Introduction

Forms of Love and Limits of Europeanness

Intentions and Assumptions

Over the past fifteen years, in an attempt to explore the relationships between political forms of identity and cultural attitudes in the sphere of the emotions, I have found myself pursuing the theme of the relationship between European identity and conjugal love in its courtly and romantic forms. Such love typically reveals an often perverse dialectic between desire and the impossibility of fusion between the lovers, even if the love is fully reciprocated. In the beginning I was intent, above all, on criticising the Eurocentrism implicit in the conceit – dating from the closing decades of the eighteenth century – that Europeans had invented a certain type of loving relationship, mainly heterosexual and exclusive to Western civilisation, defined by its contrast and supposed superiority to the cultures of other continents. Though I have not abandoned this angle, which is valuable because it considers sexism and racism as part of the same critique, I have also begun to pursue other interests more explicitly: the first being the relationship between the individual and the collective, and the second being the limits of Europeanness.

In the first case, love constitutes a unifying force that works in a similar way whether it is keeping a couple together or laying the foundation stones of a cohesive society. Various cultural traditions assume a direct link between both forms of love, in particular both Protestant and Catholic versions of Christian love, despite the considerable differences between the two forms (Passerini 1999). This direct link also lies at the basis of all analyses of the crisis in

European civilisation – a central theme in cultural debates between the two wars – which consider this crisis to be rooted in the relationship between man and woman, seen as the bedrock of civilisation. This view was shared by those who set out to subvert the order of society through a radical revival triggered by *amour fou* or the 'community of lovers' that André Breton and Georges Bataille envisaged during that period.

The link between public and private is conceived to be not only extremely close but also direct and conditioning. Certain aspects of European cultures, nevertheless, provide us with opportunities to argue for a less direct relationship, requiring two independent foundations instead of one alone and accepting a certain amount of discontinuity between the public sphere and the private sphere, despite all the bridges that may and must be laid down between the two. On the contrary, I cherish the idea of discontinuity, because it seems to me to encourage a view of the male–female relationship that does away with the dual trap of complementarity (whereby man and woman are dovetailed into a fixed joint from which they cannot escape) on the one hand, and a rigid and unalterable dichotomy between the sexual genders on the other. This view is supported by the line of thought, exemplified by Maurice Blanchot and Roland Barthes, whereby the 'neuter' acts as a sort of starting point from which the duality may be changed and shifted. This view may break the deterministic relationship between a private order based on the heterosexual couple and a public order guaranteed by a love that holds a community together. Incidentally, this same determinism – but in the opposite direction, namely, from the public to the private instead of the other way round – also crops up in the classic approach of the Third International, according to which a change in the socio-political system would automatically determine a change in private relationships and emotions.

Significant support for the argument of discontinuity is offered in this book by the play *Dybbuk*, written between 1912 and 1919 by the Belarus ethnologist and revolutionary Shlomo Ansky. The play, based on an oral Hasidic tradition, met with great success in the period between the two wars, even in Western Europe, as a result of a production by the Habima company of Moscow. The *Dybbuk* introduces the view that two foundations are present, that of the conjugal relationship implemented by the community through shared religious worship, and that of the loving relationship that draws directly on a supernatural divine and demonic order. The hindered love that led to the death of the young lover is reaffirmed

by the dead lover entering the woman's body in the form of a dybbuk. At this point, an androgynous figure is introduced, which mixes male and female in the body of a woman. Although the religious and social order of the community is respected (the dybbuk obeys the rabbi when he orders it to abandon the body of the beloved), the new being is located on another level by the independent decision taken by the young woman, released from the dybbuk, to choose death in order to be rejoined with her lover. Love which meets strong opposition, even when it results in death, speaks of freedom because it questions the unambiguous relationship between social cohesion and private love and alludes to the need for a dual foundation for both spheres.

On a methodological level, the decision to build up the book with case studies – of individuals and texts – was determined by the centrality of the relationship between public and private, which runs as a theme through the entire work, with specific reference to the 1930s. This period is marked not only by the political coercion of private individuals in countries with totalitarian regimes such as Italy, but also by the acute awareness of the link between private emotions and public affairs in debates on marriage, sex and divorce conducted in democratic countries such as France. In the book's structure, my insistence on the private sphere, as evidenced by my choice of microhistories, is intended to safeguard the relative autonomy of the private. Private histories may never be reduced to mere examples of great processes, since they always have a way of breaking out and to some extent contradicting them. My methodological approach rules out any comparison on a national scale, rather favouring the tracing of exchanges and resonances between case studies in different countries.

Access to some archives of private correspondence has allowed me to explore the relationship between public and private. In the case of Leo Ferrero, the documents revealed the concomitance of his intellectual and sentimental development, in the friendships with his male contemporaries and his tireless quest for a happy loving relationship. These emotional investments parallel Ferrero's intellectual exploration of European love. In the case of Rougemont, it is possible to document the emotional roots of the success of *L'Amour et l'Occident* through its reception not only by the press and critics but also by individuals, from unknown readers to well-known personalities such as Jakob Humm, Etienne Gilson and Théo Spoerri, all of whom were deeply moved by reading the work. In the case of Giorgina Levi and Heinz Arian, it was possible

to highlight, on the basis of their correspondence, the link between a loving relationship and shifts in identity between the two poles of being Jewish and being European. As I had found in a previous study of love letters between a German man and a British woman (ibid.: Ch. 7), the different sense of national belonging fosters a discourse of European perspective, even in private correspondence.

