studied in the schools of the Enlightenment movement.

My aim in mentioning this data is only to point out the remarkable ratio between the number of books and the number of their readers. This ratio is more than puzzling: It implies that there were almost as many books as children who could read them. The number of books, especially those published until the middle of the 19th century, should not be taken as an indication of the real scope of readership, children and adolescents, but rather as a mark of the status of the texts within the various Jewish ideological movements, which regarded children's books as a social vehicle intended to achieve social goals. Clearly we are dealing here with the creation of a repertoire whose significance was primarily ideological.

A new system had come into being which needed a supply of new and accessible books. The new and hitherto unknown demand for alternative books, which would meet the demands of the new educational system, could not be filled by the former traditional repertoire of Jewish texts. The few existing books which served as texts for Jewish children were unsuitable for Haskalah purposes, so the Haskalah was forced to look elsewhere for a source from which alternative models could be borrowed. The close relations between the Jewish Haskalah movement and the German Enlightenment made German children's literature a most desirable, virtually ideal, model for imitation. Ideologically speaking, the best guarantee of supplying the newly required books for children lay in an ongoing process of interference with the German system. Most of the books were modeled on the German repertoire of books for children.

The books of the Haskalah movement were neither the first to use German models, nor to address Jewish children in the German-speaking countries. Books for Jewish children, or passages addressing children in texts or manuscripts for adults, were written in Germany for as long as Jewish communities had been in existence. The production of texts for Jewish children has always been to some degree a result of connections with the German culture, which evidently existed throughout the entire history of the Jewish presence in Germany. But it was only within the ideology of the Haskalah that these connections were not disguised, but rather considered an ideal for imitation, an imitation which admittedly should be controlled and regulated. With the Haskalah, the question of links with German culture ceased to be an issue of permission or proscription. Involvement with German culture became a *fait accompli*, while the issue at stake became one concerning the nature and character of this involvement.

Adopting the German repertoire was neither a direct nor a straightforward process. The concrete way in which the German system served as a model for

imitation was conditioned by the Haskalah's assessment of the evolution of German Enlightenment children's literature and its inventory. This process involved the translation of concepts and ideas which did not always concur with the state of affairs as perceived by the system of German children's literature.

Compared with German children's literature, Jewish children's literature was delayed in its development, and borrowed from the German system only those stages which were suitable for its needs. This meant turning back to previous stages of the development of the German system, dating from the beginning of the 18th century. It was almost as though, at a given point in time, certain models, texts and processes of development in the evolution of German children's literature were frozen into a static image which later became the sole frame of reference for Jewish children's literature for almost an entire century. This frame of reference mainly sanctioned the translation of German Enlightenment texts, or the production of a small number of original texts based on German texts.

The eligibility of texts for translation was ideologically motivated: eligibility was determined by the extent to which these texts reflected the ideological requirements of the Haskalah. A text had to «prove» its unequivocal adherence to Haskalah ideology before it could be selected for translation; only texts seen through the *filter* of the Haskalah as affiliated to the German Enlightenment and/or the Jewish tradition were eligible for translation. Consequently, German texts were translated if they were written by German writers recognized by the Jews as German Enlightenment writers, or if they explicitly conveyed Enlightenment values. Two factors became crucial in determining the nature of the relations between the cultures: the available Jewish culture and the available German culture. In principle, the strategic options within the two cultures as well as the options regulating their contacts were unlimited. In practice, however, they always testified to the actual needs of the Jewish system at a certain period of time, its readiness to acknowledge its bonds with German culture, and most important of all – the mode and scope of its acquaintance with German culture.

Within the context of these major decisions, texts were translated if, and only if, they had managed to meet two criteria: theme and author.

3. The Case of Campe

The most prolifically translated writer of the period was Joachim Heinrich Campe (1746-1818)⁸ – a highly significant theoretician and practitioner in the field of modern pedagogy, as manifested in both his numerous books for children, and his pedagogic writings. The extent to which his journal *Allgemeine Revision des gesamten Schul-und-Erziehungswesens* was read by the Jewish maskilim is not quite clear. What is however clear is that members of the Haskalah movement knew Campe and his work.

