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This article discusses the years between the revolutions of 1848 and World War I, experienced by many Europeans as a time of unprecedented new opportunities for self-realization and collective liberation, and as one in which individual and collective identities became progressively constrained within national boundaries. In such towns as Buczacz and similar sites in the Austrian province of Galicia, people had more choices than ever before or after. Yet groups and individuals also began to be distinguished others not only by religion and ethnicity but also by whether their history gave them the right to continue living where they were. The author traces this process by discussing some better and lesser known individuals of this period: the Ukrainian author Ivan Franko, his Jewish counterpart Karl Emil Franzos, the scholar David (Zvi) Heinrich Müller, the writer S. Y. Agnon, Sigmund Freud, the doctor Fabius Nacht, his socialist-anarchist sons Max (Nomad) and Siegfried (Naft), and their idol Anselm Mosler, as well as the communist leader Adolf Langer, later known as Ostap Dłuski. Through these individual portraits, the author shows that the realization of the Enlightenment's lofty aspiration of liberating the individual from collective feudal constraints ended up unleashing forces that undermined the very core of humanism.

This article examines the lives and works of several individuals from Buczacz and its environs born between the mid-nineteenth century and World War I; one of them was Shmuel Yosef Czaczkes, later known as S. Y. Agnon, who was born in Buczacz in 1887. What links the people discussed below is that they all, in their different ways, were deeply rooted in the world into which they were born and, at the same time,
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well aware of its flaws and vulnerabilities. Most of them left their little towns in Eastern
Galicia, of which Buczacz was representative, as young men and spent the rest of their
lives looking at this remote part of the world from the outside. Some of them wanted to
change the world they came from by changing the entire universe. Others, like Agnon,
re-created their hometown as a microcosm of the world of Eastern European, especially
Galician, or, as he often called it, Podolian Jewry. The drastic changes some of the char-
acters described here had hoped to bring about ended up in catastrophe. The world that
Agnon tried to depict in his writing was wiped out halfway through his creative life, and
the task of representation became one of reconstruction.

Agnon’s monumental attempt to “build a city”—that is, to reconstruct in writ-
ing the universe that the Nazis and their collaborators had annihilated—took up an
increasing share of his energies in the wake of the Holocaust. ’Ir umelo ’ab, the tome
he left unfinished at the time of his death in 1970, is the culmination of these efforts,
a literary masterpiece that is at the same time a kind of biography of Buczacz and,
by extension, of an entire vanished world.¹ Yet, at least until recently, this volume has
not been sufficiently known and recognized, neither in Israel nor in the rest of the
world. I personally came to it when I began writing a history of Buczacz. Agnon was
concerned almost exclusively with Jewish Buczacz; I tried to write about it as a repre-
sentative interethnic town, shared by Jews, Poles, and Ukrainians, which ended up in
a frenzy of communal genocide.² No work could provide a better, more nuanced, and
deeper understanding of Jewish Buczacz than ’Ir umelo ’ab. But this was, of course,
also—indeed, primarily—a work of literature. My grasp of Agnon’s literary genius,
however limited, was in large measure a result of my encounter with Alan Mintz and
our many conversations in Jerusalem in the spring of 2015. When I spoke history,
Alan responded with literature; where I saw facts, Alan saw meaning. As I was writ-
ing a history of Buczacz, Alan’s coedited translation of ’Ir umelo ’ab, published under
the title A City in Its Fullness, was about to come out, and he was hard at work on
Ancestral Tales, his magisterial analysis of stories in that volume.³ He was also about
to launch a literary biography of Agnon that would have reflected his keen under-
standing of the links between history and literature in Agnon’s life and work. The
seminar he organized on Jewish Galicia at the Israel Institute for Advanced Studies
at the Hebrew University and especially his gentle yet probing analyses of Agnon’s
fiction have influenced my own perception of historical writing in more ways than
I can elaborate here. This article is a small tribute to that enriching and sadly all too brief intellectual and human encounter.

The great paradox of the period spanning the years between the revolutions of 1848, known as the “spring of nations,” and the outbreak of World War I in 1914, is that many Europeans experienced it both as a time of unprecedented new opportunities for self-realization and collective liberation and, simultaneously, as one in which individual and collective identities came to be progressively constrained within national boundaries. History, as it subsequently unfolded during those years of great hopes and looming despair, was not predetermined, and the citizens of Buczacz, like those of many other towns in the remote Austrian province of Galicia, had more choices than ever before or after. A new world was emerging, and the restraints of the old were falling away: tradition had weakened, religious faith was waning, and authority was loosening its grip on family and society. Travel became easier, and people could go farther, change identities more easily, aspire to previously unthinkable goals, and embrace radical, exciting new worldviews.

But, at the same time, as groups and individuals began identifying themselves nationally and ideologically, they also increasingly perceived others through different eyes, distinguishing them not only by religion and ethnicity but also by whether their history gave them the right to continue living where they were. By the same token, those who adopted nationalist discourse restricted their own horizons by determining who they were, where they belonged, and what they could and should hope and struggle for. In this brave new world, vast collectives were being transformed into communities of fate, whose history and future were determined by national affiliation; it was a fate from which others were excluded by definition, yet one from whose repercussions there was no escape.