My second interest, concerning the limits of Europeanness, emerged as a necessary antidote to the conceptual effort of opening up the sense of European belonging and making it multicultural. If we renounce any essentialism, for example by criticising the allocation of values such as democracy and equality exclusively to Europeanness, we cannot merely claim such values for humanity and oppose Eurocentrism. In this case Europeanness would run the risk of claiming itself to be all-inclusive, with a paternalistic or falsely universalistic slant. Our critique must, therefore, be accompanied by a recognition of the limits of that which may be called European in different historical periods. Though my intention is certainly not to repudiate the critique of Eurocentrism, which I have pursued on both conceptual and imaginative levels (Passerini 2004: 21–33; Passerini 2007a, Part 2), it is crucial to detail the new potential forms of Europeanness so that it may conceive of itself as limited. This limit may be understood in at least two ways. In the first place, we need to acknowledge on a historical level that Europeanness has always had its limits, which have assumed from time to time specific characteristics determined by space and time. One limit to forms of Europeanness may be found by postulating key historical discontinuities, refusing to accept a single root and a linear course, whether from antiquity, the Middle Ages or the modern age, to the concept of Europe and Europeanness.[1]

As far as cultural policy is concerned, a second limit may be applied explicitly to the way Europeans feel a sense of belonging, promoting a non-inclusive Europeanness that renounces claims of imposed universalism, while maintaining its concern for humanity as a whole. A critique of ideologies is not enough to achieve this step. If we mercilessly deconstruct Europeanness without saving anything, instead of looking for its limits we are left 'without any bread to eat', as Dipesh Chakrabarty pointed out to me. This requires us to set limits to our critique of Eurocentricism, introducing a note of *pietas* to our treatment of the past. While Eurocentricism was an intrinsic limit to all forms of European belonging, at the same time even those forms could contain elements of intercultural solidarity. Love itself in certain cases set a

limit on Europeanness, forcing it to accept the other in all its specificity.

The protagonists of this book, who are in various ways Eurocentric, touch the limits of their Europeanness when they acknowledge the other and refrain from assimilating it. The common strand that joins the case studies I have chosen is that all of them – human beings and texts – encounter others, internal and external, European and non-European, in their quest for Europe. The encounters set a limit to their being European, but also provide an opportunity to feel empathy and solidarity. It is not up to us as historians to say how individuals should have behaved in the past, although we are free to discuss their choices. On the contrary, it is up to us to recognise that under those conditions some individuals helped to redefine themselves and their own Europeanness in their dialogue with others. Thus Quartara, on meeting Africans when he went ashore in West Africa during his return from Latin America, on the one hand treats the males only in the aesthetic terms of their physical beauty, yet on the other hand is concerned for the very young African mothers and how they will manage to cope with their difficult conditions. When Leo Ferrero espies in the old *india* woman in whose house he is lodging in Mexico a closeness to the divine that allows him to criticise an aspect of his own religious culture, he finds a new sense of religiousness that drives him towards Asia. The editors of and contributors to *Cahiers du Sud* turn to Islam through the Mediterranean, setting out to re-establish a fundamental relationship between European culture and Arab culture based on the love typical of ancient Provence. Denis de Rougemont constructs his great book against the backdrop of an imagined East, so his work is not free of orientalism, but his attempt moves in the direction of taking the naturalness out of loving passion and restoring it firmly to a cultural construct. The resulting historicisation helps to lay the foundations of a European identity that is no longer essential and eternal, but the result of many influences. Moreover, the reception of *Dybbuk* in France and Italy is a coming to terms between Jewish and non-Jewish Europeans, and between this collective and the Jews of Central Eastern Europe, in which the limits of reciprocal identity are simultaneously expanded and redefined. Lastly, when Giorgina Levi states that Europeans do not have the sense of space that is sometimes present in Latin America, she is not claiming to absorb everything, but instead suggesting that a limiting effect is at work in her acknowledgement of what a European is not.

If one premise of this work and its methodological choices is to take issue with the presumed continuity of cultural processes in time, another corresponding premise is that of the deterritorialisation of the continent. Current migration patterns are having the twofold effect of deterritorialising Europe and of delineating a possible Europe that still does not fully exist. The space within which the migratory routes are plotted is already European, but is still affected by former hierarchies between the centre and the periphery, between East and West and between North and South – and by value judgements that establish different levels of Europeanness.[2] Deterritorialisation, or the act of not acknowledging oneself to be connected to a single territory, may be an individual and collective experience, but it may also be a cultural operation, such as that of disassociating Europe from its traditional boundaries and taking into consideration its relationships with other continents. Being European 'amongst other things', in the words of Derrida (Derrida 1992), may be the preserve not only of individuals but also of countries and cultures. While it is no longer of any interest to debate whether Turkey or Morocco belong solely to Asia or Europe, it is very important to work in two directions on this score as well: on the one hand keeping open an idea of Europe where countries that are not considered geographically part of the continent are in some sense considered 'European'. On the other hand, we cannot claim that countries such as Russia and its culture are exclusively European, as though they *also* have other claims on their provenance. The recognition that other countries and cultures may *also* be European helps safeguard against the possibility of a new European cultural imperialism.

