The fame of the German-Jewish painter Max Liebermann (1847–1935) was such that the answer to the question “Where does the painter Liebermann live?” was well known to Berliners: “When you come into Berlin, immediately go left!”¹ Liebermann’s home on the Pariser Platz, next to the Brandenburg Gate, fig. 1 was located in the heart of the city. Diagonally across the square was the Prussian Academy of Arts, where Liebermann served as president from 1920 to 1932. The Pariser Platz was also where the Nazis marched soon after they had gained power in 1933, parades that the artist could have seen through his windows. Liebermann’s home thus stood for his integration into German society at one point in time and his expulsion from it at another.

In an often-cited letter of February 28, 1934, to Breslau businessman and art collector Carl Sachs, Liebermann lamented his life-long striving for Jewish equality in German society. “We have unfortunately, unfortunately,” the eighty-six-year-old artist wrote, “been awoken from the beautiful dream of assimilation.”² Gershom Scholem later suggested that for assimilated German Jews, “the unending Jewish demand for a home was soon transformed into the ecstatic illusion of being at home.”³ In this paper, I employ Liebermann’s Berlin house as a central motif in a discussion of his sense of belonging. Feeling at home for Liebermann, however, involved not only a physical place, but also a socio-cultural position, language, and, especially in his later years, memories of youth.

In the early twentieth century, Liebermann held a prominent if controversial place as the leading German impressionist painter. In the reception of his work, nation and race figured significantly in claims made by his detractors and champions. From the first decade of the century, he also started to focus more of his attention on self-portraiture. Often set in the studio Liebermann had built on top of his Berlin home, these self-portraits engage in a dialogue of proximity and distance, which are at the crux of his sense of being at home, at the heart of his position as modernist painter and assimilated German Jew.

The concept of assimilation in the German-Jewish context is often understood as what the Jews were to give in return for emancipation or equality, which was granted to Jews by many German states in the nineteenth century before unification and then by the German nation in 1871.⁴ Assimilation could take on a variety of different forms from acculturation (integration into German society while keeping one’s Jewish identity) to amalgamation (merger via intermarriage, conversion and name change).⁵ Many assimilated Jews

¹. Walter Püschel, ed., Immer diskret!: Anekdoten über Max Liebermann (Berlin: Eulenspiegel Verlag, 1986), 54: “Nachdem Max Liebermann berühmt geworden war, hatte der Berliner Volksmund auf die Frage, wo der Maler Liebermann wohne, die Antwort parat: ‘Wenn man man nach
were the guardians of the great German traditions: interpreters of Goethe, Kantian philosophers, Dürer scholars. Liebermann, who often cited Goethe and Kant in his writings, understood assimilation, until his final years, in a positive light, as integration into German society through education, refinement, and self-formation (Bildung). Like other Jewish liberals, Liebermann wanted, in David Sorkin’s terms, “a Deutschtum that would get them political equality and social acceptance alongside a Judentum that would preserve their collective identity.”

For others, like Gershom Scholem, assimilation, a “turning toward the Germans,” was more significantly a “process of estrangement” from Jewish roots.

More recent treatments of these issues, sometimes called “post-assimilationist,” follow other “post” theories in trying to move away from structuralist binaries, which assume a homogeneity and purity of category (the German and the Jew). A post-assimilationist approach treats the issue of assimilation through a more subtle reading of subjectivity that emphasizes the complexity of everyday practices and personal experiences. The efforts of historians, like Marion Kaplan, to understand the great range of ways in which Jews performed identities and preserved practices in Imperial Germany in personal terms (as “private decisions”), have had a strong impact on the understanding of German-Jewish assimilation. Concluding from her research into specific cases, Kaplan explains that, for German Jews in Imperial Germany, Judaism was “the myriad private and public ways in which one connected to tradition, family, and community.” Because of the very public nature of his life in Imperial and Weimar Germany, Liebermann has often been enlisted by scholars as the representative of Jewish assimilation into German cultural life. He has been equated, in Peter Paret’s words, with the “triumph and disaster of assimilation.” Rather than treat Liebermann as the representative of a group, this essay will explore the complexity of Lieberman’s individual experience of belonging in order to suggest that his sense of home, even before 1933, was never resolved; it was always familiar and strange, present and distant, real and imagined.
In 1932, Liebermann narrated the story of his youth for a radio program for children, which was recorded in his Berlin home. “What one experiences as a child,” we hear him tell his young listeners, “one does not so easily forget.” In the program, he reflects on his childhood home: “When I was ten or eleven years old, my parents moved into the house on the Pariser Platz, that is, next to the Brandenburg Gate…There they lived until they died. And where since 1893 I have lived again. And it is from where in this moment I am telling the story of my youth.”¹¹ The Liebermann house next to the Brandenburg gate was, on the one hand, the material home in which Liebermann was raised and to which he returned at age 47, and, on the other, a representation of the affluence and social position of this wealthy Jewish family.¹² Liebermann’s narration also suggests how the notion of being at home relates as much to time as to place. Home is as inextricably connected to memory as it is to physical location.