In the wake of the 1848 revolution, the Habsburg Empire abolished serfdom in Galicia. Over the next few decades, a new nation emerged from the Ruthenian (later known as Ukrainian) peasants in the larger, more populous eastern part of the province. It was a long process: most of the former serfs remained wretchedly poor, illiterate, and the target of ruthless exploitation by the landowners. Instilling “national consciousness” into the rural masses and crafting them into a nation that would eventually claim Eastern Galicia for itself was the singular accomplishment of an increasingly radical national movement.4
The Jews of Galicia were also transformed into a modern nation in the second part of the nineteenth century. Jewish activists initially focused on civil rather than national emancipation. Emperor Franz Josef’s “constitution” of 1867 had guaranteed equal rights to all citizens and thereby emancipated the Jews. This fundamentally changed relations between Jews and non-Jews. Efforts by the Ukrainian national movement to educate peasants coincided with the return of Jews to the countryside after restrictions on occupation and residence were lifted. As rural Ukrainians were being nationalized, the growing presence and economic role of Jews in the villages created a popular sense of material exploitation and cultural decimation. Jews were presented as fleecing the ignorant peasants, tricking them into alcohol and tobacco addiction, and lending them money at cutthroat rates. Some accused the Jews of retarding the development of a healthy Ukrainian nation, and anti-Jewish comments in the new Ukrainian press soon surpassed attacks on Polish landlords.

Ironically, then, the realization of the Enlightenment’s lofty aspiration of liberating the individual from collective feudal constraints culminated in the unleashing of forces that undermined the very core of humanism. As nationalism became the carrier of ideologies that often generated mass violence, one of its central obsessions entailed unmasking assimilated Jews, perceived as a major obstacle to the creation of ethnically homogeneous nation states.

The Ukrainian author Ivan Franko was among the most influential advocates of national independence in the latter years of the nineteenth century in Galicia. Born in 1856 in a small village near the town of Drohobycz, Franko was deeply engaged with the links between social and national oppression and, in his works of fiction, relentlessly defended the rights of the peasants for dignity, identity, and material well-being. Simultaneously, he produced a series of stark literary representations of Jews as parasites sucking the blood of the Ukrainian nation in the service of Polish landowner exploitation and oppression. Still widely read in Ukraine, Franko’s fiction has been influential in creating an image of “the Jew” as young Ukraine’s explicit “other” within the setting of a social-realist depiction of Galician rural and small-town life at the turn of the nineteenth century.

It was for that reason that Franko responded enthusiastically to the publication in 1896 of Theodor Herzl’s Der Judenstaat (The Jewish State): his preferred solution to the “Jewish question” was the Jews’ departure from Ruthenian lands, and he
believed that Jews choosing to remain in a future Ukrainian state should be categorized as “aliens” with restricted political and civic rights. Franko’s Jewish contemporary, the social-realist author Karl Emil Franzos, had a rather different view of this matter. Born in 1848, Franzos spent his childhood in the town of Czortków, some twenty miles east of Buczacz. As the son of a physician, he had an atypical upbringing and sense of identity. Decades later, he still recalled his father’s admonition: “Your nationality is not Polish, nor Ruthenian, nor Jewish—you are German,” but, “as for your faith, you are a Jew.” In providing him with that hybrid identity, hardly sustainable in a mid-nineteenth-century shtetl, his father’s goal was “that I should not see Galicia but rather the West as my homeland,” concluded Franzos.

As a child in a largely Hasidic town, Franzos attended school in the Dominican monastery, had little contact with other Jews, and never went to synagogue. At age ten, following his father’s death, Franzos was sent to secondary school in the city of Czernowitz, a site of increasing Jewish assimilation into German culture. And while “it was entirely out of the question that I would ever even think of changing my faith,” he stressed, “I thought just as little that Judaism would play a decisive role in my life.”

Shortly thereafter, Franzos was denied a government scholarship to study Classics at Vienna University. His Jewish identity, he now wrote, had demanded “a terrible sacrifice from me: that I give up the profession I chose.” While he went on to study law, he decided to learn more about Jews and, as a consequence, ended up as an author whose novels were largely dedicated to explaining the fate of Galician Jewry to German readers. To be sure, stressed Franzos, he “did not become pious,” yet his “feeling of belonging to the impoverished caftan-wearing Jews” of the province “became incomparably greater than before.” It was this sense of belonging, yet also of peering from afar, that became the core of his entire oeuvre.

Franzos had no qualms about railing against the tyrannical hold of Jewish religious leaders in Galician towns over the lives of young men and women, their dismissal of love as a poor substitute for a well-arranged marriage, and their vehement opposition to any intimate relations with gentiles. But, unlike Franko, he did not call for Jewish national consciousness and reassertion; instead, he sought a trans-European culture of openness and mutual understanding, and the fulfillment of individual aspirations divorced from ethnic identification. The tragic content of his writing is derived from the impossibility of realizing these goals in Galicia.
Franzos’s greatest literary achievement is his novel *Der Pojaz (The Clown)*, an inverted *bildungsroman* about a Jewish youth’s failed quest for self-emancipation. The main protagonist is Sender, the son of a famous wandering jokester, who inherits his father’s extraordinary acting talent. While the father represents the quintessential “wandering Jew,” the son pines to play Shylock, the archetypical Jew of the Christian imagination. Paradoxically, in order to be allowed to act the Jew on the European theatrical stage, Sender must first become European by shedding his Jewish attributes, a transformation he fails to accomplish.