The need is, therefore, to ensure that Europe is not blocked by frontiers established by mistrust of the insufficiently 'European', but at the same time to understand what Europe has been: to give historical form to places that past investments in identity have made 'European', just as others may be made European in the future. Whereas in *Europe in Love* I focused on Great Britain, an area considered 'peripheral' to both Europe and love, in this book I have shifted my attention to areas that are 'central' in both respects, namely French-speaking Switzerland, southern France and Italy, as well as to the relationships between the west and the central eastern part of the continent. Paying attention to specific places when delineating a European territory is crucial: for this reason each chapter opens with a passage in italics that evokes one of the places where the love stories in the book take place or are imagined. In the

first part: Genoa and the area around Florence; in the second: Marseilles and the Gotthard; in the third: the theatres of Paris and the Bolivian landscape, all places loved by the protagonists and for this reason given extra meaning that sheds light on the European space. Apart from this, the characters in the first part are active in Paris, move towards the Americas and dream of Africa or Asia. The passages in the second part are based on networks that traverse many European countries, from France and Switzerland to Germany and Great Britain, and are directed towards the Mediterranean, North Africa and the Middle East. The third part deals with Central Eastern Europe and northern Italy, and extends to Latin America. In this way the book builds up a picture of the European horizon in the world between the two wars, criss-crossed by pathways dictated by cultural goals, political purposes and emotional reasons, and open in many directions.

The three parts of the book correspond to ideas that stand as conceptual pillars of my study and weave together various intentions and goals. The first part is centred on individual stories: it combines the biographies of two men, illustrating specific characters and collective attitudes, and introduces the various theories they developed to interpret the relationship between the discourse on Europe and the discourse on love. This part starts in Italy, but both protagonists find a sympathetic ear in France. The second part shifts to texts produced in France: the *Cahiers du Sud* and *L'Amour et l'Occident* by Denis de Rougemont, both considered from the viewpoints of their development and reception. These texts bring out themes of the relationship between Europe and the Mediterranean and between European culture and Christianity, as opposed to Eastern religions. The third part introduces the theme of the relationship between Europe and its 'internal other': Jewishness, an obligatory choice for Europe in the 1930s, whereas nowadays the same topic would require other subjects. As Talal Asad and Thierry Hentsch have noted, nowadays in the West Arabs and Muslims have to some extent replaced the Jews both as an undesirable element in our societies and as a symbol of the insidious power of money.

Connections and Contrasts

Part I of this book examines what could be defined as the two archetypal ways of configuring the link between Europe and love. Quartara, a marquis and lawyer, formulates the link in terms

borrowed from nineteenth-century materialism, offering an interpretation that adopts Bachofen's ideas on original matriarchy, and foreseeing sexual liberation as a correlate of social revolution. Quartara opens the book for the very reason that he represents a link with the nineteenth century, both positively through the international pacificism and feminism in which he was engaged, and also negatively, in his arguments against Marxism and communism. His view of Europe is strongly political: he draws inspiration from Masonic ideas and bases his writings on a firm belief in the monarchy – an idea of a united Europe for which no further tangible hope exists after the defeat of Aristide Briand's Memorandum at the Society of Nations in 1930. His was an isolated voice in the Italian cultural world and was to become even more isolated as fascism took hold. His political ambiguity of the 1930s would lead to a dramatic and enigmatic outcome at the beginning of the 1940s.

Leo Ferrero, on the other hand, was from the very outset part of a strong cultural, social and intellectual tradition due to his family and education. His concept of women and love, nevertheless, gradually moves away from the positivism of Lombroso and Guglielmo Ferrero and eventually, as a result of his religious conversion, embraces a form of spiritualism that anticipates that of Rougemont. He, therefore, connects 'Europe' and 'love' in a non-confessional form of Christianity that allows him to make intercultural comparisons with other world religions and cultures, in his quest for syncretism between East and West. Leo Ferrero's concept of Europe is culturalist. He no longer sees it as a 'young Europe', modern, industrial and democratic like the Europe of his father, but as a Europe of the heart and of religiousness. Although he harks back to traditions that join European culture with the continent's political problems, such as the tradition of Mazzini and the civil-democratic approach of Piero Gobetti and his followers, Ferrero differs from them in applying a 'culturalist' filter to the political implications of ideas on Europe. This filter is in certain respects a way of giving in to the constrictions of fascism, but in other respects provides us with elements we may use to compare the fascist idea of Europe and Europeanness. In the latter sense, it heralds an idea of Europe that has emerged in recent decades, which uses a concept of cultural identity to criticise the construction of a political, economic and bureaucratic idea of a European union.