Like his house in the heart of Berlin, Liebermann’s spoken language played a significant role in his self-fashioning. Home and language are, of course, intimately connected, for it is in the home where language is shaped and grounded. In the radio recording, we hear Liebermann’s Berlin accent, which was often commented upon by his contemporaries, as were his witty remarks. Historian Peter Gay, whose own formation took place in Berlin’s German-Jewish world, remarked that Jews often prized verbal culture to gratify both their “traditional yearning for excellence in the world of words” and their “more recent, but no less exigent, love for the country of Goethe and Schiller.”¹³ This was certainly the case for Liebermann as evidenced not only by his many carefully crafted essays, but also by an episode that occurred in 1908. Poet and writer Richard Dehmel published a dialogue “Culture and Race,” which featured a German poet and a Jewish painter, who were modelled on Dehmel himself and his friend Max Liebermann. In the dialogue, the poet argues that art is a universal language, while the painter sees it as intimately connected to race. “Something like that,” the painter says of one of his own works, “can be made only by someone who is Jewish.”¹⁴ As Chana Schütz points out, Liebermann’s attitude toward his Jewishness “was more complex and ambivalent” than Dehmel’s dialogue suggests.¹⁵ Liebermann was, however, certainly concerned with how the fictional painter used language. In a letter to Dehmel, Liebermann wrote:

Let me use Berlin expressions, as much as you like, but neither incorrect German nor Jewish German. Since I’m a dyed-in-the-wool Jew, Jewish words in the German language make me angry; at most I may allow nebbish and meshugge because there are no German words for them.¹⁶

Liebermann certainly tried to keep his Germanness and his Jewishness comfortably separate in a world in which they were often mixed, a world in which language and accent signified social status and heritage. Such relations between language and personal identity are clarified (if also simplified) in Israel Joshua Singer’s 1943 novel The Family Carnovsky, which chronicles the failure of Jewish assimilation into German society through several generations of a Jewish family. David Carnovsky, to whom German “signified light, culture, Moses Mendelssohn, and the highest form of Jewishness,” quickly learned German and spoke it fluently soon after he and his wife Leah moved to Berlin from Melnitz, a small town in Poland. Even when making love, when
“Carnovsky forgot wisdom and respectability,” the one thing “he did not forget was his German.” Leah, however, “did not speak a good German. She made errors and interjected expressions from Melnitz and caused her husband great embarrassment.”

Throughout his lifetime, Liebermann was, to a great degree, able to keep his Germanness and his Jewishness separate. He called himself an “inveterate Jew…who otherwise felt like a German.”

As suggested by David Carnovsky’s advice to his son, “Be a Jew in the house and a man in the street,” the home often acted for assimilated Jews as a sphere separate from the public, where identities could be shifted. What is of most importance, for the historical Liebermann and the fictional Carnovsky, is the very idea of separation, that is, the ability to compartmentalize aspects of one’s identity. Liebermann, unlike some assimilated Jews of a younger generation, as we shall see below, could articulate such a separation, because his sense of self was only infrequently contradicted by his experiences. He flourished as a Jew and a German in Berlin society. In the early 1870s, when he was only in his twenties, he was selling his paintings for high prices. In 1881, at the age of thirty-four, he won an honourable mention at the Paris Salon. From 1899 to 1911 he was president, and the leading force, of the Berlin Secession. And later, from 1920 to 1932, he served as the president of the Prussian Academy of the Arts.