For Franzos, Shylock was the ultimate embodiment of irreconcilable yet complementary perceptions of the world. When Sender proposes to play Shylock in a wandering theater troupe, the director exclaims enthusiastically that *The Merchant of Venice* is a play for Galicia. It is interesting for Jews and Christians and both can be pleased or angry about it to their hearts’ content. Shylock is always a sellout.” If Christian audiences see a money-grubbing, parasitical, self-hating and vengeful Jew, the Jews see in Shylock a personification of their predicament, eternally dependent on the tender mercies of the gentiles no matter how much wealth he acquires. As the dying Sender watches his idol, the great actor Dawison, perform Shylock’s soliloquy in Lemberg, “If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you tickle us, do we not laugh?” he observes: “This was no longer an actor, but rather a poor, unfortunate man who had long kept his and his brethren’s misery bottled up within himself, who had long suffered without complaint, and who had suddenly found words for his terrible pain.”

This appears to have been Franzos’s own state of mind when he wrote the novel. Completed in 1893, *Der Pojaz* was published only in 1905, after its author’s death. By all accounts, Franzos delayed publication in response to the rise of anti-Semitism in central Europe. As a prominent proponent of Jewish integration into the mainstream of European culture, Franzos was shaken by the growing tide against emancipated Jews in the culture and nation he had adopted. Ironically, despite the novel’s commercial success when it was published, German critics greeted it as “too Jewish,” and Zionist detractors saw it as “too German.”

Both Franko and Franzos felt that, by accurately yet both critically and empathetically describing the ills of the present, they would motivate society to progressive action. For Franko, the purpose of the historical novel was “to lay bare
the human heart, its fervent aspirations and consuming passions, its struggles, triumphs and defeats [...] portrayed against the backdrop of a historical event."\textsuperscript{19} Franzos, who called himself “the historian of the Podolian Ghetto” and referred to the Galician world he had come from as “half-Asia,” insisted that, despite his “great desire to give these stories an artistic form,” he would never do this “at the cost of truth [...] I am confident,” he wrote, “that I have described this strange and outlandish mode of existence precisely as it appears to me.”\textsuperscript{20} But these two writers saw the same world through utterly different eyes: their very insistence on factual accuracy betrayed the gaping fissures between the perceptions of reality by their respective ethnic groups, which eventually widened to unbridgeable chasms, irretrievably shattering that entire universe.

Unlike Franzos, most Jews of his generation had to chart their own course into the world directly from a traditional Jewish upbringing. Some, such as David (Zvi) Heinrich Müller, who was born in Buczacz in 1846 and was Agnon’s maternal cousin, made subsequent use of the skills they had acquired as children and youths. They also always retained a whiff of foreignness about them and, much as they were admired by the communities they left behind, were suspected both by the Orthodox and by the emerging Zionists of having abandoned the fold: too Jewish for the Germans, too German for the Jews.

For a man of his generation, Müller was a rare exception. By the time of his death in 1912, he had become a renowned scholar, a university professor, and the holder of a heredity noble title, all without abandoning his Jewish faith as was conventionally required for such official recognition. A child prodigy, Müller was banished from his father-in-law’s home because of his interest in the Haskalah and set out on an educational journey throughout Europe, ending up at the age of thirty-one as an assistant professor of Semitic philology at Vienna University, where he remained for the rest of his life.\textsuperscript{21}

To be sure, not everyone admired Müller. The Palestine-based Zionist newspaper \textit{Hatsvi}, for instance, accused him of having betrayed the cause of Hebrew and “worshipping only German literature.”\textsuperscript{22} Conversely, the Berlin-based liberal Jewish monthly \textit{Ost und West} described Müller as “a sharp-witted grammarian, text critic, decipherer of ancient inscriptions and texts, editor and cultural historian.”\textsuperscript{23} Müller’s most important contribution was his assertion that the Hebrew Bible had
a major impact on later sacred and secular European writing, which flew in the face of the contemporary wisdom, according to which the Bible was largely derivative of earlier Assyrian and Babylonian texts. In 1903, he published an annotated German and Hebrew translation of Hammurabi’s code, discovered two years earlier in Persia, where he showed the vast differences between Mesopotamian and biblical concepts of law and morality.24

Learned in Jewish and secular scholarship, equally comfortable in the company of rabbis and professors, committed to traditional erudition and to the Haskalah, and publishing in both German and Hebrew, Müller had all the makings of the ideal modern Jew. Contrary to the reproaches of his Orthodox and Zionist detractors, he spearheaded the establishment of the Jewish Theological Institute in Vienna, where he began teaching in 1893. As Ost und West noted, Müller also encountered much “resentment and envy” from “Protestant German colleagues eager to deny a Jew the right to have a word on Biblical questions,” especially at a time when “antisemitism raged at its fiercest in Austria.” While the journal insisted that Müller had prevailed over his opponents, Hatsvi claimed that Christian scholars had eventually adopted Müller’s views only at the price of denying his original contribution and even accusing him of plagiarism. Indeed, the old professor was said to have been so “consumed by rage” that “his health was destroyed.” As “this Jew descends to the Netherworld in discontent,” concluded Hatsvi in its 1913 obituary, “his entire intellectual work will be ignored by the sages of Semitic languages.”25

