

Heinrich Heine's Transparent Masks: Denominational Politics and the Poetics of Emancipation in Nineteenth-Century Germany and France

Ari Joskowicz
Vanderbilt University

Anti-Catholicism was integral to Heine's poetics, which emerged in the context of German denominational conflicts of the 1820s and 1830s. One of the most successful anti-Catholic polemicists of German literature, Heine reinforced denominational stereotypes while also mocking their exclusionary consequences. Writing first in a German context, he worked with his readers' knowledge that he was a converted Jew taking on the role of a Protestant critic of Catholicism. After his move to France in 1831, he felt compelled to introduce this knowledge to French readers, who sometimes perceived him simply as a German Lutheran.

Processes of secularization and ideologies of secularism did not unfold in Europe due to the decline of religious conflict.¹ Throughout Western and Central Europe the most important nineteenth-century debates on the role of religion—from philosophical religious criticism to the discussions on civil marriage and secular schooling—were, on the contrary, accompanied by major polemics against denominational Others. Secularizing liberals regularly alluded to Judaism and Catholicism in order to illustrate the particular pathologies of religion that could imperil the full development of the modern state and middle-class society.² Attacks against the Catholic Church in particular helped liberals to formulate their own agendas. In the German states, with their history of conflicts between Protestants and Catholics, many liberals developed their vision of good citizenship in contradistinction to the hierarchical and anti-modern positions that they associated with the Catholic Church.³

This dynamic created a peculiar situation for Jews, a minority that increasingly embraced the promise of integration that secularist politics held for them in the nineteenth century. With secularism closely entangled in conflicts between the two main Christian denominations in Germany, Jews engaged in their own complicated polemics, working within the framework of Protestant-Catholic antagonism while often positioning themselves as unwillingly involved outsiders. This article shows how these contradictory tensions can illuminate crucial aspects of Heinrich Heine's oeuvre. In Heine, we can see these pressures at work in an author who is both pivotal to the German and Jewish canons and who more than most contemporaries managed to position himself outside of

facile denominational identifications.

Heinrich Heine, writing in response to existing religious antagonisms, also helped revivify them by feeding the flames of denominational strife. Yet the rich scholarship on Heine has been only peripherally concerned with this aspect of his work, in spite of the fact that Heine was one of nineteenth-century Europe's best-known denominational polemicists. In particular, his attacks against Romanticism as a Catholic and conservative invention left a lasting mark on anti-Catholic rhetoric even decades after his death.⁴ This gap in the literature is unfortunate both because anti-Catholicism was an integral part of Heine's poetic program and because Heine, who was born a Jew, is an unlikely individual to find at the center of these debates. The labels that stuck to him—not just Heine the Jew, but also Heine the convert, the atheist, the pantheist, and the German (once he moved to France)—consistently defined him as an outsider.⁵ At the same time, Heine positioned himself as a Protestant, a man of letters, and an anti-Catholic critic of clerical power throughout much of his life. In all these respects, Heine adamantly insisted on his position as an insider. Taking the tension between his marginality and his attempts to be a mainstream denominational polemicist as a starting point, this article seeks to put into relief the German and French dimension of these dynamics. Focusing on Heine's polemics during his last years in Germany and his early years in France, the analysis below will explore the difficulties Heine had with translating his religious polemics and public identity from one context to the other.⁶

This attempt to understand how polemics can be transferred between national contexts and conversations aims to highlight the larger issues at stake for nineteenth-century European Jews in the debates on secularization and Catholicism. Indeed, current scholarship on French Jews can be helpful in the reformulation of the research agenda for German history in this respect as well. Michael Graetz and Lisa Leff, among others, have argued for France that liberals accepted Jewish historical narratives because they saw Jews as allies in their anticlerical battle.⁷ Anticlericalism, in other words, sometimes offered an opportunity for integration, even if it also had its pitfalls. Exploring the way this particular form of emancipatory politics translated between national contexts can sharpen our view of the stakes involved for those engaging in this form of politics from the margins.

The Turn to Anticlerical Politics

There is no evidence that either Catholicism or denominational polemics were a major issue for Heine before his conversion to Lutheran Protestantism in May 1825,⁸ an act that laid the groundwork for his later denominational identity games. Heine's conversion was accompanied by much soul-searching in the months before taking the decision to use baptism primarily as an entry ticket to regular employment (and not to European culture as he would later quip),

Heine frequently expressed his sense that he would be committing treason to his Jewish coreligionists if he were to go through with it.⁹ Even if the idea of baptism troubled Heine, he seemed to have had few doubts about his choice of denomination. As one might expect from a liberal Jew living in mid-1820s Berlin, Heine never considered anything but a conversion to Protestantism. His inclinations in this regard were motivated not just by pragmatism but also by his positive feelings towards Protestantism and the liberal politics he associated with it. Heine's conversion to Protestantism was, as Christoph Bartscherer has noted, "not so much a religious as a political confession."¹⁰ In his private correspondence from these years, we can also find hints of Heine's view of Catholicism. In a letter he wrote to his friend Moses Moser during his period of doubt, he noted, "I really don't know how I can help myself in this bad situation. I might become Catholic and hang myself out of exasperation."¹¹ Conversion to Catholicism thus became an option for Heine only in his desperate description of imagined suicide, whereas Protestantism, which did not attract him as a religious denomination, at least stood for political progress in his eyes.

Heine's shame in the face of his conversion eventually gave way to a new strategic approach to questions of religious belonging, triggered by the various well-documented conflicts in which he became embroiled around 1828. Rehearsing some parts of these events from his biography is helpful to explain his later adoption of a particular version of Protestant denominational polemics. In 1827, Heine became the co-editor of one of Friedrich von Cotta's literary and political journals, the *Neue allgemeine politische Annalen*, in Munich. From the start, Heine believed the position to be temporary and a mere steppingstone to an appointment at the University of Munich. Among the few original texts that Heine wrote as the paper's editor was a review of *Die deutsche Literatur* by Wolfgang Menzel.¹² Menzel, one of the pre-eminent literary critics of the time, championed a Protestant nationalism that he expressed in terms of his opposition to Catholicism. Continuing his earlier interest in Protestantism as a symbol of progress, Heine enthusiastically supported Menzel's comparison between the dyads liberalism/servilism, future/past, Protestantism/Catholicism. "We cannot praise enough the wit with which Mr. Menzel speaks of Protestantism and Catholicism," Heine mused, "seeing in the latter the principle of stability and in the former the principle of evolution."¹³

Although Heine applauded Menzel for his Protestant view of history, he disagreed with him about the qualities of one of the best-known anti-Catholic polemicists: Johann Heinrich Voss. In 1819, Voss, a poet and well-respected translator, had written a strongly-worded attack against his former friend, the Romantic poet Friedrich Leopold Stolberg, entitled *Warum ward Fritz Stolberg zum Unfreien?* Stolberg had converted from Protestantism to Catholicism in 1801, a move that Voss disagreed with on personal but also ideological grounds.