Liebermann was certainly not blind to German anti-Semitism. How could he have been when many times in his life he was called out as a Jew? In 1880 in the Bavarian parliament, the representative of the Catholic Centre Party objected to his painting Twelve-Year-Old Jesus in the Temple not due to the quality of the work or its modernism, but simply due to the fact of a Jew painting Jesus as a Jew. He was attacked with anti-Semitic slurs due to his involvement in the French Centennial exhibition of 1889 and the 1904 World’s Fair in St. Louis.

In 1913, anti-Semitic publicist Philipp Stauff, referring to Liebermann and others, wrote of the “Jewish enemy within” the modern and cosmopolitan German art scene.

These anti-Semitic episodes, however, did not injure Liebermann’s sense of feeling at home, or at least Liebermann did not want to show such injury in his public utterances. In a short autobiographical statement of 1889, which mostly outlines his artistic achievements, he acknowledged his position as outsider but refused to give up his belief in classical liberalism: “Even though unfortunately I have often been reminded of the opposing [point of view], I believe that every citizen is equal before the law, as is stated in the constitution.” In a second autobiographical sketch of 1910, he similarly addressed and, at the same time, dismissed anti-Semitic concerns. Liebermann’s Greek teacher at school, German nationalist and anti-Semite Paul De Lagarde, singled out the painter’s Semitic background: “he observed that due to the cut of my eyebrows I was descended from the Assyrian kings.” But, in the same sentence, Liebermann denied the importance of such labels: “I only know that my grandfather and father were textile factory owners in Berlin.” He then goes on to describe his “bourgeois” lifestyle as indicated by “the house of my parents, where I spent my childhood, and it would be very difficult for me to live anywhere else.”

Liebermann’s established, bourgeois Berlin life is well illustrated in The Artist’s Atelier, a depiction of his studio, which he added to his Berlin
home next to the Brandenburg Gate. Liebermann’s atelier was not constructed without controversy. Designed by architect Hans Grisebach in 1894, the atelier, which extended through the roof of the house, was only completed in 1898 after legal challenges and modifications. The glass and steel design of the addition (described by the Emperor Wilhelm II as “hideous”) was considered by some local officials an insult to the Neoclassicism of the Pariser Platz. The atelier was a multi-purpose space. It acted as the room where Liebermann greeted guests, where he hung important works from his collection of paintings, where many celebrated Berliners sat for their portraits, and where his daughter Käthe hosted parties for prominent young Berliners. Liebermann’s atelier was thus more than his workspace. It was also a sign of his assimilated daily life and of the central place he and his family held in Berlin social and artistic circles.

In The Artist’s Atelier, the modernity of the arched windows and the contemporary art on the wall (Manet and Liebermann’s) contrasts with the bourgeois furnishings. The colourful carpet, the lounging women (Liebermann’s wife Martha and their daughter Käthe) on the comfortable sofa, and the sleeping dachshund on the chair are all signs of the painter and his family’s middle-class lifestyle. Liebermann, whose image appears in the background in a mirror reflection, depicts himself at home in and detached from this world of affluence, a comfortable and private space where the women are at leisure to read and Liebermann to work. The painting thus shows his imagined ideal representation of home. At the same time, its visible, impressionist brushwork and the depiction of his working utensils on the table in the foreground stake a claim to a painterly style, one that goes back to Velázquez. Indeed, Las Meninas was likely the model for the painting: the back of the canvas on the left, the depiction of an artist at work, the light streaming in from the right, the paintings on the walls (including Liebermann’s copy after Velázquez’s Portrait of the Duke of Lerma).
of Innocent X), and the mirror reflection (Liebermann’s self-portrait) make for a strong comparison with Velázquez’s work. In this painting, his home and his impressionist style come together in terms of a sense of belonging, both to Berlin society and to a painterly tradition. At the same time, his reflected image suggests he sees himself, to a certain degree, somewhat apart, as an active observer of this world.