Müller’s hometown also viewed him with a mix of admiration and resentment. In 1893, Müller was sent word by his mother “that an evil rumor has come to the city of Buczacz and that informers have denounced and slandered me and that she would rather die because of this affair.” Deeply distressed, Müller responded that he was “the strong pillar upon which the house of Judah rests,” and that “the whole congregation of Vienna honors me and the Name of God is sanctified through me.” But there is little doubt that, for some of those who stayed behind, his very accomplishment on the European stage cast doubt on his commitment to Jewish faith and tradition.26

For others, not least Agnon, Müller was “a great and famous sage of whom all Galicia was proud.” In 1908, the twenty-one-year-old Agnon was instructed by his mother to visit their relative in Vienna on his way to Palestine. Perhaps the mother
hoped that the venerable scholar would dissuade her son from this adventure. Indeed, as Agnon recalled in his autobiographical novel *Ḥemdat*, Müller impressed on him that “settling Erets Yisraʾel is a great deed, but its climate is harsh, and its inhabitants suffer, and you will not be able to withstand the suffering of the land. Better that you settle down in Vienna and prepare yourself for the university and I will support you.” Agnon did not heed this advice. But four years later he abandoned Jaffa and moved to Germany, where he stayed for well over a decade.27

Although Agnon’s later writings betray the influence of Freud, who was also teaching at Vienna University, he is unlikely to have heard of him at the time or to have known that he, too, was linked to his hometown.28 In fact, Freud’s paternal grandfather and great-grandfather were born in Buczacz and there is evidence to suggest that both were rabbis, while his father was born in the nearby town of Tysmenitz (Tyśmienica, Tysmenytsya) moving later to Freiberg (Příbor) in Moravia, where Sigmund was born to his second (or possibly third) wife Amalia. The family settled in Vienna four years later, where Freud was raised, having had no direct contact with Buczacz.29

But a century later, in 1958, Freud’s sixty-nine-year-old son Martin recalled his grandmother Amalia, who “came from East Galicia” and was of “Jewish stock.” These “Galician Jews,” he commented, “were a peculiar race, not only different from any other races inhabiting Europe, but absolutely different from Jews who had lived in the West for some generations.” On the one hand, they “had little grace and no manners; and their women were certainly not what we would call ‘ladies.’ They were highly emotional and easily carried away by their feelings.” On the other hand, “they, alone of all minorities, stood up against the Nazis” and “fought the German army on the ruins of Warsaw.” Martin firmly believed that, “whenever you hear of Jews showing violence or belligerence, instead of that meekness and what seems poor-spirited acceptance of a hard fate sometimes associated with Jewish people, you may safely suspect the presence of men and women of Amalia’s race.”30

Martin Freud had served as an officer in the Austro-Hungarian army in World War I and in the British army in World War II. As tall and broad-shouldered as his paternal grandfather, he appreciated physical resistance to one’s enemies and took pride in what he believed to be the laudable qualities of his heritage, about which he otherwise knew close to nothing. One can imagine that Martin acquired some
of his views of Jews from his father. The rabbi and ethnographer Max Grunwald, who encountered Sigmund Freud a few times, has left us some telling observations on the topic. At their first meeting, following a lecture he delivered in Vienna in 1898, Freud remarked that he was “pleasantly surprised” to see Grunwald in “an elegant tailcoat,” because “he had imagined a Jewish rabbi in the image of John the Baptist, wearing a shaggy coat, with unkempt hair and tormented features.” Several years later Grunwald attended a lecture by Freud on Hammurabi’s code, where Freud rejected his colleague Müller’s views and insisted that the Hebrew Bible and thus Judaism as a whole were derived from ancient Mesopotamian mythology. Raising the issue again at their third and last encounter, Freud asserted “resolutely that the Jews had given nothing to culture” in recent times as well.

One cannot but be struck by the irony of Freud’s statement considering his own incalculable impact on modern culture. Freud’s discernible influence on Agnon is only one, albeit significant, instance, both in terms of Hebrew literature in general and, more to the point of this article, by way of linking these two singularly creative offspring of late nineteenth-century Eastern European Jewry to each other. Freud, as we know, also shared with Müller a fascination with ancient Jewish mythology. These two Jewish men made the most of the opportunities that had opened up to members of their generation, however differently they related to their own heritage, yet their personal fates were the function of changing times and circumstances: Müller, ten years older, died just before World War I as a respected Austrian scholar. Freud fled Vienna as a hunted Jew shortly after the Anschluss with Germany in 1938 and lived just long enough to witness the outbreak of World War II. His four sisters were murdered in the camps. One of his last books was Moses and Monotheism.