Quartara and Ferrero are joined by their ideas and by certain anthropological and existential attitudes, despite the differences between their systems of thought. In both cases, their way of seeing

the link between Europe and love is influenced by their ideas about women; both are upholders of women's emancipation in their different ways. In Quartara this tendency is guided by the tenets of Italian and international suffragists and emancipatory feminism. Ferrero's position, on the other hand, is linked to his relationship with his mother, Gina Lombroso, which leads him to condemn the subordination of women, albeit in an ambivalent manner. Both men managed to deal with the stereotypes of virility that they shared, but sometimes fell victim to, particularly Ferrero. Their biographies show similarities and differences. Central to both characters is an unresolved relationship with their mothers, which may have been the underlying reason why they found it difficult to form happy loving relationships and enter into marriage. In the case of Ferrero, there is a parallel between the special relationship with his mother and his relationship with a young peer group, which contributes to form his identity, given that he emphatically avows his membership of a specific 'young' generation at the end of the 1920s and at the beginning of the 1930s. The ages of Quartara and Ferrero were separated by a twenty-year gap as they were born in 1883 and 1903 respectively. This is the reason why the theme of the male generation, so marked in Ferrero, is not present in Quartara. The pair also represent different ways of considering the association between a sexual and a loving relationship. Quartara believes that they overlap and mingle and his view involves striking contradictions, such as his campaign against prostitution at the same time as he was taking part in it. For Ferrero, who was a stranger to this practice and painted it in all its squalor, love is never conceived as free of sexuality. He rejects the idea of sex as sin and attaches no blame to it, in line with his education based on a secular form of Jewishness. The tension between these two figures is a step towards a pluralisation of the category of maleness, to which my research intends to contribute.

The arguments they raised and in particular the way they linked Europe and love were destined to be at odds with the prevailing Italian environment. The two themes were pursued separately, in a climate of bitter diatribe against any line of thought that denied Mussolinian cultural autarchy and the foundation of a 'new' Europe. Even Drieu la Rochelle was acidly rebuked by the review *Antieuropa* – which proclaimed itself 'the heresy of modern Europe' (Gravelli 1929: 2–11)[3] – for having defined Maurras as 'the inventor' of fascism (ibid.: 28–29; editorial note). Interestingly enough, the only reference to the arguments discussed in this book to be found

in *Antieuropa* take the form of a 'European' love dialogue between Don Juan and Petrarch's Laura, written by the Spanish author Giménez Caballero (Giménez Caballero 1935: 567–99).[4] The dialogue presents the two fictitious characters as European models of love, the anarchic male hero the opposite of the courtly lover, defined as effeminate, and the inaccessible lady who refuses to submit. The solution to the conflict between the two, which is leading the West to sterility, is to force both to marry and discover love through the sacrifice imposed by having children. This dialogue finds a counterpart in the series of unhappy encounters between Italian men and women from other countries, painted by Corrado Alvaro as places of absolute non-communication and frustration.[5] Still more drastic are the images of a loving relationship between an Italian woman and an African man that the 1934 novel *Sambadù Amore Negro* presents as regressive compared to European civilisation (Ellena 2004: 225–72).

By contrast, Part II of the book takes us to francophone areas, where we find ourselves in the nerve centres of European culture at that time. The areas in question were remote from Paris, because the cultural and emotional roots of the two case studies considered lie in the southern part of the country, in Marseilles and Provence, for *Cahiers du Sud*, and in French Switzerland for Denis de Rougemont. The continuities with the first section should not be underestimated. In all these studies, love in all its various historical and cultural forms represents a unifying force between public and private: in Quartara between European federalism and free love, in Ferrero between civilisation and passion, in Joë Bousquet and Simone Weil between culture and *eros*. Also of particular interest are the intellectual cross-references between Leo Ferrero and Rougemont, acknowledged by the latter in *L'Amour et l'Occident*. While Ferrero was intent on questioning the connection between love and the Christian religion through his desire to secularise European faith and establish syncretism between Eastern and Western beliefs, Denis de Rougemont set out to restore the link between love and Christianity through a process of redefining both and applying psychology to literature. Both were interested in bringing sacred love and profane love back under the same aegis.

Cahiers du Sud and Rougemont are brought together not only by the awareness that leads them to combine the two themes of Europe and love,[6] but also by the political importance they attached to such a combination in the task of refounding a free Europe. The same combination existed in completely different forms during the 1930s,

for example in the writings of Pierre Drieu la Rochelle, who combined an interest in a Europe capable of rediscovering a unity 'against nations' with an obsession for 'foreign' Jewish or American women, in a view that saw only Europeans as truly capable of loving. For him, the relationship between love and Europe was situated within the framework of the 'immense healthy revolution' promoted by fascism: the regeneration 'in the blood' of European unity and European patriotism against the invasion of the Russian hordes, in the tradition of the Holy Roman–Germanic empire and in accordance with an order watched over by 'the Christ of the cathedrals, the great white, virile God'.[7] Drieu has the merit of not concealing the 'white' nature of his Europe within the framework of the Hitlerian '*nouvelle Europe*' anticipated by several French intellectuals in the 1930s (Bruneteau 2003: Part 1, 353n.).