The relations between Mendelssohn and Campe became common knowledge, almost a myth, due to their friendship and to the much-cited letter written by Mendelssohn to Campe in March 1777, analyzing the living conditions of the Jews in Germany.⁹ Campe also paid one or two visits to Mendelssohn's Berlin home, reporting on it enthusiastically, if somewhat patronizingly:

Es war an einem Freitag Nachmittage, als wir, meine Frau und ich, mit Berliner Gelehrten bei Mendelssohn zum Besuche waren und mit Kaffee bewirthet wurden. Mendelssohn, immer der freundlichste Gesellschafter, stand etwa eine Stunde vor Sonnenuntergang von seinem Sitze auf, trat auf uns zu mit den Worten: Meine Damen und Herren! Ich gehe nur in das Nebenzimmer um meine Sabbath zu empfangen und bin dann gleich wieder in Ihrer Mitte; unterdess wird meine Frau Ihre Gegenwart um so mehr geniessen.¹⁰

Characteristic of this relationship was the stereotyped manner in which Mendelssohn and Campe perceived each other. Mendelssohn regarded Campe as a representative member of the German philosemitic circles, and thus held him morally responsible for the attitude of German society towards the Jews. Campe held Mendelssohn responsible for the behavior of the Jewish community and rebuked him for the meager Jewish response to the invitation of the Fürst von Dessau to join the Philanthropin school in Dessau. Their relations

⁸ Reinhard STACH, *Robinson der Jüngere als pädagogisch-didaktisches Modell des philanthropischen Erziehungsdenkens*, Ratingen 1970, 73. Reinhard STACH, Nachwort. *Robinson der Jüngere* Dortmund 1978, 469.

⁹ Bertha BADT-STRAUSS, *Moses Mendelssohn – der Mensch und das Werk*, Berlin 1929, 199–201. Alexander ALTMANN (ed.), *Mendelssohn, Moses. Gesammelte Schriften*. Jubiläumsausgabe. Briefwechsel, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1976, letter no. 443).

¹⁰ M. KAYSERLING, *Moses Mendelssohn. Sein Leben und Wirken*. Hermann Mendelssohn, Leipzig 1862/1888, vol. 2, 422–23.

were characteristically asymmetrical. Trivial as it may sound, it is worth mentioning that their acquaintance played a far less important role for Campe than it did for Mendelssohn. Scholars of Campe have found little or no mention of Mendelssohn in their studies of Campe's works, whereas throughout studies of Mendelssohn's works, reference to his acquaintance with Campe can be found. However asymmetrical, Mendelssohn's acquaintance with Campe undoubtedly played a crucial role in Campe's introduction into the Jewish-Hebrew system. Mendelssohn was a prime force at the time in the process of interference which took place between Jewish culture and German culture, as has been astutely noted by Akiva Simon. Simon notes that it was Mendelssohn who «served both as a bridge as well as a dam» for the Haskalah.¹¹ In other words, concepts and values underwritten by Mendelssohn were further transmitted to Jewish cultural centers in both Western and Eastern Europe, while tenets and beliefs he disregarded or rejected had little chance of reaching the cultural consciousness of the average Haskalah-oriented Jew, at least until the mid-nineteenth century.

Campe's position in the Hebrew-Jewish system cannot, however, be accounted for solely on the basis of a series of biographical incidents, significant as these may be. Of no less importance was his status within the European educational and literary systems of the time, where he assumed the task of popularizing the new philosophy of education.

The combination of Campe's philosemitic leanings and his dominant position in the European scene as representative of Philanthropin made him the leading agent in the process of interference between the German and the Jewish-Hebrew cultures during the Haskalah. As far as Jewish-Hebrew culture was concerned, Campe was *the* representative of German children's literature. His books were translated into Yiddish as well as into Hebrew.¹²

Campe maintained his position as the most privileged German writer in the Jewish-Hebrew system well into the second half of the nineteenth century and was still translated into Yiddish yet again as recently as 1910 (*Robinson der Jüngere*). Even when harshly criticized by German writers, who wrote alternative versions of *Robinson der Jüngere*¹³, and even when he was no longer a

¹¹ SIMON (1953), *op. cit.*, 179, my translation.