Most of those who left their Galician hometowns never came back, but some did. They brought with them a trace of the new world and the possibilities of a different life, as well as books, newspaper subscriptions, ideas, and opinions. But they also found themselves irretrievably back in the drudgery of provincial life. Their children, growing up among those books and magazines, ideas and disillusionments, at times decided to act where the fathers had not: to transform not just their hometowns but the entire world. They were often adventurous, reckless, and tragic figures: their high hopes were irreparably dashed, their firm beliefs betrayed, the world of their youth wiped out, and the one that replaced it turned out to be
infinitely crueler and more cynical. Many died young; some of the survivors adapted to the new reality and served its masters, while others ended their days sheltered in the margins of irrelevance. They tended to be bitter and, toward the end, were occasionally given to rather unrevolutionary nostalgia. The youngest among them belonged to my grandparents’ generation.

This generational trajectory is well illustrated by the case of the Nacht family. The father, Fabius, was born in Buczacz in 1848 and raised in an affluent, German-speaking home already touched by the Haskalah. After matriculating from the Polish-language state gymnasium in Stanisławów, Fabius went on to study medicine at the University of Vienna. (He had originally aspired to acquire a degree in mathematics but abandoned that quest when he found out that Jews were not allowed to teach it in schools.) In 1879, he came back to Buczacz and opened a private medical practice. Fabius was soon recognized as one of the most respected members of the Jewish community on account of his university degree, his position as a doctor, and his “higher” German culture.

But as his son Max recalled almost a century later, in response to the limitations imposed on him by “the reactionary, church-ridden Vienna regime,” Fabius Nacht had also become a socialist in the early 1870s. Indeed, it was from his father, wrote Max, that “I got my first radical indoctrination.” Yet unlike Franzos, his exact contemporary, who was forced to study law but never practiced it, Fabius dedicated himself to his role as the most prominent medical authority in Buczacz. In 1891, a modern hospital was established in Buczacz under the direction of Fabius Nacht, a position he held for thirty-four years until his retirement at the age of seventy-seven in 1925. He was fortunate to pass away just before the outbreak of World War II. In 1942, the German occupiers, together with Ukrainian and Jewish policemen, deported the approximately 100 patients to the Bełżec extermination camp, while shooting those too sick to move in their beds. Nowadays all that is left of the hospital is an empty lot.

An obituary published in the Polish Socialist Party’s weekly in 1938 acclaimed Dr. Nacht as “a socialist out of conviction, a freethinker without hateful intolerance… a rationalist filled with deep feelings, [and] an internationalist who sympathized with all liberation movements.” Even toward the end of his life, the doctor’s “desk was overflowing with piles of socialist newspapers and magazines of all shades
and languages.” It was in this home that Fabius Nacht’s sons were raised as members of the first activist socialist generation in Buczacz.

In ‘Ir umeloʾah, Agnon depicts those early days of social mobilization: “An explosive new word is making the rounds in Buczacz and it is socialism.” Suddenly, those who used “to work for you as servants” assert that “every person is his own master and does not belong to anyone else”; they “used to work from daybreak till midnight,” but now they “stop working after eight hours.” As Agnon observed, in this struggle for social justice, not a few Jewish “sons of the wealthy who appeared to want for nothing […] joined the socialists, and no father could be certain that his son would not carry out some action that would land him in prison or that he would not marry the daughter of a worker.” All those who thought that “Zionism is the worst of all upheavals in the world” now “discovered that there are even greater upheavals,” since Buczacz had become “a city of socialists.”

One center of political ferment was Fabius Nacht’s home, described in his obituary as “the meeting point for socialist youths of all nationalities.” The local leader was Anselm Mosler, whom Max Nacht recalled as “the only citizen of our town ever to accomplish” the “intellectual feat” of earning two doctorates from Vienna University, in law and philosophy. Having spent eighteen months in a Russian prison for smuggling illegal literature, Mosler returned to Buczacz and organized a socialist association that, despite its Ukrainian name, was, according to Max, “exclusively Jewish, for the Gentile workers, Roman Catholic Poles and Uniate Catholic Ukrainians were under the influence of their respective clergymen and would not join such a society.”

In any case, as he pointed out, the majority of the population in Buczacz “consisted of Yiddish-speaking Jews,” while the remaining Polish and Ukrainian inhabitants “hated and despised each other even more than they did the Jews.”

Born in Buczacz in 1881, Max Nacht became a Marxist by the ripe age of fourteen and was an early member of Mosler’s group. He and his older brother Siegfried attended public school, where they learned Polish and Ukrainian. Siegfried soon joined the social democratic movement and was expelled from two secondary schools in a row for conspiratorial activities before finally matriculating in the larger city of Stanisławów in 1895.