The connection between Europe and love is an implicit presupposition of European culture, which can have very different political and cultural aims. Opposite intentions to Drieu were evident in *Cahiers du Sud* and Denis de Rougemont, as they took up ranks against Nazi fascism. Central to their writings considered here is the conviction that Provençal culture lies at the origins of European consciousness: for *Cahiers*, in the hope of reopening an age of European renaissance; for Rougemont, with a pessimism shot through with bitterness over the fate of the continent. Both *Cahiers* and Rougemont converge in diagnosing the fatal crisis in the European spirit, but are hostile, albeit in different ways, towards the type of moral clerical commitment to Europe dreamed of by Julien Benda. Rougemont believed that European culture could be refounded through a crucial return to religion, mediated by the thoughts of Kierkegaard and Barth and deeply rooted in the individual. As far as the editors of *Cahiers*, namely Jean Ballard, Joë Bousquet, Gabriel Audisio and René Nelli, are concerned, Europe's salvation lies in a cultural commitment, that is, a prioritisation of language and poetry, an idea shared by Simone Weil. This proposal involves the reintroduction of values considered typical of Mediterranean culture: tolerance, respect for the human person, intellectual curiosity, and a certain style of living and loving. This vision is entirely secular and for this reason distant from the Rougemontian view, but both cases envisage a form of Europe based on types of belonging that are not necessarily national, but in fact often regional.

Such values may be revived in a meeting of civilisations that hinges on the reforging of bonds between Europe and Islam, in a

concept of Mediterranean unity that is set against Mussolini's ideas of a Latin race and 'mare nostrum'. This Mediterranean alters the very idea of Europe, opening it up to Africa and Asia through a cultural movement that is particularly relevant today. On the one hand, it exemplifies the deterritorialisation mentioned earlier, while on the other hand it alludes to a multifaceted and open Europe that is no longer the centre of the world, but a place of reciprocal communication and listening between cultures, reviving and updating an ancient trade tradition (Passerini 2002: 70–71; Chambers 2005: 423–33). This discussion of the Mediterranean restores a utopian charge to the debate on Europe. *Cahiers* reveals an awareness of Europeanness as an alternative to bellicose and belligerent nationalism, and recognises – with Valéry or with Nizan – the limits of Europe and its smallness as a peninsula or offshoot of the great mass of Asia. *Cahiers* does not set Europe (despite treating it as part of the West) against the East, and its criticism of the United States is gentler and more self-mocking than that of authors such as Georges Duhamel or Robert Aron and Arnaud Dandieu, who expressed strong forms of cultural anti-Americanism.

Rougemont's book *L'Amour et l'Occident* (referred to hereafter as *AO*) was destined to become a best-seller and strike a chord both with academics and the more general public. The network of relationships that grew up around the book is an illustration of the common sentiments that it expressed, in the sense of acknowledging oneself to be European and capable of love, with all the contradictions typical of the age. *AO*, Rougemont's life work, represents a distillation of the public and private concerns of its author, who subjects the crisis in marriage and the crisis in Europe to the same impassioned scrutiny. Rougemont draws parallels between the private *eros* and the unbridled passion of Hitlerian totalitarianism, and between *agape*, capable of fidelity in marriage through a pact between the individual and God, and European democratic federalism, in which he was actively involved after the Second World War, when he also became an eco-warrior. *AO* is a multifaceted work that combines different intellectual movements in an original way: the philosophical and political, drawn from the personalism the author shared with other contemporaries; the theological, from Kierkegaard and Barth; the historical and political, arising out of his direct observation of Nazism; and the anthropological, from his contact with the Collège de Sociologie. A textual comparison between the three editions of 1939, 1956 and

1972 has revealed his incessant changes to the work and the crucial psychological slant he added to the second version. By stressing an approach that sets the first five books of *AO* within an openly psychological context, Rougemont anticipates one of the most original interpretations of courtly love, namely, a view inspired by psychoanalysis in general and Lacanian psychoanalysis in particular.

AO sets out to establish a connection between the public and private, between the political and the personal, striking a bold and fascinating balance. Tristan and Europe are figures of nostalgia for life choices that are no longer open to the author himself, who wishes to leave behind the figure of Don Juan. In the absence of documentation and serious research, Rougemont's biographical details leave us with unresolved enigmas surrounding the contradictions between his life and thought. *AO* imposed its own rules on its author, namely, fidelity to the bitter end, against divorce, deemed typical of the US lifestyle in which European civilisation could also founder. Despite this, Rougemont himself chose divorce in the end to make his second marriage possible.

Denis de Rougemont's work met with criticism from many sides, from historians such as Irving Singer, who studied ideas of love and considered the book to be superficial and historically unfounded (Singer 1984, 1987), to young academics who noted the absence of references to a new role of women or sexuality, since the work upholds the idea of formal respect for the other without actually mentioning a change in the role of women, even in the early 1970s edition (Cirulli 2002–3). Recent interpretations of the poetry of the troubadours have discharged Rougemont's interpretation. Despite these criticisms and irrespective of whether we agree with them, *AO* remains a 'long haul book' to use Starobinsky's term, able to take into account contemporary views of consciousness, literature, customs, political tensions, and the links between them. The work still lives a life of its own, having been translated and read throughout the world. The translators themselves were bowled over by it, as was the case with the Dutch translator P. Hymans, who claimed that the book had changed his life and not just his intimate life. The same was true of the Italian translator Luigi Santucci, who went so far as to purloin *AO* from the library of Princess Caracciolo, who housed him in Switzerland during the Resistance, and carry it around in his knapsack throughout his partisan period. We may read this small anecdote as a confirmation of *AO*'s resonance with that 'Tempo d'Europa'[8] characterised by the Resistance movement's struggle against Nazism and fascism.

