This essay collection encompasses a broad range of topics and approaches pertinent to Jewish visual modernity. While about half of the 13 essays included explore topics germane to German Studies, the others situate these topics within a larger and more comprehensive comparative history. The book is divided into three sections: "Critical Responses to Modernism and Judaism," "Coded Representations," and "Affirmation." The sections proceed roughly chronologically from the late nineteenth century to the early twenty-first century.

As opposed to other studies, this collection does not seek to discern only the manner in which Jewish artists reflected upon and represented Jewish identity, rather, the collection explores "the relationship between identity and artifact in the modern period," demonstrating "how the Jewish roots of an artist led or hindered his/her interaction with the larger framework of a national and/or international community of artists" (1). This characterization does not do the collection justice, for it explores Jewish cultural production, but also non-Jewish artists and their representations of Jews (Boime, Iskin, Long), the discursive fields shaping the arts markets with reference to Jewish artists' works (Antliff, Golan), the institutionalization of visual arts in museums (Rupnow, Saltzman) and the role of the Jewish collector and critic (Gallen-Kallela-Siren). The historical and geographic scope offers a model in which the above foci find resonance across national and temporal boundaries. This gestures toward a more comprehensive treatment of Jewish visual culture of the twentieth century, perhaps only now possible in hindsight.

The opening articles provide parallel tales from France and Germany. Janne Gallen-Kallela-Siren's article on German-Jewish art critic and French Impressionism enthusiast Julius Meier-Graefe examines the manner in which his art criticism was perceived as a confluence of the modern, Jewish, and foreign, making him the "corruptor of Germanic culture" par excellence (67). Romy Golan's look at the Paris art scene provides a discursive double, noting that in France "the artistic avant-garde was attacked for being not only [German] but Jewish as well" (78). Dirk Rupnow details the uneasy collaboration on the Jewish Central Museum between the Prague Jewish community and their Nazi occupiers. Detailing its inception and guidance by Jewish scholars, Rupnow provides a carefully balanced analysis of this museum between objectivity and propaganda, looting and preservation. This provides a counterbalance to Lisa Saltzman's discussion of a selection of exhibitions from the Jewish Museum of New York. These exhibitions, she argues, introduced a secularized notion of Jewish art in the 1960s, which later provided a path to the exploration of ready-made art featuring Nazi images in a Jewish museum context.

The entire section "Coded Representations" provides fascinating studies of ambivalent representations. In her article on Dix and Grosz, Rose-Carol Washton Long argues these artists have "absorbed many of the negative attitudes toward Jews that were commonplace [...] among the center and the Left," not just among
the Right, reproducing this in their own works (170). Milly Heyd examines Tristan Tzara's ambivalent coding and disguising of his own Jewish identity. The additional contributions in this section similarly challenge us as scholars to read works more carefully, potentially overturning our accepted notions of these artists.

The collection is an ambitious undertaking in its breadth. While the individual contributions are strong, the collection gestures toward an area which demands further exploration rather than comprehensively treating the topic. The real value of this collection comes in its instigation of new connections. The collection has forced an international and intercultural analysis of these themes (which are so often relegated to “national” artistic movements and schools along disciplinary lines carved out by cultural studies departments), which can—and hopefully will—inspire further studies and similar collaborations.

TODD HEIDT, Knox College


In her highly original new study, *Housing Problems*, Susan Bernstein compares the actuality of built architecture with the concept behind it in private homes belonging to Goethe, Horace Walpole, Freud, and Heidegger. The four figures seem an unusual collection at first glance, but the choice is held together by their shared status as famous writers whose former homes are, today, public museums and by an interest all four had in the Gothic represented by Gothic architecture and literature as well as the uncanny; which is also closely tied to things Gothic. Furthermore, all four wrote about architecture in some form or other: Goethe and Heidegger addressed architecture from a philosophical perspective; Goethe and Walpole wrote fiction about architecture; Walpole even elevated a building to the level of character in *Castle of Otranto*; and Freud famously wrote about the *Unheimlich*, which is both “un-home-ly” and “uncanny” in English.

*Housing Problems* explores the many disjunctive relationships between architecture and text, building and idea, and author and the text. More specifically, Bernstein juxtaposes buildings with literary texts to probe disjunctions between actualities of built architecture and human experience of it. One example Bernstein relates is that of Goethe's confrontation with the Strasbourg cathedral, which he was prepared to find garish, but actually found awe-inspiring. In this story the sensory experience contradicts the textual, but in other instances, such as the museum-house, sensory evidence is proven unreliable.

The museum-house provides the text for the investigation of the relationship between architecture, collections, display, and identity. The museum-homes all display collections of “belongings” from the authors’ lives. Implicit in the preservation of these homes is the belief that we can come to know a person by studying his home and possessions. But this assumption fails on several counts. Such houses are rarely