Liebermann’s beliefs in classical liberalism and in Jewish assimilation in Berlin society held firm throughout the 1920s. Such ideals are evident in his portraits of some 150 sitters, most of whom came from the cultured and upper middle classes, and many of whom sat for their portraits in the atelier in his Berlin home. | fig. 3 | After World War I, prominent Jews became a large part of his clientele. They likely went to him, because he held an important place in German society and did not deny his Judaism. What is clear in these portraits is that Liebermann depicts his Jewish sitters no differently than his non-Jewish clients. Formulaic as they often are, his portraits rarely specify in any way the sitter’s location, profession, or religion. Status is only indicated through dress and pose, and, as importantly, through the style and signature of Germany’s most famous painter.

Liebermann’s self-portraits, however, are of a very different nature. He often depicts himself in his profession as painter and in a particular location, the roof-top studio in his Pariser Platz home. | fig. 4 | There was an exponential increase in the number of self-portraits Liebermann executed beginning in the first decade of the twentieth century. Before 1902, he painted two self-portraits; in 1902, two more; and from 1908 (from age 61) until his death, an incredible sixty-eight, usually at least one per year and sometimes three to five. Liebermann’s frequent turn to his own image in later life is certainly overdetermined. His self-portraits could be read as an aging artist’s engagement with his own mortality, as signs of his social status in Berlin society, or as declarations of his continued presence in an art world in which he was no longer at the cutting edge. I would, however, like to read them in terms of his comfort and discomfort of feeling at home, that is, as reflections on the challenges he faced as an individual with discrete identities—Jew, German, and realist painter—especially after the turn of the twentieth century when his critical reception often centred on his membership in a group.

Liebermann’s increased attention to his own image began in the first decade of the century when he was, as Liebermann scholar Marion Deshmukh rightly claims, “at the height of his fame and cultural prominence.” His distinction as an artist is evidenced by the fact that in 1902 the Uffizi requested a contribution from him to its celebrated collection of artists’ self-portraits, a commission that seems to have spurred Liebermann on to engage more and more with his own image. He was also recognized as a leading contemporary artist by the selection of twenty of his paintings for the 1906 Jahrhundertausstellung deutscher Kunst (Centennial Exhibition of German Art), an important exhibition, held at the National Gallery in Berlin. The exhibition’s significance, as Angelika Wesenberg explains, lay in how it made impressionism “visible as the final word” in the development of nineteenth-century art.

The modernist narrative promoted by the exhibition organizers, including Hugo von Tschudi and Alfred Lichtwark, did not, however, go unchallenged

in the first decade of the century, and Liebermann played an important role in these disputes, which consistently had nation and race at their core. The debate surrounding Julius Meier-Graefe’s 1905 Der Fall Böcklin (The Case of Böcklin) “divided a nation,” as Thomas Gaethgens put it, between modernists and traditionalists. In a reply to Meier-Graefe’s critique of Böcklin’s classically inspired landscapes as lacking tonal relationships and formal unity, art historian Henry Thode maintained Böcklin’s importance on the basis that he worked from imagination and memory like all great German artists. He also belittled Liebermann and the impressionists, who merely paint “what is fleeting in the appearance of light” and take “that for a work of art.” Using the trope of the wandering Jew, he suggested that Liebermann could feel equally at home in Holland or in France. “There is nothing,” Thode claimed, “decidedly German in him.” In a strongly worded reply, Liebermann took issue with Thode’s claim that impressionism was put on display “by a small circle of Berliners out of business considerations” and accused him of using “the rusted weapons taken from the armory of the anti-Semites.” Just as importantly, he argued against Thode’s narrow definition of German art as only that which is imaginative and spiritual in nature.