¹² Zohar SHAVIT, «From Friedländer's Lesebuch to the Jewish Campe: The Beginning of Hebrew Children's Literature in Germany». *Leo Baeck Year Book*, 33 (1988), 393-423. Zohar SHAVIT, «Interference Relations between German and Jewish-Hebrew Children's Literature in the Enlightenment. The Case of Campe», *Poetics Today*, 13:1 (1992), 41-61. Zohar SHAVIT, «Literarische Beziehungen zwischen der deutschen und der jüdisch-hebräischen Kinderliteratur in der Epoche der Aufklärung am Beispiel von J.H. Campe», in: Armin Paul FRANK, Kurt-Jürgen MAAß, Fritz PAUL und Horst TURK (eds.), *Übersetzen, Verstehen, Brücken bauen*, Berlin 1993, 755-765.

¹³ STACH (1978), *op. cit.*, 474-475.

living literary figure in Europe in general or in Germany in particular, Campe's books still provided a model for the production of original texts in Hebrew.

Die Entdeckung von Amerika was the first of Campe's books to be translated into Hebrew. It was selected for translation because it was regarded as suitable for conversion into a historical narrative. However, a drastic transformation of the original text was required before it could meet the requirements of a history and geography textbook. The need for adaptation was rooted in the existing repertoire of the Jewish-Hebrew system. The emerging Jewish system was not yet in a position to endorse fictional narratives for children or adults. A translated text was expected to conform to the standards of acceptable models, which *did* not include fictional prose.

As Feiner has shown, the texts were expected to establish historical awareness.¹⁴ Indeed, the events unfolded in the text served the purpose of presenting a new world and new options of living. Thus, the history of the discovery of America was regarded by the maskilim as a sign of modern history, and as an event which instituted a new period in history, providing an example of universal history and human capability¹⁵, as a review published in *Ha-measef* clearly indicates:

On the whole it is a fine, handsome book, which will prove useful to all those interested in the history of the past.¹⁶

Even in the case of a writer of Campe's caliber, only a limited number of books were eligible for translation, and even these underwent a process of adjustment, characterized by the omission of all the elements which were not regarded as directly contributing to the acquisition of human knowledge and wisdom.

The translation by Moshe Mendelssohn-Frankfurt in 1807, entitled *Meztiat Eretz Chadasha*, transformed the book into a strictly geographical and historical text, leaving out all the elements of a novel for children. Adjusting the text to the systemic constraints resulted in replacing the original narrative of *Die Entdeckung von Amerika* with a historical-geographical narrative.

The original text was restructured as a frame-story, a narrative technique favored by the Philanthropists who regarded the dialogue constructed by the frame-story as the most suitable form for instructing children. In the frame-story of the source text, the father promises his children to tell them a

¹⁴ FEINER (1990), *op. cit.*, chapter 2.

¹⁵ FEINER (1990), *op. cit.*, 64.

¹⁶ *Ha-measef*, 5570 [1810], 101.

fascinating tale during the coming week; subsequently the frame-story determines the segmentation of the source text according to the days of the week. In this way, the dialogue with the children plays an important role in structuring the narrative sequence of the text. Recourse to dialogue enables the narrator to focus on the children, making them – rather than Columbus – the main protagonists. Focusing on the children also allows the narrator to teach the children several things by way of a series of questions and answers. The dialogue also makes it quite clear that in the course of narration, the text is meant to impart specific values to the children, among which knowledge is highly significant, but not exclusive.

It should be noted that the original narrative structure which, *above all else, manifests Philanthropist ideas* disappeared from the Hebrew translation, because Jewish-Hebrew literature could not tolerate the presence of belletristic texts.