By then, Max, too, had become radicalized; turning to anarchism, he broke with his former idol Mosler, whom he accused of wanting to go “beyond cultivating
his own garden, with its few scores of Jewish tailors, carpenters, locksmiths, sales-
men, butchers, and shoemakers,” so as “to play a more important role,” especially “in
the Polish section of the Austrian Socialist party.” Yet Mosler’s “first bid for leader-
ship,” recalled Max, “met with such bitter abuse that he resigned from that party and
joined the newly organized Jewish Social-Democratic Party,” formed after it had
been denied recognition both by the Austrian socialists and by the Polish section.
To Max, writing about these events six decades later, this demonstrated the effects
of Polish and Austrian socialists’ anti-Semitism, leading to Mosler’s “utterly ridicu-
lous … sudden conversion to Yiddish separatism,” considering that he was a former
“assimilationist who was unable to speak Yiddish.”42

In fact, Mosler had not entirely given up on trying to revolutionize the local
population. In 1905, he began publishing a bilingual Polish-Ukrainian monthly
newsletter directed at the “peasants of the Buczacz district and other districts of
Podolia” with the goal of enlightening the largely illiterate farm laborers about their
rights and helping them resist abuse and exploitation.43 Yet, as many of the peasants’
letters to this short-lived newsletter show, their sense of injustice and resentment
often translated into rage against the Jews. Disillusioned and impoverished, Mosler
finally put an end to his career as an agitator and receded from the scene. Living in
Vienna during World War I, he finally succumbed to the tuberculosis he had con-
tracted in the Russian prison as a young revolutionary.

But Mosler did make one last ghostly appearance in Agnon’s great novel, Oreah
nata lalun (A Guest for the Night), over two decades after his death, under the evoca-
tive fictional name Knabenhut. Based on Agnon’s last visit to his hometown in 1930,
the novel depicts his protagonist’s encounter with Aharon Schützling, a character
bearing a striking resemblance to Max Nacht. Both the narrator and Schützling
had left Buczacz many years earlier and are keenly aware of how profoundly both
the city and their own outlooks have changed since their departure. “Although we
differed in our opinions,” observes the narrator, “for I was a Zionist and he an anar-
chist, we were glad to talk to each other.”44

As they contemplate their respective disillusionments, they remember
Knabenhut, who is “dead and gone.” Schützling is beset with nostalgia: “Days like
those will never return. Strikes during the day and wild parties at night.” But then
he recalls a chance meeting with Knabenhut in wartime Vienna. The latter, he says,
had “fumed at me for becoming an anarchist, and some said that he had denounced me to the authorities, and I had to flee to America.” This time, the disheveled Knaben hut lectured him “about the war and the destruction that is in store for us and the entire world.” He was gravely ill, and his last words were just a whisper: “The generation that is about to come will be worse than all the generations that preceded us,” he prophesized. “The world is becoming ever uglier, uglier than either I or you had ever sought to make it.”

This prophecy expressed Agnon’s own foreboding at the time of the novel’s publication in 1939. His narrator recalled how Knaben hut had empowered the “wretched boys” of Buczacz, “who were treated like cattle, tyrannized day and night by their masters.” But the anarchists blamed him for refusing to accept that “the world can only be repaired through eradication,” whereas he viewed them, in Agnon’s words, as “rabid zealots, ready to sacrifice themselves and the whole world as well.”

To be sure, while the fictional anarchist Schützing somehow wound his way to wartime Vienna, the real Max and Siegfried Nacht were already in the United States by the time the war broke out, having also given up on their efforts to change the world after years of revolutionary activities across Europe.

In the years between his departure from Buczacz and immigration to the United States, Siegfried was transformed into an itinerant revolutionary. Having acquired a degree in electrical engineering in Vienna, he could not find an appropriate position because of his Jewish background and socialist politics. At the same time, as a member of the Austrian Social Democratic Party, he came out against Zionism and, in 1897, officially left the Vienna Jewish community. But shortly thereafter he also grew disenchanted with what he perceived as the nationalism, anti-Semitism, and parliamentarism of the Social Democrats, embraced anarchism, and moved to Berlin, from which he traveled, mostly on foot, from one revolutionary cell to another. In April 1903 he crossed into Gibraltar and was promptly arrested on suspicion of plotting to assassinate King Edward VII during his planned visit to the British territory. The pistol he regularly carried did not help matters.

Siegfried’s arrest made waves throughout Europe. Polish émigrés in Paris and Ruthenian socialists in Vienna protested. In London, a committee was formed under the leadership of Russian anarchist Peter Kropotkin and the philosopher Herbert Spencer (who died just a few months later). Siegfried’s younger brother Max
described the response to the arrest in Buczacz, noting sarcastically that Siegfried was transformed overnight from “the disgrace of the town,” into “a national hero, the fame and pride of the place.” Moreover, Siegfried was called “an engineer” and “an author” in Polish newspapers and was said to have come under the protection of “a former minister, a real countess,” and “an actual prince.” With such credentials, commented Max, the town of Buczacz came to view Siegfried as nothing less than an “eighth wonder of the world.” In Agnon’s *Oreah nata halun*, Siegfried appears as Sigmund Winter, “the son of a doctor and one of Knabenhut’s disciples,” who “was distinguished among his friends by his black hair and beautiful eyes that he would make at young women.” The narrator recalls Winter’s victorious visit to his hometown following his release for lack of evidence a few weeks after his arrest in Gibraltar. He was “holding his head high like a prince, a black cape over his shoulders with its hem flowing down below his knees, a black hat on his head slightly tilted to one side, his moustache rolled upward and his beard descending in the shape of a half Star of David.” Indeed, the young revolutionary “was walking as if” the whole city “belonged to him,” surrounded as he was by “beautiful maidens from the best families” with “all the officials making way for him.” It all sounded a little like Mordecai the Jew’s triumphant march through the city of Shushan following his victory over Haman the Agagite.47