His text combined ridicule of Catholic ritual and political commentary to express his disappointment with his former friend's decision: Whereas Menzel rejected the crudeness of Voss' diatribes against his aristocratic opponent, Heine was precisely interested in this aspect of Voss' text. Menzel had denounced Voss as a "coarse lower-Saxon peasant."¹⁴ Heine countered that such a peasant was sometimes necessary to "dig up the old battle swords of the times of the peasant wars."¹⁵ Church and aristocracy, those old and new allies, had to be defeated at the same time, according to Heine, and a violent style was the right weapon to achieve this feat.

Heine's review, which had intervened into the denominational conflicts between Catholics and Protestants, became the target of Ignaz Döllinger, a priest, theologian, and publisher of the Catholic journal *Eos*. Döllinger's main tool of criticism in this case was anti-Jewish prejudice. In an article written for *Eos*, Döllinger first reproached Heine for a comment that played with the sex appeal of the image of the Madonna in his *Harzreise*.¹⁶ In that work, Heine had noted that he would have liked to meet the model who sat for a particularly attractive painting of the Madonna, contemplating afterwards that he would like to marry her if it were not for the fact that he did not want "his head adorned with a halo or another ornament because of my wife."¹⁷ The latter comment alluded to the idea that Mary had betrayed Joseph, since he was not the father of Jesus. Döllinger depicted these comments as a typical form of Jewish "cheekiness," noting in a footnote that Heine's conversion was obviously a sham.¹⁸

The remaining and larger part of Döllinger's review focused on Heine's support for Voss. He sought to discredit Heine's anti-aristocratic and egalitarian philosophy in a series of pungent comments on the monetary orientation that Heine "must have acquired with his mother's milk," again making reference to Heine's inalienable Jewishness.¹⁹ Working with a distinction between Jewish money and old German honor, he implied that Heine had only supported Voss, a commoner, against the aristocratic Stolberg because he gave precedence to money over pedigree.

Another review in *Eos* from the same period, possibly penned by Döllinger as well, also challenged Heine's identity as a convert. The Catholic paper once again depicted Heine as a man who had "neither religion nor fatherland;" Heine was a man who lost his religion because "he became stuck in the chasm between abandoning an old belief and accepting a new one."²⁰ A central issue that Döllinger and his colleagues addressed with their anti-Jewish diatribes was the right of a non-Christian to enter into the debates between Catholics and Protestants. Depicting Heine alternately as a Jew and a person who had no authentic identity, they implied that Heine was not authorized to be anticlerical or anti-Catholic in public.

Shortly after Döllinger issued his comments, Heine engaged in his controversy with August von Platen, a poet whom Döllinger praised enthusiastically in

his publications.²¹ Like Döllinger, Platen attacked Heine as a Jew, humiliating him with anti-Jewish insults in his play, *Romantic Oedipus*. Given Döllinger's sympathy for Platen, Heine identified him incorrectly with the clerical anti-Jewish campaign in the Munich *Eos*.²² Heine's sense of a Catholic cabal working against him increased further when he learned that he was no longer being considered for the position at the University of Munich.

These well-known attacks triggered a shift in Heine's approach to religion. Identifying Catholicism as the force that motivated his political and personal enemies, Heine turned to a new strategy during an extended trip to Italy. Whereas his conversion to Protestantism in 1825 was a pragmatic move, he now started to embrace it as a potential basis for another step: the appropriation of a Protestant version of political anti-Catholicism that went beyond the general association of Protestantism and progress seen in his 1828 review of Menzel.²³ We can see early indications of this change in his letters from this period, which report on negative impressions during his travels in Italy and his intention to cultivate these resentments. Writing from the Baths of Lucca, which later became a central location for volume three of *Reisebilder*, Heine wrote to Moses Moser, "My love for human equality, my hatred of the clergy were never stronger than now, I nearly became one-sided because of it. But to act people must be one-sided."²⁴

The important point here is not so much that Heine felt injured by attacks on his person but rather that he decided to embrace his partiality. Elements of his reorientation appear in volume three of *Reisebilder* and are fully developed by the fourth volume. The following analysis will focus on the latter work, showing how the confessional polemics that saturated Heine's discussion of religion became an integral part of his program of political, aesthetic, and personal emancipation. Heine's most pronounced anti-Catholic elements appear in "Die Stadt Lucca," which he wrote around 1829 during his travels in Italy and completed in 1830, while in Germany.

The Transparency of the Mask

Unlike his earlier travel writings, "Die Stadt Lucca" introduced an additional voice, developing its themes through a dialogue. Witty Lady Maxwell is the fictional Heine's congenial partner who expresses the classical Enlightenment criticism of Christianity as irrational. Heine's alter ego corrects her by praising religious images for their immediacy and sensual appeal, even as he rejects all religions' institutional forms.²⁵ Half travelogue, half philosophical dialogue, the text acquires its meaning only through the tension between the two main actors. This makes it even more important than in other works to distinguish between Heine the author and Heine the character in the narrative.

The main target of Heine's sarcasm in "Die Stadt Lucca" was state-supported religion, which, according to him, ultimately worked to undermine the state,

damage religion, destroy freedom, and hinder the revolutionary unification of Germany. The narrator (Heine) argues: "Were there no such state religion, no privileging of particular dogmas and rites, Germany would be united and strong and her sons would be glorious and free. But this way our poor fatherland is torn because of religious conflict, the people are split into hostile religious parties: Protestant subjects quarrel with their Catholic princes or the other way around. Everywhere there are suspicions of crypto-Catholicism or crypto-Protestantism, everywhere accusations of heresy, espionage of opinions."²⁶ Heine portrayed denominational conflict as the result of the politicization of religion, blaming these conflicts in turn for the weakness of his imagined fatherland. Curiously, his text nevertheless engages in precisely the type of religious politics that he rejected.

While condemning religious division, Heine was anything but a neutral or even-handed critic of all religious "fanaticism," to use a popular word from nineteenth-century debates. Although Heine claimed at one point in the text that his observations might apply to "the whole diplomatic corps of God"²⁷—including rabbis and muftis—his main criticism was directed against the Catholic Church, whether in Germany or Italy.²⁸ Heine never wrote anti-rabbinic polemics that used the type of language that we can find in his descriptions of the grotesque physiognomies of Italian priests (even if physical features appear in his satirical characterizations of Jews as well).²⁹

At the same time, Catholicism was not a single entity for Heine. In some passages, Italian Catholicism was the butt of his criticism, in others it served as the positive counter-example to German Catholicism. When Heine commented extensively on the disfigured faces of the Italian Catholic priests he claimed to have seen in a procession, for example, he depicted the Italian clergy as representatives of all Catholicism. In another passage, he claimed that the Catholic clergy was less hypocritical in Italy than in Germany. Whereas German priests tried to pretend they were as pious and unblemished in their private life as their public position would have made one think, Italian priests knew their flock had no problem with hearing their sermon even after having found them drunk "in the muck of the street" the previous night.³⁰

Heine described this peculiar form of a double life with particularly vivid imagery. According to Heine, Italian priests had a better sense of irony. They didn't mind what he called the "transparency of the mask," which allowed them to pretend to be dignified representatives of God, even as they pursued illicit pleasures in plain view. These priests were openly dissimulating in their official function and thus not dissimulating at all. Their transparent masks hid nothing but rather symbolized a shared ironic understanding of human nature.