Thode’s and Liebermann’s positions were described by a contemporary writer as merely different sensibilities, but Liebermann’s essay suggests that he took these attacks personally. The restrictions Thode imposed on Germanness excluded Liebermann and his art from the nation in which he was born. Liebermann’s champions were concurrently arguing for an expansion of German national values beyond the vague nineteenth-century notion of spirituality or inwardness. In a 1906 essay on Liebermann, Wilhelm von Bode, General Director of the Prussian collections in Berlin, pointed out that contemporary art is no longer national, but transnational. With impressionism’s arrival in Germany, “no reasonable person,” Bode claimed, can call Liebermann “a stranger among German artists.” His paintings have an “intimacy of feeling, which is German in the best sense.”

While Liebermann’s champions argued for a reading of his painting in German terms, others saw it as explicitly Jewish. Liebermann’s realism, which “emanates from purely sensual conditions,” according to anti-Semitic medievalist Josef Strzygowski’s 1907 study of modern art, “lies in race.” A year earlier, he had stated that “Modern Jewish art, with Liebermann at the head,” is “absolutely national” in its development of “this racial characteristic [the Jewish imitation of reality],” and that the Zionist movement should recognize this fact. Indeed, some Zionists had already done just that. In 1903, Martin Buber edited a volume Juedische Kunstler (Jewish Artists) with the stated goal “to show what artistic skills there are in Judaism today.” In a chapter on Liebermann, Georg Hermann distinguished the artist from his German counterparts by his realism, that is, by having, like other Jewish artists, “an intimate, almost
fervent love of nature, a sensitive sense of nature, and, above all, an extraordinary natural freshness.”

The link between Liebermann’s realism and Judaism was also emphasized by modernist art historian Julius Meier-Graefe in a remarkable passage in the second edition (1915) of his history of modern art. Liebermann’s Judaism “has always only helped him,” he wrote. “The Jew is a realist out of self-defence... Take what you have in front of you. Do it alone. You know what you are worth.... [The Jew] is a brilliant organizer of himself, who always sees the world from where he stands.” Meier-Graefe, who may have been thinking as much of his own social and cultural position as Liebermann’s, uses a somewhat clichéd representation of Jewish restlessness and cleverness to characterize the painter.

The problem for Jewish artists, Meier-Graefe concludes, is that realism is no longer a Jewish doctrine, but has become a “world idea.” As such, “it becomes a curse and destroys even the advantage for the Jews. The ‘Judaization’ becomes just as pernicious to the people, who were originally collaborators with the Jews, as to the Jew himself. With Judaization, racial mixing is, of course, not understood.”

Meier-Graefe’s recognition of the problem, or even the impossibility, of assimilation occurred when, as Peter Paret claims, “a new anti-Semitism openly based on race” was on the rise. At this time, some assimilated Jews were feeling more and more isolated from German society. In 1912, literary scholar and Germanist Moritz Goldstein famously called for a Jewish disengagement from German culture. He referred to important recent artistic contributions by Jews, including Liebermann’s modernist painting: “We may call this German; others call it Jewish ... If they have to acknowledge the achievement, they do so with reservations, and they wish we achieved less.”

Novelist Jakob Wassermann similarly faced challenges in coming to terms with German assimilation. Like Liebermann, Wassermann considered himself German: his mother tongue was German; he attended a German school; and the domestic arrangements of his parents’ home “approached those of our non-Jewish neighbors.” He nevertheless writes of the liminal space he found himself in when he decided for “secession” from the Jews. The Germans’ “neither received nor accepted me ... Herewith the oppressive weight of my problem began to make itself felt.” Liebermann had experienced progress in the legal and social status of Jews in German society from the mid nineteenth century to emancipation in 1871, from being on the margins to the possibility of being in the social centre. Wassermann and Goldstein were also told that Jews had the same rights of all citizens; they were equal before the law. But their social experience instructed them otherwise. In Singer’s The Family Carnovsky, Jewish scholar Reb Ephraim tells David Carnovsky that “German Jews wanted to be Jews in the house and gentiles in the street but life turned this ambition completely topsy-turvy. The fact is that we have become gentiles in the house and Jews in the street.”