In addition to the intentional connections, some unexpected links emerged from my studies, which corroborated the appropriateness of the choices I made. A network of friends and cultural networks emerge, linking people who often did not know each other with invisible threads: Quartara and Leo Ferrero both contributed to *Il Lavoro* of Genoa when this newspaper, edited by the socialist Giuseppe Canepa, represented one of the few relatively free voices in fascist Italy. The editors of *Cahiers* and Rougemont shared the same cultural readings and circles. The former were strongly linked to Paul Valéry, who was to constitute an important cultural and social reference for Leo Ferrero. Ferrero's texts were reviewed by *Cahiers du Sud* and read by Denis de Rougemont, who was also in touch with Guglielmo Ferrero and Gina Lombroso in Geneva. Karl Barth and Charlotte von Kirschbaum, so important in the formulation of Rougemont's religious beliefs, fought in a group inspired by Freies Deutschland, the same movement in which Heinz Arian was active in Latin America. Moreover, the *Dybbuk* was performed at the Teatro di Torino founded by Riccardo Gualino, who was central to a network of intellectuals who shared the same ideas on Europe – ideas which aroused opposition despite their vagueness. These ideas originated in the circles influenced by Gobetti and *Solaria* and frequented by Leo Ferrero; Paola Lombroso Carrara, Leo's aunt, visited Palestine in 1932 on a trip organised by the Zionists with whom Giorgina Levi was in contact. The cultural networks are, nevertheless, open and inclusive. While the networks shared by most of the protagonists who appear in the book display the common characteristic of resistance and opposition to fascism, the overall picture also includes characters who acquiesced to fascism, such as Ludovico Rocca, composer of the opera *Il Dibuk* in 1934.

The two protagonists of Part I both demonstrate that the link between Europe and love is formulated within a male sexist framework and this is borne out by the works studied in Part II, which give priority to the male subject. *Cahiers du Sud* speaks of love within the conceptual framework of a 'contemporary male consciousness' that they are, nevertheless, aware is in crisis, as is the increasingly 'male' figure of the female. To get around this dual crisis of gender, René Nelli puts forward the idea of a passionate love founded on a spiritual, almost comradely communion, a friendship between both sexes – which in certain aspects resembles *amour fou* – but is able to return to ancient forms of sensuality such as the *assag* of Provençal and Eastern origin. This form of

friendship is hardly reconcilable with the view of 'Woman' as the quintessential foreigner, who presides over the relationship between life and death, between waking and sleeping. Few real women stand out against this male-dominated background: the one woman to stand out is Simone Weil, whose exceptional articles on the Languedoc civilisation represented an act of spiritual resistance.

The female counterpart to the male subject of whom Rougemont speaks is not a woman guardian of love and death, but a true companion, seen as a person in the fullest sense. He, nevertheless, fails to acknowledge her complete subjectivity. From the perspective of *agape*, passionate love remains a sublime form of love-dominion, which yet again enslaves women by connecting love-fidelity to God. These concepts, as in those of Quartara and Leo Ferrero before, are responsible for a typical European male myth, which may be defined as the Pygmalion complex: the obsession with forming a woman in one's own image and semblance. This complex also crops up in the letters of Heinz Arian, for whom – as for the other protagonists – it amounts to a longing implicit in the European culture and spirit. The Pygmalion myth seems to embody a cliché of *Homo europaeus* in matters of love, in the sense that such men require total devotion even on an intellectual level and aim to win back, at least in the cultural arena, a mastery that has been lost in other areas.

Identity and Otherness

Far from taking an essentialistic and privileged view of the connection between being Jewish and being European, Part III argues for the possibility of an open way of experiencing that connection, in opposition to fascist and Nazi ideas of a Europe 'expurgated' of the Jews. This possibility is still highly significant for us today, in our efforts to help formulate new forms of Europeanness, as opposed to versions of a cultural Fortress Europe, even though the forms and subjects of exclusions have changed. For this reason we are still inspired by those who, like Giorgina Levi and Heinz Arian, lived a double identification, as Jews and Europeans, in the 1930s and 1940s. This is particularly significant in the period of 'persecution of the lives of Jews', using the term coined by Michele Sarfatti (Sarfatti 2000). However, the question of Jewish identity is posed very differently today than in the 1930s. The decimation of European communities due to the Shoah and migration, the existence of the state of Israel and the growing

numerical and political weight of US Jewish communities on the international scene have changed the global relevance of European Judaism. Not only does the state of Israel pursue a cultural policy that relegates its European past to a role of secondary importance (Cohen 2004: 107–20), but some Jews from Eastern Europe also consider being Jewish incompatible with being European (Pinto 2004). The 'reconciliation' between Judaism and Europe that Simone Veil spoke of so optimistically just twenty or so years ago now appears a very difficult task, although no less necessary.[9] However, the possibility of creating a third pillar of Jewish identity – a European one, with strong links to the memory of the Shoah, but innovative in respect to the past – has been mooted (Michman 2004: 123–35).