The idea of a transparent mask, which does not appear again in the text, is also a useful metaphor to describe the way Heine depicted himself as a Protestant in the late 1820s and 1830s and how this is reflected in his criticism of

Catholicism. Unlike the discussions of mimicry and masks in post-colonial writings (Frantz Fanon, Homi Bhaba) or the attempts to connect structural and individualistic arguments in the Marxist tradition (Karl Marx's and later Georg Lukács' idea of a character mask), Heine's transparent mask defines a strategy of those who are centrally shaping hegemonic languages even if they do so from partially marginalized positions.³¹ This approach is not about the challenge of being autonomous in the face of colonization but rather about finding a stronger voice, in this case, by abandoning the uncomfortable role of Jewish poet for a much more complicated persona.

Nowhere does this peculiar form of masking appear as clearly as in the romantic scenes of his "Die Stadt Lucca." A key moment that combines Heine's religious criticism, his anti-Catholicism, and his peculiar identity games unfolds as the narrator discovers his beloved Franscheska praying in a church. Franscheska is depicted as an attractive, sensual yet pious Catholic woman, who—as the readers of the earlier parts of the travel stories knew—was in love with the priest Cecco. The narrator eventually accompanies Franscheska, moved to tears by her prayers, through the empty streets of Lucca. Franscheska barely looks at him and remains in a kind of religious trance, her gait "gloomily Catholic."³² Slowly, Heine entwines the description of religious acts with sexual innuendo. As Franscheska is passing holy images she is "crossing her head and breast; she refused my offer to help."³³ Suddenly, as they pass a marble Madonna statue, Franscheska kisses Heine whispering "Cecco, Cecco, caro Cecco!"—the name of the priest she loves.³⁴

Heine's narrative voice explains: "I accepted these kisses quietly, although I well knew that they were intended for a Bolognese *abbé*, a servant of the Roman Catholic Church. As a Protestant, I had no qualms in appropriating the goods of the Catholic clergy, and on the spot I secularized Franscheska's pious kisses. I am aware that the priests will be furious about this; they will certainly clamor about theft of church property, and will wish to visit the French law of sacrilege upon me."³⁵ To the narrator Heine's disappointment, Franscheska slams the door in his face once she arrives at home and proceeds to offer repentant prayers well into the night. Combining Catholic imagery and eroticism, the narrator stands in front of the door and makes the ultimate offer to his beloved:

for this single night, if you will grant it to me, will I become a Catholic—but for this night only! O beautiful, blessed Catholic night! I would lie in your arms, believing like a pious Catholic in the heaven of your love; with our lips we will kiss and gain the lovely confession that the word will become flesh, faith will become tangible in form and substance; what a religion! You priests [*Pfaffen*] celebrate your Kyrie Eleison, [...] that is the body!—I believe, I am blessed, I fall asleep—but as soon as I wake the following morning I rub sleep and Catholicism out of my eyes, and once more see

clearly into the sun and into the Bible. I am once again reasonable and sober like a Protestant.³⁶

Thus in "Die Stadt Lucca," Heine—the Jew who was troubled by his conversion to Protestantism—had his narrator assume the role of Protestant so that he might gain the favors of a sensual Catholic woman. Heine's carnivalesque approach to religious affiliation is a tool in these passages. By satirically undoing Catholicism, he distanced himself from the politics he identified with it while at the same time hinting at his fascination with Catholicism's aesthetic and erotic appeal.³⁷ The "secularization of Franscheska's pious kisses" can be understood as a metaphor for his attempt to appropriate the emotive immediacy of religious forms for a churchless politics.³⁸

At the same time, his satire stylized Catholicism as the exotic Other, which allowed him to appear to his audience as a Protestant rather than a Jew (through the person of his Protestant narrator). He implicitly shifted the discussion from the opposition between Jews and Christians to one between Protestants and Catholics, writing himself into the position of the insider. Paradoxically, Protestantism, which he identified primarily with rationalism, became his ticket to sensual pleasure in this narrative. The emancipatory element of the story is encapsulated in the promise that the Jew-turned-Protestant might be able to fulfill his sexual desires. This is a masculine emancipation based on romantic conquest. The seduction fails. What of his emancipation?

One way of unpacking this episode further is to look at the reception of "Die Stadt Lucca." It is striking that Heine's work was usually attacked for mocking the sacred symbols of Christianity but not for his satirical commentaries on confessional difference. The most common critique of Heine's fourth volume of the *Reisebilder* was shaped by reactions to his allusions to August von Platen's homosexuality in his third volume. Compared to the indecency that reviewers had detected in the previous volume, "Die Stadt Lucca" seemed less shocking, with the result that his religious polemics were treated as tasteless but passé.³⁹ This does not mean that all reviewers ignored Heine's self-description as a Protestant. The theologian and author August Nodnagel, for example, noted: "Indeed, one can see through him and not without reason he claims several times that he is a Protestant. He can say this a hundred times. [W]e will continue to believe [...] that he is a Jew."⁴⁰

The most vicious anti-Jewish attacks came from Döllinger's circle once again. An article in *Eos* labeled Heine's religious criticism as Jewish impudence—*Judenfrechheit*.⁴¹ Heine reacted to this criticism, which he had also received before and thus anticipated, in the epilogue to the work. He mocked the little priestlings (*Pfifflein*) who even "dig up their enemies' fathers to check if they were circumcised."⁴² But did Heine really think he might get away with claiming his Protestant sobriety or—more easily identifiable for its irony—his

Protestant right to Franscheska's kisses?

Heine was well aware that he could not convince a German audience to forget his Jewish origin. This becomes apparent, for example, in the last sections of "Die Bäder von Lucca," when he retaliated against August von Platen's anti-Jewish remarks against his person. Attacking Platen both as a homosexual and as a failed poet, Heine accused him of being a sterile author. Among other things, Heine enumerated all the witty remarks Platen might have made to satirize his opponent's allegedly secret Jewish identity, suggesting that Platen had failed even at this simple task. Clearly, Heine had no intention of hiding the fact that he was born a Jew. Rather, he mocked Platen for his inability to put this inconvenient fact to better poetic use.

Not only did Heine have no illusions about his readers' perceptions of his past, their lingering suspicion that he was still somehow Jewish was in fact essential to the satirical thrust of his text. Like the Italian clergy in his description, Heine wears a transparent mask. His claim that as a Protestant he has a right to Franscheska's kisses is a gloss on Protestant self-confidence, the Catholic clergy's collaboration with restorative powers (in the French law of sacrilege which he cites), and, most importantly, his own attempts to escape his critics' tendency to reduce him to his religion of birth. Heine claimed to be Protestant for comic effect and satirized the very act of donning masks. Drawing on the tensions between Catholics and Protestants, he exposed the entanglement of citizenship, social position, and public religious identity that precipitated his conversion.