Because of his status as representative of Jewish assimilation, Liebermann has been presented by some scholars as naïve, as unwilling to see the world as it was, blinded by a “reverence for Bildung” and by his “uncritical...bourgeois ideology,” which kept art and politics separate. Evidence often cited for Liebermann’s uncritical stance is an episode in 1927 when a National Socialist
paper called it a scandal that a Jew should paint a portrait of German President Paul von Hindenburg. | fig. 5 | Liebermann replied: “After all, I am only a painter, and a Jew can surely be that, too.” 57 Like the radical right, the socialist left took issue with this painting. A photograph similar to figure five, of Liebermann with his Hindenburg portrait in his Pariser Platz studio, was reproduced on the back of the jacket cover designed by Dadaist John Heartfield for Der Goldene Kette, the German translation of Upton Sinclair’s Mammonart, published in 1928 by the leftist Malik press. 58 For those with socialist or communist leanings, it was easy to see Liebermann’s painting as taking, in Sinclair’s words, “the path to honor and success…through the service and glorification of the ruling classes.” 59 German-Jewish painter Felix Nussbaum’s 1931 The Mad Square | fig. 6 | similarly portrays Liebermann as a member of the ruling cultural class without a care for the crumbling conditions of the present day. In the painting, the academic establishment parades into the Prussian Academy of Art past a younger generation of artists, including Nussbaum, who stand outside with their paintings, which have been rejected for the annual exhibition. In the background, Liebermann, who was president of the Academy at the time, paints on the roof of his Pariser Platz home (as if in his studio). Again, Liebermann’s house becomes a public symbol of his social and political position. But here, it is in ruins. “Zeus-Liebermann,” as Max Osborne called him in a contemporary review of Nussbaum’s painting, has his back turned to the crowd, oblivious to the fact that his world of classical liberalism was falling to pieces around him. 60 Importantly, Nussbaum portrays Liebermann in the act of painting a self-portrait, a sign for Nussbaum of Liebermann’s self-absorption and distance from the political realities of his day. Liebermann’s preoccupation with self-portraiture from the first decade of the twentieth century, when the Jewish Question was becoming more and more heated, may suggest, as Nussbaum’s painting implies, a disengagement of his art from politics. But involvement and disengagement are not necessarily mutually exclusive. And Liebermann’s fixation on his self-image may also suggest his struggles with belonging and estrangement, that is, his comfort in and detachment from a sense of home. His approach to self-portraiture certainly involved proximity and distance. We know from photographs of him in his studio in his Berlin house, | fig. 7 | the setting for many of his self-portraits, and from Erich Hancke’s 1914 biography, that Liebermann always used a mirror and sometimes two when painting his reflection or his double-reflection. 61 Liebermann’s act of painting a self-portrait, looking back and forth between his image in the mirror and on the canvas, confirms one of his theoretical maxims:

We do not paint nature as it is, but as it appears to us, that is, we paint from memory. The painter cannot portray the model but can only use it; it can support his memory, like the prompter supports the actor. 62

In the self-portraits, the mirror image acts as the support and establishes a distance between Liebermann as painter and model, two roles he negotiates in his creative process and in the painted product.

Liebermann was not the only turn-of-the-century thinker to question a naïve understanding of realist painting as capturing “nature as it is.” In his Philosophy of Money (1900), Georg Simmel states that realist painting may attempt to
Figure 5. Max Liebermann in his Atelier at Pariser Platz 6 with his portrait of Paul von Hindenburg, ca. 1927. Digital Picture Archives of the German Federal Archives, picture no. 146-1988-100-20.

Figure 6 (above). Felix Nussbaum, The Mad Square, 1931. Oil on canvas, 97 × 195.5 cm. Berlinische Galerie, Berlin. Inv. Bg-M 8/75. Photo Credit: bpk Bildagentur/Berlinische Galerie/Art Resource, N.Y.

Figure 7. Max Liebermann with a Self-Portrait in his Pariser Platz Studio, Berlin, ca. 1930. Photo: Fritz Eschen. Photo Credit: bpk Bildagentur/Art Resource, N.Y.
overcome “the distance between us and reality,” but in the end it “conforms to this basic principle of all art: to bring us closer to things by placing them at a distance from us.”