In the 1930s, the European dimension of Judaism involved the recomposition of the Jewish community in the continent. Western European Jews, including the French and Italian Jews, had experienced a relatively swift cultural and legal emancipation with an accelerated process of social integration. The Jews of Eastern Europe formed a spiritual nation that had preserved its many languages and cultures, including Hasidism. The cases studied in Part III mirror each of these two realities, without claiming to represent them exhaustively, due to the multiplicity and wealth of Jewish cultures in the various areas of Europe. Furthermore, the Hasidic culture and the left-wing humanist Judaism depicted in Chapters 5 and 6 respectively deal with minorities compared to the Jewish people as a whole. The two examples reflect the coming and going of people and cultural processes between the East and West of the continent. The interpretation of the *Dybbuk* as belonging to European culture reminds us that Europe and Europeanness are hybrid forms par excellence and that the parallels drawn between the legendary wandering Jew and Nietzsche's Shadow are not unfounded.

Both cases studied in Part III illustrate movements between Eastern and Western Europe which took place literally (Ansky's exile, the peregrinations of Heinz Arian) and metaphorically (Ansky's tendency to enlightenment and his return to the Jewish tradition; the act of opening up to another's culture in the case of Giorgina Levi and Heinz Arian). The following double movement may be considered a promise of a form of Europeanness to come: on one hand, a critical revisitation of a *Lebenswelt* such as that of the shtetl; on the other hand, a critique by tradition and the community against the system of individual rights arising out of the Enlightenment. The binary nature of this movement means that

neither of the two critiques is completely right and that only the tension between both processes – one of secularisation and individualisation, and the other involving a transformation of one's faith without total loss of faith – maintains some of the promises of freedom, justice and happiness offered by both. The two-way movement must be incessant if we are not to lose the moment of truth contained in each of the two worlds.

A similar tension is also present in the cases discussed in Part III. Both illustrate the connection between Europe and love and at the same time are illuminated by it. In the case of the *Dybbuk*, a work of fiction, love acts as a liberating force against repressive dogmas and the domination of the old and the rich – who are, however, rightly concerned with the fate of the community and no strangers to love and pain. The character of Leah is central to this dual aspect, and she herself is binary, female and male, living and dead. This is an illustration of the contradictions in the way women are represented in Jewish tradition and particularly in the Kabbalah, but perhaps also an indirect allusion, through the theme of the androgynous, to the new aspirations of Jewish women in the first half of the twentieth century. These aspirations are embodied in the historical experience of Giorgina Levi, who was a leading light of female emancipation in the intellectual, social and political field. We are struck by her strength in committing to and enduring her risk-filled union with Heinz Arian, and her ability to turn her image of herself as a European woman in relation to the Bolivians into a Europeanness open to others and to an acknowledgement of her own limits. All this assumes particular significance nowadays, when the presence of migrants forces Europeans to take other cultures into account in reformulating their own sense of belonging. The female figures in the first two parts of the book stand out as indispensable supports to the men in the case studies, yet remain peripheral despite their strength and importance – from Vittoria Gavazzi Quartara, Gina Lombroso Ferrero and some female friends and lovers of Leo, to Charlotte von Kirschbaum and Simonne Vion de Rougemont. Part III, however, finally sets women centre stage, both in fiction, in the case of Leah in the *Dybbuk*, and in historical reality, through the figure of Giorgina Levi. They allow us to break away from the blinkered view that the subject of any European discourse on love must be exclusively male and Christian.

Changes in identity induced by the bond of love demonstrate how love makes it possible to put oneself in someone else's place and illustrate the osmosis between identity and otherness. For Giorgina,

such changes meant extending her sense of Italianness to a European identity, fed by cultural references, some of which – such as Stefan Zweig, who was simultaneously a Jew and a 'great European' – embraced Central Europe, Arian's place of origin. The heritage of political opposition that came to her from her family added a further international and cosmopolitan dimension to her Europeanness. For Heinz Arian, Giorgina represented a place of identification, which in 1938 he compared to a beloved country, known only to him, a form of identification by which the other became himself. For both of them, 'mother Europe' or the 'European motherland' became a reality not only due to the persecutions but also to their reciprocal understanding of one another. In the 1930s, Europe was still of central relevance to them as their pole of identification; they were hardly affected by the idea of a Zionist homeland, a role allocated to Palestine first and foremost. Though both were aware of the appeal of Zionist arguments, the impact was lessened by their leaning towards Marxism.

We cannot let the happy end to the last love story make us forget the tremendous risk that Heinz and Giorgina had taken. The theme of separation emerges dramatically in Part III, as the link between love and death in the case of the *Dybbuk*, while in the second case study the whole of Europe appears as a killing field. It is, however, very different if the link between love and death arises as the object of a polemic, even if this is turned against oneself – and this applies to both Ferrero and Rougemont – or as a longing that is indulged for self-gratification. No one in this book fully represents the second attitude, though it could apply to Drieu la Rochelle, if we were to dig deeply enough into his reasoning.