This effect is heightened by the fact that his interlocutor in the text, Lady Maxwell, is introduced as an Irish Protestant and nevertheless appears Jewish at times. Leaving a cathedral, she dips her fingers into holy water, sprinkles it on Heine and says "Dem Zefardeyim Kinnim." How does Lady Maxwell know the name of three of the 10 plagues recited in Hebrew at the Passover Seder? Just after the episode in front of Franscheska's closed door, Lady Maxwell takes over from Heine the narrator and further develops his criticism of religion. While the character Heine's polemics are spoken in the name of a Protestant identity that readers are not meant to accept, the most radical polemics comes from a Protestant character whose Protestantism is equally undermined. Indeed, even his self-presentation as an ironic, male seducer becomes questionable to the reader when Lady Maxwell offers a more assertive critique of religion. The only uncomplicated identity in "Die Stadt Lucca," is Franscheska's: the target of his desire is the only one in the text who is not playing games. She is simply beautiful and intellectually empty.

Heine's satire consisted of the donning of various masks, an act made rich and enticing because of the omnipresent possibility of being recognized under the mask. Like ironic Italian priests, whom he admires for their sexual adventurousness, Heine does not mind the transparency of his mask. His text works

with the assumption that readers would grasp his strange position as not quite Protestant, not quite Jewish, and clearly not Catholic.⁴³

This strategy made sense in the context of the tensions between promoters of emphatically Protestant and Catholic visions of politics. In Heine's hands, these debates between proponents identifying vaguely with two Christian denominations became an opportunity to challenge his marginal status. Put otherwise: intra-Christian debates became the tool for his personal attempt to face a Jewish predicament.⁴⁴ He used anti-Catholic tropes as the basis for an emancipatory attempt to re-imagine himself as a desirable seducer and rational man but did so from a position that was both obviously unsustainable and purposefully undermined by his own prose. In this way, Heine both reinforced anti-Catholic stereotypes and used them to unhinge the very system of confessional differentiation that allowed for this stereotyping.

French Perceptions of Heine's Religious Background

To grasp the literary and political valence of Heine's anti-Catholicism more completely, however, we must also examine the different reception of his work in France and the German states, as well as his own reactions to the different understandings of his oeuvre and religious identity in each context. In Germany, Heine had to face various reviewers who denounced his attempts to appear as a Protestant. This was not the case in France, where the press was more willing to accept his self-presentation as a Protestant during his first years in the country.

Hans Hörling showed in a quantitative analysis of French reviews on Heine between 1830 and 1841 that only 0.4 percent of all reviews in major newspapers referred to Heine as Jewish.⁴⁵ A second look at the pieces in the comprehensive collection of French reviews recently edited by Hörling can confirm the general impression that Heine's religious background was not often discussed, even if it turns out that there were more debates on the topic than Hörling's earlier quantitative study suggests.

Some of the rare references made in 1830s France to Heine's original Jewish affiliation surfaced in prominent places. In a review for the *Revue des deux mondes*, for example, the French historian Edgar Quinet (1803–1875), who often acted as a mediator between German and French thought, suggested that Heine's Jewishness had added to the pungency of his satire.⁴⁶ In another instance, Heine's religious background became the topic of a small debate, provoked by his insistent references to the Protestant roots of his thinking. In the preface to the 1834 French edition of his *Reisebilder*, Heine mentioned that "his quality of being a Protestant," and indeed the "zeal of a Protestant" that he exhibited in his attacks against the Catholic Church, gave him a license to criticize religion in a way that a mere self-representation as a (denominationally-neutral) philosopher did not.⁴⁷ Such comments stood at odds with German

reports published in French papers. In September 1835, *Le Temps* printed a note about debates on Jewish emancipation in Baden; in this context, enemies of equal rights had argued that the worst anarchists, such as Börne and Heine, were Jews.⁴⁸ Two weeks later the official *Journal des débats* polemicized against the opposite accusation now being touted by German liberals that Jews were always servile and thus should not be granted full political rights. The paper's German correspondent disagreed, pointing to Börne and Heine as Jewish liberal leaders.⁴⁹

Heine was bothered sufficiently by the latter report that he sent a letter to the editors of the French periodical clarifying that "he did not belong to the Jewish religion" and "never set a foot in a synagogue." The journal continued, "Member of the Community of the Confession of Augsburg, he [Heine] never renounced the title he attached to this respectable church, which does not just give spiritual bliss but also temporal rights in many German states."⁵⁰ In spite of the hints that Lutheranism offered certain pragmatic advantages in Germany, and although later scholars have argued that his patently false claim never to have entered a synagogue referred only to his time in France, Heine's contemporaries could only understand this to mean that Heine had always been Protestant. At the same time, at least a selection of French readers also learned that many Germans thought Heine to be a Jew—in particular after another French paper reported about protestations against Heine's defense of his Protestantism in the German press and the subsequent indignation his comments caused his Jewish relatives.⁵¹ The surfacing of these debates in French journals show that Heine's alleged Jewishness became a topic of conversation in France as well, even if we cannot presume that his religious background was as widely known in France as it was in German lands.

In the abovementioned study, Hörling did not quantify how often Heine was associated with other religious affiliations, but we nonetheless have evidence that some contemporary interpreters explained Heine's anti-Catholic polemics through his adherence to Protestantism. In 1835, the critic Philarète Chasles wrote a portrait of his acquaintance Heine in the *Revue de Paris* where he denounced Heine's destructive "Protestant spirit," for example.⁵² Whereas we might read Chasles metaphorically, another reviewer in the *Revue de Paris* was clearly misguided in his interpretation of Heine's background. The reviewer attempted to explain Heine's anti-mythical and, implicitly, anti-Catholic inclinations as the result of his supposedly Protestant upbringing.⁵³ Another anonymous reviewer for *La Quotidienne* even attacked Heine for daring to make anticlerical comments as a Protestant.⁵⁴ Such misunderstandings should not surprise us given Heine's purposeful politics of disinformation as well as the fact that, in France, Heine was seen less as a Jew and more as a German—and that Germany was associated with Protestantism.