Simmel would later describe in similar terms how the stranger, exemplified by the Jew, approaches the world through “a particular structure composed of distance and nearness, indifference and involvement.” The problem for the stranger’s integration into society, Simmel believed, was that “strangers are not really perceived as individuals, but as strangers of a certain type.” Wilhelm Bode may have written in 1907 that “no reasonable person” can call Liebermann “a stranger among German artists,” but it seems difficult to reconcile this position with Liebermann’s critical reception from the turn of the twentieth century, which consistently claimed him as German or non-German or Jew, that is, as a type rather than an individual. Liebermann’s turn to self-portraiture at this time can be interpreted in this context as a repeated claim to his individuality, represented through a process of close looking and stepping back.

Liebermann’s self-portraits were often read by his contemporaries not in terms of the depth of self-examination expected in the genre and often associated with Rembrandt’s self-portraits, but in terms of Liebermann’s reputation as a realist painter. Walter J. Friedlaender wrote that his self-portraits do not have the “unsettling and driving tension” of portraiture, and Karl Scheffler thought they “were better pictures than portraits, because he is a better painter than psychologist.” Liebermann’s self-portraits, however, involved not only his observing himself, but also his being observed, a fundamental aspect of his very public identity. Liebermann’s image, “a public head” as it has been recently called, was easily recognizable, like his well-known home next to the Brandenburg Gate. Published photographs and caricatures of him were in frequent circulation. His self-portraits thus added to his public persona.


Most of Liebermann’s self-portraits were either commissioned by museums or purchased by museums or private collectors soon after completion. For their provenance, see Eberle, Max Liebermann.

In most of Liebermann’s self-portraits, however, he is depicted observing himself in a mirror. He is attempting to see himself from a distance as another. These paintings, more painterly in style and more self-probing in their gaze, reveal a meditative and pensive older artist. The ease that one senses in the Hamburg self-portrait has given way to a more critical self-analysis. In these self-portraits, where the private and public meet, where introspection and self-presentation intersect, Liebermann could meditate on questions so relevant to his sense of self and feeling at home: How can I maintain my individuality in a world in which I am constantly defined by types? How can I be a German artist when I paint in an ostensibly French painterly tradition? How can I be a Jew when I work in a world of visual representation that was for so long denied by Jewish tradition? Liebermann’s many self-portraits from
age sixty onwards, his repetitive and obsessive act of looking at himself, suggest what was both close and far, familiar and strange in his position as German-Jewish painter.

After 1933, it was no longer possible for Liebermann to question or reflect on his place in German society in the same way. He resigned from the Prussian Academy of Arts, because, as he stated, “my point of view is no longer valid.”\(^71\) And, as we have seen, he renounced his “dream of assimilation.” That Liebermann could go from feeling at home to feeling not at home reminds us that the concept of home is as imagined as it is material. And, as importantly, it has temporal and memorial components. Home can be something different in one’s youth than in one’s adulthood, under a democracy and under a dictatorship, in present experience and remembered. In other words, home is constructed by the individual and the society at large. For Liebermann, changes to the latter resulted in a feeling of loss, a sense that something he had cherished was being taken away. But Liebermann’s sense of belonging was, perhaps, always tenuous. That he described his assimilated life as a dream suggests that he recognized the elusive quality of home. Jacob Wassermann, in his *Life as German and Jew*, similarly found it difficult to describe the phenomenon: “One’s knowledge of home is hard to formulate in words. Undeniably it resembles one’s knowledge of one’s mother. One absorbs it not only through the senses and the atmosphere, but in a mystical and metaphysical manner also.”\(^72\)

Home as one’s mother, that is, a place of comfort, a house one never leaves (fig. 1). Home as a memory of one’s youth. Home as a dream or a representation of a place one has constructed (fig. 2). Home as one’s body (figs. 4 and 8–10). Liebermann’s life and work as a German Jew makes us reflect on these varied and ambivalent understandings of home. ¶

---

\(^{71}\) Liebermann, *Max Liebermann: German Painter and Berlin Jew*, 238.

\(^{72}\) Wassermann, *My Life as German and Jew*, 238.