The first part of the translation was published following the translator's correspondence with Campe. It did not, however, enjoy success, and Mendelssohn-Frankfurt failed to publish the remaining two parts, which he had hoped to do upon the successful sales of the first.

Despite Mendelssohn-Frankfurt's failure, *Die Entdeckung von Amerika* became a most popular text among Haskalah writers. Jewish maskilim outside Germany often chose to begin their careers as writers by translating this very book, regardless of other existing editions.

The second translation of the book, entitled *Giluy Amerika*, was carried out by Hirsch Baer Hurwitz, also known as Hermann Bernard. Hurwitz, who belonged to the first generation of maskilim in Russia, translated Campe's book into Hebrew as early as 1810, twelve years before establishing a school in Uman together with Metz Landau. It is not quite clear why it was deemed necessary to produce a new translation only three years after Mendelssohn-Frankfurt's book had been published. There may indeed have been several reasons for this, including the fact that Mendelssohn-Frankfurt's translation may not have been known or available in Russia. At any rate, this translation has been lost.

Thirteen years later the first full translation of *Die Entdeckung von Amerika* was published in Eastern Europe. The translation entitled *Sefer Galot Ha-arets Haskalah-xadasha*, Vilna 1823 – in three parts – was carried out by Mordechai Aaron Günzburg. As Bartal has shown, Günzburg who often journeyed to Lithuania and Courland, became a main conduit in the cultural flux through which German culture and the Haskalah filtered into Jewish East European society.¹⁷

¹⁷ D.R. MAGID, *Mordechai Aaron Günzburg, 5556-5607*. St. Petersburg 1897 [Hebrew]. BARTAL (1990), *op. cit.*

The interference between East European Haskalah and the German culture, and the function of the latter in the development of Jewish-Hebrew culture in Eastern Europe is beyond the scope of the present article. It is, however, worth mentioning that at the periphery of the German-speaking area, Campe's *Die Entdeckung von Amerika*, and similar texts such as *Merkwürdige Reisebeschreibungen* underwent further translation. The translations continued to ignore completely the underlying model of the original text, referring to it «purely» as a history book. This was the case with Mendel Lefin's *Mas'ot hayam*, published in Lemberg in 1818, and Abraham Mohr's *Columbus, Hu sefer metziat eretz Amerika*, published in Lemberg in 1846.

Thus, translating Campe was not perceived of in terms of writing fictional narratives, nor in terms of mere «adventure stories» about the discovery of America or any such «wonderful journeys», but in terms of creating a repertoire of historical awareness and creating tools for implementing a new and enlightened Weltanschauung.

Die Entdeckung von Amerika was also the first book by Campe to be translated into Yiddish.¹⁸ It was translated by Haikel Hurwitz in Berdichev as early as 1817. Entitled *Zafant paaneax* it was followed by a second translation, *Di Entdeckung fun Amerika*, published in Vilna in 1823-4. The first translation, *Zafant paaneax*, enjoyed overwhelming success, especially among women readers.

As the following citations indicate, this book seems to have replaced books of religious teaching (Erbauungsliteratur) such as *Tsene-rene* and *Bove mayse*¹⁹:

This Haikel Hurwitz wrote Jargon! He translated Campe's book on the discovery of America from German and called it *Columbus* [...]. At this time, the book had spread to such an extent that all the Jews had read it, needless to say the women, too. They shut the *Tsene-rene*, *Techinot*, and even the *Bove mayse* and read nothing but *Columbus*. Until then, only a few Jews even knew that America existed. [...]

Columbus was written so beautifully that it could be read and understood everywhere – in Russia, Poland, Galicia and Rumania, every place where Jews were to be found.²⁰

Campe's books became reading material for adults not only in the case of Yiddish literature. As the reviews of the book indicate, the translation ad-

¹⁸ Z. RAYZN, «Campe's *Entdeckung von Amerika* in Yiddish», *Yivo Blätter*, V (1933), 30-40.

¹⁹ Israel ZINBERG, *A History of Jewish Literature*. Translated and edited by Bernard Martin. Hasidim and enlightenment, Cincinnati, Ohio / New York 1976, 225-226.