Heine's identity management appears even more complicated when we consider that, during his early years in France, he did not simply reject being identified as a Jew but also as a believing Protestant. In 1833, *L'Europe littéraire*, which defined itself as strictly apolitical, published Heine's essays on German Romantic literature on the first page of its first issue. Perhaps reacting to the article's political undertone, the journal added a disclaimer to Heine's second article. Beyond clarifying that his work did not represent the ideas of the journal, its editors also explained their choice of author: "Thus Germany finds herself judged by a Protestant writer, because, in our opinion, intellectual Germany needs to be presented to Catholic France from a Protestant perspective."⁵⁵

Heine apparently felt misunderstood in his new French context. He therefore chose to explain the nature of his confessional commitments in a foreword to the first German edition of the *Zur Geschichte der Religion*. According to Heine, he had told the publishers of *L'Europe littéraire* that France was not Catholic and that he was only nominally Protestant. This position, he continued, merely expressed "the fact that I have the pleasure of parading in the Lutheran Church book as a Protestant Christian, which allows me to voice any opinion in my scholarly books, even those that contradict Protestant dogma. The [journal's] comment that I was writing from a Protestant perspective, on the other hand, puts me in dogmatic shackles."⁵⁶ French readers could find a similar passage in the essays Heine wrote for the *Revue de deux mondes*.⁵⁷ There he remarked: "Protestantism was for me not just a religion but a mission and, for 14 years, I have been fighting for its interests and against the machinations of our German Jesuits. Later, of course, my enthusiasm for the dogma faded and some years ago I declared openly in my writings that my Protestantism consists only of being entered into the Church register of the Lutheran community as a Protestant Christian."⁵⁸

These statements are interesting for multiple reasons. Heine explained to his French readers once again his understanding of Protestantism as a political stance defined by its opposition to reactionary Catholicism, here epitomized by the "German Jesuits." Consequently, he dated his involvement in this mission to the beginning of his career as a writer and not to his formal conversion.⁵⁹ The German version, on the other hand, makes explicit some of the literary strategies underlying Heine's confessional polemics, which were not to be understood as denominational in the narrow sense. The last thing Heine wanted to be associated with was a Christian church. The French journal had misunderstood his self-presentation as an indication of his involvement in Protestantism as a confessional milieu or an expression of a religious sentiment. In contrast, German journals had either ignored Heine's claim to be Protestant, if they were positively disposed towards him, or criticized his attempts at masking his identity if they were not. It was only in France that journalists, apparently unable to get their heads around his provisional, politically instrumental Protestantism,

took Heine seriously as a Protestant. Having taken Heine's claims that he was a Protestant writing against Catholicism at face value, the *Europe littéraire* along with many French reviewers reframed Heine's satire, turning slippery political humor, which aimed for literary effects above all, into a German expatriate's rather straightforward exercise in confessional polemics. Only in the face of these French interpretations did Heine feel compelled to make explicit that his nominal Protestantism was a strategically chosen identity that allowed him to take an oppositional stance in religious, political, and aesthetic matters.

Fransheska in France

The complicated shifts in Heine's public identity also speak to the ways that he adapted his literary and political strategies in response to different pressures—particularly as these pertain to his multiple religious identities. For a German audience, Heine could joke that he was drawing on his (newly acquired) rights as a Protestant in his description of his efforts to “secularize” the kisses of the Catholic woman he desired, trusting that the irony of the scene he portrayed would not be lost on his readers. Given the record of Heine's reception in France, however, the humor of episodes such as the Fransheska scene from “Die Stadt Lucca” must have remained largely impenetrable to a new audience with little sense of Heine's religious background. Believing him to be either Jewish or Protestant, or not thinking in terms of denominational divisions at all, French audiences would not read him as someone with a complex religious past who remained strategically ambivalent in his denominational self-presentation. If Heine had been a believing, Church-oriented Protestant, both his flirtation with the violence of Protestant anti-Catholicism and his erotic stories might have been primarily violent. The reviewer in *La Quotidienne* complaining about his audacity to write such comments as a Protestant would have been right. Yet, in fact, Heine never wrote as a Protestant in an unproblematic way: his transparent mask had become opaque in the French context, and the political intentions of his stories lost on an audience that could not see through his purposeful posturing.

The translation history of Heine's work gives further clues to support this hypothesis. The first translation of the Fransheska material from “Die Stadt Lucca” appeared in 1832. The French writer Loève-Veimars appended this episode to his translation of “Die Bäder von Lucca.” His abbreviated version left only the erotic parts of the story but eliminated Heine's elaborations on his Protestantism.⁶⁰ Loève-Veimars was apparently more interested in the apolitical gender dynamics between the seducer and the seduced, a theme that also excited the Romantic poet Théophile Gautier, who recommended Heine's Fransheska scene to his readers in a review for *La Presse*.⁶¹

The full text of “Die Stadt Lucca” was published in French two years later in an edition by Eugène Renduel. This time the translation was closely supervised

by Heine. Although Heine did not decode the whole scene for readers, in this new French version he expanded the description of his offer to abandon Protestantism in exchange for a single night with the Catholic woman he desired. Whereas the German text was purely emotive, highlighting the erotic frenzy that Franscheska evoked, the French version added new arguments and allusions to Heine's pragmatic conversion. The French version replaced the phrase "for this single night, if you will grant it to me, will I become a Catholic—but for this night only!"⁶² with the following: "I promise you that I will quit the Protestant faith, this wicked and cold religion that I professed without ever loving it. For your adorable feet I will abjure the errors of Luther to which I had remained attached by a mundane necessity and due to the Prussian ruses of Satan."⁶³ The satire is thus interrupted in the French translation with explanation reminiscent of the clarification Heine gave to the *Europe littéraire* after he believed the paper had reduced him to an uncomplicated Protestant identity.

Since Heine described emancipation as a carnal and passion-driven process, it should not be surprising that his erotic scenes are also a crucial venue for the overlap of denominational polemics and liberal politics. His erotic scenes were crafted to reflect not just the power dynamics between men and women but also those between Jews, Protestants, and Catholics—which in turn shifted depending on the political, national, and denominational context.

Undoing Heine's Polemics in France

Heine's frequent glosses on his text can underscore how much he struggled with the differences in denominational politics that existed between Germany and France, the two major markets for his publications. Juggling the perceptions of German and French readers, he regularly attempted to correct the impression his texts might give in one or the other contexts. In the process, he adjusted two types of personas: the identity he projected in his prose works when he spoke in a biographical manner (Heine the character of his text) and the identity of his forewords, footnotes, and corrections, which had a greater truth claim.

One central topic for this latter set of texts concerns the difference between Heine's religious polemics in Germany and France. Although Heine wrote his most famous anti-Catholic texts in Paris, he was careful to add glosses that clarified his unwillingness to attack French Catholicism as he did so. Two of the most important works that received comments from Heine in this regard were his lasting contributions to the genre of denominational defamation, both of which were published first in French: *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland* (henceforth *Zur Geschichte der Religion*) and *Die Romantische Schule*. In both texts the dichotomy between Protestantism and Catholicism structured Heine's historical vision as much as his famous distinction between sensualist and spiritualist forces in human history. The contrast between these two Christian denominations became the basis for his wholesale attack against

romanticism—or the Romantic School—as a Catholic invention.