The link between love and death does not appear in Part I, which underscores the intellectual links between dissertations on Europe and on love. It is particularly absent in Quartara, for whom love is an affirmation of vital and free sexuality. We find hints in Leo Ferrero, who knew the anguish of the demand for infinite love, when he highlights the unhealthy link between the decadence of Western civilisation and love – passion. In *Cahiers du Sud*, love is connected with non-tragic death, resembling sleep, as well as to the abandonment of the male within the female, as in Joë Bousquet, for whom love is a cosmic force that alleviates pain and relates it to transcendence. In the case of Weil, death is in the background, in the massacre of the Albigensian civilisation, where the fusion between civilisation and love had reached one of its greatest heights. Rougemont unravels the knot between love and death: there is a love

that is indissolubly joined to death, a love whose aim is fusion and which threatens to eradicate individuality. The love associated with life respects distances and differences: between God and human beings, between woman and man, between public and private. Rougemont believed death to be disease and the extreme outcome of love–fusion, a paroxysmal exaltation of religious origin, as in deviant mysticism or Nazism. Within this framework the confusion between public and private corresponds to the fusion that sees death as the only outcome of a loving relationship.

The *Dybbuk* also shows us the risk of fusion, although it exalts death as freedom from an oppressive community and emancipation from an insuperable divide between male and female. We are in the realm of a painful utopia, which separates the public and private spheres by establishing a relationship between the latter and transcendence. The sixth case study takes us back to historical experience: Giorgina Levi and Heinz Arian are forced to combine public and private more than they would have wished in order to escape Europe and death. Their experience of exile was to contribute to this union, but in general both retain their individuality within their relationship, despite the forms of osmosis described above.

The actuality of the link between Europe and love operates on different levels. An awareness of this link may be useful to keep alive an idea of a Europe vaster than the European Union. Nowadays we cannot pretend not to be in Europe and neither can we claim to reject our heritage. We can no longer share the type of Europeanism that existed in the past, Eurocentric and male-centred; we must find new forms of Europeanness that allow the full respect of differences. This means we cannot avoid passing through a critique of Europe's cultural legacy, within which the attitude to love is a central element. While it is important to break away from Eurocentricism in order to establish relationships with other peoples and cultures that contain an element of loving emotion, it is essential to recognise the limits not only of Europeanness but also love itself in its historical forms. This thought runs through the letters written by Jews imprisoned in concentration camps in France between 1941 and 1944, who were often deported and killed in Auschwitz (Sabbagh 2002). Many of these letters, some exchanged between married and engaged couples, are full of love, but they do not succeed in expressing that love, except in their obsessive need to alleviate their physical misery with their despatches and in their pitiful reassurances that they were surviving quite well. A few salutations such as 'adorée', 'mon tout', 'mon amour', punctuate the letters, paltry scraps of loving words

suffocated by the atrocity of events. Even love can succumb to extreme violence, but sometimes it is able to project a message of union – not of fusion – beyond the violence, which allows people to endure the current oppression and look forward to other realities both in public and in private.

Notes

1. For a criticism of the term 'Europe', considered as 'a stable, unchanging referent', see J. Boyarin, 'From Derrida to Fichte? The New Europe, the Same Europe, and the Place of the Jews', in Boyarin (1996: 109–39).
2. On the process of European deterritorialisation due to migrations, see Passerini et al. (2007b).
3. This journal was against democracy, communism, Malthusianism – in short, all 'decrepit parliamentarian and internationalist European civilisation'.
4. See also J. Labanyi, '(Un)requited Conquests: Love and Empire in the Work of Ernesto Giménez Caballero and Salvador de Madariaga', forthcoming.
5. I am thinking of stories such as 'Il Mare' (in which 'the resentments between men and women of different race' are discussed at length) or 'Stranieri', in which a relationship between a young Italian and a German widow does not improve the opposition between both cultures but exacerbates it. See Alvaro (1994: 45, 247). Or stories about unions that came about during the migrations to America, such as 'La Donna di Boston', and 'Il Marito', which express the lack of communication between cultures within couples (ibid.: 198–204, 205–10).
6. An awareness that is similar in certain respects also crops up in other essayists of the period, who do not, however, discuss the same themes. Gaston Riou, for example, suggests a link between the West, Provençal love and Christianity, central to *La Naissance de l'Amour* (1927), and defines 'white civilisation as not only a technique but a mystique', that of the human person, in *Europe, ma Patrie* (1928: 289), but does not develop the connection between private love and the public sphere. Other important writings on love, such as that of Emmanuel Berl, above all *Le Bourgeois et l'Amour* (1931) and *Recherches sur la Nature de l'Amour* (1932), leave the theme of Europe in the background, even though the first is a rough caricature of the sentimental conformism typical of Western, but above all European, middleclasses, incapable of considering women as people or of taking love seriously.
7. I refer not only to some of the main works of Drieu la Rochelle, such as *L'Europe contre les Patries* (1931) and *Gilles* (1939), but also to minor and partly unpublished works. The quotations are taken from Drieu la Rochelle (1939: 672–75, 687).
8. I have taken this expression from M. Giovana's book *Tempo d'Europa* (1952), which considers the Resistance a European phenomenon since it was triggered by the general crisis in the continent and inspired by principles that exceeded national boundaries.
9. See Veil (1984) and Pinto (2004) respectively.