This was Siegfried’s finest hour. In 1912 he immigrated to the United States and was joined there by his brother the following year. Max had begun studying law at Vienna in 1900, but he soon teamed up with fellow student Mykhailo Lozynsky, a Ukrainian poet, journalist, and political agitator, to produce a single issue of a projected anarchist periodical, which led to their arrest and indictment for high treason by the Austrian authorities. Max, who somehow escaped to Switzerland, ruminated years later that, had it not been for this event, “I most likely would have remained in Austria to die for my Emperor during World War I, or, in case of survival, to be gassed by Eichmann during World War II.” By then, he rationalized his adoption of anarchism as “compensation for the personal sense of inadequacy and insecurity of the impractical son of a radical Jewish physician.” Conversely, he saw his Ukrainian comrade’s anarchism as the “expression of a nationalist intellectual’s protest against the Austro-Polish landed nobility,” who “were oppressing four million Ukrainian peasants” in Galicia. Yet, in the wake of World War I, Max noted,
Lozynsky “capitulated to Moscow, taking a job with one of the Ukrainian scientific institutions in Kiev.” Nevertheless, during the Great Purges of the late 1930s he “was shot along with all the other well-known Ukrainian intellectuals who had ever shown any Ukrainian nationalist inclination.”

In the United States, the brothers changed their names to Stephen Naft and Max Nomad and lived most of the rest of their lives in New York City. Max achieved certain notoriety in the American left. The eminent critic Edmund Wilson wrote an introduction to Nomad’s 1961 book, *Aspects of Revolt*, where he described him as a “connoisseur of radicals” not least because he was, in his own words, “a Socialist in my high-school days, an Anarchist as a college student, a Syndicalist *sui generis* during the years of my romantic and not-so-romantic vagabondage, and finally a Soviet sympathizer some forty years ago when Lenin and Trotsky were still glorious legends, between 1917 and 1920.”

To lifelong professional revolutionaries, Mosler and the Nacht brothers would have appeared as mere dilettantes who ended up betraying their ideals. Adolf Langer, born in Buczacz in 1892, just eleven years Max Nacht’s junior and five years younger than Agnon, had the temperament and perseverance of the numerous apparatchiks who have populated so much of the twentieth century. After his death, his communist colleagues noted vaguely that he was raised “in an atmosphere of patriotism and democratic ideals.” In fact he was the son of Joachim Langer, director of the Baron Hirsch School, where classes were held in Polish but German, Ruthenian, and some Hebrew were also taught; Joachim’s wife, described by one of her former students as “a beautiful blond,” taught there as well, while he offered additional extracurricular classes on Jewish religion at the Buczacz state gymnasium, which his son Adolf also attended. In the small universe of Jewish Buczacz most people knew each other: Markus (Mordechai) Kanfer, a teacher at the Baron Hirsch School and an essayist for Hebrew-language magazines, also taught Agnon German and some Polish; Markus’s son Mojżesz (Moshe) attended gymnasium with Siegfried Nacht and later became an important intellectual figure in interwar Kraków. He and his wife were murdered in the Holocaust but their daughter, Irène (Irma) Kanfer, became a well-known postwar French poet. Markus Kanfer’s daughter Sabina (Sara) became romantically involved with Max Nacht and apparently had a son by him in Paris before he left for the United States. I met Alain Kanfer, a
retired physician and Sabina's (and likely Max's) grandson, in 2001 in Paris; raised as a Roman Catholic, he was trying to recover his roots in Jewish Buczacz.52

By the time Adolf enrolled as a philosophy student in Vienna University in 1914, he had become a member of the Austrian Social Democratic Party but, two years later, shifted his loyalties to its “revolutionary left wing grouped around Lenin.”53 A founding member of the Austrian Communist Party in 1918, Langer led the establishment of the Communist Party of Eastern Galicia the following year. In 1921, he chaired its national conference in Lwów, where the mostly Ukrainian Galician communists clashed with the Polish representatives over the demand to retain their autonomy in newly independent Poland. Ironically, the twenty-nine-year-old Jewish communist Adolf Langer, now known by the more Polish-sounding name Ostap Dłuski, was charged with resolving this largely ethnonational crisis within the new Polish Communist Party.54

Not unlike Mosler, and despite being a loyal communist, Dłuski had much sympathy for the Ukrainians. He spoke frankly about Poland’s “brutal suppression of the Ukrainian nation” in 1919, and stressed that even the Polish communists “came to us not with a vehement, all-inclusive protest against the horrors that were committed, but rather with the slogan ‘Polish Soviet Republic,’ which to us was incomprehensible, alien, and aroused suspicion.” In fact, while three quarters of the Galician communists were Ukrainian, and Jews were prominent among the leadership, the majority of the Ukrainian population of Eastern Galicia, mostly made up of peasants, was strongly anti-Polish. As Dłuski noted at the time, the “simple Ukrainian” responded to assertions by Polish communists that “this was one state” by saying: “You are nationalists, you are exactly like the other bourgeois parties.”