The anti-Catholicism of these works has been discussed mostly in a German or literary context. Jeffrey Sammons explains the anti-Catholicism Heine expressed in *Die Romantische Schule* as an act of evasion aimed at obscuring the poetic ambivalences Heine struggled with.⁶⁴ According to Sammons, Heine merely tried to discredit romanticism through this association with Catholicism without acknowledging his debt to the movement. Without challenging such readings, it is crucial to understand how the different contexts in Germany and France might have influenced Heine to limit his polemics to Germany. Why did “Heine’s Jesuit syndrome,” as Gerhard Höhn called Heine’s frequent references to the dangers of Jesuits and Jesuitism, not apply to French Jesuits?⁶⁵

Heine had originally written a section comparing romanticism and its relationship to Catholicism in Germany and France for his articles in the *Revue des deux mondes* (which later became *Zur Geschichte der Religion*), but then decided not to include it. When the first complete French edition appeared in 1835, Heine published these reflections as a preface.⁶⁶ The text explained to readers that his broadsides against Catholicism had nothing to do with French Catholics: “Loyalty demands that I most clearly distinguish between the party which one called the Catholic here, and those droll figures who carry that name in Germany.”⁶⁷ Introducing this section as an exercise in loyalty to his country of exile, Heine proceeded to make an argument that was at odds with the confessional tone of his works. According to Heine, while in Germany the Catholic party was characterized by deceit and despotism, in France Catholicism was associated with men of talent. If the French Catholic party thought it was the party of the restoration it had merely misunderstood itself. Catholicism had been destroyed so thoroughly in eighteenth-century France that its newer representatives were actually reinventing it and were, in this sense, forward-looking.

Heine’s remarks are puzzling and scholars have suggested various explanations for his decision to attack German Catholicism in particular. In trying to make sense of this move, we might first note that romanticism was indeed different in its political outlook in Germany and France.⁶⁸ Whereas in Germany romanticism was associated primarily with political reaction as well as a specific type of anti-French nationalism, in France the second wave of romantics were mostly liberals.⁶⁹ Heine was personally and politically close to a number of these liberal romantics, many of whom supported Louis-Philippe’s attempt to find a *modus vivendi* with the Church.⁷⁰

Such considerations about the realities of French anticlericalism can only take us so far, however. Had Heine tried to please those members of the *juste-milieu* who longed for reconciliation with the Church, his text would have made little sense. Heine positioned his two texts on German religion and philosophy, after all, so they would make an impact on the French literary establishment.

He fashioned his work as a sequel and response to Mme. de Staël's famous account of German cultural life, *De l'Allemagne*, purposefully copying the title of her book. Her work had acquired its reputation in France not only as an attempt at fostering inter-cultural understanding but also as an implicit commentary on French politics. De Staël championed Protestantism as a welcome provocation against the Catholic Emperor.⁷¹ Manfred Windfuhr's argument that Heine hoped to intervene in French debates about romanticism in order to warn of the movement's possible Catholicizing and reactionary tendencies thus seems plausible in this respect.⁷²

Indeed, the only known sympathies Heine harbored for an author associated with Catholic romanticism were directed towards Pierre Simon Ballanche, whom he met shortly after his move to Paris.⁷³ Heine was clearly skeptical of French Reform Catholicism and repeatedly censured Lamennais and his disciples. Ludwig Börne's support for Lamennais, which led him to translate that author's *Paroles d'un croyant* into German in 1834, was one of the points of contention between the two authors. This conflict inspired Börne's description of Heine as a poet with aristocratic affectations who cared little about politics as well as Heine's infamous rebuttal in his book *Ludwig Börne*.

Another less likely explanation is that Heine's French environment did not allow a Jew, or even a former Jew, to criticize Catholicism from a confessional perspective. This argument is undermined by the biographies of several French Jewish liberals who associated themselves with Protestantism and anticlericalism for political reasons. Such was the case with Léon Halévy, an early follower of Saint-Simon. In 1834, Halévy translated Friedrich Ludwig Zacharias Werner's (1768–1823) drama *Luther*, describing Luther in his introduction as "that great Christian philosopher, that bold champion of political and religious liberty."⁷⁴ Halévy advertised Protestantism as a symbol of rationalism with the explicit intention of challenging a religiously-charged, Catholic political reaction.

Contrary to the position he took during his first years in France, Heine was more willing to join the likes of Halévy by the 1840s. By this time, Heine's reluctance to criticize French Catholicism gave way as he entered the fray of French conflicts between conservative Catholics and anticlerical liberals. In 1843, he wrote an appreciative report about the battle of Edgar Quinet and Jules Michelet against clerical influence in French universities, for example.⁷⁵ Heine's public identity as a former Jew or Jew thus clearly did not impede his participation in the so-called Franco-French wars over religion.

The more important challenge to Heine was his attempt to translate his political satire into a new context. It is unlikely that Heine was reluctant to attack French Catholicism because he feared to overstep boundaries of propriety, even if his reference to the demands of "loyalty" are revealing. Such transgressions constituted Heine's signature style after all. They might, nevertheless, have been the wrong transgressions or transgressions that worked differently

in France. Francheska remained the fantasy of a German Jew-turned-nominal Protestant, who developed this figure to reflect not just his sexual desires but also his desire to enter into politics from a difficult denominational position. The tale's attendant image of forbidden sensuality and the anti-Catholic discourse attached to it lost their literary and political valence when Heine became, more than anything else, a German in France. Heine's original attempts at satire were politically relevant—and also funny—because German readers could be expected to see through his transparent mask and understand that he mocked his own attempts to be something he was not. Once in France, Heine might have been more comfortable in his role as a foreigner than he was as a Jew in Germany, since the former role allowed more freedom, as Marcel Reich-Ranicki suggests.⁷⁶ At the same time, in France, Heine felt obliged to give his works new glosses. Each of his glosses can be understood as gestures signaling to his readers that they should rethink the person under the mask.

Another layer of explanations must be attached to the different character of denominational polemics in Germany and France. Heine's attempt to discredit romanticism as a Catholic invention had a sharper tone in Germany, where his work reinforced the association between a rising liberal camp and Protestant milieus. In France, debates on the division between Protestantism and Catholicism were mostly fought between Catholics, whereas Protestantism had primarily a symbolic function in the public debates. Nonetheless, some French readers seemed to perceive Heine as a believing Protestant just as much as they interpreted his expressions as a form of symbolic politics. Heine thus played a double game in the French context. On the one hand, he tried to continue his German polemics, which were based on concrete divisions between the Christian denominations as well as conflicts between individuals such as Stolberg and Voss. On the other hand, he also hoped to rid himself of the identification as a denominational Protestant and tried, rather, to join those French authors who—like Halévy—announced their attachment to Protestantism as a symbol of progress.

Only once we look at Heine in France can we grasp that his German context implied Protestantism could be more than just a symbolic bow to an abstract notion of secularization; it included, rather, an attempt to play poetically with tangible social divisions. Anticlericalism, especially in its anti-Catholic variety, opened spaces for Heine's emancipatory politics in a particularly complex manner. Heine's writings both reinforced the divisions between different denominations, giving voice to Protestant anti-Catholicism, and simultaneously undermined these divisions when referencing his own public identity. Due to the increasing importance of the politics of denominational difference in Germany in his day, Heine's program of personal, erotic, and universal emancipation was ultimately inextricably entangled with his anti-Catholic polemics.

