

Article published in:

Björn Siegel, Mirjam Thulin, Tim Corbett (Eds.)

Intersections between Jewish Studies and Habsburg Studies)

PaRDeS : Journal of the Association for Jewish Studies in Germany, Vol. 29

2024 – 202 pages

ISBN 978-3-86956-552-1

DOI <https://doi.org/10.25932/publishup-62207>



Suggested citation:

Hava Tirosh-Samuelsan: Andrea Dara Cooper, *Gendering Modern Jewish Thought* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2021), 270 pp. PaRDeS 29 (2023), S. 185–187.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.25932/publishup-65128>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0

This does not apply to quoted content from other authors. To view a copy of this license visit:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode.de>

graduate students and scholars interested in Chinese Jewish Studies and Sino-Jewish interactions.

Cheuk Him Ryan Sun, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Andrea Dara Cooper, *Gendering Modern Jewish Thought* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2021), 270 pp., \$34 (paperback).

The scope of the book is much narrower than the title promises. Focusing on Franz Rosenzweig (d. 1929) and Emmanuel Levinas (d. 1993), with some discussion of Jacques Derrida and Hannah Arendt, Cooper argues that modern Jewish philosophers can be properly understood only if we attend to the “organizing metaphors of kinship: erotic love, marriage, brotherhood, paternity, and maternity” (p. 7). Kinship language, however, is neither innocent nor neutral, but one that is based on exclusion and that brings about further exclusion and marginalization. This is most evident in the case of “brotherhood,” a trope that functioned as a “regulative theological and philosophical ideal for modern Jewish thought” (p. 8). “Brotherhood” is problematic because it can efface gender, support patriarchy, prioritize procreation, privilege fraternal relations, endorse “troubling gender dynamics,” (p. 10) or take embodiment to be “merely a metaphor” (p. 11). Reading for gender, as Susan Shapiro named the practice, Cooper analyzes how gendered metaphors frame the philosophy of these two influential thinkers. She argues that only if we undertake this interpretative labor, can we “see how they [i.e., Jewish philosophers] provide valuable models for intersubjective ethics, reciprocity, embodiment, and positionality” (p. 11). The mission of the book is thus twofold: to expose the limitations of Jewish philosophy from a feminist perspective and to make (problematic) Jewish philosophy usable for Jewish feminists. Reading philosophical text through the lens of feminist theory, Cooper highlights the “positionality” of Rosenzweig and Levinas as Jewish males who did not transcend the social and cultural conventions of the Jewish tradition. The purpose of the analysis is to “reveal and disrupt relations of power in these texts,” but without “reproducing the exclusionary logic within foundational works that make uncritical use of gendered terms” (p. 12). This is not a particularly novel strategy, but it is skillfully executed.

The book consists of five chapters and an epilogue: Chapter 1 and 4 focus on Rosenzweig; chapters 2 and 5 focus on Levinas, and Chapter 3 brings

Rosenzweig and Levinas in conversation with Derrida and Arendt. In the epilogue Cooper discusses her own positionality and how she got interested in Jewish philosophy, even though her initial training was in literature. Throughout the study, Cooper analyzes Jewish philosophers in conversation with Western philosophers, especially Plato and Hegel, and she is primarily concerned about reading Jewish texts from the perspective of feminist scholarship. Written as a discourse analysis, the novelty of the book lies in the intersection of feminist and gender studies, religious studies, Jewish studies, biblical studies, philosophy, and literature. Cooper's literary approach makes Jewish philosophy a distinctly humanistic discipline.

Chapter 1 focuses on "Rosenzweig's antiquated gender constructions" and their "harmful application" (p. 104), exposing Rosenzweig's "essentialist" position. Echoing Elliot Wolfson, her doctoral advisor, Cooper claims that according to Rosenzweig, "while a woman can *act* as lover, she can become active only if she is gendered masculine. If she is to remain feminine, she will inescapably be drawn back by her sexuality to her natural position as the passive beloved" (p. 104). Focusing on Levinas, Chapter 2 shows that his gendered analysis of the ethical is "theoretically flexible," yet based on "practically rigid gender roles" because "the feminine allows the masculine subject's access to the ethical, without participating in this relation as the subject reaches toward the future in fecundity" (p. 104). In the case of both philosophers, "the feminine is subordinated to the masculine, the female beloved to the male lover, the mother to the father, and the daughter to the son" (p. 104).

In Chapter 3, Cooper engages Rosenzweig and Levinas in conversation with Derrida and Arendt's reflections on friendship and concludes that "Rosenzweig and Levinas's thought is explicitly marked as male and Jewish, forcing the reader to confront the usually invisible assumption underlying Western thought that attempt to implicitly shore up a masculine and Christian norm" (p. 119). In Chapter 4, Cooper returns to the filial model and examines "scandalous relations," namely brother-sister relations and the love affair between Rosenzweig and Margarit (Gritly), the wife of his best friend, Eugen Rosenstock-Hussey. The chapter uncovers "the struggle between erotic love and family obligation" and shows how "this tension informs Rosenzweig's philosophical/biographical regulation of kinship and bloodlines" (p. 153). Chapter 5 returns to Levinas' gender economy where Cooper finds a path toward a viable future for Jewish philosophy. She contends that "a gendered reading

of modern Jewish philosophers can expose their limitations in a way that simultaneously makes their approaches available as we seek a way forward” (p. 169.). Not surprisingly, Cooper concludes that “modern Jewish thought [...] has been a largely masculine discursive space, and [...] foundational texts that rely on fraternal logic are always built on androcentric frameworks” (p. 217). While the trope of brotherhood “*appears* universal,” (p. 217) its power is based on the exclusivity of family and the peculiar dynamics within family members (i.e. parents, siblings, and lovers). Cooper’s critical “intervention” is to expose the exclusionary logic of seemingly inclusive language.

In the 1970s, Jewish women took active part in the women’s movement giving rise to Jewish feminism that has changed Jewish communal life and transformed the practices of Jewish studies. Cooper is not concerned about these social, political, and cultural struggles because she was born after these fights were already won. She also greatly benefits from the successful inclusion of Jewish studies into the Western academy after centuries of exclusion. Writing exclusively for other academics, Jewish and non-Jewish, Cooper’s project has a programmatic message, even though it is not stated as such. To her (mostly male) cohorts in Jewish philosophy Cooper shows that feminist scholarship is indispensable to the interpretation of Jewish philosophical texts, and, to feminist (mostly non-Jewish female) cohorts Cooper shows that Continental philosophy cannot be fully understood without the analysis of Jewish philosophy. Will Cooper’s feminist critique of Rosenzweig and Levinas make their philosophy relevant to feminists and gender theorists? Will (male) Jewish philosophers become interested in feminist philosophy? Only time will tell, but Cooper at least paves the way for this future development.

Hava Tirosh-Samuelson, Tempe, AZ, USA

Jaclyn Granick, *International Jewish Humanitarianism in the Age of the Great War* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 418 pp., \$39.99.

World War I was central to the development of modern humanitarianism. The unprecedented devastation and destruction of civilian life required a new kind of response that was filled by private and government-run organizations, many of which still remain in existence today. Jaclyn Granick has written an important institutional history focused on the little-studied role of