The 1921 conference came to an abrupt end when the Polish authorities arrested all the delegates. At the trial, Dłuski unflinchingly professed his belief that “only communism could eliminate the oppression, poverty, and misery of humanity,” and that the Soviet Union marked “a new beginning in the progress of humankind.”55 Throughout his life, at least publicly, Dłuski never wavered from this position and, following his release from prison in 1923, made a career in the Polish Communist Party, becoming a member of the Central Committee and later head of its National Secretariat. In 1936, he moved to France in order to liaise with the French Communist Party.56 When the Polish government dissolved the Communist Party in 1938, Dłuski
remained in France, resuming underground activities following the German invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941. With the French police hot on his heels, in 1942, he went into hiding in a shack owned by Dr. Edgar Longuet, Karl Marx’s grandson and mayor of Alfortville near Paris, where he spent several months composing a lengthy German-language indictment of Nazism. In his only known written reference to the ongoing Nazi genocide, Dłuski condemned Hitler’s “bloodhounds,” who “drag millions of unarmed Jews in all occupied lands out of their houses, bring them to Poland, and heinously slaughter them there in slaughterhouses built especially for this purpose, among them hundreds of thousands of Jewish children.”

By 1943, Dłuski was back in action, organizing a Ukrainian underground in France, editing the Ukrainian-language magazine *Fatherland*, and justifying Stalin’s takeover and reordering of Eastern Europe in a series of French-language articles. The Soviet Union, he asserted without a trace of irony, “had made the principle of liberty and independence of peoples into the basis of its *raison d’État* and of its foreign policy,” because “a nation that oppresses another people cannot be free.” In a victory speech he delivered in liberated Paris in 1945, Dłuski blamed the recent crushing of the Polish uprising and the destruction of Warsaw by the Wehrmacht as the Red Army stood by on “the egotistical politics” of those who “wanted to drive a wedge into the Allies’ front,” to which “the heroic people of Warsaw fell victim.” He made no reference to the Warsaw Ghetto uprising of 1943 or to the extermination camps overrun by Soviets.

Dłuski’s firm Stalinism seems to have been shaken only once. On July 4, 1946, the bloodiest postwar pogrom in Europe took place in the Polish town of Kielce; over forty Jewish survivors of the Holocaust were butchered. Altogether between 500 and 1,500 Jews were murdered in Poland in the immediate aftermath of the war. Back in Warsaw as member of the Central Committee, on July 29, Dłuski proposed to his colleagues “that an institution be established which would facilitate departure of the Jews from Poland, so that they could join their families.” He went so far as to take note of the Jewish community’s disappointment with the lack of democracy in Poland and the fact that Władysław Gomulka—at the time deputy prime minister and de facto ruler of Poland—had not made a single reference to the situation of the Jews in a five-hour speech to the Communist Party. In 1968 Gomulka, by then leader of the renamed Polish United Workers’ Party, expelled the remaining Jews from the country.
Dłuski’s brief preoccupation with anti-Semitism in Poland may have been mostly motivated by the communists’ attempt to accuse their enemies at home and abroad of inciting anti-Jewish sentiments, but it is at least possible that he was also personally shaken by the violence that followed the destruction of the world into which he was born. Subsequently, Dłuski became engaged mainly in propagandistic humanitarian activities. When given the opportunity to speak publicly about Nazi crimes, as on the occasion of Goethe’s 200th anniversary in 1949, Dłuski refrained from any mention of Holocaust. Conversely, after Stalin’s death in 1953, which put an end to the anti-Jewish campaign he had just unleashed, Dłuski depicted his memory as “eternally alive, warm and sincere,” and described the Bolshevik Party as representing “the highest achievements of advanced human thought.” No wonder that, following his death in 1964 at the age of seventy-two, he was described as “a model communist.” He certainly had impeccable timing; four years later he would likely have been unmasked as the crypto-Jew Adolf Langer and expelled from Poland as a fifth column Zionist.

Still, for all the ideological baggage Dłuski piled up between himself and Buczacz, he always remained within the Polish sphere on whose periphery he was raised. Others, who had wandered much farther, remained attached to the world they had striven to leave behind. Max Nacht acknowledged toward the end of his life that his worldview had initially been forged in Buczacz. Müller, whose move across the Carpathians to a Vienna professorship was a giant step for members of his generation, drew greatly on his early years in Buczacz and was pained by rumors about his lack of loyalty to its community. Agnon spent a lifetime writing about Galicia; had he lived longer, he might have continued compiling ever more stories about Buczacz because, in the aftermath of destruction, “building a city,” as he depicted the writing of ‘Ir umelo’ah, “in its fullness,” could not but be a never-ending labor of love:

For if my city has been wiped out of the world, its name exists in the poem that the poet has written as a sign of my city. And if I do not remember the words of the poem because of its greatness, the poem resonates in the heavens above among the poems of the holy poets beloved of God.
In different ways, they were all trailblazers: coming from the margin they struggled to make themselves known to the world and in the process became part of its remaking.
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