¹ I would like to thank Barbara Hahn, Jeffrey Sammons, Galili Shahar, and the Workgroup on Nineteenth-Century History at the University of Mississippi for their feedback on earlier versions of this article.

² See Christopher Clark and Wolfram Kaiser, *Culture Wars: Secular-Catholic Conflict in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) on the European dimension of the debates on Catholicism. On Germany see Wolfgang Altgeld, *Katholizismus, Protestantismus, Judentum: Über religiös begründete Gegensätze und nationalreligiöse Ideen in der Geschichte des deutschen Nationalismus* (Mainz: M.-Grünwald-Verlag, 1992).

³ The literature on these dynamics in the German case has grown considerably in the past decades. See, among others, Manuel Borutta, *Antikatholizismus. Deutschland und Italien im Zeitalter der europäischen Kulturkämpfe* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009); Michael B. Gross, *The War against Catholicism: Liberalism and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004); Helmut Walser Smith, *German Nationalism and Religious Conflict: Culture, Ideology, Politics, 1870–1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); Olaf Blaschke, "Das 19. Jahrhundert: Ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter?" *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 26 (2000): 38–75.

⁴ See Gerhard Höhn, "'Wissenschaft der Freiheit' und jesuitische Falschmünzerei," in *Internationaler Heine-Kongress: Aufklärung und Skepsis*, eds. Joseph A. Kruse, Bernd Witte, and Karin Füllner (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1999), 33–46. Several works, mainly focusing upon Heine's balanced approach to religious issues, also touch on this topic: Joseph A. Kruse, "'Der Dichter versteht sehr gut das symbolische Idiom der Religion': Über Heines kritisch-produktives Verhältnis zu religiösen Traditionen," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 58/4 (2006): 289–309; Christoph Bartscherer, *Heinrich Heines religiöse Revolte* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2005); Willi Goetschel, "Heine's Critical Secularism," *boundary 2* 31/2 (2004): 149–71; Hermann Lübke, "Heinrich Heine und die Religion nach der Aufklärung," in *Der späte Heine: 1848–1856: Literatur-Politik-Religion*, ed. Wilhelm Gössmann and Joseph A. Kruse (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, Heinrich Heine Verlag, 1982), 205–18; Eda Sagarra, "Heine und die 'Katholschen'," in *Harry—Heinrich—Henri—Heine: Deutscher, Jude, Europäer; Grazer Humboldt-Kolleg*, 6.-11. Juni 2006 (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2008), 121–29.

⁵ See Hans Mayer, *Outsiders: A Study in Life and Letters* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982).

⁶ Some of the most significant studies on cultural translation started with scholarship on Heine. See especially Michel Espagne, *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1999); idem., *Les juifs allemands de Paris à l'époque de Heine: la translation ashkénaze* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1996).

⁷ Michael Graetz, *The Jews in Nineteenth-Century France: From the French Revolution to the Alliance Israélite Universelle* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996); Lisa Moses Leff, *Sacred Bonds of Solidarity: The Rise of Jewish Internationalism in Nineteenth-Century France* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006).

⁸ In his *Geständnisse*, Heine wrote about the positive impression that Catholic priests made on him as teachers in his lyceum in Düsseldorf, Heinrich Heine, *Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe der Werke*, ed. Manfred Windfuhr (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1982) vol. 15:51, cited as DHA below. Since he made these comments 40 years after the fact as part of an attempt to reinterpret his earlier polemics, however, they are only of limited

value as biographical information. See Jeffrey L. Sammons, "Who did Heinrich Heine think he was?" in *Heinrich Heine's Contested Identities: Politics, Religion, and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (New York: P. Lang, 1999), 1–24.

⁹ On his conversion in the context of the history of Jewish conversion in Germany, see Deborah Sadie Hertz, *How Jews became Germans: The History of Conversion and Assimilation in Berlin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), chap. 6.

¹⁰ Bartscherer, *Heinrich Heines religiöse Revolte*, 79.

¹¹ *Ibid.*; see also a similar sentence in his "Lazarus" poem, DHA, 3/1:349.

¹² DHA 10, 238–48.

¹³ DHA 10, 245.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Galley/Estermann, *Heinrich Heines Werk im Urteil seiner Zeitgenossen I*, 343–4.

¹⁷ DHA VI, 567.

¹⁸ Galley/Estermann, *Heines Werk* 1:344; see also the review from *Eos* on p. 350.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 345–46

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 354.

²¹ Hans-Joachim Teichert, *August Graf von Platen in Deutschland: Zur Rezeption eines umstrittenen Autors* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1980).

²² *Ibid.*, 34–35.

²³ Cf. Bartscherer, *Religiöse Revolte*, 79.

²⁴ Heine to Moses Moser, Sep. 6, 1828, Heinrich Heine, *Säkularausgabe: Werke, Briefwechsel, Lebenszeugnisse*, (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970–) vol. 20, no. 282, p. 341 (cited as HSA below). Heine made similar comments about adopting a partial position and choosing nobility and clergy as enemies for tactical reasons, in a later letter to Varnhagen, Nov. 19, 1830, HSA 20, no. 357, p. 422.

²⁵ Klaus Pabel, *Heines "Reisebilder": ästhetisches Bedürfnis und politisches Interesse am Ende der Kunstperiode* (München: W. Fink, 1977), 218.

²⁶ DHA 7/1:194.

²⁷ DHA, 7/1:167.

²⁸ See Jost Hermand, *Der frühe Heine. Ein Kommentar zu Heines Reisebildern* (Munich: Winkler, 1976), 168–80. Hermand's analysis is contradictory on this point. He argues that Heine criticized Jews less than Protestants and Protestants less than Catholics (170–75); in other instances, however, he claims that they are all equally the butt of Heine's criticism (168).

²⁹ DHA, 7/1, 166–7

³⁰ DHA 7/1:166.

³¹ This notion of a transparent mask is not meant to imply any psychological claims (unlike Frantz Fanon's debates on masking), or any attempt to rethink colonial differences in terms of epistemological hegemony, as are found in Homi Bhaba's theories of mimicry. I understand the notion of a "transparent mask" rather as a literary response to a form of marginalization operative in nineteenth-century Europe that is of a different quality than colonial exclusions. For a discussion of masks in Heine's work in the context of theories of the carnival, see Stephan Braese, "Heines Masken," in *Konterbande und Camouflage: Szenen aus der Vor- und Nachgeschichte von Heinrich Heines marranischer Schreibweise*, ed. Klaus Briegleb, Stephan Braese, and Werner Irro (Berlin: Vorwerk 8, 2002), 51–72.

³² DHA, 7/1:175.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid. The fact that this kiss takes place in front of a Madonna underlines that Francheska is a personification of Catholic tradition. See Olaf Briese, "Venus—Madonna—Maria: Über Heines Marienverständnis," in *Internationaler Heine-Kongress: Aufklärung und Skepsis*, 436–49, especially 441; Dolf Sternberger, *Heinrich Heine und die Abschaffung der Sünde* (Hamburg: Claassen, 1972), 181–205, discusses the motif of marble statues in Heine's work.