²⁰ Abraham Baer GOTTLÖBER, *Memories and Travels* (2), Jerusalem 1976, 15-17 [Hebrew]. (my translation)

dressed adults as well. The reviews saw it as a multifaceted text with respect to the category of audience. A review published by *Ha-measef* recommended that Mendelssohn-Frankfurt's *Meztiat eretz xadasha* should be read by any «lover of the Hebrew language and book» and especially «the dear people of Poland who do not read books written for gentiles».²¹

Thus, the original German text of Campe, which addressed children, was transformed in the Jewish system into a book for both adolescents and adults. In this manner, children's literature, addressed to adults as well, served as a particularly successful channel in creating a new Jewish culture in Germany.

4. Conclusions

Examination of the role fulfilled by Campe in the creation of Jewish culture in Germany, leads to the conclusion that he served as one of the agents of cultural interactions, making the relations between the German and the Jewish cultures possible.

Campe fulfilled a constitutive function in each and every one of the initial stages of the creation of the system of books for Jewish children. In fact, one of the first accomplishments to be performed by the Jewish maskil, whether in Germany or in Russia, was to translate at least one of Campe's books into Hebrew. Translating Campe suggested an effort to create texts for Jewish children in a totally new context. Campe hereby functioned not only in the creation of a new Jewish repertoire, but also in legitimizing it, and marking it as part and parcel of European culture.

Hence, agents such as Campe can serve as a first-rate source for studying the way, or ways, in which German culture was understood and interpreted by Jewish culture, and consequently, the ways these understandings and interpretations determined and shaped the nature of Jewish identity in Germany.

Campe was an important channel in the process of interference between the German and the Jewish cultures, but he was not, of course, an exclusive source. The creation of a Jewish-Hebrew system in Germany involved the adaptation of the German model of development in two ways: historically, by following its stages of development, and by borrowing its textual models.

²¹ *Ha-measef*, 5570[1810], 101.

Reliance on the German system implied that each process and procedure in the development of the Jewish-Hebrew system was conditioned by the German system. It was the German system, or more precisely the interpretation thereof by the Jewish maskilim, which determined the nature and limitations of the Jewish-Hebrew system, its repertoire, and its structure.

This brief examination of the interference between the German and the Jewish cultures during the Haskalah period leads to conclusions of a concrete, as well as a more general, nature. On the concrete level, this case clearly shows that the study of interference with the German system is an indispensable parameter in the attempt to chart the development of Jewish-Hebrew children's literature, without which the bulk of the evolutionary process cannot really be understood.

On a more general level, the following can be concluded: When studying the issue of cultural relationships, it is the question of the functions fulfilled by the texts which becomes crucial for the understanding of cultural dynamics. The traditional comparative studies paradigm does not allow the investigation of the textual functions of one system in another, but has been concerned with the mere existence of texts, preferably of high standing, transferred from one literature to another.

The case of Campe shows, that his importance did not lie in his affiliation to the great German heritage. Campe never shared the status of writers like Goethe and Schiller. In fact, his status in the German adult system was marginal, and even in the children's system he gradually lost his central status, while still functioning in a significant manner for the Jewish system.

Despite Campe's marginal status he played a decisive role in the creation of a new and modern repertoire in Jewish culture in Germany. Jewish culture found it convenient to use his writings as a vehicle for introducing new models into the system. Furthermore, Campe functioned significantly not only as a source for translating texts from German into Hebrew, but also in determining the character of many other texts. In other words, he functioned not only at the level of the texts themselves (which can be analyzed through examining text relations), but also in the creation of the repertoire, itself, where the question of models is more relevant than the metamorphoses of any given text.

The case of Campe, like many other cases in the history of Jewish culture in Germany, cannot be studied in the traditional framework of comparative studies. Only a theoretical framework which makes possible the analysis of texts, repertoire and institutions and their functioning in each of the systems discussed, can provide impetus for comparative studies.

University of Tel Aviv