³⁵ DHA, 7/1:175. The law that Heine refers to punished the theft of Church property more severely than other theft under certain circumstances. Its passing in 1825 served as the occasion for a famous anticlerical campaign in France. See Mary S. Hartman, "The Sacrilege Law of 1825 in France: A Study in Anticlericalism and Mythmaking," *Journal of Modern History* 44/1 (1972): 21–37.

³⁶ DHA, 7/1:175–76.

³⁷ Heine made this fascination explicit towards the end of his life in his *Geständnisse* (1854). DHA, 15:51. Kruse discusses Heine's artistic appreciation of Catholicism in Kruse, "Der Dichter versteht'."

³⁸ On sensualism in the *Reisebilder* see Olaf Hildebrand, *Emanzipation und Versöhnung: Aspekte des Sensualismus im Werk Heinrich Heines unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der 'Reisebilder'* (Tübingen: Niemeyer: 2001).

³⁹ See, for example, Wolfgang Menzel and Karl August Varnhagen's reviews, Galley/Estermann, *Heines Werk* 1:534 and 461–63.

⁴⁰ Galley/Estermann, *Heines Werk* 1:476–78. For a similar critique of *Reisebilder* III, see, for example, DHA 7/1, 146–47.

⁴¹ Galley/Estermann, *Heines Werk* 1:488.

⁴² DHA, 7/1:204.

⁴³ Sigrid Weigel has referred to the symbolic practices that follow from the potentially incomplete character of Jewish conversion in a secular Christian world as "cultural techniques of multilingualism." Sigrid Weigel, "Die Konversion zwischen religiösem Ritual und Kulturtechnik: Schwellenkunde in der Dialektik der Säkularisierung," in *Literatur als Voraussetzung der Kulturgeschichte: Schauplätze von Shakespeare bis Benjamin* (Munich: Fink, 2004), 95.

⁴⁴ Here I differ from earlier interpretations that saw Heine's theories about priestly deception mainly in the context of an abstract political critique. Cf. Günter Oesterle, *Integration und Konflikt; die Prosa Heinrich Heines im Kontext oppositioneller Literatur der Restaurationsepoche* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1972), especially 8–12.

⁴⁵ *Die französische Heine-Kritik*, ed. Hans Hörling (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1996–2002), vol. 1:20–25; Hans Hörling, *Heinrich Heine im Spiegel der politischen Presse Frankreichs von 1831–1841* (Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 1977), 233–40.

⁴⁶ *Französische Heine-Kritik* 1:82–83.

⁴⁷ DHA 6: 351. François Buloz also published this preface in his review of the French edition of *Reisebilder* for the *Revue des deux mondes*; *Französische Heine-Kritik* 1:297. He praised it for its spirited style but did not comment on Heine's self-representation.

⁴⁸ *Französische Heine-Kritik* 2:125–26.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 128.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 128–29.

⁵¹ Ibid., 136–37.

⁵² Ibid., 33.

⁵³ *Französische Heine-Kritik* 2:107–09.

⁵⁴ *Französische Heine-Kritik* 1:322.

⁵⁵ *L'Europe littéraire* 1/4 (March 8, 1833): 17n. This sentence is also cited in DHA, 8/2:1578.

⁵⁶ DHA, 8/1:493. This foreword or “Vorbericht” was published as part of the first German edition of the first book of his “Etat actuel”; Heinrich Heine, *Zur Geschichte der neueren schönen Literatur in Deutschland* (Paris and Leipzig: Heideloff and Campe, 1833); printed in Paris.

⁵⁷ The article was called “De l’Allemagne depuis Luther” published in three installments in 1834 and eventually published as *Die romantische Schule* in Germany. This statement was also part of the first French edition of Heine’s *de l’Allemagne* in 1835, which comprised the texts of *Zur Geschichte der Religion* and *Die romantische Schule*. DHA, 8/2:991–92.

⁵⁸ DHA, 8/1:456.

⁵⁹ DHA, 8/2:993.

⁶⁰ DHA 7/1:369–72.

⁶¹ *Französische Heine-Kritik* 1:201–7.

⁶² DHA, 7/1:175.

⁶³ DHA 7/1:442.

⁶⁴ Jeffrey L. Sammons, “‘Die romantische Schule’ as Evasion and Misdirection,” in *Heinrich Heine und die Romantik: Erträge*, 13.

⁶⁵ Gerhard Höhn, “Wissenschaft der Freiheit’ und jesuitische Falschmünzerei,” in *Internationaler Heine-Kongress: Aufklärung und Skepsis*, 40.

⁶⁶ “Romantik in Deutschland und Frankreich,” DHA, 8/1:484–86, Bruchstück 26.

⁶⁷ DHA, 8/1:241–42 (German text) and DHA, 8/1:260–62 (French text). My translation follows the French variant in this case, DHA, 8/1:260.

⁶⁸ Manfred Windfuhr offers this explanation in DHA, 8/2:1393. Windfuhr also gives another explanation that is in tension with this one; see n. 72.

⁶⁹ This was also the assessment of Heine’s political friends. Buloz, the editor of the *Revue des deux mondes*, argued in his review of the 1835 edition of Heine’s *de l’Allemagne*, for example, that French romanticism was not reactionary, unlike the German version; *französische Heine-Kritik*, 2:39–42. Théodore Toussenet, who had been acquainted with Heine, made similar comments in his review of *De l’Allemagne*, in *Le Temps; französische Heine-Kritik*, 2:89–94.

⁷⁰ See Georges Weill, *Histoire de l’idée laïque en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 2004), 86–88.

⁷¹ Jean-Paul Barbe, “Madame de Staël *De l’Allemagne* als Politikum,” in *Poetisierung-Politisierung: Deutschlandbilder in der Literatur bis 1848*, ed. Wilhelm Gössmann and Klaus-Hinrich Roth (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1994), 79.

⁷² DHA, 8/2:1050. Heine mentions this as one aspect of his motivation in a fragment written for his *Geständnisse*, DHA, 15:169–170. Michael Werner has also emphasized the political statement Heine made in France with his texts, although he focuses more on his implicit attacks against Victor Cousin. See his “Crossing Borders between Cultures: On the Preconditions and Function of Heine’s Reception in France,” in *Heinrich Heine and the Occident: Multiple Identities, Multiple Receptions*, ed. Peter Uwe Hohendahl and Sander Gilman (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991), 42–62.

⁷³ See the letter from Franz Liszt [or Marie d'Agoult, the authorship is disputed], April 15, 1838 in HAS, 25:134.

⁷⁴ Léon Halévy, *Luther: poème dramatique en 5 parties* (Paris: Dépôt central de la librairie, 1834), foreword.

⁷⁵ DHA 14/1:89–96.

⁷⁶ Marcel Reich-Ranicki, *Der Fall Heine* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1997), 92–107.